

AN INVESTIGATION OF EDUCATORS' PERCEPTIONS
OF THE INTEGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
IN SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLS

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF TECHNOLOGY

OF

DURBAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Barathwanth Biputh

June 2008

Declaration by the Candidate

I, Barathwanth Biputh, declare that this doctoral thesis on:

**An investigation of educators' perceptions of the Integrated
Quality Management System in South African schools**

is my own work and that all the sources cited or quoted have
been duly acknowledged.

SIGNATURE : _____

DATE : _____

APPROVED FOR FINAL SUBMISSION

SUPERVISOR: Dr Sioux McKenna

Ph.D., M.A., H.D.E., B.A.

SIGNATURE : _____

DATE : _____

Abstract

Educational institutions are pursuing quality improvement for various reasons. A great deal of literature on staff evaluation covering a wide spectrum of fields such as industry and commerce, including schools, has been produced and it generally identifies three main purposes of quality evaluation. Firstly, evaluation is conducted to review performance, identifying strengths and weaknesses. Secondly, it provides information about the service in order to improve the quality of the service and to demonstrate accountability. Thirdly, evaluation is aimed at encouraging personal and professional development.

This study analyses the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS), an evaluation system which was implemented in South African public schools in 2005. The IQMS is a clear reaction to the autocratic mode of evaluation that operated during the apartheid era and is a major shift from the old paradigm of external evaluators. The new paradigm calls for a joint collaboration between schools, districts and supervisory units with the overall aim of enhancing the quality of education in South Africa, in addition to addressing the inequities and injustices of the past.

Since its introduction, very little empirical research has been carried out to establish whether the IQMS model addresses that which it was intended to. This thesis evaluates the extent to which the IQMS is perceived to have enhanced individual development and ensured improvements in teaching and learning.

This study uses a discourse analysis of interviews with eleven educators from the Phoenix area of KwaZulu-Natal. Discourses are understood as ways in which language constructs versions of reality often in ways that favour the interests of the dominant forces in society. The perceptions of educators were analysed in order to identify the ways in which the IQMS is discursively constructed. These constructions are discussed in the thesis alongside the discourses constructing the IQMS in national documents.

While many discourses could be found, the three main discourses identified in this thesis are a compliance discourse, a discourse of accountability and a discourse of development. The compliance discourse constructs the IQMS as a bureaucratic activity comprising time consuming activities to be undertaken “just for the sake of it”. The discourse of accountability constructs the IQMS as a mechanism that promotes accountability to the various stakeholders in respect of quality teaching and learning. The development discourse constructs the IQMS as the continual improving of skills in order to enhance the quality of education.

This thesis ends by recommending that there is a need to separate performance evaluation from developmental appraisal so that the issues of accountability are addressed while ‘a safe space’ is created for engagement with developmental issues.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my late parents, Mr Jugdeo Biputh and Mrs Sathiwathi Biputh, who made many sacrifices to ensure that I received a decent formal education and for instilling in me the values of humility and continuous learning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Mother Saraswathie for granting me strength and perseverance for completing this research study. To the Almighty God is all the glory!

I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to Dr Sioux McKenna, the Principal Supervisor of this thesis. I deeply appreciate her support, encouragement and professionalism throughout this study. I will always be indebted to her for the knowledge she has imparted to me.

This project would not have been possible without the encouragement and many sacrifices of my wife, Neeraka and my two sons, Dhirvaan and Jashveer. I want to thank them for their unconditional love, unfailing support and understanding and for sharing the trials and tribulations researching and writing this thesis with me.

To my mother-in-law, Mrs.Janki Hariparsad, whom I consider as my mother, for constantly showing a keen interest in my progress.

A special thanks to all the educators who willingly participated in the interviews and for providing such interesting data.

Declaration by the Candidate.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Dedication and acknowledgements	v
Chapter One – Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background to the study.....	1
1.2 Rationale for the study	8
1.3 Aims of the Thesis.....	12
1.4 The research design	14
1.5 Limitations of the study	17
1.6 The current system of educator appraisal in South Africa: IQMS.....	18
1.6.1 Introduction	18
1.6.2 Legislative context	19
1.6.3 Finalisation of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS)	21
1.6.4 Developmental Appraisal System	24
1.6.4.1 Appraisal processes.....	24
1.6.4.2 Training and establishment of Staff Development Team (SDT)	25
1.6.4.3 The appraisal instrument and rating.....	27
1.6.4.4 Criteria	28
1.6.4.5 Self-evaluation by educator.....	29
1.6.4.6 Development Support Group (DSG)	29
1.6.4.7 Data collection and lesson observation.....	30
1.6.4.8 Personal Growth Plan (PGP)	32
1.6.5 Performance Measurement.....	32
1.6.6 Whole School Evaluation	33
1.7 Structure of the Thesis.....	34

Chapter Two - Literature Review	37
2.1 Introduction	37
2.2 Performance appraisal	37
2.3 Purpose of appraisal	41
2.4 Quality management in teaching versus industry	46
2.5 The benefits and limitations of appraisal	52
2.6 Models of Appraisal	55
2.6.1 The accountability model of appraisal	56
2.6.1.1 Bureaucratic Accountability Model	57
2.6.1.2 Moral Accountability Model	58
2.6.1.3 The Professional Model	58
2.6.1.4 The Consumerist Model	60
2.6.1.5 The Self-Accounting Model	61
2.6.1.6 The Partnership Model	62
2.6.2 The Staff Development Model	64
2.6.3 The Accountability versus the Staff Development Model	68
2.7 The Appraisal Process	72
2.7.1 The initial meeting	72
2.7.2 The self-appraisal	73
2.7.3 Classroom observation and data collection	75
2.7.4 Appraisal discussion and target setting	77
2.8 Educator appraisal in Britain and the United States of America	81
2.8.1 Educator appraisal in Britain	82
2.8.2 Educator appraisal in the United States of America	89
2.8.3 Lessons to be learned from the two case studies	94
2.9 Historical overview of educator appraisal in South Africa	100

2.9.1	Introduction	100
2.9.2	Inspection and supervision during the pre-Union period	101
2.9.3	Educator appraisal during the apartheid era	102
2.9.3.1	Principles underpinning appraisal	102
2.9.3.2	The role of the inspectorate in educator appraisal	105
2.9.3.3	Educators' perceptions and reaction to appraisal	114
2.9.3.4	Appraisal instrument	116
2.9.3.5	Educator resistance to appraisal	117
2.9.3.6	New appraisal system being developed.....	119
2.9.3.7	New educator appraisal Teacher Pilot Project	122
2.10.7	Summary.....	123
 Chapter Three - Research Design		124
3.1	Introduction	124
3.2	Paradigms.....	124
3.2.1	Positivist/Postpositivist paradigm	125
3.2.2	Critical paradigm	126
3.2.3	Interpretive paradigm	127
3.3	Quantitative versus Qualitative	131
3.4	The Research Process.....	137
3.4.1	Data collection: Educator interviews	137
3.4.2	Data analysis: Discourse Analysis	148
3.4.3	Subjectivity/Objectivity.....	152
3.4.4	Ethics	154
3.5	Summary.....	155

Chapter Four - Compliance Discourse	157
4.1 Introduction	157
4.2 Compliance to bureaucratic demands.....	162
4.3 Compliance to meet deadlines.....	166
4.4 Compliance to the letter of the law.....	174
4.5 Resistance to compliance	177
4.6 Support for compliance culture	179
4.7 Compliance for monetary gain	181
4.8 Unquestioning Compliance to Criteria.....	185
4.9 Summary.....	190
Chapter Five - Discourse of Accountability	191
5.1 Introduction	191
5.2 Accountability in curricular activities.....	197
5.3 Accountability in co- and extra-curricular activities.....	201
5.4 Call for external evaluation.....	203
5.5 Summary.....	209
Chapter 6 - Discourse of Professional Development	210
6.1 Introduction	210
6.2 Self-evaluation	212
6.3 Peer Appraisal	215
6.4 Educator Development.....	220
6.5 Summary.....	224

Chapter 7 - Conclusion	225
7.1 Introduction	225
7.2 Reflection on the preceding chapters.....	226
7.3 Further Findings.....	230
7.3.1 Lack of capacity	230
7.3.2 Time constraints.....	231
7.3.3 Policy overload.....	232
7.3.4 Infrequency of Appraisal.....	232
7.3.5 Context and insufficient infrastructure	233
7.3.6 Piloting	233
7.3.7 Complexity of the IQMS	234
7.4 Recommendations	234
7.4.1 Reconceptualising the IQMS.....	234
7.4.2 Evolution and incrementalism in policy implementation	235
7.4.3 Need for capacity building	235
7.4.4 Support for Professional Development.....	236
7.4.5 Review of the IQMS	236
7.5 Recommendations for further research	236
7.6 Conclusion	237
Bibliography	239
APPENDIX A: The interview schedule.....	253
APPENDIX B: Permission to conduct research	254
APPENDIX C: Request for permission from School Principal.....	255
APPENDIX D: Letter of Informed Consent.....	256
APPENDIX E: Approval to conduct research	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Chapter One – Introduction

1.1 Background to the study

The quest for quality education is a world-wide phenomenon as “the imperatives of globalisation and international competitiveness have placed educational outcomes on the agenda” of countries around the world (Skilbeck, 1995: 1). Building a quality education system is particularly important in a developing country such as South Africa, as reflected in the following extract from the *National Policy on Whole School Evaluation (WSE)*:

...an effective monitoring and evaluation process ... is vital to the improvement of quality and standards of performance in schools...The findings must be used to re-orientate efforts towards improving the quality and standards of individual and collective performance. (DoE, 2000: 7)

This study will consider the “monitoring and evaluation process” currently in place in South African schools. Educators’ perceptions of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) are analysed in an attempt to understand how this particular educational reform is discursively constructed.

“Educational reform is complex, non-linear, frequently arbitrary, and always highly political. It is rife with unpredictable shifts and fragmented initiatives” (Fullan, 1992: 2). This is perhaps nowhere as true as it is in South Africa. As with most aspects of South African education, the issue of quality assurance has been complicated by the legacy of apartheid. The education system during the apartheid era was complex as there were fifteen education departments,

reflecting the racially fragmented society, with a differentiated system of inspection, control and appraisal across these departmental sectors (Educators Workload Report, 2005: 10). The relationship between educators and the inspectorate varied considerably across these education departments.

On the whole, the appraisal system during apartheid was geared towards control and containment of learners and educators, rather than their development and support. The system was “highly bureaucratized with strict control through standardized procedures, codes and lines of responsibility” (McLennan 2000 cited in Smith and Ngoma-Maema, 2003: 352). African schools suffered under a regime of inspection that was autocratic. Judgemental, summative forms of evaluation, inspection and appraisal seem to have proliferated in African schools. The reaction to these negative forms of appraisal was overwhelming and towards the end of the 1980’s, there was widespread resistance against apartheid authorities in schools. Inspectors and subject advisors were often violently cast out of African schools and educators resisted any form of evaluation of their and their schools’ work (Educators Workload Report: 11). In their attempts to resist the apartheid regime, many African schools became dysfunctional and this conflict resulted, sadly, in a complete breakdown of the culture of teaching and learning (Christie, 1998). The apartheid system had left education in a “state of chaos, a chaos that is still overwhelming as the current state battles to redress the various legacies of apartheid” (Smith and Ngoma-Maema, 2003: 351).

The deficiencies in the educator appraisal system, consequently led to educators rejecting evaluation in the majority of African schools in South Africa. In fact, very little if any form of evaluation took place in most schools at this time (Williams, 2003: 5). With the imminent demise of apartheid though, it was time for a new system to be negotiated.

In order to reinstate the culture of teaching and learning in schools, a new model of appraisal was required. In 1992, at a time when South Africa was preparing for its first democratic elections and changes abounded in all spheres of life, the South African Democratic Teachers' Union (SADTU) approached the Education Policy Unit (EPU) at the University of Witwatersrand to assist in developing an alternative educator appraisal model (Swartz, 1994: vii). The unit decided that a top-down approach in developing a new educator appraisal model would yield very little and therefore called for a wider consultative process. In the year of South Africa's first democratic elections, the Pretoria-Witwatersrand-Vaal Education Department (CEPD) and the University of Witwatersrand EPU organized a conference on School Management, Teacher Development and Support on the 18 and 19 August 1994 (Swartz, 1994: 2). At the conclusion of the conference delegates agreed that appraisal was necessary as it provided opportunities for educator development. Delegates rejected the summative and judgemental appraisal of the apartheid era, and called for an appraisal system that was formative and developmental in nature (Swartz, 1994: 60). Throughout the 1990's and early 2000's, the Department of Education (DoE) and unions were engaged in discussions about the best way to conduct school and teacher

appraisals. It is important to note that these initiatives were strongly led by unions and were explicitly placed within a developmental model of appraisal.

Between the end of 1992 and the beginning of 1994 representatives of SADTU, NAPTOSA and the DET negotiated the new principles and procedures for the appraisal of educators. The essential elements of the new proposed system of evaluation included self-evaluation, peer review, consideration of contextual factors, and mediation, *only in the event of a conflict*, by an inspector. The system was linked to a developmental plan for the individual educator, and linked, in turn, to “more general school development planning” (Swartz, 1994: 1).

The pilot of the proposed new educator appraisal system was conducted between 1995 and 1996 with the findings released in July 1997. The findings revealed that there was unanimous support for the new educator appraisal system. The report concluded that the new educator appraisal system could be applied in all schools in South Africa irrespective of contextual conditions because a focus on contextual issues was embedded into the process. The pilot also indicated that the new appraisal system contributed significantly to facilitating relations between educators and school management, and between schools and departmental offices (DoE, 1999: 51). “The pilot, thus, validated empirically the nature, philosophy, processes and instrument of the new appraisal system” (DoE, 1999: 51).

However, the pilot instrument was seen to need further development and finalization before national implementation. It was during this time that the developmental model was linked to a Performance Measurement System and an evaluation of schools as a whole. The final agreement for a new educator appraisal system, namely the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS), was reached in the Education Labour Relations Council on 27 August 2003 (Educators Workload Report, 2005: 10).

Kraak (1998) tracks broad policy periods during this time, and while his study does not look at the development of the IQMS, I believe his findings are pertinent in explaining the shift that occurred between the piloting of the Developmental Appraisal System and the formation of the IQMS. Kraak identifies a “radical discourse” of People’s Education underpinning policy initiatives in the early 1990’s. This radical discourse emerged from the political struggles against Bantu Education and foregrounded issues of equity, critical thinking and empowerment. I believe that the formation of the DAS was largely within these discourses. Kraak asserts that this radical discourse was largely displaced by an emerging “systemic discourse” that arose from “an expert-led, multi-stakeholder policy-making process that prioritized other discourses – primarily the economic and the systemic” (1998: 3). The IQMS with its concern with efficiency and accountability seems to be constructed largely within this systemic discourse.

Despite these tensions between development and accountability, it is important to note that the IQMS, the educator and school appraisal model currently being

implemented in South African state schools, is an undoubtedly major shift from the old paradigm of external evaluators making judgements purely on inputs. The new paradigm calls for a joint collaboration between schools, districts and supervisory units making judgment about the school, looking at both inputs and outputs (Mgijima, 2000: 9). The aim of the new educator appraisal, in addition to addressing the inequities and injustices of the past, is to enhance the quality of education in South Africa.

The Integrated Quality Management System, as a new system of appraisal for educators and schools, came into effect in 2005. The main features of this model can be summarized as follows:

- Self-appraisal for educators for Developmental Appraisal
- Classroom observation
- Peer appraisal
- Self-appraisal by school for Whole School Evaluation
- External Whole School Evaluation (ELRC, 2003: 5)

The Department of Education foreground the differences between judgemental and developmental approaches to quality assurance:

JUDGEMENTAL	DEVELOPMENTAL
Negative	Positive
Fault-finding	Acknowledging
Blames the educator	Find ways to improve educators' performance
Excludes the educator	Includes the educator
Leads to forms of failure	Leads to ways of improvement
Policing	Supportive

(Department of Education: 2002)

School evaluations have historically been the prerogative of the Minister of Education and his local representatives. The emphasis in such processes was accountability, where the school has been called to “give an account” (Smith and Ngoma-Maema, 2003: 347). But there are serious doubts in the mistrust following apartheid evaluation systems that external evaluation can address the need for accountability (Smith and Ngoma-Maema 2003: 347), and there are concerns that in the South African context such evaluation might simply result in compliance with the bureaucratic procedures. The use of external evaluation for accountability purposes is supported in the literature with varied cautions (Learmonth 2000, Cullingford 1997, Gray and Wilcox 1999) but its use for developmental purposes is fairly uniformly rejected. School self-assessment is thus seen as preferable for developmental purposes and for accountability that moves beyond compliance. School self-assessment stresses that the primary responsibility for institutional development and quality assurance must lie with the institution itself (Chambers 1998 cited in Smith and Ngoma-Myena 2003: 348). In the uneven schooling landscape of South Africa, many schools may not have the capacity to perform self-assessment and it is tempting to assume that external evaluation is the only alternative. But it is the development of reflective capacity that needs to be addressed rather than taking this role away from schools.

Smith and Ngoma-Maema (2003) stress the need to contextualize quality processes to local conditions and criticise the importing of many of the OFSTED quality processes from the United Kingdom. But they take this argument even

further in terms of school evaluation by referring to the great variance between schools in South Africa and warn against a 'one size fits all' approach to whole school evaluation. These variances are multiple, such as educator-learner ratios, educator qualifications and even the presence or absence of electricity and running water.

1.2 Rationale for the study

The differentiated approach to educator development and school improvement that characterized the apartheid era did not lend itself to extensive accountability. As an attempt to redress the imbalances of the old system, the National Policy on Whole School Evaluation has been designed to improve the overall quality of education in South Africa. This research is designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the IQMS since it was introduced in 2005 and to evaluate the extent to which it has enhanced individual development and improvements in teaching and learning. The study of the IQMS becomes of interest in the South African Education system for several reasons.

Firstly, since its introduction in 2005, very little empirical research was carried out to establish whether the IQMS model addresses what it was intended to. Hlatshwayo (2002: 78) conducted an investigation into the implementation of the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) in a former High School in the Inanda District of the KwaZulu-Natal Department of Education and Culture, and recommended that "The whole system needs to be reviewed and conceptualized, it should be streamlined and made easier than it is at moment." Hlatshwayo

(2002: 80) came to the following conclusion in his research which calls for further research in the area:

Subsequently, the new DAS was gazetted and throughout 1999 and 2000, the process of its implementation was embarked upon all schools. It was intended that a national review of the implementation of the DAS was due to taken place by the end of 2002. However, for whatever reason, this did not happen and there is no substantial evidence about how successful, or otherwise, the implementation has been.

This viewpoint is also strongly supported by Madaus, Sriven and Stufflebeam (1987: 385) who stated:

We need research on evaluation; we especially need grounded, empirical studies of evaluation practice. We have almost no descriptive information on the practice of evaluation, few field studies on evaluation impact, and scant attention to the empirical study of evaluation method.

Secondly, the study is significant as it may provide findings that will make valuable contributions to the improvement of staff appraisal. Wragg (1987: 76) contends that any form of appraisal should not remain static and unchanged. The actual implementation will reveal the strengths and weaknesses of the model and it would be counterproductive to allow inadequate practices to persist unaltered.

Thirdly, the study will be of value as the recommendations may provide an alternative to the appraisal methods presently being used. In 1980 a Joint

Committee was appointed by twelve organisations concerned with educational evaluation. After extensive research, the Joint Committee issued “one of the most significant documents to date in the field of educational evaluation” (Madaus, Sriven and Stufflebeam, 1987: 395). The document, entitled *Standards for Evaluation of Educational Programs, Projects, and Materials*, was published in 1981. The Joint Committee made a pertinent statement on the dynamic nature of evaluation:

The Joint Committee is convinced, based on its deliberations and extensive input from many people, that these Standards do encompass a valid and widely shared conception of evaluation and the conventional wisdom about its practice. But they also recognize that no set of standards should be enshrined as complete and adequate for all time. Instead, they should be applied in combination with pertinent laws, other relevant codes, and recent findings from research and development; and they should be revised periodically as more is learned about evaluation. (The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1981: 6)

The above statement made by the Joint Committee is supported by Wragg (1987: 97) who deem that any school introducing appraisal for the first time, therefore, “should regard its initial format as a pilot, subjected to modification in the light of experience and feedback from those involved”. In the light of the above, this study will be of value to educators interviewed as it will present them with an opportunity to articulate their experiences and perceptions of the IQMS, an opportunity which is not accorded to them by the Department of Education.

Educators will have the opportunity to voice their experiences and feelings in a safe setting with someone who will validate the importance of their participation. The interviewees in the study will have the opportunity of expressing their views and opinions about the IQMS without anxiety as their confidentiality will be assured. Kvale (1996: 35) is of the view that the interview situation may for the researcher and the interviewee “be characterized by positive feelings of a common intellectual curiosity and a reciprocal respect.” Furthermore, educators will have the opportunity to voice their feelings and thoughts about which they usually remain silent. From my experience in schools, educators are generally reluctant to critique the IQMS in the presence of their supervisors for fear of reprisals. This study will afford educators the opportunity to express their views and experiences of the IQMS in a somewhat safe and non-threatening environment, an opportunity not usually accorded to them by the Department of Education. Another benefit to educators will be the power dispensed by the interview. Providing educators with the opportunity to give voice to their experiences expands their personal power. Educator discourses may also help to magnify important issues such as the challenges educators encounter in fulfilling the IQMS, the benefits the IQMS has for educators as well as the negative aspects of the IQMS. The value of the study is that it will highlight issues and educator understandings of educator appraisal that may resonate in other parts of South Africa or even internationally.

In my capacity as a deputy principal and as a member of the School Management Team of Foresthaven Secondary School, my responsibility at

school includes facilitating the implementation of the IQMS as well as appraising educators. This study will offer me useful insights as to how educators construct the IQMS. This study is also important in that it will reveal any inconsistencies in the discourses used to construct the IQMS by educators and by the Department of Education.

1.3 Aims of the Thesis

This study will examine the way in which the discourses of educators construct the IQMS at ten schools in Phoenix. This study proposes to examine three 'realities':

1. the 'reality' of quality management systems in education according to the theoretical research in the area;
2. the 'reality' of South Africa's IQMS in the Department of Education's documents; and finally
3. the 'reality' of the IQMS as it is constructed in educator discourses in the data to be collected.

Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam (1987: 321) posit the view that in the arena of social inquiry, the 'realities' that we are dealing with "are constructed and exist only in the minds of people". This view is supported by Mertens (1998: 11) who distinguish a 'reality' as a socially constructed phenomenon that means different things to different people. MacDonnel's (1986: 73) position on the issue of 'realities' concurs with the above assertions. "A 'reality' is made up of referents and constructs of all different discourses. Everything is dispersed and plural." In

this study the term 'reality' refers to the meanings and interpretations that various stakeholders attach to the IQMS from their particular standpoint or situation.

The study investigates the following broad problems and issues:

- a) A historical overview of how educator appraisal has been managed in South Africa: pre- and post apartheid.
- b) An overview of quality management systems, with special reference to quality management in schools.
- c) A study of different types of quality management systems and the theoretical underpinnings of the different systems, with particular focus on the IQMS.
- d) An in-depth qualitative analysis of how educators construct the IQMS.

The main research question of the study is:

What are the educators' perceptions of the Integrated Quality Management System?

Out of this main research question, the following sub-questions emerge to guide the study:

- a) What challenges do educators encounter in fulfilling the IQMS?
- b) What benefits do educators gain from the IQMS in their teaching and what negative effects do educators indicate the IQMS has in their teaching?

1.4 The research design

As this research endeavours to investigate educators' perceptions of the Integrated Quality Management System in South African schools, an interpretative, qualitative paradigm was used. The interpretative paradigm does not concern itself with the search for broadly applicable laws and rules, but rather seeks to produce descriptive analyses that emphasise deep, interpretative understanding of social phenomena (Henning, 2004: 21). This ties in with the focus of my research, as its purpose is to gain a deep level understanding of the perceptions of educators. More specifically, this research focuses on understanding how the educators interviewed construct the IQMS from their experiences in their day-to-day working environment, as well as from their unique contexts and backgrounds.

According to Marshall and Rossman (1999: 57) qualitative research takes place in the natural setting and focuses on individuals' lived experience. It is argued that one cannot understand human actions without understanding the meanings that participants attribute to those actions – their thoughts, feelings, beliefs, values and assumptions. The researcher, therefore, needs to “understand the deeper perspectives captured through face-to-face interaction” (Marshall and Rossman, 1999: 57).

Interpretivists construct the world “by means of multiple perspectives” (Henning, 2004: 23). In this research, data were collected primarily from unstructured interviews with eleven educators from ten schools to find out their experiences in

regards IQMS. Data were collected through a random sample of primary and secondary schools in Phoenix. The educators chosen for participation were determined by principals who selected educators mainly by asking for volunteers and in some instances by persuading educators who willingly accepted.

At the time of the interview, the purpose of the study was reviewed and each participant was asked to sign a consent form. This form outlined the study, risks, benefits, extent of confidentiality, and also requested permission to audio-tape the interview. Participants were also informed that they would have the opportunity to review a transcribed copy of the interview before its inclusion in the final document if they so desired.

The interview strategy entails close, personal interactions between researcher and participants. The primary strategy of the interview was “to capture the deep meaning of experience in their own words” (Marshall and Rossman, 1999: 61). Direct quotations of educators were used to reveal their perceptions of the IQMS. Patton (1987: 11) states that direct quotations:

... are a basic source of raw data in qualitative evaluation. Direct quotations reveal the respondent’s levels of emotion, the way in which they have organised the world, their thoughts about what is happening, their experiences, and their basic perceptions.

According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2002: 147) data analysis involves organising, accounting for, and explaining the data. Vithal and Jansen, (2001: 27)

indicate that organising the data allows the researcher to make sense of the information by arranging it in a manageable form and identifying patterns of responses. In this research a discourse analysis of educator interviews was undertaken.

The use in this study of a discourse analysis of interviews of educators to ascertain how they talk about the IQMS is based on a particular understanding of the role of discourses. Discourses are expressed as social practice such as conversation, procedures and formal policies and interpreted as forms of social and religious ideals, systems of moral ideals and ideals of rationality (Alvesson and Billing, 1997). Alvesson and Billing (1997:40) define a discourse as:

... a set of statements, beliefs, and vocabularies that is historically and socially specific and that tends to produce truth effects – certain beliefs are acted upon as true and therefore become partially true in terms of consequences. Different discourses produce different effects ...

The use of discourse in this research assumes the elaboration of meaning through discourse. Parker (1992: 5) states that “Discourses provide frameworks for debating the value of one way of talking about reality over other ways”. In other words, discourses contain within them ambiguous and contradictory practices and whilst appearing stable, are always open to contestation. This study analyses how educators construct the ‘IQMS’, that is, how educators talk about this system and its implementation. What discourses do they use to construct their ‘reality’ of this system, and is their ‘reality’ similar to or quite

different from the 'reality' espoused in the Department of Education documents referring to this system?

According to Bennet (1990: 33) "The constructive effects of discourse can be transformative, reproductive or both. Consequently, discourse can be linked to both overt and covert practices in educational settings" Discourses can be described as "ways of living out meanings", but these meanings are "always more than just linguistic meanings" (Morgan *et al.*, 1996: 11). Power operates through discourse. It shapes and controls knowledge in ways that seek to define and defend particular 'truths'. Foucault (1981) argues that discourses structure and constrain individuals' social reality and their relationship to it and each other. Foucault argues that truth operates as:

A system of ordered procedures for the application, regulation, distribution, circulation, and operation of statements ... linked in a particular relation to systems of power which produce it and sustain it and to the effects of power which it induces and which extends it. (Rabinow, 1984: 74)

From the above it can be inferred that dominant ideologies are discursively constituted and legitimised in terms of the search for universal truths that explain the social world.

1.5 Limitations of the study

According to Marshall and Rossman (1999: 42) no research project is without its limitations and there is no such thing as a perfectly designed research. In the

light of the above I understand that my research is bounded and situated in a specific context and as such I cannot make claims to generalizability. “Although no qualitative studies are generalizable in the statistical sense, their findings may be transferable” (Marshall and Rossman, 1999: 43). This study may be broadly applicable to other settings as it may highlight issues and educator understandings of the IQMS that may resonate in other parts of South Africa or even internationally.

1.6 The current system of educator appraisal in South Africa: IQMS

1.6.1 Introduction

This chapter will now move to an overview of the IQMS in order to provide the context of the study. The current system of educator appraisal, the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) is a clear reaction to the autocratic mode of evaluation that operated during the apartheid era (Thurlow, and Ramnarain, 2001: 14). The democratization of South Africa on 27 April 1994 had repercussions for every facet of South African society. One of the consequences has been the need to democratize educational processes and practices as enshrined in the new Constitution of South Africa, which came into being in 1996, based on democracy, equal citizenship and the protection of human rights and freedom. Democratic governance is thus one of the principles which are to underpin the education and training programme of the South African Department of Education. The acceptance of the principle of democratic governance has found manifestation in a number of new policies. One of these policies includes

educator development and the implementation of the new educator appraisal system (Department of Education, 2000: 29-30).

1.6.2 Legislative context

The rationale for designing and implementing the Integrated Quality Management System is guided by both legal and socio-political imperatives. According to the *National Education Policy Act, 1996*, Subsection 3(4), the Minister shall be responsible for “National policy for the planning, provision, financing, staffing, co-ordination, management, governance, programmes, monitoring, and well-being of the educational system”.

Section 8 of the Act deals specifically with the responsibility of the Minister of Education with regard to monitoring and evaluation. Subsection 8(1) states that:

the minister shall direct that standards of education provision, delivery and performance through the republic be monitored and evaluated by the Department annually or at other specified intervals with the object of assessing progress in complying with the provisions of the constitution and with national education policy.

Hence, the overall national responsibility for monitoring and evaluation the standards of education in terms of legislation resides with the National Department of Education (DoE, 1998: 7).

In terms of Section 20(1) (a) of the South African Schools Act, 1996, school governing bodies must promote the best interests of the school and strive to ensure its development through the provision of quality education. This involves continuous monitoring and evaluation of quality by members of the school governing body.

For many years, there has been no national system of evaluating the performance of schools, and there is no comprehensive data on the quality of teaching and learning, or on the educational standards achieved in the system. (DoE, 2002: 1)

As a result the National Policy on Whole School Evaluation was introduced. This policy has been designed to ensure that school evaluation is carried out according to an agreed national model. It sets out the legal basis for school evaluation, its purposes, what is to be evaluated and who can carry out evaluations. In an attempt to redress the imbalances of the old system, the National Policy on Whole School Evaluation has been designed to improve the overall quality of education in South Africa (DoE, 2002: 1). It will ensure that all children are given an equal opportunity to make the best use of their capabilities (National Education Policy Act No.27 of 1996: 4).

The Chief Directorate: Quality Assurance (CD: QA) of the National Department of Education has been entrusted with the responsibility of monitoring and evaluating education provision and performance (DoE, 1999: 2).

The *Employment Educators Act No.76 of 1998* stipulates that the performance of educators must be evaluated according to performance standards, which may be presented by the minister. In the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) these performance standards are presented in the form of core criteria (ELRC, 1999: 13). This will be elaborated later.

From the above discussion, it is evident that legislation such as the Labour Relations Act of 1995, the National Education Policy Act of 1996, the South African Schools Act of 1996 and the Employment of Educators Act of 1998 are all attempts to transform the education system so that it is in keeping with the provisions of the new Constitution of South Africa (ELRC, 1999: 62).

1.6.3 Finalisation of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS)

After several years of discussion and deliberation the major stakeholders, that is, the Department of Education and educator unions/organizations, reached consensus on a new educator appraisal model. The final agreement for a new educator appraisal, namely the IQMS, was reached in the Education Relations Council (ELRC) on 27 August 2003 [Resolution 8 of 2003]. The IQMS integrated the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) that came into being on 28 July 1998 (Resolution 4 of 1998), the Performance Measurement System that was agreed to on 10 April 2003 (Resolution 1 of 2003) and Whole School Evaluation (Educators Workload Report, 2005: 10).

In order to enhance and monitor the performance of the education system, the Department of Education combined three integrated programmes:

- Developmental Appraisal;
- Performance Measurement; and
- Whole School Evaluation.

Each of these programmes, which form the IQMS, has a distinct focus and purpose.

The purpose of **Developmental Appraisal (DA)** is to appraise individual educators in a transparent manner with the view to determining areas of strengths and weaknesses, and to draw up programmes for individual development. The purpose of **Performance Measurement (PM)** is to evaluate individual teachers for salary progression, grade progression, affirmation of appointments and rewards and incentives. The purpose of **Whole School Evaluation (WSE)** is to evaluate the overall effectiveness of a school - including support provided by the District, school management, infrastructure and learning resources - as well as the quality of teaching and learning. (ELRC, 2003: 3)

The philosophy underpinning the IQMS is based upon the fundamental belief that the purposes of the new measures are to:

- determine competence;
- assess strengths and areas for development;
- provide support and opportunities for development to assure continued

growth;

- promote accountability; and
- monitor an institution's overall effectiveness.

(ELRC, 2003: 4)

The main features of this model for the implementation of an Integrated Quality Management System, which includes Development Appraisal, Performance Measurement and Whole School Evaluation programmes, are as follows:

- i) Developmental Appraisal and Performance Measurement inform and strengthen one another without duplication of structures and procedures.
- ii) Performance Measurement and Developmental Appraisal must be linked to an annual cycle, which must be completed within a calendar year.
- iii) Developmental Appraisal and Performance Measurement inform and strengthen internal Whole School Evaluation.
- iv) The separate purposes of DA, PM and WSE remain. (ELRC, 1999: 4)

The guiding principles in managing the developmental appraisal process are as follows:

1. The process of appraisal should be open, transparent and developmental.
2. The appraisal of educators is in essence a developmental process which depends upon continuous support. It is designed and intended to entrench strengths, develop potential and overcome weaknesses.
3. The process of appraisal should always involve relevant academic and management staff.

4. The appraisal should be all inclusive of stakeholders, and its members should be trained to conduct the process of appraisal.
5. Educators should be informed of all aspects of the appraisal process, so that they can take initiative to conduct the process of appraisal.
6. Prompt feedback by way of discussions and written communication to those who are being appraised should be one of the indispensable elements of appraisal.
7. The appraisee has the right to have access to and to respond to the appraisal report. The *audi alteram partem* rule should apply.
8. The instruments for the appraisal should have appropriate criteria to appraise the nature and level of the work performed.

(ELRC, 1999: 60)

The guiding principles of the IQMS are clearly developmental in nature and promote a transparent process unlike the appraisal methods of the apartheid era which policed educators and where assessment was shrouded in secrecy. I now look at the Developmental Appraisal System.

1.6.4 Developmental Appraisal System

1.6.4.1 Appraisal processes

Developmental appraisal consists of the following ongoing processes:

- a) Reflective Practice: Educators are required to interpret and analyse the extent to which their performance meets objectives in serving the needs of clients with the intention to rethink current practice.

- b) Self-appraisal: The educator undertakes a self-analysis of his/her own work.
- c) Peer appraisal: It is the involvement of a colleague in assisting the appraisee to review his/her performance with the intention to prioritise professional development needs.
- d) Collaboration: Educators working together to assist in problem solving.
- e) Interaction with panels: Members develop relationships to work collectively in order to assist the appraisee to identify needs, formulate objectives, select professional development activities, implement such activities and to provide timeous feedback.

(ELRC, 1999: 3; Adendorff, Gultig and Mason, 2001: 59)

The above process supports a developmental agenda and it incorporates both an individual and a collaborative approach. Firstly, educators are responsible for determining their own strengths and weaknesses. Secondly, educators engage with colleagues and management in order to improve their expertise. This process will, no doubt, be a time-consuming exercise as educators, peers and management will have to source time mostly out of teaching time to engage in identifying professional needs and providing the necessary support.

1.6.4.2 Training and establishment of Staff Development Team (SDT)

The new system indicates that all members of staff would receive appraisal training to ensure that the appraisees and appraisers are familiar with and understand how the single IQMS instrument would be used (ELRC, 2003:20).

The complexity of using one system for three fundamentally different processes would, it was believed, be understood as a result of this appraisal training. While various regional training workshops have been held, the main responsibility for IQMS training at the level of the educator is vested in the principal of the school. This assumes a capacity in principals that studies have shown is not always there. Mestry and Grobler (2002: 21) assert that principals are “often not well prepared for tasks they must undertake and are not given sufficient training to perform these tasks”. Without the involvement and commitment of senior managers the “process is likely to collapse” (Smith and Ngoma-Maema 2003: 361).

After the initial training, each school is instructed to democratically establish a Staff Development Team (SDT) comprising of elected members from senior management and educators, with the school principal as a mandatory member. The Staff Development Team and the School Management Team (SMT) are tasked with responsibility for, inter alia, assuring fairness and accuracy of Performance Measurement process of Developmental Appraisal; providing ongoing support; co-ordinating lesson observations; development of the ‘School Improvement Plan’ (SIP) and ensuring the link between appraisal and Whole School Evaluation (ELRC, 2003: 21). The bureaucratic complexity of these tasks raises issues of the extent to which the development agenda will be carried out.

1.6.4.3 The appraisal instrument and rating

The instrument for post level one educators (classroom-based educators), which is used for DA and PM, is made up of seven Performance Standards. Four Performance Standards are for observation of educators in practice and three are for aspects for evaluation that fall outside of the classroom. The Performance Standards are as follows:

1. The creation of a positive learning environment.
2. Knowledge of curriculum and learning programmes.
3. Lesson planning, preparation and presentation.
4. Learner assessment.
5. Professional development in field of work/career and participation in professional bodies.
6. Human relations and contribution to school development.
7. Extra-curricular and Co-curricular participation.

Each Performance Standard includes a number of criteria. For each of these criteria there are four descriptors which are derived from the four point rating scale as follows:

- **Rating 1:** Unacceptable. This level of performance does not meet minimum expectations and requires urgent interventions and support.
- **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.

(ELRC, 1999: 3-4)

The appraisal instruments of the apartheid era included aspects such as personality and professional disposition which had little to do with measuring an educator's classroom practice and often led to subjective interpretations and ratings. Most of the performance standards included in IQMS actually focus on the job-related expectations for educators and are based on effective teaching and learning.

1.6.4.4 Criteria

To ensure that appraisal is in line with key job functions, core criteria have been identified and defined for each level of educator. These criteria are uniform for all educators and do not take into consideration the variance in South African schools. Educators in more affluent schools which are better resourced will be advantaged compared to educators in rural schools which are under-resourced and under-staffed. The prescribed criteria which assumes a 'one size fits all' approach is not feasible in South African schools given the huge disparities left by the apartheid regime.

In addition to the core criteria which cover the essential elements of the job description of an educator, provision has also been made for some core criteria

to be made optional through agreement in the appraisal panel because of contextual factors at institutions. The appraisal panel may decide on 'additional criteria' depending on the needs of the institution and/or individual educator; however, these 'additional criteria' must be accepted by all stakeholders (ELRC, 1999: 5). This is a grey area and has not been adequately discussed at training workshops and may, therefore, lead to various interpretations. Furthermore, by adding on criteria the maximum score for Performance Measurement will vary from school to school and will make the appraisal instrument inconsistent.

1.6.4.5 Self-evaluation by educator

After the appraisal training each educator is required to evaluate him/herself using the same instrument to be used for both Developmental Appraisal and Performance Measurement. This exercise was supposed to familiarise educators with the instrument, the performance standards, the criteria as well as the levels of performance required for performance management and developmental appraisal (ELRC, 2003: 21).

1.6.4.6 Development Support Group (DSG)

Each educator is required to "identify his/her personal support group" within the school to "provide mentoring and support" (ELRC 2003: 22). This is certainly in line with the notion that professional development can be fostered through professional mentoring. But the IQMS process then delimits this group to "the educator's immediate senior" and one other educator (though in "some instances" an educator is permitted to include more than one peer in his/her DSG)

(ELRC 2003: 22). The DSG has to include the educators' immediate senior (Head of Department) and one other educator (peer) – selected by the educator- and who has the phase/Learning Area/Subject expertise and “is able to provide the necessary guidance and support” (ELRC, 2003: 22).

The DSG is designed to assist the educator to set his/her targets and time-frames for improvement in a personal growth plan (Muller, 2004:6). One wonders about the extent to which the DSG is seen as a place where educators can reflect on their own weaknesses and honestly identify problem areas requiring improvement when the members of the DSG are also responsible for the educator's promotion, pay issues and performance evaluations. This is particularly problematic when one considers that the DSG is responsible for the end of year summative evaluation for performance measurement purposes.

1.6.4.7 Data collection and lesson observation

The IQMS includes lesson observations as the main source of evidence for performance management purposes. For pragmatic reasons, observation of educators in practice is conducted by the DSG's only once per annum. The “summative evaluation” at the end of the previous year becomes the “baseline evaluation” for the next year. Summative evaluation through classroom observation, for performance management purposes, are thus only required at the end of each year where this is compared to the summative evaluation of the previous year in order to determine progress (ELRC, 2003: 27). The use of observation for development is fundamentally different from its use as a

performance measurement indicator. The use of lesson observation for the purpose of improving teaching is severely undermined by its use by the same people for PM purposes. The process has the possibility of becoming solely about performance management especially as the language used in detailing the lesson observation is within an accountability discourse.

The lesson observation is preceded by a “pre-evaluation discussion” to check whether the educator understands “what is expected of him/her in terms of the various performance standards and criteria and how he/she will be rated” (ELRC, 2003, 24). The process, therefore, is entirely about performance measurement and the language used in detailing the lesson observation is clearly within the accountability discourse. The process as detailed in the IQMS allows for an overt, transparent engagement with the criteria to be used for performance measurement and minimizes the types of manipulations of evaluation associated with apartheid era observations (Chetty *et al.*, 1993: 3). But it leaves little or no room for developmental appraisal through lesson observation. In the section of the IQMS detailing the Lesson Observation, the notion of a developmental model seems to have been dispensed with entirely. The mention that there will be a baseline evaluation, including a lesson observation, in the first year of IQMS implementation and for new teachers in subsequent years is not for developmental purposes, but rather to have a set of data against which to measure the later summative evaluations. The pre-evaluation discussion is also the place where the educator is given an opportunity to raise issues that are “hampering his/her performance” (ELRC, 2003: 26). But again this is not with a

developmental objective, such as with a view to understanding the educator's context in order to co-construct a development plan, but rather it is for the purpose of "possible adjustment of the mark awarded in respect of a particular criterion" (ELRC, 2003: 23). My argument is not with the performance evaluation emphasis *per se*, but rather with the way in which the integrated nature of the process has allowed the developmental agenda to be completely subsumed by the accountability one.

1.6.4.8 Personal Growth Plan (PGP)

After the evaluation and post-appraisal the educator is required to develop a Personal Growth Plan (PGP) taking into consideration suggestions made by one or both members of the DSG. The PGP should address areas that need improvement on the part of the educator, those areas for which the DSG or someone else in the school is able to provide guidance, those areas for which the Department of Education should provide INSET or other programmes and, where applicable, recommending whether an un- or under qualified educators requires reskilling (ELRC, 2003: 23-24).

1.6.5 Performance Measurement

For purposes of pay or grade progression an overall rating is given to educators. The final score is used to arrive at an overall rating (ELRC, 2003: 6). This brings us to the crux of the tensions inherent in an integrated appraisal instrument. Will an educator honestly list their flaws and set a plan to address them if there is also a question of whether or not you get your next salary notch?

1.6.6 Whole School Evaluation

External Whole School Evaluation (WSE) will take place for the majority of schools in a cycle of 3 or 5 years cycle. The external WSE Team, including supervisors, appointed by the provincial departments for this purpose, will carry out WSE, including an evaluation of a sample of educators. The observation and evaluation will be used to verify the DA and PM of educators concerned and will serve to validate the PM's of other educators.

During the evaluation, the WSE Team must collect evidence through reading and analyzing any of the school's documents. They must also see any district documentation that they require in order to help them reach fair judgements about the school. These documents should include educators' and learners' attendance registers, educators' records of learners' performance, educators' curriculum plans, learners' personal record files, learners' portfolio's and documents for developmental appraisal and performance management (DoE, 2001: 5).

After the evaluation, the WSE Team must provide feedback to individual educators on the quality of their work; feedback to heads of each subject/learning area/programme evaluated on the quality of work; a report to the principal, school management team, staff development team, school governing body, staff and a representative of the district/regional support services on the main findings and they must make recommendations as to how the school might improve its practice (DoE, 2001: 7).

School evaluations have historically been the prerogative of the Minister of Education and his local representatives. The emphasis in such processes has been accountability, where the school has been called to “give an account” (Smith and Ngoma-Maema, 2003: 347).

There are serious doubts that a system of external evaluation can address the need for accountability (Smith and Ngoma-Maema, 2003: 347), and concerns that in the South African context such evaluation might simply result in compliance with the bureaucratic procedures. The use of external evaluation for accountability purposes is supported in the literature with varied cautions (Learmonth 2000, Cullingford 1999, Gray and Wilcox 1999) but its use for developmental purposes is fairly uniformly rejected. School self-assessment is thus seen as preferable for accountability that moves beyond compliance and for developmental purposes. School self-assessment stresses that the primary responsibility for institutional development and quality assurance must lie with the institution itself (Chambers cited in Smith and Ngoma-Maema, 2003: 348). In a system where the school may not have the capacity to perform self-assessment it is tempting to assume that external evaluation is the only alternative. But using external people for development of reflective capacity is one way of increasing a school's capacity to evaluate them.

1.7 Structure of the Thesis

This chapter provided an introduction to the research problem and located the Integrated Quality Management System against the background of an emerging

education system and positioned it within the historical context that constructed it. The rationale for the study was presented followed by the aims and the research question. An overview of the current IQMS was then provided. Finally, the research methodology, ethical considerations and the limitations of the study were briefly explicated.

Chapter Two provides the theoretical framework of the research. This chapter looks at different types of quality management systems and the theoretical underpinnings of these quality systems. In addition to providing two case studies of how educator appraisal systems were introduced in the United Kingdom and the United States of America, a historical overview of how quality has been managed in South African schools pre-apartheid and during the apartheid era is furnished as well.

Chapter Three is the research methodology chapter which provides an explanation of the research approach I take in this thesis. An interpretative, qualitative paradigm was employed to examine the educators' perceptions of the IQMS. In this chapter, I provide details about the data collection and data analysis procedures with particular reference to discourse analysis. The chapter also examines issues such as ethics, sampling, objectivity/subjectivity, generalisation and the limitations of the study.

In Chapter Four I discuss the discourse of compliance which emerged from the educator interviews. Chapter 5 examines the discourse of accountability and Chapter 6 looks at the professional development discourse.

Chapter Seven concludes the thesis with a reflection on the implications of findings, followed by a self-critical evaluation of the research and recommendations for further research.

Chapter Two - Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a theoretical framework for the study. The first part reviews the concept of appraisal by looking at the definitions and purposes of appraisal in organizations in general, as well as in schools in particular. It further explores the concept of quality management in teaching versus quality management in commerce and industry, discusses the advantages and disadvantages of appraisal, outlines the appraisal process and reviews the models of appraisal that are implemented in various educational settings. The next part presents a historical overview of how educator appraisal has been managed in South Africa pre-apartheid and during apartheid. The final part of the chapter provides two case studies of how educator appraisal was introduced in the United Kingdom and in the United States of America. These case studies will help to evaluate the current IQMS against a backdrop of international experiences of educator appraisal.

2.2 Performance appraisal

The concern for improving quality is probably the most important task facing any organization; hence the importance of appraisal in any institution cannot be overemphasized (Sallis, 1993: 1). Educational institutions are pursuing quality improvements for a number of reasons. Some are linked with professional responsibility, others as a result of competition in the educational marketplace or the need to demonstrate accountability (Sallis, 1993: 3). Bollington, Hopkins and

West (1993: 2) believe that the introduction of appraisal in education has been characterized by the concern for improved quality, greater degree of accountability, and more efficiency as well as a move to develop educators as professionals. In this context, appraisal is viewed as a form of in-service training and as a means of identifying further in-service training needs in order to improve the quality of teaching and learning.

Studies in educator appraisal predominantly identify the two models, namely, the accountability model and the professional development model, in order to show the distinctiveness of the two approaches. Lacey (1996: 5), Hargreaves and Hopkins (1994: 8) and Jones (1993: 3) concur that confusion still exists over recurring tensions, such as whether appraisal is for professional development or for accountability. Is it meant to be a supportive form of professional development or is it a device for assessing educator competence, rewarding the effective and dismissing the ineffective? Can appraisal meet both these demands? These prevailing tensions in relation to the accountability model versus the developmental model will be examined later after a discussion of these two models of appraisal.

The terms “performance management”, “evaluation” and “appraisal” are used interchangeably in much of the literature dealing with the topic. In this study the above-mentioned terms are also used interchangeably. According to Hartle, Everall and Baker (2001: 3) performance management in organizations is, firstly, a process that links educators, support staff and their respective roles to the

success of learners and the school. Secondly, it is a process of establishing a shared understanding of what has to be achieved and how, and of managing staff in such a way that it will be achieved. Thirdly, it is a process for ensuring that staff is doing the right things in the most effective way to the best of their ability.

Poster and Poster (1993: 1) maintain that appraisal is:

a means of promoting through the use of certain techniques and procedures, the organization's ability to accomplish its mission of maintaining or improving what it provides while at the same time seeking to maintain or enhance staff satisfaction and development.

Sergiovani and Starrat (1993: 38) share the same sentiment by defining performance appraisal as:

a process designed to help teachers and supervisors learn more about their practice; to be better able to use their knowledge and skills to better serve parents and schools; and to make the school a more effective learning community.

How people define and apply appraisal will depend on their own attitudes and values. Wragg (1987: 2) maintains that the many who actually work in education will regard appraisal as part of a continuous process for the improvement and extension of professional skills. Bunnell (1989: ix) argues that if appraisal is to succeed in practice, it must be seen not only as an innovation leading to higher standards of education for learners in schools, but also as an opportunity for the professional development and individual fulfilment of every educator.

On the contrary there are those who believe teaching to be a refuge for life's incompetents and therefore view appraisal as a way of weeding out the indolent and incapable. Bunnell (1989: ix) concurs with Wragg (1987: 2) that appraisal will be doomed if it is seen as a means of getting rid of incompetent educators or as a strategy to improve performance by external sanctions.

Jones (1993: 1) defines appraisal as "a continuous process for securing the extension of the professional skills of teachers and the improvement of schools." Appraisal does this by offering a means of assisting educators take stock of their professional performance, their career aspirations and their targets for action. The most critical benefit for the educator during the appraisal process is that "it creates opportunity for dialogue about performance based on observation and reflection of practice" (Middelwood and Cardno, 2001: 1). Hence, giving and receiving of feedback is crucial as this process not only measures current performance, but also reinforces strengths and identifies deficiencies, thereby creating possibilities for educator development. All educators can benefit from appraisal if they wish and if the school organizes appraisal as a meaningful process. Horne and Pierce (1996: 17) contend that success depends on commitment from the school principal, an effective co-ordinator and the support of individual staff. Without this appraisal will be merely a process which has to be undertaken because it is a mandatory requirement.

In summary, appraisal is a process of management which entails improving the organization's performance through the enhanced performance of individuals

(Fisher, 1995: 11). The focus of appraisal is the improvement of instruction, and, it is hoped, subsequent maximization of learner academic performance. Thus, appraisal can be viewed on two levels; providing for instructional effectiveness and enhancing educator performance (Guthrie and Reed, 1986: 312).

2.3 Purpose of appraisal

Studies in performance appraisal show that various authors and researchers have differing views on the several purposes of appraisal. Cullingford (1997: 11) maintains that recognizing that there is a plurality of purposes, reminds us that appraisal is a complex and sensitive area. Whilst there may be legitimacy of some of the purposes of appraisal, there will certainly be dispute about the relative importance of different purposes of appraisal for different forms and stages of education.

Nolan and Hoover (2004: 8) believe that if a system of educator supervision and evaluation is to work as designed, then all stakeholders must understand the basic purpose of the system and the various processes used to achieve these goals. Hartle, Everall and Baker (2001: 27), therefore, suggest that the first key steps management have to take in communicating the performance management process are to convince their staff of its benefits to them. Supervisors must be able to answer their question: "What's in it for me?" Everard and Morris (1996: 78) are of the view that whilst appraisal and development procedures are standard practice in most walks of life, appraisal is still not fully understood and treated with suspicion in parts of the education profession. In order to counteract such a

perception, Bunnell (1989: 5) suggests that there must be openness about the purposes of appraisal.

Poster and Poster (1993: 6) recognize that appraisal may have a multitude of purposes, some centred on the needs of the organization, some on those of the individual, some on both. Lacey (1996: 5) shares this sentiment by stating that appraisal for educator improvement and appraisal for performance review or accountability are the key differences in philosophical outlooks towards appraisal.

Appraisal models developed around improvement can be aimed at individual educators or the whole school. Schools that base their model on one of educator improvement do so with the intention of improving educator performance. In this approach the educators' strengths and areas for improvement are identified with a view to develop an improvement plan for the educator. Nolan and Hoover (2004: 7) concur with this view by stating that an effective educator appraisal system must be capable of remediating or eliminating poor performance as well as nurturing excellent performance.

The purpose of the school improvement model is to review and improve the overall teaching performance across the whole school or in particular subjects or departments. This process is generally undertaken by management and culminates in a professional development plan (Lacey, 1996: 5). The accountability model of appraisal which is increasingly being called performance review is conducted to assess whether agreed goals have been achieved or that

teaching standards are satisfactory. Lacey (1996: 6) states further that schools occasionally participate in appraisal processes for research purposes and this “is usually at a system-wide level for the purpose of refining professional practice”.

Poster and Poster (1993: 2) contend that educator appraisal is one of the number of techniques designed to promote the integration of the individual into the organization. This will enable management to harness the unique talents of individuals and co-ordinate their activities towards achievement, by effective and efficient means, of organizational goals. Appraisal, therefore, creates an opportunity for the individual to meet with his or her manager in order to take stock of individual and joint achievements. After the post-appraisal discussion, there should be consensus on how to improve the performance of the individual, improve working relationships and develop the individual’s career (Everard and Morris, 1988: 98). Bell (1988: 8) supports the above assertion by stating that staff appraisal is “an integral part of the overall process of school evaluation with the intention of supporting and developing programmes for action.”

Wise *et al.* quoted in Bollington, Hopkins and West (1993: 4) provides the framework shown in Figure 1.1 which depicts the varied possible purposes of appraisal. They see appraisal as operating at both individual and organizational levels as well.

Purpose Level	Improvement	Accountability
Individual	Individual staff development	Individual personnel Decisions e.g. job status
Organizational	School improvement	School status Decisions (e.g. Accreditation)

Figure 1.1 A *Framework for understanding appraisal*

Similar to Poster and Poster's contention, Bollington, Hopkins and West (1993: 4) argue that in practice appraisal schemes often serve diverse purposes. Their table draws attention to the fact that appraisal has an impact at the level of both the individual and the school and also makes the common distinction between appraisal for development and improvement purposes and appraisal for the sake of accountability.

At the individual level, quality appraisal focuses firstly, on improving the ability of employees to perform their roles through the provision of training and self-development opportunities. Secondly, for accountability purposes appraisal involves the collection of data to determine the extent to which educators have achieved minimum acceptable levels of competence, or prescribed standards of performance (Duke & Stiggins, 1991: 116). Guthrie and Reed (1986) state that appraisal data may be used for awarding tenure to probationary educators; identifying candidates for promotion to higher responsibility; improving individual's motivation; dismissing or demoting the incompetent as well as rationalizing and redeploying employees.

At the organizational level appraisal is designed to “ensure credibility and uniformity” (Jantjies, 1996: 52) as well as to link appraisal to whole school improvement. The literature on educator appraisal distinctly illustrates that when educators and school management work jointly in integrating appraisal processes for professional growth with school improvement efforts, both individuals and institutions improve (Iwanicki, 1991: 160).

Another common distinction is made in appraisal between summative evaluation and formative evaluation and is closely related to the development and accountability divide. Summative evaluation of educators has finality to it in a sense that it takes place at the end of an educational activity. In evaluating an educators’ performance, summative evaluation suggests that a judgement is made about the quality of one’s teaching (Sergiovanni and Starrat, 1993: 203). Formative evaluation is concerned with providing information which helps to improve educator performance. Ingvarson and Chadbourne (1994: 12) state that appraisal is “formative assessment for improving the performance of teachers within their current position, and for accountability”. Sergiovanni and Starrat (1993: 204) argue that formative and summative evaluation cannot be separated in its strictest sense as each contains aspects of the other. They believe that it is “useful nevertheless to speak of a formative focus and a summative focus to evaluation”.

2.4 Quality management in teaching versus industry

According to Middelwood (cited in Middelwood and Cardno, 2001: 188) quality management in education drew heavily in its early days as a recognized discipline on theory and practice outside of education, especially from business and industry. Although much expertise has been gained from matters such as financial management, external relations, strategic planning and organization theory, it must be borne in mind that the main purpose of schools is teaching and learning for which there is no real industrial equivalent. Valuable lessons may be learnt from outside of education, but they must be adapted to the special circumstances in schools. Middelwood cited in (Middelwood and Cardno, 2001: 188) report that a review of performance management in business and industry carried out by two non-educational sectors in the United Kingdom raised some important points of interest to schools. The term “appraisal” is rarely used now in business because it implies looking back, whereas the emphasis in performance management is on the future as it looks forward at the developmental needs of individuals and the organization. Furthermore, the introduction of any performance appraisal should not be rushed because if rushed the measures might be superficial and the intended purpose might not be met. Appraisal schemes must also be fine-tuned by individual organizations in order to accommodate contextual factors. Finally, as far as remuneration is concerned, the emphasis is on performance-linked progression rather than performance related pay.

According to Wagner (1989: 17) proponents of the business model argue that by using engineering and management techniques long known to business and to which much of its success may be attributed, education can overcome serious problems of inefficiency and economy.

In essence, these procedures that have worked well in certain areas emphasize: clarifying goals, designing plans for attaining them, measuring progress toward them, diagnosing difficulties, and redesigning the plan, with subsequent appraisal, and further revisions, if necessary. In applying strategic planning, the total organization and its several parts are held accountable for reaching the goals. As these management procedures are becoming more widely known, they are frequently being recommended by businessmen and other laymen for use in schools.

(Wagner, 1989: 17)

Although the 'product' of schools (learners) is usually stated to be more important, accountability proponents consider business to be more successful in achieving efficiency, economy and results, which they attribute to rather sophisticated procedures that should now be employed in education. They argue that this is necessary as education must deal with three serious problems: rising costs, a significant incidence of failure in achieving results and growing demands for accountability. They believe that each of the above can be countered if education incorporates the managerial and engineering techniques of modern business that have accounted for the greater success of business in achieving results and efficiency of operation (Wagner, 1989: 18). I believe that the business model of

efficiency will not succeed in schools since schools are not business enterprises. Schools do not have to consider the question of efficiency only, as schools have a social transformation role to consider alongside the questions of efficiency.

Doherty (1994: 89) contends that industry has learnt to pay close attention to the processes which produce the goods and services. The important principle derived from the industrial experience is:

If you want to improve a product or service, pay close attention to the processes which produce the product or service. Measurements on the product or service provide, at best, lagging indicators. They are too late to provide more than regrets. Measuring the characteristics of the process provides leading indicators upon which actions may be taken to ensure a good result.

Doherty (1994: 87) advises that in adapting quality management, originally developed for business, it is important to take cognizance of the differences between education and business: the school is not a factory, the student is not a 'product' and the *education* of the student is the product. Seyfarth (1999: 62) supports this thinking by stating that:

Quality management has a long and respected history in industry, but the effort to apply the principles of quality management to schools is relatively new and requires one to consider differences between industrial operations and teaching children.

Some principles of quality management have application to schools, whereas others may not be practical. Seyfarth (1999: 62) believes that the following quality principles can apply easily to schools: continuous improvement, attention to customers' preferences and attitudes, internal quality, quality teams, a flattened hierarchy, natural work groups, empowerment, abandonment and reduction of inspection. Some of these principles might entail structural changes in schools, whereas others may require employees to embrace new ways of thinking.

Davies and West-Burnham (1997: 193-194) state that presently educators in the USA have a management improvement process based on Deming's TQM principles which "provides structure, flexible guidelines, evaluative procedures, and a systematic interactive network between principals, teachers, parents and community members". Deming's fourteen principles of Total Quality Management (TQM) provide an invaluable, yet highly contested restructuring template for school improvement which allows educators to adopt proven research practices and to refine and expand these components to their fullest potential. These include: shared decision-making, problem-solving teams, training and staff development and a new approach to leadership (Davies and West-Burnham, 1997: 194).

Davies and West-Burnham (1997: 194) state that many businesses have recognized the potential and reaped the benefits of TQM as a means for product and service improvement. Although TQM is not new to the business world in the United States, the management method is relatively new to education, therefore

there has been some reluctance to apply quality practices to education, yet central to Deming's methodology and management philosophy is an insistence that "anything can be made or done better" (Goldberg and Cole, 2002: 9).

Total quality management (TQM) was first introduced as a business management approach in the post-World War II era when Deming, Crosby, Juran and others successfully reinvented the Japanese economy. In the early 1980's American business leaders looked to the philosophy, principles and TQM tools to improve the economy. This quality management method is relatively new to education; however, education leaders are beginning to recognize the potential for TQM in educational settings (Goldberg and Cole, 2002: 9). Currently, TQM has become central to international educational reform efforts in nations such as Australia, Japan, Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom as they strive for higher quality products and services through educational renewal and school restructuring (Davies and West-Burnham, 1997: 194). The concept of TQM centres on redesigning the school's instructional delivery system and its governance policies by allowing the schools themselves to be held accountable for their own success and failures. Davies and West-Burnham (1997: 194) are of the view that the shift toward internal school reform "runs counter to past reform movements which were externally mandated, hastily conceived, functionally narrow in scope, and lacking in research-based data to support their paradigms".

In the United States the decision to use TQM principles to guide change in schools was made for several reasons. Some school districts were encouraged

by business partnerships and training; some saw the similarities with effective schools research, and others as a result of statutory requirements which compelled educators to embrace quality as a key part of the process of change.

According to Goldberg and Cole (2002: 10) Total Quality Management can be applied to quality management in education at three levels. The first level is the management processes of a school which includes strategic planning, recruitment and staff development, deploying resources, and alignment of what is taught, how it is taught, and how it is assessed. The next level is teaching quality to students and recognizing them both as customers and workers in the educational system. Students must be involved in their own education by training them to evaluate the learning process and accept responsibility for their learning. The third level of quality principles is in learning. In order to achieve desired results, educators must question their core teaching and learning processes and methods. Quality standards are established for each work process that results in improving grades and test scores. The input of quality management is the greatest when the focus becomes instructional processes and student learning.

Davies and West-Burnham (1997: 206) and Goldberg and Cole (2002: 10) concur that the industrial model does not have all the answers and does not transfer perfectly into education. They believe that successful practitioners take the best from industrial experiences and combine this with the best learning theories and method. The result is a hybrid which naturally varies from school to school.

2.5 The benefits and limitations of appraisal

Unless there are genuine benefits for appraisal for educators in a school, there is little point in embarking on an appraisal scheme. Educators must feel that they are deriving some benefit from the appraisal process, rather than viewing it as yet another mandatory, paper exercise or one that is superficial. It is, therefore, worth examining the potential benefits of investing time in introducing appraisal. On the other hand, it would be also unrealistic to suggest that the introduction of appraisal in schools is without problems. An understanding of the benefits and limitations of appraisal will assist appraisers in the successful implementation of the appraisal scheme.

Poster and Poster (1993: 6-7) assert that a well-run appraisal system will benefit both the individual members of staff as well as the organization. Bell (1988: 32), Jones (1993: 7-8) and Poster and Poster (1993: 6-7) concur, firstly, that appraisal benefits the individual by giving them a greater sense of purpose through the provision of clear objectives, recognizing effective practice, encouraging their self-development and personal initiative, and enhancing their self-esteem and self-confidence by valuing their contribution to the school.

Secondly, a well-planned appraisal system will benefit the organization, apart from the personal and professional development of educators, by channelling individual effort into organizational goals, ensuring greater accountability, identifying and co-ordinating staff development needs, and by creating a more open ethos and supportive environment. Ultimately learners will benefit as the

main aim of appraisal is to enhance and maximize the educational opportunities of learners through the professional growth of educators. Learners will benefit through a clearer understanding by educators of their needs, more systematic planning of learning experiences, a wider variety of learning opportunities and the experience of styles of teaching which make learning a more active process.

It would be unrealistic to believe that a school will ever be able to achieve all these potential benefits of an appraisal system. I agree with Poster and Poster (1993: 7) that any school which seeks to be so comprehensive that it combines all the possible benefits of appraisal will almost certainly create such a confused multi-targeted approach that it will fail. The climate and the contextual circumstances of the school will determine which potential benefits might be realistically achieved and which will not be able to be accommodated. In a school that has an open climate where educators are ready to discuss their work and where professional relationships are good, there is the potential for encouragement and development of educators. In another school where there are constraints in material and human resources, the focus of appraisal might be on achieving specific objectives within the resource constraints.

It must be borne in mind that appraisal has to be resourced in terms of time and expertise. Appraisal does not take place in a vacuum in a school. While appraisal is being conducted, educators are inundated simultaneously with various other issues such as curriculum transformation, co-curricular activities, disciplinary problems and a host of other activities. In view of the above the school has to

establish and prioritize in terms of time and resources what appraisal objectives need to be targeted.

The School Teacher Appraisal Pilot Study conducted in the United Kingdom during the period 1987-9 (Bollington, Hopkins and West, 1993: 3; 62) revealed a range of benefits experienced as a result of appraisal. These benefits arose both during the process itself and as a result of target-setting. The report stated that appraisal frequently served to prompt reflection and greater self-awareness. It created an opportunity for receiving assurance, recognition and praise and in this way served to boost morale and self-confidence. Furthermore, appraisal also served to improve communication in schools, led to greater sense of coherence and mutual understanding. It also encouraged educators to work on and improve specific areas of their teaching to the benefit of their learners.

According to Bollington, Hopkins and West (1993: 63) the School Teacher Pilot Study also concluded; however, that where appraisal did not prove to be beneficial, it was due to the following factors:

- lack of appropriate training or a gap between training and appraisal;
- having an appraiser you don't have confidence in;
- failure to understand the process;
- delays in the process, for example in giving feedback;
- too "cosy" appraisal;
- vague targets;
- lack of commitment from the principal and

- pressure from other concerns and innovations.

From the above discussion it is clear that whilst appraisal has much to offer to both the individual and the organization, there are a number of factors, as mentioned above, that may threaten the impact of appraisal. An understanding of these factors will better equip managers and appraisers to be successful in their planning and implementation of the appraisal scheme.

2.6 Models of Appraisal

Sallis (1993: 3) states that in the commercial world it is the survival imperative that often drives quality improvement, but the complexity of education and the importance of values in education makes the motive for taking a quality stance more complicated and diverse. Lacey (1996: 5) is of the view that schools participate in performance appraisal processes for different reasons. She believes that appraisal for educator improvement and appraisal for performance review or accountability are the key differences in philosophical approaches towards appraisal. Poster and Poster (1993: 1) concur with the above assertions as they too, draw a distinction between two trends in appraisal: “one focuses on performance, the other on development”. Whilst I agree that appraisal can serve both purposes of accountability and improvement, from my own experience as a school manager I have observed that the developmental agenda has been subsumed by the accountability one.

2.6.1 The accountability model of appraisal

The accountability model is based on the assumption that educators should be held accountable to the public in order to ensure the provision of quality education. Sallis (1993: 4) maintains that schools are part of their communities and as such they must meet the political demands for education to be more accountable and publicly demonstrate high standards. Since education is directly funded by the treasury, schools like other public sector organizations are being called upon to provide evidence that they are accountable for their activities. The various stakeholders such as the taxpayers, parents, school boards, and state and national funding agencies want to know whether the involved personnel and organizations charged with the responsibility for educating learners and for improving education are achieving all they should be achieving, given the investment of resources to support their work (Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam, 1987: 28). According to Wagner (1989: 16), the rationale behind the demand for accountability in education is, therefore, to hold schools and educators accountable for greater effectiveness and efficiency, especially in view of rising costs in public services. Apart from the above-mentioned reasons the increased demand for accountability in South African schools can be attributed to the absence of a uniform system of appraisal since the dismantling of apartheid. This issue will be explored further in the section dealing with the historical overview of educator appraisal in South Africa.

It is against this background that the concept of accountability in education, particularly in schools is discussed. While McCormick (1982: 27) discusses the

nature of accountability under three broad categories: answerability to one's clients (moral accountability), responsibility to oneself and one's colleagues (professional accountability) and accountability to one's employers (bureaucratic or contractual accountability), other proponents of the accountability model advances the following models: the Consumerist Model, the Self-Accounting Model, and the Partnership Model. A discussion of the above models will illustrate how they are related.

2.6.1.1 Bureaucratic Accountability Model

According to Becher, Eraut and Knight (1981: 20) and Kogan (1986: 35), bureaucratic accountability is typified by employment contracts by means of which bureaucratic systems are established and employees are recruited. Wagner (1989: 23) stresses that contracts are essentially agreements with educators who are obliged to demonstrate that they are doing what they are remunerated for. This form of accountability is hierarchical in nature, and is achieved by assigning responsibility for oversight of subordinates by those holding supervisory positions. It is exercised through educator evaluation and authoritative actions to direct the work of educators (Seyfarth, 1999: 104). It must be noted that whilst neither employment contracts nor educator evaluation can guarantee marked improvements in educator performance, appraisal can, however assist educators to do a better job, but the results depend as much on the educator's desire to improve as on the supervisor's actions. I believe that this model might evoke negative reactions from educators as it may be seen as being judgemental and inspectoral.

2.6.1.2 Moral Accountability Model

Becher, Eraut and Knight (1981: 21) believe that moral accountability is of special importance in education because it pervades the educator-learner relationship. Leaving aside legal obligations to the employer, an educator is answerable to learners and parents in moral terms. Sallis (1993: 4) feels that this is the moral high ground in education and where there is very little dissent. It is, therefore, the duty of educators and administrators to have an overriding concern to provide the best possible educational opportunities to its customers and clients of the education services (learners, parents and the community). Whilst the above-mentioned sentiment may be the ideal expectation of educators, I believe that in practice it is something difficult to attain as economic imperatives is increasingly becoming more apparent as teaching is a bread and butter issue. The most recent and longest educator strike in the history of South Africa which took place from 1 June 2007 to 29 June 2007 clearly showed that educators are fighting for their right to a reasonable living salary and proper working conditions. The idea of teaching being a 'calling' does not seem to be favoured in this generation.

2.6.1.3 The Professional Model

Seyfarth (1999: 20) asserts that this model depends on members of professional groups to protect the public interest. It requires that educators be well-informed in the most appropriate pedagogic practices as they have a professional duty to improve the quality of education. Scott (1994: 153) states that this model avoids the problem of managerial hierarchy by leaving educational decisions, except on

issues on which they are contractually bound, to the judgement of the professional educators or school.

According to Kogan (1986: 41) professional accountability would make “professionals contractually committed to ethical practice”. This model would be an alternative to a result based model and would expect educators to be accountable for their modes and actions. Accountability will not be determined by external determinations, but rather by self-evaluation and self-report. Educators take responsibility for establishing codes of conduct, especially in areas such as classroom conduct and relationship with parents and learners. The professional model of accountability would include drawing up a “contract”, that is, discussion with the interested parties on what the school and the individual educators ought to be doing by providing justifications and explanations which are relevant to the different parties. In these actions the educator aspires to the status of an autonomous professional, and is not regarded as “a social technician within the bureaucratic framework of a school and the educational system” (Kogan, 1986: 42).

I believe that the professional model does have the capacity to improve instruction. By providing educators opportunities to collaborate with colleagues in order to extend their professional expertise, this model can help to bring about improvements in teaching practice and the concomitant improvement in learner achievement. One of the philosophical approaches of the IQMS is a focus on improving the ability of employees to perform their roles through the identification

of professional development needs and the provision of subsequent training or self-development opportunities.

2.6.1.4 The Consumerist Model

This model is based on the premise that as a result of the competition in the marketplace, schools are no longer guaranteed clientele. Parents are exercising their right to choose the schools their children will attend. The consequence of this market approach is that if a school is not able to attract learners, it will cease to operate. On the contrary, this model may motivate and compel educators and schools to demonstrate a higher level of accountability by pushing up educational standards in order to sustain (Seyfarth, 1999: 104).

The supply and demand model had major quality implications for South African schools, especially in the post-apartheid scenario. The dismantling of apartheid and the formation of a single education department offered both schools and learners greater autonomy. While schools had the freedom to admit learners from any geographical location and irrespective of their race, parents had the right to select the school of their choice for their children. This transformation had a major impact on quality assurance in schools. Urban schools that were predominantly situated in more affluent areas saw an influx of learners from township schools and this situation advantaged them. These schools charged higher school fees and consequently had more teaching resources and staff to ensure quality teaching and learning. On the contrary many township schools experienced a decline in their school population which impacted on funding and

staff establishment. As a result quality teaching and learning was stifled to a large extent in the latter schools.

The supply and demand model in post-apartheid South Africa also had a positive impact. It has compelled schools to demonstrate higher levels of accountability in order to attract learners and maintain their sustainability in a competitive environment where parents are looking for the best schools for their children.

2.6.1.5 The Self-Accounting Model

This model is closely tied to the notion of self-reporting or self-evaluation. It implies that educators monitor their own activities within the scope of contractual obligations while holding onto as much professional autonomy as possible. Proponents of this model argue that the developmental potential of self-evaluation may be spoiled by external validation or inspection. On the contrary, this model may lack credibility. Kogan (1986: 46), therefore, argues that there is a need for some element of external monitoring of self-evaluation.

I believe that self-evaluation as a method of appraisal does have the capacity to improve teaching and learning, but it can only be effective as a strategy for quality improvement if educators are honest during self-evaluation. In a fledgling appraisal scheme such as the IQMS which is tied to performance incentives there is definitely a need for external validation of self-evaluation to ensure fairness and quality assurance.

2.6.1.6 The Partnership Model

Kogan (1986: 50) points out that this model calls for a relationship between schools and parents that goes beyond the thinking of the marketplace. Rather, “clients should participate in a partnership and not in a relationship where the client is dependent on the professional” (Kogan, 1986: 50). Educators and parents should share co-responsibility in educational decisions. This relationship should contain the following components: consensus about objectives, an exchange of information about methods, their limitations and implications, and some dialogue to deliberate on the success of what has been done.

In a country such as South Africa where there is such a great disparity between urban and rural schools as well as the variance in socio-economic conditions, the Partnership Model would be idealistic and impractical. The high illiteracy level especially in rural areas will make it difficult for this model to succeed however good are its intentions. The South African Schools Act (1996) does allow parent representatives on the school governing body to share co-responsibility in the functioning of schools. Experience has revealed that these governing bodies work well in the affluent areas where parents are educated and they do make a positive contribution to the enhancement of quality education. Unfortunately this expertise from parents is not available to the vast majority of communities in the rural parts of South Africa and does have a negative impact on the provision of quality education.

Thus far six accountability models have been presented and from this preceding discussion, it must be noted that these appraisal models represent ideal types. In practice, it is unlikely to meet any appraisal process that exclusively has the characteristics of any one type.

In the light of the above discussion, the following question needs to be answered: Will school performance improve as a result of internal or external accountability measures? Seyfarth (1999: 104) is of the view that no employee of a school system is wholly accountable for learners' performance. An educator depends on administrators at both the school level and the education department level to create conditions that facilitate learning, to provide resources and to enact instructionally sound policies, and so on. If the above conditions have been met, then the educator can reasonably be held accountable for exercising good judgement in the selection and presentation of instructional materials, discipline and allocation of time. This issue will be further developed later when educator appraisal in the UK and the USA are discussed in order to get an international perspective of the accountability model.

The accountability model is popular among its advocates such as politicians and administrators for two reasons. Firstly, it is aimed at improving the quality of education. Secondly, it is a useful yardstick to measure competence for tenure, promotions, pay progression and even dismissal. But among educators this model creates acrimony as educators perceive their obligation to provide an account of their work as an intervention in their professional role (Kyriakides,

1999). Furthermore, educators perceive this type of appraisal as judgemental, hierarchical, top-down and threatening, as well as a means of checking on individuals for purposes such as demotions, redeployment or sacking (Hattersley, 1992: 3).

In the South African context, the IQMS is intended to serve two purposes, namely, internal accountability and external accountability. The idea of external accountability carried out by a team of appraisers from the DoE, which is similar to the Office of Standards in Education (OFSTED) inspections in the UK, has been met with resistance from educators and their unions as it was viewed as being similar to the panel inspections of the apartheid era. As a result, external and whole school evaluation is currently on hold in South African schools.

2.6.2 The Staff Development Model

A brief discussion and definition of what staff development entails is necessary to gain insights into the staff development model. According to Poster and Poster (1993: 1) staff development “focuses on improving the ability of employees to perform their present and prospective roles, through the identification of professional development needs and the provision of subsequent training or self-development opportunities”. Musaazi (1992: 197) supports this assertion by stating that educators are part of a dynamic profession and must be kept abreast of developments in matters relating to education. Badenhorst *et al.* (1995: 144) concur that educators should be kept informed of the latest trends in their learning areas in particular, and in education in general. No member of the

teaching profession can enter teaching and remain in it for several decades without frequently updating his or her professional skills (Bell, 1988: 172).

Davidoff and Lazarus (1997: 36) view development as a re-educative strategy for managing change. This is aimed at facilitating the development of people and the organization wholly for the purpose of optimizing human fulfilment. The development of human potential is so invaluable to any organization that an investment in promoting this goal will enhance individual and organizational performance tremendously.

Horne and Pierce (1996: 81) view the word “development” as a much maligned word as they are of the view that individuals become disappointed when appraisal is branded as a developmental process and then does not produce development for them. Appraisal has to be seen as positively valuable. In her study, Montgomery (cited in Bunnell, 1989: 9), put it cogently:

Evaluation without enhancement is sterile and that is why our project has been set in a way it has, to provide teachers with feedback on performance which will enable them to grow from their strengths. This method can help make teacher assessment more systematic, objective, open and geared to helping the teacher.

Enhancement is impractical without appraisal. Hence, staff development needs that emanate from the appraisal process are vital in designing programmes to

foster the personal and professional growth of educators (Guthrie and Reed, 1986: 320).

There are many definitions of staff development but the most common thread in the various definitions is recognition that staff development is a planned process which enhances the quality of student learning. At the heart of this process is the identification and clarification of the needs of the educators within the context of the school as a whole (Jones, 1993: 11). Bollington, Hopkins and West (1993: 56) argue that appraisal is a “valuable means of promoting the professional development of teachers and their schools”. The developmental potential of appraisal can be accomplished during the various stages of the appraisal process. For example, in the case of classroom observation, the educator is given feedback on specific areas in such a way as to encourage development and change. There are also many opportunities arising from the appraisal for educators to collaborate in a supportive and critical community.

Bell (1988: 172) argues that until recently ‘staff development’ was equated with attendance at in-service courses. He asserts that there is now a need within schools for a clearly defined co-ordinated policy for staff development which satisfies both individual and organizational needs in a compatible way and which cannot be achieved only by course attendance. In this context, therefore, ‘appraisal’ as a means of identifying both individual and organizational needs, has benefits for the school. Firstly, through appraisal additional training needs specifically related to the individual and the school will be identified. Secondly,

this will lead to the provision of more relevant in-service training courses and improve the use of these resources.

Poster and Poster (1993: 9) cover the main features of staff development by suggesting that the developmental model:

- assumes professional, collegial and evaluative authority to lie within the profession;
- is concerned with accuracy and the maintenance of moral, ethical and professional values;
- recognizes the value of peer appraisal of colleagues;
- has a bipartite approach towards enabling self-improvement;
- is designed to enable shared responsibility for the achievement of objectives and;
- is concerned with ongoing professional development.

During the apartheid era staff development was the responsibility of school inspectors and school management. The approach was mainly top-down and created an illusion that educators were not empowered enough to offer advice to their peers. The IQMS makes provision for collaboration between peers for the enhancement of each other's potential. Educators have the subject expertise to develop one another.

2.6.3 The Accountability versus the Staff Development Model

From the analysis of the two models above, the following inferences can be made: firstly, the two models serve distinctly different purposes, summative and formative; and secondly, there are tensions as to whether the multi-level purposes of appraisal aimed to ensure accountability and development are compatible.

Hargreaves (1994: 8) sums up the tensions inherent in staff appraisal schemes as follows: “Is it meant to be a supportive form of professional development or is it a device for assessing educator competence, rewarding the effective and disciplining the ineffective?” Much of this tension results in running battles between educator unions or professional associations and politicians and parents. Educators want appraisal to foster their professional growth and vehemently resist the pressures from politicians and parents to use it to ‘discipline’ or dismiss weak or incompetent educators.

Middelwood and Cardno (2001: 6) are of the view that an integration of the ‘accountability’ and ‘developmental’ model in the performance appraisal system offers considerable opportunities for schools to make links between strategic intent, staff performance, the achievement of effective educational outcomes for learners, and the development and training needs to meet professional and strategic objectives. Bollington, Hopkins and West (1993: 2) support the above argument, but they do concede that at times there are tensions between the two purposes, that is, accountability and professional development. However, they

argue that a well-constructed and managed professional appraisal scheme can enhance the development of educators, and, at the same time, provide reassurance to the public that measures are in place to improve the quality of education.

There is a fundamental difference in the purpose of the accountability and development models of appraisal; therefore I believe that there should be a difference in the types of processes that should be undertaken within each model arising from these differences in purpose. A blunt appraisal instrument cannot be used to ensure accountability in educators and schools while also encouraging reflective development. Different mechanisms are required to achieve these differing aims. Combining the developmental and accountability educator evaluation models supposes a fairly sophisticated context in which the different forms of appraisal can co-exist within one process. It assumes that all stakeholders actually value both development and accountability and will do justice to both these aspects within one integrated system. In a fledgling education system, such as we have in post-apartheid South Africa, such a context does not exist, making it vital that the two models be implemented independently if they are to achieve their somewhat opposing goals.

Lacey (1996: 3) states that recent career structures and the increasing workloads of educators in schools has resulted in policymakers constantly looking for new ways to streamline appraisal processes, and to eliminate the duplication of tasks. Lacey (1996: 3) cautions us that we must “be wary of falling into the trap that one

appraisal process will meet both these needs". This sentiment is strongly supported by Kyriakides *et al.* (2006: 5) who believes that the dual character of evaluation as described earlier, is practically impossible to be achieved within a single evaluation system, since 'the determination of the evaluation purposes influences the design of the evaluation instruments and their administration, as well as the interpretation of the results". McGreal cited in (Kyriakides *et al.* 2006: 5) argues that a comprehensive educator evaluation system should be rooted in the two broad purposes of evaluation, namely, accountability and development. He states that it is important to establish different mechanisms for formative and summative educator evaluation and different criteria might be used for conducting each type of educator evaluation. However, he further states that in order for educator evaluation systems to serve both purposes, there must be a rational link between them. This should not allow the summative function of evaluation to dominate the formative function.

In its second year of the implementation of the IQMS, the experiences at schools are increasingly revealing the incompatibility of the dual purpose of appraisal. This has been aptly highlighted at a meeting of Regional Principals by the Superintendent-General of Education in KwaZulu Natal, Dr.R.Cassius Lubisi (2006: 8), who made the following assertion regards the current IQMS:

While many strengths can be listed about the IQMS, let us fool no one: its twin purpose character is yielding serious contradictions which have to be addressed. The fact that the IQMS is intended to be used for both salary

progression and professional development, is presenting us with challenges that could render the mechanism unsustainable. The experience of last year's evaluations show us that the overwhelming majority of teachers place not just greater, but all emphasis, on salary progression element of the IQMS. The results of both the self- and peer evaluation told us that almost all our teachers are good teachers. Of course if one is a good teacher, one does not need development. You and I know that this picture is clearly wrong, and comes no where near the reality of the education system.

I believe that the above scenario is not a shortcoming of the IQMS model *per se*, but rather as a result of shortcomings in its implementation at school level. I tend to agree with Muller (2004: 7) who states that "the achievement of quality is likely to depend not only on what people are doing, but also on the way they are doing it". The IQMS can only be made sustainable if each person involved in the process assumes full responsibility for his or her role in development and improvement. Although the preceding discussion demonstrates the dichotomous nature of the two models, in the final analysis, both approaches lead to the improvement of the quality of teaching and learning in schools. There is, no doubt, a need for educators who are responsible for the future of learners to be held accountable for their actions. By the same token, one must be mindful that education is a dynamic process and as such educators need to keep abreast of the new trends in education. Therefore, the development of staff is vital for educators to perform to their maximum potential in providing the best education

for our learners. In the final analysis, both models of appraisal are complementary and contribute in their own way to the enhancement of quality education.

2.7 The Appraisal Process

This section describes and discusses the following stages of the appraisal process: the initial meeting, the self appraisal, classroom observation and data collection, and the appraisal discussion and target setting.

2.7.1 The initial meeting

McBride (1989: 99) states that the importance of the initial meeting is to ensure the goodwill and involvement of educators by setting an invitational climate. Furthermore, it is vital for the success of the appraisal cycle that the appraisee and appraiser develop a good professional relationship “so that the appraisee feels confident about revealing possible areas of concern without being regarded as a poor teacher” (Horne and Pierce, 1996: 32). If the relationship lacks professional rigour, then the appraisal becomes a ‘back patting’ exercise and will add little or no value to either the educator or the school.

To successfully implement an appraisal scheme, there needs to be a climate of trust between the appraisee and appraiser. The initial meeting creates an opportunity for rapport between the appraisee and appraiser. In addition to selecting and agreeing areas of focus and arranging the future time-table, this occasion allows participants to share information which may be useful for the

observation and collection of data. Participants are also accorded the opportunity to negotiate and agree on the sources of information to be collected such as the documents that need to be read, the people that need to be consulted and the tasks to be observed. Dealing with the above issues in the initial meeting helps to build an atmosphere of professional trust which will lead to a more productive and useful appraisal (Bollington, Hopkins and West, 1993: 32).

According to Horne and Pierce (1996: 31) the initial meeting serves, inter alia, the following purposes:

- to confirm the purpose and clarify the context of the appraisal;
- to consider the educator's job description;
- to agree on the scope of the appraisal, identifying areas of the appraisees' job on which the appraisal might usefully focus;
- to agree on the scope of the appraisal, in the context of the school or departmental development plans;
- to agree on arrangements for classroom observation;
- to agree on the methods other than classroom observation by which data for the appraisal should be collected; and
- to agree on a time-table for the appraisal process.

2.7.2 The self-appraisal

The use of self-appraisal within an appraisal scheme has been advocated by a number of experts who see this as a very useful and essential component of the appraisal process. Jones (1993: 60) states that self-appraisal can, firstly, ensure

that appraisal is a two-way process. Secondly it ensures that the appraisee clarifies thoughts and knows what he or she wants from the appraisal process. Thirdly, self-appraisal encourages ongoing reflection to celebrate successes and establish improvement.

To be effective and to help the appraisee get the maximum benefit from the appraisal scheme, it is important for the appraisee to be both honest and fair during self-appraisal (Horne and Pierce, 1996: 33). Self-appraisal requires a detailed and honest critique of one's performance. Hattersley (1992: 45) is of the opinion that problems arise when self-appraisals are written in the knowledge that they are going to be read by others and evaluated. Self-confessed weaknesses are hardly likely to figure when appraisees are aware that the self-appraisal will be judged. As mentioned earlier, the purpose of the self-appraisal is not only to dwell on strengths and achievements, but to also focus on potential areas for improvement.

Where self-appraisal is considered for summative appraisal, there is the likelihood of educators inflating their self-appraisal scores for securing monetary incentives or promotion. When this happens, the validity of the self-appraisal is likely to be adversely affected. The self-appraisal of educators is used by management and peers during appraisal to confirm or refute the educator's final score. Conflict is likely to arise when there are discrepancies between the scores of the appraisee and appraisers.

In summary, the purpose of self-appraisal is to encourage an educator to reflect on his or her work and to prepare for the various discussions in the formal appraisal process. West and Bollington (1990: 21) posit the view that for self-appraisal to serve as a positive and useful exercise, it must:

- be carried out in a highly focused and structured manner;
- be seen as a major vehicle for professional development rather than an isolated event;
- encourage educators to analyse their own practice in precisely the way a formal appraisal system can support; and
- enable educators to analyse their own practice in a balanced way and discuss and exchange ideas freely with colleagues.

2.7.3 Classroom observation and data collection

Classroom observation occupies a prominent position in the appraisal process. If appraisal is aimed at educator and school improvement, then it follows that what educators spend most of their time engaged in, that is, teaching, “must be a central feature of the appraisal process” (Poster and Poster, 1993:61). However, it must be noted that this issue of classroom observation will be the most contentious aspect when implementing a comprehensive system of appraisal. It is this component of the appraisal cycle that appears to have threatened and worried educators the most for several reasons. Firstly, educators’ main fear of the classroom observation component is that they would lose their autonomy given the fact that educators have enjoyed a long tradition of autonomy of the classroom. Secondly, educators are suspicious of the standard checklist

approach of evaluating the lesson as it viewed by them as being non-collaborative and a fault finding bureaucratic exercise.

The above-mentioned concerns of educators may be allayed if the purpose of the classroom observation is clearly discussed with educators. This is usually done in the initial meeting where the criteria, method of observation and the focus will have been decided. Lacey (1996: 33) prefers to call this phase the pre-observation conference. During this session both the appraisee and appraiser identify a general focus of the observation such as the use of a range of teaching strategies, or learner movement patterns.

During the lesson observation, the appraiser notes as much significant behaviour as possible, whilst keeping in mind the purpose of the observation agreed upon beforehand. Note-taking may not be the only method of recording data. Some schools make use of an observation recording form of some description.

After the observation the appraiser should provide some immediate, informal feedback while the memory is still fresh and to allay any nervous apprehension on the part of the educator. This debriefing session requires sensitivity and skill, and should not only be supportive, but also developmental. The role of the observer is to assist the educator to analyse the data rather than telling him or her how it should have been done. Poster and Poster (1993: 75) contend that since one of the main purposes of the classroom observation is to encourage

self-awareness, it is important that the debriefing begin with the educator's own views on the merits and demerits of the lesson under review.

Horne and Pierce (1996: 39) believe that feedback should be constructive and based only on evidence of the observation, and comments should only be made on behaviour that can be changed. Furthermore, recognition and celebration of the strengths of the appraisee and the achievements of the lesson should be made while offering alternatives to be explored. In order to achieve the above, it is advisable to be descriptive rather than judgemental. Horne and Pierce (1996: 39) suggest the use of the 'POD' framework to check that:

1. The **planning** has been adequate. This applies to both the appraisee and appraiser.
2. The agreed criteria have been followed for the **observation**.
3. There has been adequate **discussion**, both at the initial meeting and in the feedback immediately following the observation.

The IQMS processes calls for pre-observation conference, lesson observation and feedback after the lesson observation. The above-mentioned framework will assist to ensure that all the requirements and protocols of the IQMS policy are adhered to by both appraisers and appraisees.

2.7.4 Appraisal discussion and target setting

This component of the appraisal cycle is often referred to as the appraisal discussion and sometimes the appraisal interview. Irrespective of the terminology

used, Horne and Pierce (1996: 40) state that a comprehensive discussion between the appraiser and appraisee is a crucial and compulsory component of any appraisal scheme.

Bollington, Hopkins and West (1993: 47) state that the appraisal discussion provides:

an opportunity for reflection of previous work with the aim of agreeing on plans for the future. It is potentially a sensitive occasion, dealing as it does with matters at the heart of a teacher's career and job. It is also an occasion that can trigger further development and growth.

Hunter (cited in Bollington, Hopkins and West, 1993: 49) proffers the following advice on the evaluative conference, that is, appraisal discussion:

An evaluative conference should be the summation of what has occurred in and resulted from a series of instructional conferences, information given and conclusions reached in an evaluative conference should come as no surprise to the teacher because the supporting evidence has been discussed in previous instructional conferences. As a result, the evaluative conference has high probability for being perceived as fair, just and supportable by objective evidence rather than based on subjective opinion. This conference is the culmination of a year's diagnostic, prescriptive, collaborative work with a teacher and supervisor who shared responsibility for the teacher's continuous professional growth.

In the light of the above, Horne and Pierce (1996: 40) agree that at this stage professional targets are set. These targets must be precise, realistic and capable of being monitored; therefore, it is imperative that when targets are set they are SMART:

- Specific
- Measurable
- Achievable
- Realistic
- Time-bound

The IQMS process requires the educator together with the appraisal panel to formulate a personal growth plan. In the personal growth plan the educator should enumerate realistically specific areas that need development and there should be a time-frame. The professional development needs should be realistic and attainable; otherwise the appraisal process could degenerate into an exercise in futility.

The appraisal discussion provides an opportunity to discuss the agreed areas of the educator's work, while giving feedback and recognition on the basis of the classroom observation and data collected. This discussion should provide an opportunity for general dialogue which assists the appraisee to identify areas for professional and career development and it provides the forum to negotiate targets for that development. It also provides information for negotiating the writing of the appraisal statement. The appraisal discussion also provides the

opportunity to negotiate and clarify points that can be included in the appraisal statement.

It must be noted that the appraisers have the right to add a comment to the appraisal statement if they wish. Appraisal discussions can be very threatening and some educators can become quite defensive during this phase. Bittel and Newstrom (1990: 197-198) are of view that the appraisal discussion shouldn't cause people to become defensive. This can be achieved by appraisees and appraisers comparing notes, acknowledging what has been achieved and agreeing on future targets. Such an approach will create an objective and a non-threatening environment for the appraisee and I believe that the educator who shares responsibility for his or her professional growth rather than it being imposed on them will approach a task with greater confidence and enthusiasm.

In summary, (Bollington, Hopkins and West, 1993: 4) cogently propose that the appraisal discussion should, firstly, include a review of work done and targets achieved since the previous appraisal. Secondly, it should include targets for the future both for developing the present job and for professional and career development. Thirdly, it should identify ways of achieving these targets and criteria for their successful accomplishment and, finally, on agreeing a final record or statement of the appraisal.

There is, no doubt, that the appraisal discussion as discussed in the literature, ideally, contributes immensely to the professional growth of the educator and the

enhancement of the school. However, from my experience at school, this exercise will lack clout if appraisers are not adequately trained in dealing with the appraisal discussion, as this phase requires certain skills. Appraisers who are not empowered with the necessary skills generally 'go with the motion', and as a result educators see no value in the appraisal process. Furthermore, this exercise requires time to carry out. In schools where an appraiser is responsible for appraising up to eight educators in a particular department, the appraisal discussion is often hurried as a result of time constraints. Unfortunately, the value of the appraisal process is consequently lost. The above are but some of the practicalities that might impede an exercise which otherwise has the potential to improve the quality of teaching and learning.

2.8 Educator appraisal in Britain and the United States of America

While there is some literature on educator appraisal in third world countries, there is; however a dearth of research-based information on educator appraisal especially in Africa. A study of Eurocentric models was therefore undertaken. Appraisal schemes in the UK and the USA have been well documented as they have been in existence for a long time and are under constant review. A study of these appraisal systems will provide useful insights as to what influenced the introduction of these schemes and the challenges they encountered during implementation. Furthermore, it will provide a valuable conceptualisation of educator appraisal and should serve as a basis for evaluating the current IQMS in South Africa and also for offering guidance for future practice and policy.

2.8.1 Educator appraisal in Britain

In the United Kingdom, the early approach to educator appraisal was based on the “inspectoral model”. According to Thompson (1990: 10), the original approach to appraisal in England was a confidential report by an inspector. The educator did not have access to this report. The purposes and processes of school inspection in the United Kingdom have changed over time. Since the early 1990’s the educator appraisal system in the United Kingdom has shifted after the inspectoral model from an almost professional development model to an assessment of performance related pay.

In 1976, James Callaghan made his Ruskin College speech which criticized the inappropriateness of the school curriculum for the last quarter of the twentieth century. He called for the school curriculum to come under public scrutiny, and consequently, in order for this to take place educators had to become more accountable to interest groups outside the school, including parents and industrialists. Thus the pressure for formal educator appraisal in Great Britain came into being. This, no doubt, roused the ire of educators and unions (Bell, 1988: 3).

In 1977 Shirley Williams argued in her Green Paper, quoted in *The Times Educational Supplement*, that if the education service was to give value for money, then, a high priority had to be the establishment of standard procedures for advice, and where necessary, warning to underperforming educators. In 1983, Sir Keith Joseph, Secretary of the State, insisted that those managing schools

had a clear responsibility to establish a policy for staff development based on the assessment of every educator's performance. In 1986, Kenneth Baker, successor to Keith Joseph as Secretary of State for Education, passed his new Education Act through Parliament which agreed to a national framework for the appraisal of educators (Bell, 1988: 3-4).

Over the years there have been a large number of appraisal schemes which had been devised by Local Education Authorities (LEAs), even more schemes have been devised by individual schools influenced by management development training and others have been part of official pilot studies (Bollington, Hopkins and West, 1993: 2; Bell, 1988: 8). These various influences combined created a case for educator appraisal. The movement towards appraisal was given further impetus when the Department of Education and Science (DES) funded a study carried out by Suffolk LEA and published as *Those having Torches* (Suffolk Education Department, 1985) and *In the Light of Torches* (Suffolk Education Department, 1987). This study came up with recommendations on the principles and processes appraisal should ideally encompass (Bollington, Hopkins and West, 1993: 3).

In the light of the above recommendations representatives of the LEA's, educator associations and the DES met in 1986 under the auspices of ACAS (Advisory Conciliation and Arbitration Service) to determine a process by which educator appraisal could be introduced into schools for the benefit of all. During the period 1987 to 1989 the DES funded the School Teacher Appraisal Pilot Study for the

piloting of teacher and head teacher appraisal in six LEA's – Croydon, Cumbria, Newcastle, Salford, Somerset and Suffolk. The outcome of the pilot was a National Framework for appraisal which proposed in 1989 the introduction of a national appraisal system which was concerned with the professional development of educators and the good professional management of schools (Hewton, 1988: 29; Turner and Clift, 1988: 19).

Horne and Pierce (1996: 8-9) offer the following model as a stereotype of what is currently happening for most of the educators in the appraisal process in the United Kingdom in terms of regulations. The introduction of appraisal begins with awareness-raising of the aims, processes and the links with school development plans. Educators thereafter engage in broad self-evaluation using job descriptions. This process affords educators an opportunity to introspect their practices. After self-evaluation, appraisers and appraisees meet at a pre-observation conference to set ground rules for the process, agree on dates and decide on focus areas. This is followed by the classroom observation which is compulsory. After the classroom observation an appraisal interview is held to set targets for future development. Appraisees and appraisers meet often thereafter to review progress on the targets. It is interesting to note that the IQMS has borrowed heavily from this model as the IQMS processes are quite similar.

The appraisal cycle is two years, with the main activity taking place in year one and a meeting at least once before the end of the second year to review the progress made towards achieving targets. However, it is recommended that it is

advantageous to have several meetings in the second year; otherwise progress targets will be somewhat limited (Horne and Pierce, 1996: 17). The IQMS differs in this respect as the IQMS cycle is one year.

While formal appraisal schemes were evolving and gaining momentum in the United Kingdom, Newman (cited in Poster and Poster, 1993: 14) felt it appropriate to warn that:

While there are many common features in appraisal schemes operating in different schools, there is no single universal arrangement that will work for all. Experience has shown that there may be difficulties if a school 'borrows' a scheme from another school and tries to use it without any attempt to see whether it is suitable or not.

The above assertion suggests that schools need to be given flexibility to adapt their appraisal process to meet their different management styles and structures, different approaches to learning and different staff experiences. If this does not occur, then the appraisal scheme is reduced to a 'one size fits all', and fails to serve effectively as a strategy for improvement.

Until the early 1990's, there was a national structure for Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Schools in England and Wales with teams of inspectors who covered both subjects and regions. Subject and phase committees met regularly to exchange and analyse evidence about the strengths and weaknesses of provision and each LEA had a team of inspectors which provided a link with

schools and the Department of Education and Science (DES). During this era a series of Conservative Secretaries of State felt that “LEA’s were not moving fast enough to implement a systematic process of inspection, or, if they were, the relationship between LEA’s and their schools was too ‘cosy’ for inspections to ‘have teeth’ ”(Learmonth, 2000: 36). It was clear to the authorities that this model of appraisal was not sufficiently ‘improving educators’ level of performance’. This review led to the current process of inspection in England and Wales which was introduced by the Education (Schools) Act of 1992 which set up OFSTED to carry out school inspections (Learmonth, 2000: 6). Since its implementation this system of appraisal has attracted much discussion and controversy in the United Kingdom.

The OFSTED framework for school inspection was devised along with a four-year cycle of inspection which was later extended to every six years in 1997. All schools are inspected according to a specified format and an explicit framework. There are different handbooks for the inspection of secondary, primary, nursery and special schools, but all are inspected against the four main areas of educational standards achieved, the quality of education provided, the effective management of resources, and the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of the learners at the school. Schools are inspected by teams of inspectors, trained and accredited by OFSTED, and who are led by a Registered Inspector. The inspection of a school or a group of schools is allocated to inspection teams by OFSTED through a bidding and contracting process. A typical secondary school inspection involves about 12 – 15 inspectors and takes

about a week with the bulk of the inspectors' time spent observing lessons. A report written by the lead inspector, and based on the record of evidence collected by members of the inspection panel, will follow the inspection week, usually after a month, and will include a list of recommendations or 'key issues for action'. The school and its governing body are then obliged to produce an action plan within 40 days outlining how the school will address the issues identified. A summary of the inspection report and the action plan are also made available to parents (Earley, 1998: 1-2).

The main purpose of inspection, as espoused by OFSTED, is to promote school improvement by identifying priorities for action, and to inform parents and the local community about a school's strengths and weaknesses (Earley, 1998: 2). However, this form of external inspection was viewed by educators with anxiety, and in some cases with terror. The educator's anxieties were rooted in several perceptions as enumerated below:

1. Educators felt that there may be a 'hidden agenda' to the inspection and those inspectors are interested in finding the negative aspects of educators' performance.
2. The inspection is viewed as an abnormal situation as the usual pattern of lessons will not be seen; hence educators will be inclined to putting on their best performance for these inspections.
3. Educators felt that the vast amount of time and energy that would be used to prepare for these inspections could be used more constructively in school improvement.

4. Inspectors may be unsympathetic, inappropriately qualified and too busy and judgements will, therefore, not be fair.
5. Feedback after the lesson observation would be non-existent.

(Learmonth, 2000: 44)

This section showed that educator appraisal evolved in the United Kingdom from the inspectorial model to an entirely professional development model, conducted by LEA's to an external accountability model, conducted by OFSTED. All of the above-mentioned appraisal models have advantages and disadvantages. Recently the United Kingdom government came up with a new strategy set out in the Green Paper, *Teachers Meeting the Challenge of Change* (DfEE 1998) which called for performance management linked to performance related pay. The proposed annual assessment of performance came into operation in all schools in England in the 2000/01 academic year. Whilst there was tremendous opposition from educator unions to the performance related pay, often called 'Payment by Results', this resistance was diluted after the government offered a substantive salary increase in 2000 for those educators willing to be assessed (Middelwood and Cardno, 2001: 127 ; Hartle, Everall and Baker, 2001: x).

A study of the IQMS illustrates that the current educator appraisal scheme in South African schools has been modelled closely along the UK model. There are, however, subtle differences such as the appraisal cycle and external evaluation which in the UK is carried out by agencies outside the education department whereas in South Africa it is carried out by Whole School Evaluation teams

selected by provincial departments of education. The IQMS is similar to the UK model which combines the accountability and professional development models into one appraisal scheme. The UK model has been recently reviewed and it would provide useful guidance to the South African policymakers as South Africa is ready for a review of the current IQMS.

2.8.2 Educator appraisal in the United States of America

The purposes and processes of educator appraisal have changed over time. Nolan and Hoover (2004: 22-25) in their study of the history of educator supervision in the United States of America observed that over time, competing educational philosophies and movements defined the role of the supervisor in various ways, ranging from inspector to helper to evaluator. In the early 19th century the 'inspectoral model' continued to flourish in the USA. Supervisors were concerned with overseeing the curriculum, improving the efficiency of the methods of instruction and evaluating educator performance and learner achievement. In the early 20th century, influenced by the time-and-motion studies in industry, the use of rating scales by skilled supervisors to rate educator effectiveness was in practice. The role of supervision was primarily educator evaluation. These educator rating scales were vigorously opposed by educators who viewed this model as anti-democratic and anti-intellectual. By the mid 1950's the 'collegial' function of supervision was emphasized. Collaborative problem solving, group supervision, and curriculum development were utilized by supervisors to facilitate educator development. By the late 1960's the tradition of 'clinical supervision' was practiced. This model emphasized the role of the

supervisor as colleague who developed a trusting relationship with educators. This model did not contribute much to educator development and, therefore, did not achieve popularity in schools. By the late 1980's and 1990's alternative models of educator supervision was introduced to counteract the previous models. The 'developmental supervision' and 'reflective supervision' models were designed. These developmental and reflective approaches currently dominate the appraisal practices in the USA.

According to Turner and Clift (1988: 10) staff appraisal in the USA has developed mainly along summative lines as the basis for initial certification of educators and for the renewal of contracts. Concern over the competence of educators to carry out their jobs successfully led some educator training institutions to develop competency-based educator training programmes. Many States have developed their own programmes for competency-based teaching which has either been mandated through legislation or State Department of Education regulations. Assessment is carried out by a team of experts, usually experienced educators, using agreed instruments of appraisal such as observation schedules and knowledge tests. On the basis of these assessments contracts of educators are either renewed or terminated.

One of the most influential policy documents issued by the federal government was *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative of Educational Reform* (1983) which intensified a long era of legislated school reform that enforced a rigorous educator selection, educator evaluation, standardization of curriculum, and

testing of learners. This new reform movement was a shift from the previous years of school reform which was based on the assumption that educators are the problem and reason for mediocre school performance, and therefore needed to be carefully controlled and monitored. *A Nation at Risk* concluded that the education system was 'mediocre' and responsible for low levels student performance and stimulated efforts at reform to improve these conditions (Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon, 1998: 26; Riley and Nuttall, 1994: 40).

A year after *A Nation at Risk*, the US Secretary of Education released the first series of 'league tables' comparing the state's educational performance. This was unprecedented in the US and stakeholders complained about this chart. One of the compelling reasons for the resistance to the 'league tables' was the lack of contextualizing data reflecting the different socio-economic conditions and challenges the states face (Riley and Nuttall, 1994: 42).

A Nation at Risk precipitated a major awareness of reform which resulted in various state mandates and regulations designed to raise standards in a number of critical areas. These areas included, but were not limited to, attendance and academic requirements for students; professional licensure requirements and performance outcomes for educators; and student contact hours, curricula, and accountability measures for schools. Anderson and Pellicer (2001: 2) are of the opinion that the results achieved from these massive efforts were disappointing as there were modest gains in terms of learner achievement. Furthermore, these

initiatives created more work, stress and frustration for learners, educators and administrators.

Unlike Great Britain where there was a call for a national scheme of appraisal, in the United States of America there could be no federal legislation in matters such as educators appraisal as the states themselves enact what they individually claim necessary (Poster and Poster, 1993: 23). In the light of the above the ensuing discussion focuses predominantly on the current trend in educator appraisal in Washington DC.

According to Weiss and Weiss (1998: 1) educators are becoming frustrated with conventional educational practices used to determine educator effectiveness as these models are not necessarily structured to support dynamic regenerative school environments. Evaluation procedures that encourage regimented set of behaviour do not encourage educator involvement in their self-development or in the development of collaborative cultures.

In 1987 the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) developed a performance-based assessment system to recognize competence among 'experienced educators'. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF), which created a blueprint for recruiting, preparing and supporting excellence in all of America's schools, recommended that the NBPTS's standards become the cornerstone for educator evaluation. The NBPTS's assessment help educators reflect and learn from their practice. The

NBPTS assessments are based on evidence of constructive practice and evaluate how specific teaching behaviours contribute to particular student's learning over time. By using these guidelines, evaluation becomes "part of a reflective process in which teaching is studied on a regular basis with colleagues for purposes of continual growth, rather than static formalities determined outside the classroom" (Weiss and Weiss, 1998: 3). The above model implies that a single observation of an educator alone cannot provide a complete picture of what educators do. Educators need to be understood in the multiple contexts in which they operate and, hence, performance data ought to be gathered from diverse sources.

Weiss and Weiss (1998: 3) state that several local and state institutions are beginning to incorporate peer review and assistance as these approaches tend to be more effective than traditional evaluations systems at both improving and letting go of educators. The American Federation of Teachers and National Education Association locals have initiated peer review in districts such as Rochester, New York; Toledo, Columbus, and Cincinnati, Ohio; and Seattle, Washington. Because these systems encourage educators to engage in decision-making and collaboration with colleagues, the process of evaluation becomes an integral part of everyday practice. Furthermore, by allowing educators increased autonomy, greater accountability may be assured.

Some districts such as Rochester and Cincinnati have developed career paths that link salary increments with satisfactory performance. In Rochester's Career

in Teaching (CIT) programme, educators who do not meet professional standards do not receive salary increases and are candidates for the intervention process. The CIT programme includes the Performance Review for Teachers (PART), which requires educators to reflect on five areas of behaviour: pedagogy, content, school quality, home involvement, and professional development. Tenured educators select peer reviewers for their summative appraisal, which is conducted every third year.

New educators in Rochester are observed three times a year by a supervisor (principal or assistant) for the first three years. In the first year educators participate in a mentor intern programme in which they are observed by a lead educator. The mentor basically visits the classroom more than forty times during the year and attends parent meetings and other professional events with the intern. Rochester's education evaluation model supports a career path ranging from the initial internship to "residency", to professional educator status, and finally to lead educator status. Tenure is granted only after rigorous evaluation of performance by administrators and peer reviewers in the first few years of teaching. The advanced certification from NBPTS may qualify educators for another salary increment and/or for position of lead educator (Weiss and Weiss, 1998: 5).

2.8.3 Lessons to be learned from the two case studies

The two case studies have demonstrated that appraisal is not a static process, but rather a dynamic one. In both the United Kingdom and the United States of

America, appraisal schemes have evolved over time. In both countries the appraisal schemes have been constantly evaluated and reviewed in order to improve the quality of education. It is clearly evident, for example, that there has been a shift from top-down approaches to a more collaborative approach to appraisal where educators are active participants in their own appraisal.

Teacher evaluation schemes were introduced in the two countries with its emphasis almost exclusively on the professional development model; however, over time policymakers have realized this model lacked real accountability. Hence, in order to ensure accountability, the United Kingdom has introduced external validation and evaluation by OFSTED, whereas in the United States performance-based assessment such as the NBPTS have been introduced. It is also interesting to note that in both countries there has been pressure from educator unions and professional associations in favour of the 'soft option' of the professional development model; however, political pressure and public outcry for accountability in both countries has called for more stringent measures for accountability.

It is also interesting to note that staff appraisal in both the USA and Britain has to some extent been informed by research into what constitutes an effective educator, as well as pilot studies before policy formulation. There has been a considerable amount of research into staff appraisal in the United States of America (Turner and Clift, 1988: 11). As mentioned earlier, in the United Kingdom the School Teacher Appraisal Pilot Study was carried out before a

national guideline on educator evaluation was formulated and became mandatory. Wragg (1987: 97) encapsulates the importance of pilot studies by stating that any school introducing appraisal for the first time should “regard its initial format as a pilot, subjected to modification in the light of experience and feedback from those involved”.

The experiences of both countries reveal that educator appraisal is not an isolated activity in the school. Appraisal is closely linked to the individual’s development as well as the school’s improvement. In the United Kingdom the appraisal process culminates in a professional growth plan for the educator and a whole school development plan for the school. In the USA the Performance Review for Teachers (PART) is aimed at individual educator professional development as well as whole school improvement.

Middelwood (cited in Middelwood and Cardno, 2001: 130) believes that for an appraisal scheme to be successful, it is vital that the appraisal process is consistent. All appraisers need to ensure that all appraisees are being treated in the same way. In the UK and the USA all appraisees are subjected to the same appraisal instruments, processes and procedures.

In both countries educator unions and associations played a pivotal role in the development of the appraisal schemes. They pressurized their governments to change from an accountability model to a professional development model. In the United Kingdom, the National Union of Teachers (NUT) feared that the results of

appraisal would be used against them and, therefore, insisted that appraisal be linked to professional development and not to pay, promotion or capability procedures (Montgomery, 1999: 1). In South Africa the South African Democratic Teachers' Union (SADTU) played a leading role in initiating discussion with the Department of Education and other stakeholders in developing an alternative educator appraisal model.

Both countries also gave prominence to the training of educators and appraisers to ensure the success and smooth administration of the appraisal scheme. All stakeholders involved in the appraisal process received training which ensured that they were competent to implement the appraisal scheme. The issue of educator training for the IQMS will be raised in the South African discussion.

Turner and Clift (1988: 122) are of the opinion that schools place more emphasis on who should conduct appraisals than what kind of skills, knowledge and other attributes an appraiser should ideally have. In the United Kingdom the LEA's viewed the issue of both educators and appraisers being provided with training in skills development as being essential. In fact, the School Teacher Appraisal Pilot Study emphasized the need for the training of appraisers and appraisees. In general the focus was on the following skills: self-appraisal, negotiation, interviewing skills, classroom observation methods, giving and receiving feedback, listening and conflict resolution. (Wragg *et al.*, 1996: 56; Hewton, 1988: 40-41). It is important for educators to receive access to training. If educators do not receive guidance in, for example, in the methods of observation, then they

may not feel competent to discuss these issues and this could hinder the appraisal process.

The experiences of the two case studies should inform the study under investigation; however, as mentioned earlier, one must be guarded not to transfer an appraisal model of another country. It would be useful to borrow ideas from another appraisal system with the proviso that it is adapted to meet local conditions. The preceding review of related literature focused on the two main approaches to educator appraisal, that is, the professional development and the accountability models as well the prevailing tensions between these two approaches. Although a conceptual distinction has been made between formative (professional development) and summative (career decision-making) evaluation, in practice most schemes tend to merge and serve both purposes to varying degrees. Ultimately both models contribute to improving teaching and learning in schools.

It is evident from the literature review, particularly from the two case studies from the United Kingdom and the United States of America that the introduction of an educator appraisal scheme is a complex exercise as it is a topic that evokes much controversy and debate. The case studies also revealed that collaborative approaches to appraisal are favoured as it ensures 'buy in' from educators. Furthermore, educators need to be trained in the various appraisal processes so that they have a clear understanding of the processes and procedures of the appraisal scheme so that they can successfully implement it.

The review has also succinctly shown that no appraisal scheme will be in its 'final form' as the evaluation and review of the appraisal scheme after implementation ensures that the appraisal scheme is continually evolving. Appraisal schemes must, therefore, be seen as organic in the sense that they constantly adjust to the needs of individuals and institutions (Turner and Clift, 1988: 71). As mentioned earlier the IQMS is in its third year of implementation and needs to be reviewed to ascertain whether the appraisal system is valid, that is, what it measures is genuinely representative of educators' classroom practices. Wragg (1987: 76) contends that any form of appraisal should not remain static and unchanged. The actual implementation will reveal the strengths and weaknesses of the model and it would be counterproductive to allow inadequate practices to persist unaltered.

Seeking to throw light on educators' responses to quality assurance mechanisms and monitoring regimes prompts us to pose fundamental questions. How do educators engage with quality frameworks or policy emanating from national or school level? What meanings do educators attach to different facets of quality? Are they adopters of policy or resisters, adapters, or makers and shapers of quality policy initiatives? Newton (2002: 49) argues that "front-line staff do not mutely accept policy or changes associated with it, and are not passive recipients of management objectives". Newton (2002: 50) adds that there is a 'gap' between what is designed into a policy and situational factors that prevent policy intentions from being achieved. In respect of the IQMS it is of paramount importance how this policy is received and decoded by educators.

2.9 Historical overview of educator appraisal in South Africa

2.9.1 Introduction

Williams (2003: 3) believes that there is a general consensus amongst education theorists that the main purpose of any form of staff evaluation should be to contribute to the professional development of the staff. In South Africa this instrument was, however, never utilized to fulfil this function. “In fact, before 1994 the majority of black teachers in South Africa developed a general aversion towards any form of teacher evaluation” (Williams, 2003: 3). There are many contributory factors towards this state of affairs and these will be developed further in the ensuing discussion.

As with many aspects in education, the issue of quality assurance was complicated by the legacy of apartheid; however, it must be borne in mind that the history of educator appraisal in South Africa predates the apartheid era. The ensuing discussion attempts to present an overview of educator appraisal during the Union era and the apartheid era. However, in presenting an exposition of educator appraisal prior to 1994, cognizance must be taken of “the fragmented nature of educational administration and substantial differences in levels of resourcing between the various education departments at the time, appraisal practices and the quality of relationships between educators and inspectorates varied considerably” (Thurlow and Ramnarain, 2001: 92).

2.9.2 Inspection and supervision during the pre-Union period

During the pre-union period, well qualified inspectors had been appointed to inspect and supervise White education in the Cape, Natal and in the Boer Republics. This contributed to a high standard and quality of education in White schools. Qualified inspectors were appointed in all four provinces during this period. The inspectors were responsible for the evaluation of classroom practice and supervising educators with regard to educational pedagogy and general classroom efficiency. They advised and guided educators and principals in the management of schools and in classroom teaching as well as in organizing and conducting in-service training programmes. In addition to carrying out these responsibilities, the inspectors were also entrusted with the responsibility of upgrading school curricula, the drawing up and distribution of official syllabi as well as making recommendations to provincial governments on where additional schools should be established (Baloyi, 2002: 72).

Before the Union almost all Black schooling was provided for by missionary schools. Missionaries supervised and inspected these schools. According to Hartshorne (1992: 24), these missionaries “had limited knowledge and experience of educational matters, in addition to being burdened with a host of other (church) responsibilities.” This invariably contributed to low academic standards in some missionary schools. According to Behr (1984: 176), state controlled inspection brought significant improvement in the academic standard of Black education. When the Union government took control of Black education, appropriately qualified inspectors were appointed. In some schools in the

townships, the inspectors in White education also inspected and supervised Black education.

2.9.3 Educator appraisal during the apartheid era

The education system during the apartheid era was complex as there were fifteen education departments, and as such there was a differentiated system of inspection, control and appraisal (Educators Workload Report, 2005: 10). The traditional method of quality control in South Africa has been external evaluation carried out by inspectors and subject advisors. It emphasized control rather than quality assurance (Department of Education, 2001: 43). This form of inspection was unpleasant for educators who often viewed these inspections with suspicion and fear, as well as discontent and disillusionment.

Interaction between the educators and the inspectorate is characterized by authoritarian relationships and follows a top-down management style. Appraisal and evaluation are generally judgemental and summative, rather than developmental. Teachers live in fear of the inspectorial or subject advisory visits. (Swartz, 1994: 36)

2.9.3.1 Principles underpinning appraisal

Due to the fragmentation of South Africa's past apartheid educational system, there were many divisions between education departments in the previous four provinces, between Whites, Blacks, Coloureds and Indians, in the ex-Homelands, and in rural and urban areas. Whilst taking into consideration the above context, this study will be focusing on appraisal procedures and practices experienced by

the majority of Black educators as they form the majority in South Africa; however, reference will be drawn to the experiences of Indian and White educators.

There were fifteen racially-based education departments during the apartheid era and consequently the relationship between educators and the inspectorate varied considerably in the various education departments. The experience of appraisal and the relationship with the inspectorate of educators employed by the White and Indian departments, although not entirely problematic, were largely positive and characterized by a light supervisory function (Thurlow, and Ramnarain, 2001: 93). In contrast, the experiences of the majority of Black educators were substantially different (Swartz, 1994: 81). African school suffered a regime of inspection that was autocratic. Judgemental, summative forms of evaluation seemed to have proliferated inspection and appraisal in African schools. The reaction to these negative forms of appraisal was overwhelming and towards the end of the 1980's, there was widespread resistance against apartheid authorities in schools. Inspectors and subject advisors were often violently cast out of African schools and educators resisted any form of evaluation of their or their schools' work. African schools became dysfunctional and this conflict resulted, sadly, in the breakdown of the culture of teaching and learning (Educators Workload Report, 2005: 11).

South Africa's system of appraisal has been largely inspectoral and bureaucratic. It shares with all other aspects of the education bureaucracy a top-down, closed, hierarchical and authoritarian character. In the case of Black teachers it has been concerned with bureaucratic efficiency and

social control rather than professional development. (Chetty *et al.*, 1993: 2).

Under apartheid educational administration, the approach to educator appraisal has been largely summative, in that “it aimed at rewarding excellent teachers and punishing incompetent performance, rather than formative, in the sense of helping teachers to identify and overcome their shortcomings”(African National Congress Education Department, 1994: par.10).

Chetty *et al.* (1993: 2) pointed out that at school level, and particularly in African departments, supervision was oriented towards the narrow objective of improving examination results rather than improving educational process generally. The inspection focused on assessing educators with a view to monetary rewards and promotion, and it was overwhelmingly about compliance with departmental regulations rather than engaging educators about their work. Loyalty to officials and their departments outweighed the interests and needs of educators.

On the whole, the appraisal system during apartheid was geared towards control and containment of learners and educators, rather than their development and support. The system was “highly bureaucratized with strict control through standardized procedures, codes and lines of responsibility” (McLennan, 2000 cited in Smith and Ngoma-Maema 2003: 352). As a consequence, towards the end of the 1980’s, educators’ tolerance level of inspectors and subject advisors were at an all time low. There was a strong sense of distrust and anxiety

amongst educators. As a result of educator dissatisfaction and frustrations, inspectors and subject advisors were ejected from schools and refused entry (Metcalf, 1994 cited in Swartz, 1994: 30).

2.9.3.2 The role of the inspectorate in educator appraisal

The appraisal systems for educators in the fifteen education departments were not necessarily uniform across all departments. In practice each had its own peculiarities and the experience of educators within these departments differed substantially as well (Chetty *et al.*, 1994: 4). Whilst the inspection in Black schools was characterized by bureaucratic control, in White schools inspections was viewed as a light supervisory function. The inspectors in White schools were better qualified, played the role of trouble-shooting and assisted schools and teachers in their functions. In contrast, Black schools encountered an autocratic form of inspection which was intended explicitly to control the masses.

(i) Department of Education and Training

The Department of Education and Training (DET) controlled Black education outside the homelands during the apartheid period. In DET schools, the inspectorate played a limited role in the appraisal of educators. The heads of departments were expected to evaluate educators first.

Inspectors monitor the submission of these evaluations, but there are no formal links between subject advisors and circuit inspectors. This process gives rise to a variety of difficulties, in particular a judgemental rather than

a developmental emphasis in the system as a whole. (Chetty *et al.*, 1993: 5).

It is no wonder that this bureaucratic, top-down approach to appraisal was vehemently opposed in the 1980's.

(ii) House of Delegates

In the Department of Education and Culture in the House of Delegates (HOD) which controlled Indian education, educator evaluation was conducted for probation, promotion, merit awards and professional development (Department of Education & Culture: House of Delegates, 1989: Chapter B7).

In 1987 the HOD adopted a new educator evaluation system as it was of the view that the 'old system' was fraught with many deficiencies. Prior to 1987 the Superintendents of Education were responsible for the inspection of individual educators. The new system entailed the inspection of the subject as a whole. This meant that all educators of a particular subject at a school were evaluated. The rationale advanced for the transformation of the evaluation system was that by evaluating all educators teaching the subject, the Superintendent of Education would be in a better position to assess the state of the subject. In addition to inspecting learners' work and the record books of educators, the Superintendent of Education conducted at least one classroom visit of every educator of the subject. Individual reports were not made on educators after these visits by the superintendent, but rather a report on the state of the subject was compiled

enumerating the strengths and weaknesses of the particular subject (Pillay, 1991: 47).

As a head of department during this era I can attest to the fact that this form of 'panel inspection' was very bureaucratic, impersonal and humiliating. Superintendents went through a checklist, asked for evidence of work and merely made notes of their findings. There was neither corroboration of facts nor accommodation of contextual factors. At the end of the inspection process the superintendent presented his/her findings to the subject team and you dared not to question the superintendent for fear of reprisals as they played a decisive role in awarding merit notches and promotions. The 'panel inspection' was followed by a written report to the principal of the school with recommendations. The subject team was then at the mercy of the principal who believed everything in the report as being beyond questioning.

The system of 'panel inspection' was rather unfair as these inspections were erratic and done on a random basis. As a result some subject teams in the schools were not inspected at all. Furthermore, since the inspection reported on the state of the subject and not individual educators, diligent educators had to succumb to the negative remarks of tardy educators in their department as if it were their fault and it demoralized and demotivated them. It is no wonder that educators are quite suspicious of the external whole school evaluation component of the IQMS which reminds them of the 'panel inspections' of the apartheid era.

Pillay (1991: 60) states that it is necessary for an organisation to have information available so that when the occasion arises, promotion posts can be filled. An evaluation assists organizations to obtain the necessary information required of educators. In the HOD educators who applied for promotion posts were, firstly, evaluated by the principal with the help of his management team. Thereafter educator ratings were moderated by the superintendents of education of the particular subjects.

School management teams comprising of the principal, senior deputy principal, deputy principal and head of department were responsible for the 'in house' evaluation of educators. The principal assumed the overall responsibility for evaluating all members of his staff. When evaluating educators, the principal consulted his management team. In evaluating heads of department, the principal consulted his senior deputy principal and deputy principal. The principal was the sole evaluator for the senior deputy principal and the deputy principal (Pillay, 1991: 60).

In the above-mentioned educator appraisal model one of the purposes of evaluation was for the promotion of educators. The IQMS on the other hand uses evaluation for performance measurement but not for promotion purpose. Unlike in the UK and the USA where the educator appraisal instrument is used for promotion purposes, in South Africa this is not the case. It is ironic that an instrument which evaluates the core responsibilities of educators is not used for educator promotion. The responsibility of educator promotions in South African

schools is the responsibility of representatives of the school governing body. In most cases these representatives have no background in education and are assigned with such an important responsibility which determines quality assurance in the school system. Furthermore, the criteria used for promotion differs considerably from that of the IQMS. I am of the strong conviction that the IQMS should be used for promotion of educators and this responsibility should be undertaken by officials of the Department of Education who have the necessary skills.

The Department of National Education provided all education departments with a rating scale and a set of criteria which was used to evaluate educators for merit awards. The HOD did not only use the rating form to evaluate educators for merit awards but also used it as a basis for promoting educators.

The criteria used in the evaluation in the HOD for achievement recognition (merit award were as follows (Department of Education & Culture: House of Delegates, 1993) :

A. Task Orientation

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 1. Expertise | 7 x 3 |
| 2. Curricular efficiency | 7 x 3 |
| 3. Work achievement | 7 x 3 |
| 4. Planning | 7 x 3 |
| 5. Motivation | 7 x 3 |
| 6. Aptitude for extra-curricular involvement | 7 x 2 |

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------|
| 7. Organisational ability | 7 x 2 |
| 8. Professional attitude | 7 x 2 |
| 9. School administration | 7 x 2 |
| 10. Communicative ability | 7 x 2 |

B. Human Orientation

- | | |
|---|-------|
| 1. Attitude towards pupils/students | 7 x 2 |
| 2. Attitude towards staff | 7 x 2 |
| 3. Attitude towards education authorities | 7 x 2 |
| 4. Attitude towards parents | 7 x 2 |
| 5. Attitude towards community | 7 x 2 |
| 6. Creation of climate | 7 x 2 |

C. Personal Qualities

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Initiative/creativity/innovation | 7 |
| 2. Study/self development | 7 |
| 3. Leadership ability | 7 |
| 4. Outlook on and philosophy of life | 7 |

The assessment of each criterion is made on a seven point scale represented as follows:

- 1 - Poor
- 2 - Weak
- 3 - Below average

- 4 - Meets the required standard
- 5 - Above the required standard
- 6 - Considerably above required standard
- 7 - Exceptional

The criteria for task orientation were in keeping with what was expected of educators and evidence of these criteria could be gathered for validation. Apart from attitude to pupils, the other criteria for human orientation were rather subjective and this did lead to bias and manipulation of scores. In respect to the personal qualities, apart from outlook on life which was rather subjective to evaluate, the other three criteria could be evaluated with incidentation.

The evaluation of an educator for achievement recognition was based on a total of 20 criteria as illustrated above. To qualify for an achievement recognition an educator had to attain at least 245 out of a possible 287 points (that is, approximately 85%). The measuring instrument was made known to the educator. The evaluation was done by a committee comprising the principal and at least one other member of the management. A subject superintendent moderated the scores submitted by the principal (Department of Education & Culture: House of Delegates, 1993: 2). Although the above-mentioned circular indicated that the educator must have personal and or written access to the evaluators so that they could motivate their achievements, this rarely occurred in practice. The evaluation exercise also required the principal to provide feedback on strong and weak points, as well as to proffer guidance with a view to enhance the proficiency

of educators (Department of Education & Culture: House of Delegates, 1993: 2). From my experience this system worked well where principals were fair and applied the criteria objectively; however, this did not occur in all cases as some principals were biased and used the system to get back at educators.

Pillay (1991: 48) concedes that “there is no one system of teacher appraisal that is universally or nationally acceptable”. Each education department adopts a system that is most suitable to its context. However, when the above-mentioned evaluation system was implemented in Indian schools, educators reacted in a militant fashion: mass meetings were held and they vehemently opposed the evaluation system (Pillay, 1991: 43).

(iii) House of Assembly

Educator appraisal in White education, though not uniform at provincial level, was nevertheless well-developed as it integrated advisory services successfully with educator development (Chetty *et al.*, 1993: 5). White educators had the benefit of substantial representation in policy making at state level for many years. Their teacher organizations, through the Teachers’ Federal Council (TFC), assumed most of the regulatory and supervisory roles. The appraisal system of White educators had been, therefore, “shaped by an ethos of negotiation, consultation and participation, conceded by departments as a result of years of negotiation and pressure” (African National Congress Education Department, 1994: par.4).

In White education a common system of evaluation and a common evaluation form was introduced in all four provinces in 1993 and entailed the following process. Each school had to establish an 'evaluation team' and members of staff had to choose a member of this team to evaluate them. The evaluator would conduct a class visit and discuss the lesson and the evaluation form with the educator. The completed form was then returned to the evaluation team for comment and possible changes. Staff members who scored well on the evaluation form were recommended for merit awards and promotions. Superintendents and Chief Superintendents in the four provinces were responsible for moderating and supervising this process. The state also introduced this system of inspection and supervision to the other constituents of the tricameral system, namely, the House of Delegates and the House of Representatives. At this point, Black schools were left out of these new educator evaluation procedures (Chetty *et al.*, 1993: 13).

The above system does have much merit and I am supportive of a system that includes personnel with subject expertise to be part of the evaluation team. Furthermore, this system also had an external evaluation component to verify the scores. From my interaction with educators the present system of promotion in South African schools does not have the support and confidence of most educators as the system is open to nepotism and manipulation. I believe that the Department of Education has abdicated its responsibility as far as educator promotions are concerned and this will invariably impact on quality administration as well as quality teaching and learning.

2.9.3.3 Educators' perceptions and reaction to appraisal

The collapse of the system of supervision and inspection in the 1990's can be attributed to the negative experiences of educators as well as various other factors. Chetty *et al.* (1993: 3) points out that whilst the strongest criticisms of the appraisal system had been levelled at the Department of Education and Training, there were specific issues taken up by other education departments. For example, the educators in the House of Delegates resorted to strike action as a reaction to the HOD's poor handling of merit and specific awards.

Chetty *et al.* (1993: 3), Shah (1985: 269), Williams (2003: 3-4) and the ANC Education Department (1994: par. 10) capture the reasons for educators' aversion towards any form of evaluation. The following are the key factors that contributed to this scenario:

1. There was a prevalence of bias in the system, including political victimization of educators.
2. Inspectors wielded unchecked power and often abused their position.
3. Educators were victimized on the basis of organizational affiliations.
4. New educators were kept on probation for extended periods.
5. Sexual harassment and discrimination against women candidates.
6. Irrelevant criteria, absence of contextual factors and arbitrariness of scores given for appraisal.
7. The abuse of merit awards.
8. The evaluation was shrouded in secrecy. Scores were not made available to educators. Even the evaluation reports remained veiled in secrecy. Inspectors

were not informed beforehand of the intended visit by principals and inspectors.

9. Educator evaluation often comprised of 'one off' visits by inspectors and this scenario questioned the validity of the appraisal. Due to the inspectors' busy schedule, visits to educators normally took place when recommendations had to be made for probationers to be confirmed in permanent capacity and the when educators had to be assessed for promotion.
10. Many educators questioned the competence of the evaluators. Many school principals had no training in evaluation of educators and especially in high schools which required subject specialization, principals did not have the curricular competency to evaluate all educators.

Whilst the above-mentioned list sounds pretty dismal, it encapsulates only the negative aspects of the previous regime. It must be accepted that acknowledgement must be given to the many visionary inspectors and school principals who did their work with conviction and were committed to the enhancement of the quality of education.

The deficiencies in the educator appraisal system, consequently, led to educators developing a general aversion and opposition to evaluation in the majority of Black schools in South Africa. In fact, very little if any form of evaluation took place in schools in the 1980's (Williams, 2003: 5). The apartheid system had left education in a "state of chaos that is still overwhelming as the current state

battles to redress the various legacies of apartheid” (Smith and Ngoma-Maema, 2003: 351).

2.9.3.4 Appraisal instrument

According to Jantjies (1996: 51) the major problem that educators experienced in South Africa during the apartheid era was with the rating scale used to evaluate educators in the prescribed top-down evaluation approaches. He asserts that the rating scale did not contain a record of what an educator did or did not do to persuade the rater to record a number. Furthermore, the rating process was not transparent and inferences generally took place in the rater’s head. Waghid (1996: 81) concurs with Jantjies that a score fails to provide a record of any measurable proof of an educators’ performance as the explicit task of the rater is to record a score and it is, therefore, virtually impossible to trace back a score to the actual performance of an educator, since a score contains no articulated record of such performances. Waghid (1996:81) and Chetty *et al.* (1993:7) are of the contention that the rating scale cannot justifiably claim to measure the “efficiency” of educators because the main criteria concentrates on aspects such as personality and character, professional disposition and observation of educator performance, to mention a few. Waghid (1996: 81) is of the view that these criteria fail to protect the evaluation system from problematic issues such as educator deception, ‘compliance’ and the halo effect.

The rating scale cannot lay legitimate claim to measuring the performance of educators for several reasons. Firstly, the rating forms did not make provision for

consideration of contextual factors such as school size, school population, the socio-economic class of learners and school resources, which influences an educators' performance. Secondly, the educator played no active part in either the setting of criteria or validating a score. It was often the principal who was entrusted with the sole responsibility of giving a final assessment in terms of an educator being promotable or not. The actual score that the educator received remained confidential. Thirdly, the checklist used for promotion and merit awards had contributed to much abuse in schools as the ratings led to gross subjectivity.

There is no doubt that a system of evaluation characterized with so many deficiencies and one which engendered mistrust and uncertainty would, undoubtedly, not receive a favourable response from educators as it undermines their integrity and professionalism.

2.9.3.5 Educator resistance to appraisal

Jantjies (1996: 50) aptly sums up the reasons for the majority of educators' opposition to the hierarchical and authoritarian nature of the educator appraisal system in the apartheid era as follows:

Teachers' resistance to traditional evaluation procedures are not demands by them to be left alone. Teachers are looking for evaluative procedures that are enabling, that allow for self-reflection, and that form an integral part of teaching. Teachers are saying that the hierarchical tendencies inherent in the prescribed top-down approaches constrain self-development, collaborative discourses and self-reflection.

Black schools, in particular, suffered under a regime of inspection that was judgemental, summative and autocratic. The reaction to these forms of evaluation was overwhelming, and towards the end of the 1990's, in the context of widespread resistance against apartheid authorities in schools, inspectors and subject advisors were often violently cast out of African schools, and educators refused any form of evaluation of their or their schools' work. Consequently, the entire inspectorate function of inspection in African schools became dysfunctional and it led to the breakdown of the culture of teaching and learning in Black schools (Educators Workload Report, 2005: 11).

The Shopsteward (1996: 1) encapsulates the tense mood of Black educators against one of the most contentious issues of the time – educator appraisal.

In the 1980's, teachers were vehemently opposed to teacher evaluation, particularly in former Department of Education schools. Teachers said there was political bias in the system and that they were victimized on the basis of the organizations they belonged to. They complained that they played no part in their evaluations and were left to the mercy of corrupt and incompetent principals and inspectors who wielded unchecked power. Finally, they protested that contextual factors were not taken into consideration. Teachers asked: "How can an educator teach effectively if he or she is not provided with the basics such as proper classrooms, textbooks and equipment?"

Lewis, a spokesman for the National Professional Teachers' Organisation of South Africa (NAPTOSA) remarked that:

the system of external inspection had been seen as part of the oppression of the apartheid government, and that resistance to it had spilled over into rejection of the authority of principals and destruction of the entire teaching and learning in schools. (Dispatch Online, 1998: 1)

Chetty *et al.* (1993: 1) points out that the “widespread rejection of the existing appraisal systems has not been intended as a rejection of appraisal *per se*: the majority of teachers want appraisal to be an essential part of their professional development – not a mechanism of enforcing state control”. Furthermore, the basic demand which teachers made was that the instruments for their appraisal “**as a matter of principle** should be **negotiated** and **appropriate to their needs**” (Chetty *et al.*, 1993: 7).

In 1989 the South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU) embarked on a campaign to drive inspectors out of schools. However, by the end of 1992, “in the context of widespread panic over the collapse of Black education, the union began to see the importance in negotiating the restructuring of the appraisal system” (Shopsteward, 1996: 1).

2.9.3.6 New appraisal system being developed

In order to reinstate the culture of teaching and learning in the majority of schools, a new model of appraisal was required. As the momentum towards democracy

gained impetus in the early 1990's with the unbanning of political organizations, the newly-formed South African Democratic Teachers' Union of South Africa (SADTU) began an internal process of participatory research, discussion and mobilization around new forms of appraisal for a democratic South Africa (Educators Workload Report, 2005: 11).

In 1992 SADTU approached the Education Policy Unit (EPU) at the University of Witwatersrand (Wits) to assist in developing an alternative educator appraisal model (Swartz, 1994: vii). The unit decided that a top-down approach in developing a new educator appraisal model would yield very little and therefore called for a wider consultative process.

In the year after South Africa's first democratic elections, the Pretoria-Witwatersrand-Vaal Education Department (Centre of Education Policy Development, Management and Evaluation) and the University of Witwatersrand Education Policy Unit organized a conference on School Management, Teacher Development and Support on the 18 and 19 August 1994 (Swartz, 1994: 2).

At the conclusion of the conference delegates, which included educator unions/organizations, educators, principals, inspectors and subject advisors from all nine newly constituted provincial departments across the country, agreed that appraisal was necessary as it provided opportunities for educator development. Delegates rejected the summative and judgemental appraisal of the apartheid

era, and opted for an appraisal system that was formative and developmental in nature (Swartz, 1994: 60). The conference did not develop a single, coherent model for educator appraisal, but deliberated on several potential models. It was thereafter left to the provinces and policymakers to consider all the suggestions that emanated at the conference and to come up with a uniform, national system of appraisal (Swartz, 1994: 73). The following were among the key issues in regard to the new appraisal system to be resolved. There had to be agreement on the guiding principles, the nature of the instrument and the need to pilot the new appraisal system with post level one educators before implementation (ELRC, 1999: 51).

Between the end of 1992 and the beginning of 1994 representatives of SADTU, NAPTOSA and the DET negotiated the new principles and procedures for the appraisal of educators. The essential elements of the new proposed system of evaluation included self-evaluation, peer review, consideration of contextual factors, and mediation, only in the event of a conflict, by an inspector – were linked to both a developmental plan for the individual educator, and linked, in turn, to “more general school development planning” (Swartz, 1994: 1). These new principles and procedures for a new educator appraisal scheme was a conspicuous shift in philosophy from a bureaucratic, top-down approach characteristic of the apartheid era to a more collaborative and democratic approach post-apartheid.

2.9.3.7 New educator appraisal Teacher Pilot Project

The pilot of proposed new educator appraisal system was conducted between 1995 and 1996. Its findings were released in July 1997. The pilot covered a representative sample of 93 schools throughout the country. KwaZulu-Natal was the only province which did not participate in the pilot due to a range of difficulties that could not be resolved within the scope of the pilot. The findings of the pilot revealed that there was unanimous support for the new educator appraisal system. The report concluded that the new educator appraisal system could be applied in all schools in South Africa irrespective of contextual conditions. The pilot also indicated that the new appraisal system contributed significantly to facilitating relations between educators and school management, and between schools and departmental offices (DoE, 1999: 51). “The pilot thus validated empirically the nature, philosophy, processes and instrument of the new appraisal system” (DoE, 1999: 51).

It is evident from the preceding discussion that the system of educator appraisal across the various education departments during the apartheid era was rather diverse. With the formation of a unitary education system following the democratic elections of 1994 the need to have a uniform system of appraisal for all educators in South Africa was a priority. A single uniform system of educator appraisal would, firstly, help to redress the imbalances of the past. Secondly, it would contribute towards reinstating the culture of teaching and learning which was left in shambles during the apartheid era in the majority of African schools.

After protracted discussions between the education department and unions in the late 1990's South Africa's first uniform educator appraisal system, namely, the Integrated Quality Management System came into being on 27 August 2003. The current system of appraisal has been discussed in Chapter One.

2.10.7 Summary

This chapter examined the different types of quality management systems and the theoretical underpinnings of these quality systems. It is clear from the literature review that tensions exist between the accountability and developmental model. The two case studies from the United States of America and the United Kingdom have demonstrated that the introduction of an educator appraisal system is a complex exercise. Finally, this chapter outlined the background to the appraisal system in South Africa, providing a context for the introduction of the IQMS.

Chapter Three - Research Design

3.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the research design employed in this study. This chapter briefly outlines the positivist paradigm and the critical paradigm followed by a discussion of the interpretative paradigm and its appropriateness for this research. This chapter thereafter focuses on the research process, the data collection and data analysis procedures used in the research. Finally, issues of ethics selection are discussed.

3.2 Paradigms

Mertens (1998: 6) defines 'a paradigm' as a way of looking at the world. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2003: 245) 'a paradigm' is a set of beliefs that guide inquiry and it is composed of certain philosophical assumptions that guide and direct thinking. Cresswell (1998: 74; 2003: 77) states that these assumptions are related to the ontology (the nature of reality), the epistemology (the relationship of the inquirer to that being researched), the axiology (the role of values in the study) and the methodology (the process of the research). These basic belief systems or paradigms are the starting points or givens that determine what inquiry is and how it is to be practiced (Guba, 1990: 18).

According to Durrheim (1999: 36) paradigms are "systems of interrelated ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions". They act as perspectives that provide a rationale for the research and commit the researcher to particular methods of data collection, observation and interpretation.

Paradigms are, therefore, vital to the research design because they impact both on the nature of the research question, that is, what is to be studied and also on the manner in which the question is to be studied. By ensuring that the research question and methods used fit logically within the paradigm, the principle of coherence can be preserved when designing a research study.

Habermas (1972) postulates that knowledge is constructed according to three fundamental human interests, namely, the “technical”, the “practical” and the “emancipatory” interests. Many researchers speak of four or five paradigms and they go by many names. Myers (2001: 2) suggests three paradigms, based on the underlying research epistemology: positivist, interpretive and critical. It needs to be noted that while these three epistemologies are philosophically distinct (as ideal types); in the practice of social science research these distinctions are not always clear cut (Myers, 2001: 1). The ensuing discussion briefly examines the positivist/positivist and critical paradigms, and thereafter focuses on the interpretative paradigm and its appropriateness for this study.

3.2.1 Positivist/Postpositivist paradigm

The positivist paradigm assumes that there is an objective truth existing in the world which can be revealed through the scientific method where the focus is on measuring relationships between variables systematically and statistically. The positivists assert that one reality exists and it is the researcher’s job to discover that reality. Positivism is about finding truth and proving it through empirical means. The philosophical position of positivism is that the goal of knowledge is

simply to describe it and, in some designs, to explain and also to predict the phenomena that we experience (whether quantitatively or qualitatively). Positivists hold that the purpose of science is about what we can observe and measure. Knowledge of anything beyond this is impossible (Myers, 2001: 3; Mertens, 1998: 8 and Henning, 2004: 17).

A new paradigm, 'postpositivism' has emerged after positivism and is best described as a modified version of positivism and it has challenged the conceptual and methodological underpinnings of positivism (Guba, 1990: 20). 'Postpositivism' refers to the thinking after positivism and it challenges the traditional notion of the absolute truth about knowledge (Cresswell, 2003: 7). The postpositivist paradigm agrees that a reality does exist but argues that it can be known only imperfectly because of the researcher's human limitations (Mertens, 1998: 9). The implication is that researchers can discover 'reality' within a certain realm of probability, but they need to be critical about their work because of those human frailties.

3.2.2 Critical paradigm

Myers (2001: 3) state that the critical paradigm assumes that social reality is historically constituted and that it is produced and reproduced by people. Although individuals have the ability to change their social and economic circumstances, critical researchers are aware that their ability to do so is constrained by various forms of social, cultural and political domination. Muffoletto (1993: 4) states that the critical theory relates to a concern "with

questions of power, control and epistemology as social constructions with benefits to some and not to others”. Theorists working in this paradigm, therefore, take up socio-political issues and research ways in which forms of activism might impact on experience and social relations (Henning, 2004: 23).

3.2.3 Interpretive paradigm

While many interpretivists support positivism for certain types of research, e.g. medicine, but not for others, e.g. social, there others who are of the opinion that the positivist and postpositivist paradigms are badly flawed and that there is a need for an entirely new paradigm. Guba (1990: 23-24) advances the following arguments in support of this stance. Firstly, no theory can ever be fully tested because of the problem of induction. There are always a large number of theories that can ‘explain’ a given body of facts. Theory is revisable. Secondly, inquiry cannot be value-free. Thirdly, objectivity is not possible as the results of an inquiry are always shaped by the interaction of inquirer and the inquired. Finally, the basis for discovering “how things really are” and “really work” is lost as proponents of science believe that the facts are facts only within some theoretical framework while social researchers view paradigms as “human constructions” which “inevitably reflect the values of their human constructors” (Guba, 1990: 23).

The interpretive paradigm assumes a relativist ontology (there are multiple realities), a subjective epistemology (knower and subject create understandings), and a naturalistic (in the natural world) set of methodological procedures (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998: 27).

Ontologically, the interpretive paradigm holds that reality is socially constructed and there are always multiple interpretations of constructions that can be made in an inquiry. Interpretivists reject the notion that there is an objective reality. In fact, they believe that there is no foundational process by which the ultimate truth can be determined, and consequently posit that there is no alternative but to take a position of relativism as realities are multiple and exist in people's minds (Guba, 1990: 26; Mertens, 1998: 11).

Epistemologically, interpretivists take a subjectivist position. Guba (1990: 26) states that subjectivity is not only forced on us by the human condition, but because it is the only means of unlocking the constructions held by individuals. If realities exist only in people's minds, then subject interaction seems to be the only way to access them. In this paradigm, the inquirer and the inquired are interlocked into an interactive process where each influences the other. The researcher can, therefore, be seen as an "insider" during the process of conducting the research.

Methodologically, the interpretive paradigm generally makes use of qualitative research methods such as interviews, observations, document reviews and idiographic descriptions in order to capture the meaning people assign to phenomena. The interpretive researcher encourages varieties of data and different sources and analysis methods in order to strive for validity. Interpretivists maintain that knowledge is constructed not only by observable

phenomena, but also by descriptions of people's intentions, beliefs, values and self-understanding (Henning, 2004: 20).

The interpretive paradigm adopts the hermeutic/dialectic methodology in order to produce as informed and sophisticated a construction as possible. The hermeneutic aspect consists obtaining multiple perspectives that yield better interpretations of meanings (hermeneutics) while the dialectic aspect entails comparing and contrasting these existing individual or multiple perspectives with the aim of generating one (or a few) constructions on which there is sustainable consensus (Guba, 1990: 26-27).

Interpretive research does not predefine dependent and independent variables, but focuses on how people make meaning in their lives as situations emerge. The "variables" are usually not controlled and it is this freedom and natural development of action and representation that interpretivists wish to capture. Interpretivists also do not intend predicting and controlling the 'real' world, nor do they want to transform it. They intend to capture the lives of participants in order to understand and to interpret meaning (Henning, 2004: 18).

This research is situated in an interpretivist research paradigm in that it reflects one of the basic tenets of this theoretical paradigm, that is, 'reality is socially constructed'. Interpretive research is fundamentally concerned with "individuals' lived experience" (Marshall and Rossmann, 1999: 5). Marshall and Rossmann (1999: 57) posit the view that one cannot understand human actions without

understanding the meanings participants assign to those actions – their thoughts, feelings, assumptions, beliefs and values. The researcher, therefore, needs to understand the deeper perspectives captured through face-to-face interaction with participants. In this study I analysed educator perceptions of the IQMS by listening to what educators told about their experiences of the IQMS and by hearing educators express their views and opinions of the benefits and challenges of the IQMS in their own words. The interpretivist paradigm does not concern itself with “finding the truth and proving it through empirical means” (Henning, 2004: 17), but rather emphasizes a deep interpretive understanding of social interactions. Positivists, on the contrary, do not “learn from experience” in a metaphysical sense, therefore, an empiricist theory of knowledge would exclude personal insight as they generally assume that knowledge is objectively driven (Henning, 2004: 17). This research focused on understanding the experiences and perceptions of educators of the IQMS as experienced in their day-to-day working environment.

According to Denzin and Lincoln (1998: 27), the fundamental assumptions of the interpretive paradigm include the following: firstly, the interpretive paradigm assumes that there are multiple realities (a relativist ontology). As mentioned earlier, this study intends analyzing how the IQMS is constructed by educators and the Department of Education in particular, as well as the understandings of quality managements in education in the literature in general. Secondly, the researcher and the subject create understandings (a subjective epistemology). Creswell (2003: 200) asserts that particularly in qualitative research “the role of

the researcher as the primary data collection instrument necessitates the identification of personal values, assumptions and biases at the outset of the study". As a deputy principal I am also subjected to the appraisal process. My perceptions of the IQMS have been shaped by my personal experiences. On a positive note, I believe that this understanding enhances my awareness, knowledge and sensitivity to the challenges faced by educators in this study. On the other hand, due to my own experience of the IQMS, I will bring certain subjectivities to this study. Whilst I make every effort to ensure objectivity, I am aware that these biases might have shaped the way I viewed, interpreted and understood the data I collected. Thirdly, inquiry takes place in the natural setting of the subjects. This study was, therefore, conducted in primary and secondary schools. The above-mentioned assumptions underlie the theoretical framework of this research.

3.3 Quantitative versus Qualitative

Henning (2004: 2) states that the distinction between the qualitative and the better known quantitative paradigm lies in the difference between the quest for understanding and for in-depth inquiry. In a qualitative approach, the researcher stresses the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is being studied and the situational constraints that shape inquiry (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998: 8). Qualitative researchers seek answers to questions that stress how social experience is created and given meaning and emphasize the value-laden nature of inquiry. In contrast, the quantitative approach emphasizes the measurement and analysis of causal

relationships between variables and is purported within a value-free framework (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998: 8).

Popkewitz (1984: 88) acknowledges that the controversy over the symbolic and empirical science is not new to the academic disciplines and to society. He posits the view that many in our society believe that scientific discourses provides the only 'reasonable' way of documenting and interpreting the course of cultural events. Consequently, he states that "the sacred quality of 'science' makes one lose sight of the 'as if' quality of organized knowledge (Popkewitz, 1984: 102). Whilst there are distinct differences between the qualitative and quantitative approaches to knowledge claims, I believe that both approaches are valid and can sometimes be used within a single study. The ensuing discussion explores the quantitative and the qualitative approaches to research.

Johnson and Christeen (2000: 17) define quantitative research as an approach which relies predominantly on the collection of quantitative data, that is, numerical data. The quantitative study focuses on the deductive component of the scientific method because the focus is generally on hypothesis and theory testing, but often interpretive and critical research includes quantitative aspects. Crowl (1996: 234-235) concurs with the above assertion as he agrees that the primary goal of quantitative research is to provide a numerical or statistical description on how one or more variables are distributed among members of the population, and in this way quantitative studies often fall within a positivist paradigm.

Henning (2004: 3) states that the focus in a quantitative study will be on control of all the components in the actions and representations of the participants. The variables will be controlled and the study will be guided with a keen focus on how the variables are related. Quantitative research uses measurement and statistical principles and models familiar to many natural and physical scientists (Mason and Bramble, 1997: 38). Researchers in this paradigm usually operate under an assumption of objectivity. Furthermore, quantitative research methods are based on the collection and analysis of numerical data, usually obtained from questionnaires, tests and checklists. The research subjects or respondents are usually not free to express data that cannot be captured by the predetermined instruments. Hence, quantitative researchers generally have little personal interaction with the subjects they study since most of the data is gathered using non-interactive instruments (Henning, 2004: 3).

I now look at the qualitative research approach. According to Mertens (1998: 159) qualitative methods are used in research that is designed to provide an in-depth description of a specific programme, practice or setting. Denzin and Lincoln (1998: 2) provide the following generic definition of a qualitative study:

Qualitative research is multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. Qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials - case study, personal experience,

introspective, life story, interview, observational, historical, interactional and visual texts - that describe routine and problematic moments and meaning in individual's lives.

Cresswell's (1998: 15) definition of qualitative research focuses less on sources of information, but conveys similar ideas as the previous definition:

Qualitative research is an inquiry process of understanding based on distinct methodological traditions of inquiry that explore a social or human problem. The researcher builds a complex, holistic picture, analyses words, reports detailed views of informants and conducts the study in a natural setting.

"The key words with qualitative methods include *complexity, contextual, explanations, discovery* and *inductive* logic" (Mertens, 1998: 160). By employing the inductive approach, the researcher can attempt to make sense of a situation without pre-empting expectations.

"Qualitative researchers are intrigued with the complexity of social interactions as expressed in daily life and with the meanings the participants themselves attribute to these situations" (Marshall and Rossman, 1999: 2). In the light of the above assertion, qualitative researchers delve into natural settings rather than in laboratories and use multiple methods for examining the topic of interest. Thus, "qualitative research is pragmatic, interpretive and grounded in the lived experiences of people" (Marshall and Rossman, 1999: 2).

There are many different types of qualitative methodologies, but there are certain general features that characterize most qualitative research. Rossman and Rallis (cited in Marshall and Rossman, 1999: 2) advance eight characteristics of qualitative research and researchers. It is naturalistic, draws on multiple methods, is emergent and evolving, is interpretive, view social worlds as holistic, engage in systematic reflection on their own roles in the research, is sensitive to their personal biographies and how these shape the study, and only rely on complex reasoning that moves dialectically between deduction and induction. It must be noted that not all qualitative studies will necessarily display all of these characteristics with equal weight; however, taken together they give a good overall picture of what is involved in this type of research.

Cresswell (1998: 76-77) advances five philosophical assumptions that guide all qualitative studies. The **ontological** assumption addresses the nature of reality. Reality is constructed by individuals involved in the research situation, hence multiple realities exist. These include the realities of the researcher, those of the individuals being investigated, and those of the reader or audience interpreting a study. The qualitative researcher needs to report these realities, rely on interpretations of informants through extensive quotes, present themes that reflect words used by informants, and advance evidence of different perspectives on each theme.

On the **epistemological** assumption, qualitative researchers interact with those they study. This interaction would involve living with or observing informants over

a prolonged period of time or actual collaboration. In this approach, the researcher tries to minimize “distance” between him or her and those being investigated.

The close distance between the researcher and the participants do have implications for the **axiological** assumption, that is, the role of values in a study. In a qualitative study, the researcher acknowledges the value-laden nature of the study and vigorously reports his or her values and biases as well as the value-laden nature of information gathered.

Basing research on the **rhetorical** assumption implies that the qualitative researcher uses specific terms and a personal and literary narrative in the study. The language of qualitative studies becomes personal, literary and based on definitions that emerge during a study rather than being defined by the research at the beginning of the study.

On the **methodological** assumption, the researcher starts inductively and develops categories from informants rather than specifying them in advance of the research. In other words, the researcher uses inductive logic, studies the topic within its context and uses an emerging design.

In this study I analysed the educator IQMS discourses in terms of how closely they align to those of the Department of Education, in particular, in terms of the stated aims of IQMS. Firstly, I analysed the themes or categories that emanate

from the data and establish “the meanings and importance of these categories” (Walliman, 2001: 259). Thereafter, during the analysis process thought was given to “the interconnections between categories and to their theoretical implications” (Walliman, 2001: 259). This approach will enhance the credibility of my research findings as the theory will be grounded on “evidence from the field” (Walliman, 2001: 259-260).

The current study which investigates educator perceptions of the IQMS employs the qualitative research paradigm. The ensuing discussion of the research design will focus on the ontology, epistemology and the methodology of the qualitative paradigm in the context of the study in question.

3.4 The Research Process

3.4.1 Data collection: Educator interviews

In terms of data collection protocol, Mertens (1998: 177) states that before data are collected, the researcher must follow appropriate procedures “to gain permission from the gatekeepers (typically defined as those with power in the organization or agency) of the organization or community”. In the light of the above, I gained permission from the Department of Education to enter sites to interview educators (see Appendix E: Approval to conduct research). The principals of schools chosen for the interview were contacted personally or by phone prior to data collection to introduce the researcher, explain the purpose of the study and to ask for permission to participate (see Appendix C). Confidentiality was discussed and permission to tape the interviews was

requested. Thereafter dates and times for the interview were negotiated with the interviewees.

At the time of the interview, each participant was requested to sign a *Letter of Informed Consent* (see Appendix D). This form outlines the study, risks, benefits, extent of confidentiality, and also requests permission to audio tape the interview. Each educator was also verbally informed about the nature and consequence of the research. They were also notified of their right to participate voluntarily without any physical or psychological coercion, and that they had the right to withdraw at any time. The confidentiality of the educators was assured. All data would be secured or concealed and made public only behind a shield of anonymity. I will also ensure that data is kept accurately and that the research steers clear of fabrications, fraudulent materials, omissions and deceptions as these practices are clearly both non-scientific and unethical (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003: 217-219). In addition to the above-mentioned principles, this research will subscribe to the following ethical issues advanced by Creswell (2003: 65). Educators will be assured that they will not be at risk. Fortunately, as Fraenkel and Wallen (1990: 28) state educational research involves activities that are within the customary, usual procedures of schools and as such involve little or no risk. Furthermore, each participant was also informed that they would have the opportunity to review a transcribed copy of the interview before its analysis in the research document if they so desired.

I interviewed a random sample (Kumar, 2005: 169) of eleven educators from primary and secondary schools in Phoenix. A “focused, narrow, concentrated” sample (Cutcliffe, 2000: 1478) has been chosen in order to get a detailed in-depth analysis of the problem. A rich and detailed analysis of a few cases (interviews) enabled me to understand how particular educators construct the IQMS. I selected schools in Phoenix because I teach in this area and I, therefore, had easy access to these schools as they are in close proximity to my school. “A convenience sample is a group of individuals who (conveniently) are available for study” (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1990: 75). Furthermore, I know this community well, especially the school principals, and this assisted me in gaining access to schools. I did not interview educators from my own school as I am aware of the power relations inherent in such an exercise. The educators at my school are answerable to me to an extent; therefore, I felt it was inappropriate for me to interview these educators. I am of the view that my presence would have stifled the educators’ honesty and openness during the interview.

This sampling technique raises issues about the generalisability of the study; however, the interpretative case study nature of this research makes notions of generalisability less appropriate. May (2002: 125) states that “the use of self-reflective, autonomous nature of human subjects produce states which are not amenable to the explanation-prediction schema of natural science”. This view is supported by Denzin and Lincoln (1998: 51) who assert that for researchers interested in questions of meaning and interpretation in individual cases, the traditional thinking about generalizability falls short. As researcher, I am aware

that this study will only show the discourses of the eleven educators at the time of the interview, and will, therefore, not be reflective of all educators in South Africa. However, I tend to agree with May (2002: 131) that whilst total generalization is indeed impossible in interpretive research, interpretivists do make “*moderatum* generalizations”. Qualitative research establishes credibility through “rich, thick” description (Creswell, 1998: 203). This ‘thick description’ will allow readers to make a judgement regarding applicability or transferability to their own contexts. In the light of the above, I believe that this study will highlight educator understandings of educator appraisal that may resonate in other parts of South Africa or even internationally.

The research design includes a general interview approach for interviewing a number of educators selected by the principal as knowledgeable of, and experienced with the IQMS. The interview method of data collection had been selected because an interview is a useful way to get large amounts of data quickly (Marshall and Rossmann, 1999: 108). Furthermore, the qualitative interview is “a uniquely sensitive and powerful method for capturing the experiences and lived meanings of the subjects’ everyday world. Interviews allow the subjects to convey to others their situation from their own perspective and in their own words” (Kvale, 1996: 71).

I tend to agree with Kvale (1996: 36) that a well-conducted qualitative interview can be a rare and enriching experience for the interviewee. It is probably not a very common experience for another person to make time to listen to one’s

experiences and views on a subject. My personal experience during the interviews with educators indicated that educators enjoyed the interview as they freely expressed their views on the IQMS and raised issues both positive and negative. I believe that the enthusiasm of the educators could be attributed to several factors.

Firstly, it was an opportunity for educators to articulate their feelings and experiences in a safe setting with someone who validated their participation, without any inhibitions or fear of reprisals.

Secondly, educators were content that the interview afforded them an opportunity to voice their feelings and thoughts about which they usually remain silent and they also felt that the current research would amplify their concerns to a broader audience such as to other colleagues, management teams, policy makers and the Department of Education.

Thirdly, I believe that the timing of the interviews contributed to the co-operation of school principals and educators participating in the project with enthusiasm. I interviewed educators after the final examinations when there were no learners in school and after educators completed all their post-examination commitments. Hence, educators were willing to participate in the interviews since they had the 'free time' to spend with me. Furthermore, there was also no disruption to the school's programme.

Data was collected primarily by means of unstructured interviews. I tend to agree with May (2002: 231) that despite the use of the term 'unstructured interview', it is not possible to conduct a structure-free interview. Therefore, I had a set of structured questions to prompt and probe interviewees when the interview did not proceed smoothly and to ensure that relevant issues were addressed. (Refer to Appendix A: *The interview schedule*).

My general interview schedule or guide did not have a formal set of questions to be asked word-for-word and in a set order, but rather a list of questions or issues that are to be explored in the course of an interview. According to Patton (1987: 11) and Cassel and Symon (1994: 19) the interview guide has several advantages:

1. An interview guide ensures that essentially the same information is obtained from a number of people by covering the same material.
2. It provides topics or subject areas about which the interviewer is free to explore, probe, and ask questions that will elucidate and illuminate that particular subject.
3. The interview guide serves as a basic checklist during the interview to make sure that all relevant topics are covered and gives the interviewer the freedom to adapt both the wording and sequence of questions to specific respondents in the context of the actual interview.
4. The interview guide helps make interviewing different people more systematic and comprehensive by delimiting the issues to be discussed.
5. The interview guide also ensures that the interviewer has carefully

decided how best to use the limited time available in an interview situation.

During my interviews with educators, a vast amount of information was gained through the use of probes and follow-up questions. The use of probes helped to deepen the response to a question, to increase the richness of the data being obtained, and to give cues to the interviewee about the level of the response that was desired (Patton, 1987: 125). It also helped to establish a conversational style.

May (2002: 206) believe that it is important to include probes:

that distinguish among the various dimensions of lived experience – including the actual event, the social context in which an event or experience takes place, the person's behavioural response, the person's feelings, perceptions and beliefs before, during and immediately following the experience, and the person's evolving and current interpretations of the experience.

May (2002: 206) add that in this way, a well constructed in-depth interview:

goes well beyond the more structured survey to explore a range of theoretically important dimensions, including pre-existing beliefs and outlooks, events and situations that trigger or prevent action, the social contexts in which choices are made, the social and psychological consequences of contextually embedded choices, and the longer-term interpretations that people develop as their lives proceed.

It must be pointed out that the unstructured interview has its advantages and disadvantages. Some of the advantages of the unstructured interview are discussed below.

- i) There is a shift from obtaining knowledge mainly through external observation and experimental manipulation of human subjects, toward an understanding by means of conversations with the human beings to be understood. The subjects not only respond to questions posed by the interviewer, but themselves formulate in a dialogue of their own conceptions of their lived world (Kvale, 1996: 11).
- ii) The qualitative interview is a highly flexible method, it can be used almost anywhere and it is capable of producing data of great depth.
- iii) The qualitative research interview is ideally suited for studying topics in which different levels of meaning need to be explored.
- iv) The qualitative research interview is a method with which most research participants feel comfortable and this is partly due to familiarity with the conversational feel of interviews. As mentioned earlier, the interview presents the forum for participants not only to share their enthusiasm or to vent their grievances but to do so with interested outsiders. It also helps participants in some cases to clarify their thoughts on a particular topic (Cassel and Symon, 1994: 33-34).

The following are some of the disadvantages associated with the use of the interview as a research instrument:

- i) In terms of financial implications and time, interviews are quite costly.

Developing an interview guide, conducting interviews, which includes interviewing and travelling time, and analyzing transcripts are all highly time-consuming activities for the researcher (Cohen and Manion, 1995: 283; Cassel and Symon, 1994: 34).

- ii) Interviews are also time-consuming for interviewees, and this might pose problems in recruiting participants.
- iii) A further limitation of the interview process lies in fact that the coding, categorization and typologizing of stories may result in telling only parts of stories, rather than presenting them in their 'wholeness' (Silverman, 1998: 101). In this study educator responses were selected and categorised into themes. Issues raised by educators that did not fit into these themes were ignored and this may have resulted in not presenting the complete story.
- iv) The researcher may experience 'difficult' interviewees, that is, participants who are defensive, hostile or unwilling to focus on the research topic. This situation would require patience and the use of interpersonal skills on the part of the researcher to diffuse these likely awkward situations. The educators I interviewed were very professional and did not present any difficulty.
- v) A further difficulty that many researchers using qualitative research interviews experience is the feeling of data overload as a result of enormous volumes of rich data produced by even a moderate-sized study (Cassel and Symon, 1994: 34). The interview transcripts in this

study were quite lengthy but by categorising the data into themes the relevant data was used effectively.

- vi) The question of researcher bias also comes into play as the research interview is not a conversation between equal partners, because the researcher defines and controls the situation. The topic of the interview is introduced by the interviewer, who also critically follows up on the interviewee's answers to his or her questions (Kvale, 1996: 6). The issue of bias will be addressed in section 3.4.3.

Despite the above-mentioned limitations the interview is, without doubt, the most widely used qualitative method in organizational research (Cassel and Symon, 1994: 14). This is attributed to the fact that the qualitative research interview “attempts to understand the world from the subjects’ point of view, to unfold the meaning of people’s experiences, to uncover their lived world prior to scientific explanations (Kvale, 1996: 1). Through “in-depth interviewing” (May, 2002: 199) the educators’ perspective of IQMS unfolded as they viewed it, not as I viewed it.

The interviews were audio-taped with a dictaphone. This method of recording allowed the researcher to concentrate on the topic and the dynamics of the interview, rather than focusing on comprehensive note-taking during the actual interviews. Tape-recording ensures that the interviewee’s words, their tone and pauses are recorded in a permanent form and, hence, can be preserved and made available for re-listening or re-analysis. Kvale (1996: 160) concedes that the audio-tape gives a decontextualised version of the interview as it does not

include the visual aspects of the situation; neither does it capture the setting and the bodily expressions of the participants.

Patton (1987: 138-139) advises researchers that in addition to a tape-recorder being used during the interview, the interviewer should take down notes. This should be in the form of key phrases, major points made by the respondent; and key terms or words shown in quotation marks that capture the interviewee's own language. These notes could be used for later expansion into more detail of what was said during the interview. During the interviews with educators, I personally found it difficult to take notes as I had to listen attentively, whilst at the same time formulating follow-up questions. However, immediately after the interviews, I reviewed the interviews and made pertinent notes. Some of the educators felt much more at ease after the dictaphone was switched off and made vital inputs outside the formal interview. I, therefore, had to take down thorough and comprehensive notes at this point.

On completion of all interviews a technical assistant was hired to undertake a full transcription of the interviews since the raw data of interviews are quotations. Patton (1987: 138) acknowledges that though transcribing might be expensive, "transcripts can be enormously useful in data analysis or later, in replications or independent analysis of data".

3.4.2 Data analysis: Discourse Analysis

A discourse analysis of educator interviews was undertaken. According to Gee (2005: 110), discourse analysis “involves asking questions about how language, at a given time and place, is used to construe the aspects of the situation network as realized at that time and place and how aspects of the situation network simultaneously give meaning to that language”. This understanding of a discourse is supported by Morgan *et al.* (1996: 11) who describe discourses as “ways of living out meanings: of framing/constructing, transmitting, sharing, giving, receiving, refining and changing meanings”. Discourse analysis, therefore, challenges us to shift our thinking in viewing language as abstract to seeing our words as having meaning in a particular historical, social and political condition.

MacDonnel (1986: 1) agrees with the above notion of a discourse by cogently stating that “Discourses differ with the kinds of institutions and social practices in which they take shape, and with the positions of those who speak and those whom they address. The field of discourse is not homogeneous.” In other words, discourse is social. The statement uttered, the words used and the meanings attached to these words, depends on where and against what the statement is made. The same word may figure in two mutually clashing contexts. Different social classes may use the same words in different senses and disagree in their interpretation of events and situations (MacDonnel, 1986: 1-2).

For Schreiber and Moring (2001: 4) discourses “constitute and construct the world of meaning”. When individuals talk and write, they both create and organize

their social reality and produce a construction of reality through communication. The intention of using discourse as the unit of analysis is “to analyse social practices for their way of producing new understandings of knowledge, identities and social relations or to produce old ones” (Schreiber and Moring, 2001: 6).

According to Fairclough (1995), discourse is to be understood as more than language usage and he emphasizes the constitutive nature of discourse. Discourse constitutes the social, including ‘subjects’ and is, therefore, to be understood not only as language use but as a social practice. Fairclough (1995) states that in communication between people more than one discourse may be active at the same time and he refers to this concept as ‘interdiscursivity’. The different elements of discourses are referred to as discursive practices. Discursive practices are practices “through which texts are *produced* (created) and *consumed* (received and interpreted)” (Philips and Jørgensen, 2002).

According to Parker (1992:5) discourses “provide frameworks for debating the value of one way of talking about reality over other ways”. Parker (1992: 7) adds that discourse analysis should be “a process of exploring the connotations, allusions and implications which texts evoke”. It involves two preliminary steps:

1. Treating our objects of study as texts which are described, put in words; and
2. Exploring connotations through some sort of free association, which is best done with other people.

In discourse analysis, language is not seen as “a neutral medium for transmitting information” (Walliman, 2001: 98). In this research, discourses refer to “the way people communicate with each other through language within a social setting” (Walliman, 2001: 98). Cassel and Symon (1994: 93) state that the aim of discourse analysis is to examine the constructions and meanings of phenomena in society as people make sense of the various aspects of their lives. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2004: 298) concur with this stance as they believe a speech situation has a double structure. Firstly, the speech situation contains the propositional content, that is, what is being said (the locutionary aspect). Secondly, it has the performatory content, that is, what is achieved through the utterance (the perlocutionary aspect). The power of the discourse lies in the latter (Walliman, 2001: 98). Cassel and Symon (1994: 92) are of the view that any person, policy or event can be described in many different ways. Speakers draw on varying characterizations of ‘reality’ according to what they are doing. The aim of discourse analysis, therefore, is to examine the variation, to see how and when variation emerges and what purpose it serves. The discourses of educator perceptions of the IQMS as well as those of the Department of Education in their policy document will illuminate how each stakeholder constructs versions of reality that reflect their world view.

In this study the research data is in the form of the IQMS policy document and a transcription of the tape-recorded interviews of educator discourses of the IQMS. A coding phase, which was designed to organize the data collection into categories and concepts, was performed after the interviews in order to ascertain

patterns of thinking of educators and of their experiences in regards IQMS. The aim of the coding phase was to create a central theme or “story line” that revealed (but not necessarily proved or refuted) whether the IQMS was an effective system of quality management (Goldberg and Cole, 2002: 12).

Cresswell (2003: 191, 192) and Holliday (2002: 101, 102) suggest the following generic steps in discourse analysis: corpus of raw data, read through all data, coding or thematic organization of data, and formation of basis of argument emanating from extracts of data under each thematic heading. In this study, a discourse analysis of the educator perceptions of the IQMS included the following steps:

Step 1: The tape-recorded interviews of the educators of the IQMS was organized and prepared for data analysis. This involved transcribing the interviews of educators.

Step 2: The transcripts of the educator interviews were read to obtain a general sense of educator perceptions and to reflect on its overall meaning.

Step 3: The transcripts of educator interviews (text data) were then coded and arranged under thematic headings or categories. Coding entailed the process of organizing the educator data into ‘categories’ before assigning discursal meaning to those ‘categories’.

Step 4: The analysis of the educator discourses of the IQMS is conveyed through a narrative interpretation. According to Terre Blanche, Durrheim, and Painter (2006: 382) the idea of an interpretative account as a narrative

is the “process of putting one’s interpretations together into an overarching general account”. This narrative account has the qualities of a story, in that it weaves all the parts together into a single account having a kind of unity while it may still have different facets. A discussion of several themes arising from the educator discourses was undertaken. By looking at the interview data and by trying to work out what the organizing principles are that ‘naturally’ underlie the material, recurrent themes or patterns are identified and these themes are presented as discourses. Discourse analysis is not simply to present these themes, but “to show how subjects and objects are constructed in the text, and to interrogate the effects of these constructions” (Terre Blanche, Durrheim, and Painter, 2006: 382) Actual extracts (quotations) of educators’ perspectives of the IQMS are included in the discussion and used as evidence for the ongoing interpretation and argument.

3.4.3 Subjectivity/Objectivity

The coding process presented above raises questions about subjectivity in identifying discourses. According to Patton (1987: 166) the most common concern about qualitative methods is the subjectivity of the researcher. Whilst science places great value on objectivity, qualitative methods, however, assume multiple perspectives and multiple “truths” depending on different points of view. Patton (1987: 166) mentions that philosophers of science now typically doubt the possibility of anyone or any method being really “objective”. He further argues

that quantitative methods are no more synonymous with objectivity than qualitative methods are synonymous with subjectivity.

The ways in which tests and questionnaires are constructed are no less open to the intrusion of evaluator's biases than the making of observations in the field or the asking of questions in interviews. Numbers do not protect against bias; they sometimes merely disguise it. (Patton, 1987: 167)

In this debate about attaining objectivity and truth, Patton (1987) believes the practical solution may be to replace the traditional search for truth with a search for useful and balanced information, and to replace the mandate to be objective with a mandate to be fair and conscientious in taking account of multiple perspectives, multiple interests, and multiple possibilities. My research adopts the use of multiple perspectives. I acknowledge my own multiple perspectives about the IQMS and was able to identify various perspectives within each of the eleven educator interviews.

Guba (1990: 169) addresses the issue of objectivity and subjectivity in research. He is of the view that there has been a shift in thinking that "the world of acts must be logically and distinctly separate from the world of values". In whose voice do qualitative researchers write? Denzin and Lincoln (2003: 189) agree that qualitative researchers write in their own voice. Mertens (1998: 175) mentions that the qualitative researcher is the instrument for the data collection. I am aware that as the researcher, I am an important part of the research; however, I

have been mindful of reflecting my own values, assumptions, beliefs and biases during the research.

Creswell (2003: 200) asserts that particularly in qualitative research “the role of the researcher as the primary data collection instrument necessitates the identification of personal values, assumptions and biases at the outset of the study”. As a deputy principal I am also subjected to the appraisal process. My perceptions of the IQMS have been shaped by my personal experiences. On a positive note, I believe that this understanding enhances my awareness, knowledge and sensitivity to the challenges faced by educators in this study. On the other hand, due to my own experience of the IQMS, I might bring certain biases to this study. Whilst I will make every effort to ensure objectivity, I am aware that these biases may shape the way I view, code, interpret and understand the data I collect.

3.4.4 Ethics

Fraenkel and Wallen (1990: 26-27) states that by behaving ethically, the researcher is doing “what is right”. Denzin and Lincoln (2003: 217) are of the opinion that in a social science, “codes of ethics for professional and academic associations are the conventional format for moral principles”. There are a range of principles of ethics that are advanced for qualitative studies and these ethical principles underpin this research. Guba (1990: 158) proposes three basic principles – “the principles of mutual respect, of non-coercion and non-manipulation, and of support for democratic values and institutions”. In respect of

my research, I respected the inputs and views of educators interviewed without being judgemental. Prior to the interview educators signed a letter of consent. The letter of consent included a statement of non-coercion. Educators were, therefore, aware that they were at liberty to withdraw from the interview. When principals were approached to select educators, the issue of voluntary consent was discussed. In most instances the principals used the democratic approach in the selection of interviewees. They appraised educators at a staff meeting of my proposed research and asked for a volunteer. In a few cases principals suggested the name of a staff member as there were no volunteers.

Denzin and Lincoln (2003: 217) identify the following four ethical principles: informed consent, lack of deception, privacy and confidentiality, and accuracy. The incorporation of the above-mentioned ethical principles in my research was discussed in 3.4.3. These ethical principles by no means exhaust the moral principles in research, but cover in the main the relevant ethical issues.

3.5 Summary

This chapter discussed the three paradigms that direct inquiry, namely, the positivist paradigm, the critical paradigm and the interpretative paradigm. This research is situated in the interpretative paradigm as it is fundamentally concerned with individual's lived experiences. I interviewed a random sample of eleven educators from primary and secondary schools. Data was collected primarily by means of unstructured interviews and analysed for discourses about the IQMS. The issue of informed and voluntary consent of the educators as well

as permission from the Department of Education to enter sites to interview educators was addressed. Finally, the question of subjectivity, the transferability of this research to other contexts and the matter of ethics was discussed.

Chapter Four - Compliance Discourse

4.1 Introduction

A discourse of compliance was identified from the interviews of educators. This chapter looks at how the compliance discourse is constructed by referring to the data. Furthermore, the chapter explores how the literature discusses the compliance discourse and what the implications of this discourse are for the implementation of IQMS in South African schools.

Storey (1992; 2001) distinguishes between 'compliance discourse' and 'engagement discourse'. The compliance discourse was structured round the discursive concept of compliance "that signified and built upon a control-centred approach ... concerned with notions of 'efficiency', 'cost-control' and 'adding value' " (Storey, 1992: 26). Engagement discourse "places emphasis on creation of committed workers who will be motivated to work 'beyond contract' in an environment which allows for employee growth and development" (Storey, 1992; 2001).

Compliance to the IQMS generally means compliance with all processes and regulations pertaining to the educator appraisal scheme. But the IQMS policy requires more of educators than following surface issues in a technicist way. It requires educators to engage in its underpinning purpose, that is, to "advocate accountability" and to "assure that there is ongoing support and improvement" (ELRC, 2003: 4).

Harvey and Newton (2004: 151) state that the rhetoric and documentary preambles in many countries “refer to quality evaluation as a process of improvement, yet all the emphases are on accountability, compliance and, in some cases, control of the sector”. Newton (2002: 42-43) states that we should not be at all surprised that the impact of external quality monitoring had alerted us to the dangers of ‘ritualism’ and ‘tokenism’ with participants primarily engaged in learning ‘the rules of the game’. The ensuing discussion evaluates whether the educators perceive the IQMS as fulfilling its underpinning philosophy of determining competence, assuring educator growth and promoting accountability as opposed to complying with the bureaucratic processes in a technicist manner.

Kuzmanić and Sedmak (2006: 104) define discourse as “a set of meanings that represent some aspect of social and political world in a particular way”. They see discourse as an element of all social processes and as such it may initiate, enable, and influence changes in the social world. It could be then inferred that with reform comes new discourses. When Fairclough (2002: 163) talks about language in the new capitalism, he claims that it is not just information or knowledge based, but also:

...discourse led, for knowledges are produced, circulated and consumed as discourses (economic, organizational, managerial, political, educational and so forth). Moreover, discourses are dialectically materialized in the ‘hardware’ and ‘software’ of organizations, enacted as ways of acting and inculcated (through a variety of processes including, e.g. ‘skills training) as ways of being, as identities. So that transformations of organizations

(workplaces, universities, local government, etc.) under the pressure of restructuring and re-scaling are partly, and significantly, semiotic and linguistic transformations.

Kuzmanić and Sedmak (2006: 107) believe that it is not possible to separate managerial discourse from managerial ideology, which legitimizes existing power relations. When people accept things as they are, as taken for granted, then ideology is at work.

The most effective use of power occurs when those with power are able to get those with less power to interpret the world from the former's point of view. Power is thus exercised through consent rather than coercion.

(Mumby and Clair, 1998: 184)

This may have occurred through the inclusion of Unions in the roll-out of the IQMS. This is recognizable from the language of the DoE in the IQMS policy document which presents the process as objective and neutral. However, in practice the language of management becomes ideological and supports managerialism as the new dominant ideology through which change, namely, the new educator dispensation takes place. The IQMS discourse becomes so 'common sense' and takes on the position of being seemingly obvious that it "cannot be contested" (Fairclough, 1989).

Van Dijk (2006: 360) talks about manipulation and discourse which involves power, but specifically abuse of power, that is, domination. He states that the

discourse of manipulation is intended as “a communicative and interactional practice, in which a manipulator exercises control over other people”. Manipulation, therefore, implies the exercise of a form of illegitimate influence by means of discourse: manipulators make others believe or do things that are of interest to the manipulator, against the best interests of the manipulated (Van Dijk, 2006: 360). The discourse of compliance influences educators to begrudgingly complete the IQMS process without engaging in developmental reflection as portrayed by the following educator: “... the other HoD is just doing it for the sake of doing it ...”¹(Educator 04).

Sculley (1998: 752) states that by creating a compliance culture:

managers encourage workers to participate in a neatly proscribed domain of issues, but once the discourse opens the gates, workers can seek participation – pretending earnestly to go along with the spirit of what management has asked – in broader, more system-challenging areas like training, scheduling and pay systems.

The above assertion implies that managers may compel employees to comply with mandatory policies such as the IQMS, but once the processes unfold educators may play along with what management wants by complying with the bureaucratic requirements such as form-filling exercises and due dates rather than fulfilling its underpinning purpose of development. In the light of the above

¹ All interview quotes are provided verbatim.

assertion, it must be questioned whether people can be really be forced into compliance that moves beyond surface level to engaged compliance.

The terms “compliance discourse” and “managerialism” have similar connotations in the literature. Gitlin and Smyth’s (1989: 132) claim that “teaching is an inherently *political* process rests on the view that it serves certain interests in demonstrable ways, while actively denying others”. They believe that managerialism imposes quite severe limits and constraints on personal and collective choice. Speaking about the context of school and classroom struggle, clearly, the way in which managerialism issues like supervision and educator evaluation encroach into classrooms has political implications in that they reduce the scope of the educator and learner choice over what is learned and how that learning takes place (Gitlin and Smyth, 1989: 133).

Furusten (1999: 34) states the general managerial discourse can be seen “as a layer of the institutional environment of an organization, where cultural elements such as knowledge, ideologies or myths are articulated”. By being textualised either orally or in written documents, ideas become elements in the environments of different organizations. He states that by being textualised, that is, manifested, managerial ideas are enabled to travel long distances both in space and time. By being articulated in the IQMS document, the new educator appraisal policy becomes accepted by educators and other relevant stakeholders as a requirement of the job. The IQMS policy document then becomes a powerful tool

for the implementation of DoE's ideas and philosophies regarding the new educator appraisal model.

Furusten (1999: 34) is of the view that the discourse, in its different forms, impinges on institutional pressures on the organization from their environments. "Through coercive, cognitive, mimetic and normative mechanisms in the environment, the pressure to which the popular managerial discourse in particular contributes, then influences the daily life of organizations" (Furusten, 1999: 34). In the context of the above, the issue that needs to be resolved is "what happens when managerial manifestations move in time and space, that is, when they are de-contextualised from the setting where they are developed to become parts of other processes in other organizations and settings" (Furusten, 1999: 36). The educators and schools implement the IQMS at a distance from where it was developed and are often unaware of the context in which it arose.

4.2 Compliance to bureaucratic demands

In the context of the present study, the discourse of compliance was strongly articulated in the educator interviews. Whilst for the Department of Education the main objective of the IQMS "is to ensure quality public education for all and to constantly improve the quality of learning and teaching" (ELRC, 2003: 3), this did not materialize in practice as most educators view the IQMS as a bureaucratic, paper exercise rather than a reflective and developmental process and they view it as something with which they had to comply at a surface level rather than something with which they had to engage at a deeper level. Furthermore, many educators considered the IQMS as an exercise in just fulfilling the 'letter of the

law' without touching its purpose; this view is enunciated by the following educator:

I think IQMS is purely a paper trail which is being filled for the formality of the process and not really for professional development or building teachers' potential. It's just a process which is done on paper – it's to satisfy certain norms, and that's about the extent of it. The spirit of the actual document or policy is not being retained. (Educator 06)

In his critique of the IQMS, Weber (2005: 69) aptly states that by co-opting educator unions in implementing the IQMS in partnership, the state's interest are likely to be served. I concur with the above sentiments as my experience at training workshops created the impression that that the Department of Education's agenda to fully involve the educator unions in the implementation process, was not only to get a 'buy-in' from the influential unions, but also to secure employee's compliance to the IQMS. Whilst the Department of Education consulted the educator unions during the process of drawing up the IQMS policy, educators at grassroots level were not given an opportunity to interrogate the document before its implementation. It had become *fait accompli*: the IQMS was a blueprint for educator appraisal and there was no room for any questioning of the policy. The unions having been party to the formulation of the IQMS policy became vociferous in 'selling' the new educator appraisal policy. Whereas I believe that it was the responsibility of departmental officials to unpack the IQMS policy at advocacy and training workshops, once again union representatives were at the forefront conducting training workshops at circuit level. By allowing

the unions to be at the forefront of these training workshops at circuit level, the Department of Education was successful in legitimizing the implementation of the IQMS and ensuring educator compliance to departmental policy. Educators generally don't question the directives from their unions.

In its attempt to ensure compliance and conformity to the IQMS processes, the Department of Education declared the IQMS as a mandatory process (ELRC, 2003: 2). In addition to this, the DoE linked a one percentage pay increment to educators who performed at a satisfactory level and also stated that the IQMS was a developmental exercise. The compliance discourse in the IQMS policy document sets the platform for compliance and educators have little option but to comply.

But do above-mentioned measures on the part of the state ensure that educators comply with the spirit of the policy in practice and do these quality monitoring initiatives lead to improvement? Robinson (1992: 345) states that "tightening of control leads to controlling relationships". The bureaucratic demands of the IQMS were seen in this study to place pressure on educators and stifle their creativity in the classroom. Educators become pre-occupied with the classroom visits by supervisors, deadlines and checklists of the Department and tend to be distracted from their core responsibility of effective teaching. This impacts negatively on appraisal as internal commitment is essential for the successful implementation of appraisal rather than a bureaucratic, top-down approach (Robinson, 1992: 345).

The discourse of compliance was very evident in the responses of seven of the eleven educators interviewed in which they reveal that the IQMS was perceived as a bureaucratic exercise, often rushed by school principals to appease the Department of Education deadlines. The following extracts illustrate that educator's experience the IQMS in their schools as a paper exercise rather than reflective and developmental.

Yes, because they feel, as I told you, the teachers are coming in just for the sake of saying I've done IQMS and to say I've got it on record, yes this has been said, satisfied and so on and given in, but they don't really go out there with the idea of developing the educator. (Educator 03)

Some teachers are basically doing this just for the sake because they are compelled to do it, they are doing it. Some schools, perhaps, are just rating themselves and scoring themselves without going through the whole process and this, in the long run, will disadvantage those teachers. (Educator 04)

It seems like the bottom line with certain schools is that they do it more as a financial gain rather than a development process. I think the mere fact that there is so much of paper work to put into it, that in some schools the educators merely shied away from it. (Educator 11)

The disjunction between the educator discourses and that of the DoE as articulated in the following extract from the IQMS policy document has far

reaching implications for the successful implementation of the IQMS. “For the Department of Education – and for all educators – the main objective is to ensure quality public education for all and to constantly improve the quality of learning and teaching ...” (ELRC, 2003: 3).

From the above educator quotes, it is evident that in these schools the IQMS is really not achieving its intended purpose of encouraging effective teaching to in turn produce quality education.

4.3 Compliance to meet deadlines

Six out of eleven educators stressed that time constraints were one of the debilitating factors in implementing the IQMS since the evaluation process has been added on to the duties already being performed. The heavy workload allocated to educators and members of management impacted on them implementing the IQMS process and they therefore engaged in the IQMS processes to merely comply with departmental regulations rather than engaging in deeper level issues of reflection and development.

Well you see at the present moment with the large numbers that we have and the planning and preparation that is required by educators, the timeframe becomes quite a problem, and, um, well in most cases this has merely become now a paper chase where, just for the sake of getting the work done, the educators spend, when evaluating their peers, maximum 5 to10 minutes because they also have classes that they need to go to.
(Educator 02)

We've got to make do with the time we have, we've got to make do with the energy we have. Uh, with the loads we carry, it is not possible to stay in long hours and experience development. (Educator 03)

Time factor and workload doesn't allow you to spend the time that you should be spending on development which will impact on your future teaching experiences. (Educator 07)

Although the educators were not averse to the principle of evaluation, they expressed common concern that time constraints impacted negatively on the process. If the classroom observation which forms an integral part of the evaluation is completed in five to ten minutes, it would not be possible to realistically determine an educator's strengths and weaknesses and to pass a judgement on the educator's capability. Where the classroom observation is rushed and not done in the spirit of the policy, then the appraisal exercise becomes counterproductive. The IQMS process which was aimed at improving educator competence is actually not taking place in practice because the process is often rushed in schools to ensure compliance to departmental time-frames.

Another concern related to time constraints was that the same educators and heads of department were sometimes appointed to different appraisal panels and this made it difficult for the panels to cope with the process.

Well, for one we would require educators to be evaluating their peers, with the result that for that specific time, their classes are unmanned. Now we need to have mechanisms in place to have those classes occupied as well. (Educator 03)

The pre-evaluation conference, classroom visits and feedback sessions are often rushed to ensure that the IQMS process is completed within the prescribed time-frames. The main issue of development is sidelined by this compliance discourse, that is, the need to complete the process irrespective of the outcome of educator growth and development.

The above scenarios have implications for the IQMS process in particular and the culture of teaching and learning in general. Firstly, when educators are observing their peers, their classes are often unsupervised. This is an indictment to the whole question of quality management as it is unacceptable for learners to be left unattended in order to complete a quality assurance process. Secondly, an appraiser who does not have the appropriate subject expertise will not be in a position to appraise an educator, nor will he be able to offer any support. This is a challenge which the DoE needs to address as it is a widespread phenomenon in schools and it is impacting negatively on the IQMS process. It appears as though educators are simply obeying and fulfilling the IQMS process, that is, they comply with the process but the reality means that the fundamental philosophy of development is completely sidelined. This philosophy is evidenced in the Joint Committee for Standards and Evaluation (1981: 24) which advises that persons conducting the evaluation “should be both trustworthy and competent to perform the evaluation so that their findings achieve maximum credibility and acceptance” are completely sidelined. Appraisers are credible to the extent they exhibit technical competence, substantive knowledge, experience and integrity. The

absence of these characteristics will bring the integrity of the appraiser and the evaluation process into question.

One educator indicated that the time frame of one year prescribed by the management plan of the DoE (ELRC, 2003: 9) to complete the appraisal cycle was inadequate to complete it effectively. She suggested that in order to do justice to the process and to comply meaningfully with the requirements of the IQMS policy, the appraisal cycle should span a period of three years.

The IQMS should be phased in. It shouldn't have been a year. It's difficult to find fault in somebody and say within the next year I'm going to develop this person. It's not going to happen overnight. I think it should be a three-year cycle to make some change. (Educator 11)

I agree with this educator as this would give appraisers sufficient time to complete the evaluation thoroughly and honestly and to move from surface compliance to meaningful implementation and developmental reflection.

It is clear from the experiences of educators that the IQMS is being done merely to comply with the time frames set by the DoE. In the process the deeper level aims of reflection and development are consequently not being realized in schools as was expected by the DoE in the IQMS policy document. I agree with the educators that the IQMS process is time-consuming given that the following activities have to be covered: initial advocacy and training at staff level, pre-observation conference, classroom observation, perusal of educator and learner

portfolios, and feedback session. Most of these activities, except for classroom observation, have to be done after school hours. Often educators are busy with extra-mural activities after school and there is little or no time for development support groups to meet.

Wragg *et al.* (1996: 134-135) in their study of the appraisal system in England and Wales mentioned that time, money and energy were frequently raised by educators and policymakers as working against the process of improvement. Both appraisers and appraisees indicated that they found the amount of time required to undertake the appraisal process a major drawback. Horne and Pierce (1996: 12-13) are of the view that it must be acknowledged that educators will always say there isn't enough time. They believe that it is the task of management to ascertain how much time they are prepared to invest in the staff in order for them to comply with the policy with utmost effectiveness. In drawing up the management plan for the implementation of the IQMS, management could make time for educators by employing substitute educators to fill in while they are engaged in the appraisal process. As suggested by an educator, another alternative could be to undertake all processes of the IQMS except observation during non-contact time or after school hours.

Well, for one I would like regular monitoring, right, and then as I mentioned earlier, the timeframe for the IQMS should be set outside school so as not to impact on teaching/learning time, and also that much of the planning can be done in this period. (Educator 02)

To be completed thoroughly and to ensure compliance to the deeper level issues, appraisal requires a large amount of time. Most of the educators interviewed were more concerned about losing time with their own classes than giving up their own time for debriefing and feedback sessions which often take place during non-contact time.

While educators were not averse to keeping essential records, some educators raised the concern that the IQMS process placed greater demands for excessive record-keeping. One educator expressed the view that some educators are shifting their focus to maintaining meticulous records rather than actual teaching in the classroom. Compliance with the IQMS system has the opposite effect from the one it was intended to have.

The focus has now shifted to record keeping rather than what you are delivering in the classroom. For an experienced teacher it's not a problem. You've got your records in order, you are coping very well. For a teacher who has just joined the profession – they are battling to keep their records in order. Their focus is now diverted. (Educator 05)

Educators have also intimated that some educators are using teaching time to get their records up to date in order to appease appraisers who are often interested in monitoring record books. They believe that appraisers are of the view that if the educators' record books are in order, then quality teaching and learning is taking place. "It's not so much the subject matter that they are

focusing on, they are more interested in window-dressing – getting their records up to date” (Educator 05).

Instead of promoting effective teaching, the compliance discourse is encouraging educators to comply with bureaucratic demands and thereby compromise the quality of teaching. The way in which the compliance discourse is constructing the process is causing this serious unintended consequence. The compliance discourse has become so dominant for the educators I interviewed that fulfilling the bureaucratic IQMS processes is done at the expense of quality teaching and learning. The compliance discourse has become so overriding that evidence of compliance is what is being appraised and valued.

The IQMS has been reduced to the belief that the existence of up to date records is evidence of quality teaching and learning. One educator has resisted the compliance discourse as she is of the view that the emphasis on record-keeping has compromised teaching and learning.

You know sometimes I just wonder whether those things are really necessary. Do they want that kind of documentation and paperwork, or are they looking at quality education where a teacher is in class and teaches the children, because I think that is more important? By doing all these little record keeping, you know, all the time we’re losing sight of the fact that we’re using the child’s time - certain record keeping has to be done in class, and we’re using up the time doing that rather than teaching, and you

know like, the children who are coming out are getting weaker and weaker.
(Educator 09)

French (2002: 1) in a paper presented at the Australian Association of Institutional Research Conference questioned whether public institutions should focus on measures of quality or is there a responsibility to consider underpinning values which impact on quality. French (2002:3) states that “quality teaching and learning generally means more than that which is quantifiable”. However in operating within the current systems of education we are often driven by the need to produce evidence under the quality precepts of accountability, measurement and transparency. Do these very terms tend to exclude holistic approaches to quality in education? Can we take account of important values with our current standards and ways of measuring? If we can, do we? If we can’t should the quality systems be changed?” The IQMS evaluation emphasises the collation of evidence for validation of educator ratings. My analysis of educator perceptions leads me to conclude that this quantifiable based system encourages a discourse of compliance.

In the context of the above assertion, the concerns of educators have implications for the IQMS. According to eight educators I interviewed, educator’s compliance to the bureaucratic demands of the IQMS is having a negative impact on teaching and learning. One of the purposes of the IQMS is to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Quality education certainly cannot take place if educators are doing their record keeping in learner’s contact time when actual

teaching should to be taking place. This practice raises ethical questions that need to be addressed. Encouraging compliance through maintaining record books merely to impress appraisers in order to secure a higher score undermines the validity of the appraisal system.

4.4 Compliance to the letter of the law

The IQMS policy stipulates the observation of one lesson and most educators and evaluators are complying with this requirement to the letter of the policy. From my own experience as an appraiser as well as from the experiences of educators interviewed, one lesson observation is not enough to appraise an educator effectively. Nolan and Hoover (2004: 30) purport the view that effective evaluation depends on observing the educator over time rather than just once or twice. People often put their best foot forward when observed for a limited time. However, when the appraiser observes the educator more frequently, a more comprehensive picture of the educator's classroom teaching performance can be obtained with a view to providing a positive developmental process.

Wragg (1987: 16) is of the view that in order to give a broader perspective, outside appraisers must be brought in; otherwise fresh practices will never be introduced following an appraisal exercise. I asked educators whether external evaluation by the Department of Education could possibly address this problem of 'window dressing'. Two educators were adamant that external evaluation will not eradicate this problem.

Yes, but how often do they go to schools? You see they notify schools in advance, so for that particular week everyone's shining, but is that continuing after they have left? So are you really creating an impression that this is what's happening all the time in your school? (Educator 03)

It must also not allow for window-dressing, where certain schools just window dress for that period only, you know, everything's tip-top and then as soon as our external people are gone and then the level drops again and stuff. (Educator 04)

The main implication of the compliance discourse is that educators become sceptical of and resistant to the appraisal process and consequently although there is compliance to the letter of the law (paperwork), there is no involvement in the spirit of the law (development). The challenge is for the DoE and the profession to create an ethos where educators work in the best interest of the learners. A value system has to be inculcated where educators apply themselves honestly in the classroom with the sole purpose of enhancing the quality of education and not for self interest. As the educators enunciated above, this is not taking place and the appraisal system is constructed as simply demanding surface level compliance. Educators need to carry themselves with a high degree of professionalism by being accountable to learners without being monitored. It is unethical, though pretty human, for a professional to behave differently when being monitored.

Weber (2005: 67) in his analysis of the Integrated Quality Management System in South Africa points out that the “guiding principles” that inform the alignment between Developmental Appraisal, Performance Measurement and Whole School Evaluation highlights a central theme that runs through the IQMS document. He sees this as “the tension between holding teachers and schools to account through checking on them and ‘measuring’ their ‘performance’ and a commitment to developing human capacity and skills where required” (Weber; 2005: 67). In the light of the above critique of the IQMS, it was interesting to note that five educators felt strongly that the entire IQMS process was a strategy to ensure compliance to departmental regulations and requirements in the guise of being a developmental exercise. The quote below illustrates an educator’s perception of the IQMS as being a managerial tool for control and ensuring compliance for the purpose of tracking accountability and has nothing to offer in terms of development.

I would think it is a policy instrument as well, a policing rather, instrument as well, because, as I said to you, it provides the loophole through which accountability is managed to your employer. (Educator 06)

There is a “tension” between the developmental rationale of the IQMS policy and the compliance discourses of implementation. The processes of record keeping, time-frames and checking are emphasized during the implementation phase of the IQMS and compliance with these processes is demanded. According to my interviewees this compliance is at the expense of professional development which is lacking.

4.5 Resistance to compliance

In the next extract an educator questions the issue of educator professionalism. She implies that as a professional, educators are self-regulating and since they have undergone intensive training, there is no need for them to be closely monitored.

No fine. I mean, it's good – as long as the aim is development and not criticising the individual because, I mean you've got to understand that the educator has gone through vigorous training, right, and you know yourself. Now you don't expect an outside body to come there and criticise you.
(Educator 11)

It is interesting to note that the above-mentioned educator sees the DoE as an outside body – “them” versus “us”. Educators perceive quality monitoring by external agencies as a smoke screen by the government to ensure compliance as opposed to development. Perhaps as a result of the modus operandi of the previous regime towards educator appraisal, educators still view external evaluators with suspicion. Newton (2002: 41) observed that with the rise of managerialism there was a concomitant withdrawal of the ‘trust’ accorded to the academic community. An intrusion into their work situation is perceived by educators as unsettling, threatening and an indictment to their professional autonomy.

Whilst I acknowledge that the professional autonomy of the educator must be respected, I believe that educators are accountable to the various stakeholders, namely, the government, the Department of Education and the parent community.

I am of the view that educators cannot compare themselves to self-regulating professionals such as doctors and lawyers who also have professional bodies with quality processes. An educator's job is regulated by the various policies of the Department of Education who also fund education, and as such educators need to be accountable to the Department of Education. Furthermore, the public are also contributing through taxes and school fees to the education of their children and they too, are entitled to some form of accountability.

It is a challenge for managers to ensure that the appraisal process is executed in such a manner whereby educators do not feel intimidated and construe the process as policing, but rather as a professional activity for the mutual benefit of the school and the educator. I see the IQMS as it is currently being experienced in schools as being more about compliance. The professional development aspect of the IQMS has to be addressed otherwise the IQMS will not achieve its intended goal. The shift of policy during the implementation phase is cogently summed up by Newton writing about Higher Education (2002: 60) who states that research reveals that 'quality policy' becomes :

... changed in the implementation process, that 'quality' may become pre-occupied with accountability rather than improvement and enhancement, and that, given the influence of context, there is no 'blueprint' or ideal model for a quality system or for policy implementation, then how the academic community, at various levels, responds to these new monitoring arrangements will continue to demand the close attention not only of researchers but of national quality bodies also.

4.6 Support for compliance culture

One educator appeared to be more enthusiastically supportive of the compliance discourse suggesting that there is a need for monitoring the work of educators.

Uh, teachers are going to be monitored concerning their skills, their abilities, and, um, as well as you know it would give us some form of accountability as to what we do in the classroom and how we perform.

(Educator 01)

This individual is a seasoned educator and has experience of supervision during the old regime when educators were frequently scrutinized. He was quite upset at the malaise that had set in during the years when appraisal was non-existent in schools. He is of the view that some form of monitoring is necessary to ensure accountability.

As a school manager, I agree with the educator that the work of educators has to be appraised in order to ensure that there is meaningful compliance to departmental policies. The challenge; however, is for appraisers is to ensure that the approach they use when appraising educators is one that is supportive and developmental, and not a fault finding mission which characterized the apartheid era and to ensure that compliance is in terms of the developmental spirit of the IQMS policy (ELRC, 2003: 3) rather than in terms of adherence to the technical aspects of the process. Hartle, Everall and Baker (2001: 63) believe that the key to the success of appraisal is the continuous process of monitoring and coaching including lesson observation, providing support and coaching.

Whilst most educators vehemently resisted the policing mechanisms in the IQMS, it is interesting to note what the views of the policymakers were. An article which appeared in *The Daily News* (7 February, 2006:7) encapsulates the government's position in respect of their perceptions of the implementation of the IQMS in South African schools:

Four years after the Department of Education and unions reached an agreement on evaluating teachers' classroom performance, Minister Naledi Pandor has admitted that no one is checking whether teachers are doing their job properly.

Pandor candidly told reporters that while children were failing at schools, teachers' evaluation sheets reflected high performance scores through an unmonitored peer review system.

"We want our children to get quality education, not just agreement between teachers. I have got to look at what instrument we could use to ensure that there is external, objective evaluation," she said.

Compliance to the IQMS processes has clearly not improved quality and yet my interviews indicate a strong belief among many educators that it is the technical, surface compliance that is required. Whilst it is clear that the DoE is aware that the IQMS is not achieving its desired objectives, it would be simplistic to believe that any form of external, objective evaluation would remedy the situation overnight. The DoE needs to review its approach to educator appraisal by

addressing issues which inhibit its implementation, namely lack of resources at schools and inadequate training of evaluators as well as the inability of the IQMS to truly address developmental needs because of it being constructed by a compliance discourse.

4.7 Compliance for monetary gain

Seven educators spoke about the financial incentive emanating from the IQMS process. They mentioned that their only motivation to comply with the IQMS process was the one percent financial incentive which they received at the end of the process. The following excerpt expresses the feelings of most educators interviewed. They participated in the IQMS just for the financial gain.

No, it is more regarding the monetary gain. If it affects monetary gain then, of course educators will put in the effort to make sure that it is implemented. But as far as developing teachers are concerned, very few are really honest enough to admit where their weaknesses are. (Educator 02)

The above assertion has major implications for the IQMS. Firstly, as the educator in the next excerpt states, the developmental aspect of the IQMS is being sidelined as educators are mainly focusing on securing the one percent increment. Educators are merely going along with the IQMS process for the monetary gain. There is clearly no intrinsic motivation for the appraisal process. It seems as though the thinking amongst educators is that as long as they comply

with the minimum requirements of the IQMS and receive their salary increment, why work harder.

Um, people will make it work, simply because of the financial gain. At the moment the development part at our school is not very, very strong. It is simply an exercise to ensure the monetary reward at the end of the only one percent. But for the purpose of the monetary gain it will work and it will be made to look as if it works. (Educator 07)

Secondly, educators are of the view that there needs to be a better incentive than the current one percent increment given the demands placed on them by the IQMS, albeit these demands are all in terms of time and paperwork and not demands in terms of reflection and quality improvement. The next quote shows an educator's frustration.

I don't know how you're going to take this, but I get – can I use this word “measly” – this measly one percent for all the extreme requirements and the stuff that you need from us and for this measly one percent. I think it's really not worth the run, really. I think there should be a much better incentive offered to the educator for all this. (Educator 03)

I believe that it is problematic for the IQMS to serve as both an evaluation tool for salary progression and, at the same time, a developmental tool for educators. This is precisely one of the reasons why the IQMS is not succeeding. This sentiment is also shared by the DoE as well as the unions.

Unscrupulous teachers are giving colleagues top marks for classroom

performance, although pupils' results are dismal. Education Department Director General Duncan Hindle told Parliament's education portfolio committee recently that "most teachers had given their peers good marks which were not warranted by learner performance.

Free State's Superintendent-General of Education, Mafu Rakometsi, said that the issue of teachers being lenient with one another "cannot be ruled out" because they did not want to offend their colleagues.

The South African Democratic Teacher's Union said because assessments were linked to payments, "people are not going to take action that penalizes their fellow teachers" (Sunday Times, 2 April 2006).

The issue of tying money to performance is quite controversial. Fitz-Gibbon (1996: 195) believes that performance-related pay is a waste of public money. He is of the opinion that if you are measuring outcomes and feeding the information back, you have a monitoring-with-feedback system already in place. Before tying any bonuses or performance-related pay to this system, he states that the effects of the system itself should first be assessed. He further argues that if feedback alone produces improvements, why add performance-related pay? In respect of the IQMS we need to get rid of the system of pay increase for merely "compliance to the system" and rather change to a system of "quality teaching" being rewarded by pay increase or promotion.

Wragg (1987: 72) also raises the question of paying competent educators more money. Although the system of merit pay is contentious, he believes that if there are extra payments to be made to those deemed especially good, then the results of appraisal cannot be totally ignored when decisions are made. Whyte (1986) cited in Wragg (1987: 72) in her review of appraisal in several contexts states that it is not advisable to link directly an appraisal review with a payment decision. She cites evidence from studies of the United States General Electric Company which has shown quite persuasively that pay reviews should be separated from performance reviews. According to her, “mixing pay and appraisal in the same interview is confusing for all concerned, as the roles of counsellor, patron and paymaster become blurred and can produce negative results” (Wragg:1987: 72). If pay is linked to appraisal then there will be additional pressure to comply with the process rather than critically engaging with it.

There is no doubt that doing away with performance-related pay will leave most of the educators disgruntled; however, it is a challenge for the DoE to rethink the use of one appraisal mechanism to serve many purposes simultaneously. In an attempt to reduce the negative constructions of the IQMS by a compliance discourse, Professional Development and Performance Measurement should be viewed as separate entities and should therefore have different time-frames and processes.

4.8 Unquestioning Compliance to Criteria

The IQMS policy prescribes the criteria that must be used to appraise educators. As was discussed in 1.6.4.4 these criteria emanated from negotiations with the DoE and educator unions. It must be noted that while unions were consulted, educators were not given an opportunity to make inputs to the criteria prior to its finalization and adoption. These criteria became mandatory and schools are required to comply with these criteria without question. Compliance to these criteria implies that educators cannot question nor change the criteria to accommodate local conditions. Weber (2005: 69) aptly critiques the use of criteria in the IQMS document as a means to gain compliance.

None of these criteria can be critically interrogated. They stand above time, place, and social context. No alternatives exist. The IQMS as a whole is a *fait accompli*: there being no room for asking awkward questions about it, there can be no room for improvements in the light of practice and implementation. Thus the purpose of training is anti-intellectual, to gain compliance on the part of a “trainee”, cast in the passive role of being trained and moulded in a prescribed way by an expert who, likewise, has also been “trained”.

Newton (2002: 48) states that any given quality assurance system “will always be affected by ‘situational factors’ and by ‘context’ and that in the process of development and implementation, ‘quality policy’ becomes changed and subverted”. He adds that the success in the application of a system may be dependent less on the rigour of application or the compactness of the

documented quality system *per se*, important though that may be, but more so on the use by the relevant actors , and on how the system is viewed and interpreted by them. It is precisely as a result of situational factors that the IQMS is construed and interpreted differently by various schools. As a result of this educators are concerned that they may be disadvantaged by the process during its implementation.

Boyd (1989: 3) attributes one of the reasons for educators' perception of appraisal as not being productive is because educators do not have an input into the evaluation criteria. Unlike other professionals such as doctors, lawyers and engineers who control the criteria for entering and maintaining membership in their profession, educators, on the other hand, often do not have that privilege. State laws decide the focus of evaluation and this leads to a compliance culture. The implication for educators is that they begin to distrust the evaluation process and question the validity of the results it produces.

McGreal (1988: 23-27) cogently states that setting criteria collaboratively fosters mutual trust in the appraisal relationship, as opposed to when criteria are imposed on educators. He adds that with imposed criteria, educators conform to artificial standards, to obtain appraiser approval instead of setting goals for growth.

Whilst the criteria seem to be clearly defined in the IQMS policy document, in practice there are many contextual factors which impede its application. The

discourse of compliance to criteria has elicited negative responses from educators. The criteria in the IQMS is uniform for all schools in South Africa yet there are vast differences between well-resourced urban schools compared to rural schools that are generally under-resourced in terms of human and material resources, yet the same criteria is used without considering these contextual factors.

Compliance to the criteria and its inconsistent application evoked negative responses from six of the eleven educators. They believe that the criteria are set for an ideal teaching situation. In the next excerpt an educator argues that the criteria are prescriptive as they do not take into account the local conditions of schools such as the lack of adequate resources, socio-economic conditions as well as teacher's allocation of workload.

Well, IQMS has high expectations because these parameters are very prescriptive and then we're faced with other problems as well. We don't have the necessary resources. At the same time you have educators who are teaching subjects outside their specialization. Then there are also economic factors to be considered. (Educator 02)

The educator in the extract below concurs with the above educator, but she is concerned that the compliance discourse often leads to the inconsistent application of the criteria within a school between departments, as well as between schools.

You know if your manager doesn't like you or the people on your DSG are too hard, because if you compare two schools as well maybe the DSG in one school is very lenient and the DSG in the other school is fairly demanding. So the ratings that the teachers in both schools receive might vary. More so like, especially in one school you may have two or three HoD's who are in charge of the teachers below them, and maybe one HoD is very hard and the other HoD is just doing it for the sake of doing it and maybe the other HoD is a bit lenient, so in one school you might have a lot of inconsistency. When you're dealing with humans there is always - you know, as hard as you try, there is that chance of subjectivity. I know at my school we have broken down the criteria, exactly what does one mean, what does two, but then this rating is for my school only. Then another school might have their own rating as well. There will always be that amount of subjectivity and varied opinions and ratings. (Educator 04)

The implication of the above concerns is the call for intensive training in the interpretation of criteria so that all stakeholders share a common understanding of criteria and hopefully this will ensure its fair application. As one educator suggested there is a need to workshop the criteria so that individuals are not accorded the opportunity to interpret the criteria subjectively. Whilst the DoE mandates that educators comply with uniform criteria, educators are grappling with the implementation of the IQMS as the criteria in the policy document does not take into consideration the context of implementation and contextual information through the Whole School Evaluation are not fed into individual

performance appraisal. There needs to be space for contextual factors in the application of the criteria.

I believe it is very subjective and in the absence of the whole process taking place as it should on paper, um, I don't believe that the scores are a real indication of what is going on. When the criteria are not sufficiently workshopped and understood by everybody, you are free to interpret it in any way that you want. There's quite a range within which you can interpret and to prevent management from actually having many workshops addressing all our needs, they tend to gloss over certain of the problems and therefore we lose out on opportunities to be workshopped in those areas. (Educator 04)

Educator 4 made a constructive suggestion to deal with the problem of applying the criteria consistently. In her school the criteria had been workshopped before the appraisal process. This entailed analyzing each criterion and all educators were aware of what was required for each rating. While the above suggestion may seem idealistic and time-consuming, it will nevertheless help to ensure some degree of fairness, but the issue of subjectivity will remain a challenge to be resolved.

Wragg *et al.* (1996: 129) mention that although issues to do with power and control are commonly played down in schools, they are inescapable. While the IQMS policy stresses the collaborative and collegial nature of appraisal, in practice, as articulated in the educator discourses in the interviews, appraisal can

become a powerful form of managerial control over process and outcome. Mulderrig (2003: 5) concurs with this viewpoint as she stresses that one consequence of the new managerial logic in educational organizations is an intensified regulation of educators' working practices, alongside an increased emphasis on standards, targets, quality and delivery. Dale (1989) sees this as a removal of educators' professional autonomy or judgement.

4.9 Summary

The preceding discussion illustrates the competing voices and discourses of educators. It shows how the broader pattern of power, knowledge and control enshrined in the ideology of new managerialism impacts on the every day lives and work of educators. The discourse of compliance is promoting educators to comply with the surface level, bureaucratic processes of the IQMS in a technicist way rather than engaging in the underpinning purpose of reflection and development. The compliance discourse is so dominant that it has become seemingly obvious and incontestable. The main aim of the IQMS is being sidelined by this compliance discourse at the expense of educator growth and development. It is interesting to note that in the overview of South African history in Chapter 2 the educator appraisal model during the Apartheid era was all about 'obeying' the system and 'rigid compliance' to departmental regulations. The new educator appraisal model aimed to eradicate these perceptions of appraisal, yet many educators speak about the IQMS in the same way.

Chapter Five - Discourse of Accountability

5.1 Introduction

The dual purpose of the IQMS as enunciated in the policy document (ELRC, 2003: 3) includes educator accountability and the development of human resources. The tension between educator accountability and professional development has been discussed earlier. This chapter explores, firstly, the discourse of accountability as advanced in the literature and secondly, the chapter looks at the discourse of accountability as evident in the IQMS policy document and, finally an analysis of educator perceptions of accountability as experienced by them will be undertaken.

Whilst governments intervene and promote certain policies such as the educator appraisal scheme, the question that needs to be asked is: Whose interests do these policies serve? Policies are constructed of discourses. Daniel (2005: 767) states that:

Policies are initiated in the context of influence where policy discourses are shaped and constructed. The struggle takes place in different arenas. Some occur openly, and some behind the scenes as policy texts are articulated and produced. The path from the context of text production to the context of practice is neither linear nor straightforward.

This suggests that policy writers cannot control the meaning of their texts. Ball (1994:23) conceives of policy both as text and discourse. Text and discourse are

implicit in each other. Policy as a discourse has specific characteristics in that the “effect of policy making is primarily discursive; it changes the possibilities we have for thinking otherwise” (Ball, 1994: 24).

Discourses have power to further certain agendas. To understand how the IQMS is situated in the general structure of the new “accountability discourses” in education reform, I explicate how the IQMS policy is influenced, produced and implemented in the ensuing discussion. This is achieved by looking at how the IQMS limits the possibilities for thinking of alternatives to the present educator appraisal system. Furthermore, I look at how practice departs from the social democratic values and beliefs espoused by People’s Education post 1994 in terms of equity and efficiency to a managerial discourse.

Ball (1994:21) says: “Discourses are about what can be said, and thought, but also about who can speak, when, where and with what authority.” Discourses have degrees of authority. By negotiating with the leading teacher’s organization, the South African Democratic Teacher’s Union (SADTU), the government has strengthened the legitimacy of the IQMS by representing policy in terms of democratic consultation and partnership. As a result, it is very difficult for educators to find their own voice, far less to have it listened to in order to make any impact.

Discourse “generates, limits, and restricts educators in many ways by constructing certain possibilities for thought and action through the use of certain

propositions and words” (Daniel, 2005: 766). In this way power is seen as diffused throughout the system as it is exercised from a distance through surveillance and ruling. Ball (1994: 260) asserts that power is exercised through its effects, through a “combination of micro-disciplinary practices and steering at a distance”. The IQMS policy attempts to make educators accountable through internal and external monitoring of their work.

Charlton (2002: 14) states: “Discourse on the desirability of ‘increased accountability’ has become ubiquitous in political, managerial and even journalistic discourse.”

Charlton (2002: 5) offers two definitions of “accountability”. Firstly, in general discourse, “accountable” means something similar to ‘responsible’ and carries connotations of ‘being answerable-to’. In the context of teaching this definition implies that educators are accountable and answerable to the various stakeholders, namely, the learners, parents and the Department of Education in respect of quality teaching and learning. There is bad quality out there in schools; therefore, we need to have educators who are accountable. As discussed in earlier we cannot allow a situation, for example, where educators get consistently high performance ratings in schools which produce 0% pass rate in the Senior Certificate Examination.

Secondly, according to Charlton (2002:5) the technical meaning of accountability in managerial discourse “refers narrowly to the duty to represent auditable

accounts.” This definition implies that educators need to give an account of their teaching through some form of evidence. In respect of the IQMS, the technical aspect of accountability seems to be emphasized as educators are required to show evidence when rated against the various performance standards in the IQMS checklist. The implication of this discourse is that if educators show evidence of work done according to the various performance standards, then it implies that quality teaching is taking place. As indicated in the previous chapter by an educator this may not necessarily be true as some educators may have all their records in order and yet not be teaching effectively in the classroom. In the light of the above it must be questioned whether the IQMS is truly achieving its objective of promoting quality teaching and learning.

Charlton (2002:5) further argues that the drive for increased accountability may operate as an excuse to justify managerial takeover. The implication of the above assertion is that audit systems such as the IQMS may be set up to advance the interests of those who have introduced them, namely, the Department of Education. During the post-apartheid period and prior to the implementation of the IQMS many schools were “no go zones” for school inspectors and as such there was no mechanism for the DoE to hold educators accountable for their work. The introduction of the IQMS as a mandatory educator appraisal scheme has currently made it possible for the DoE to enter schools and exercise managerial influence by monitoring standards in education and promoting accountability. This is necessary given that some schools remain dysfunctional in

the post-apartheid era. This discourse of accountability as espoused by the IQMS is supported by the following educator:

It's a start, it's a start, considering we've come from where there was no accountability and supervision and what have you, it definitely is a start and I can see, and it's also evident where teachers have started to improve; they are conscious, they are becoming accountable and stuff like that. (Educator 04)

The role of educators in South Africa has altered drastically during the last decade. Williams (2003:1) has pointed out that prior to 1994, South African educators merely fulfilled the role of enactors of state policy while making very little meaningful contribution to the decision-making process. Since 1994, the South African education system has transformed in many respects. I believe that it is necessary to contextualize this study against the background of the People's Education and the vision for South African education that was articulated in 1994 and the "efficiency" discourses of post-apartheid South Africa. The hierarchical nature of educator appraisal during the apartheid era has been dealt with in Chapter 2. After the first democratic election that took place in South Africa on 27 April 1994, a constitution was adopted based on democracy, equal citizenship and the protection of fundamental human rights and freedom. Consequently, democratic governance was one of the principles which were to underpin the education and training programme of the South African Department of Education. The principle of democratic governance had found manifestation in a number of policies, including the policy for educator appraisal.

The IQMS has a two-pronged approach to measuring accountability in schools. Firstly, there is internal evaluation at school level where appraisal is undertaken to ensure that minimum standards are met. Secondly, there is an external component to the IQMS which mandates the Whole School Evaluation Unit to carry out whole school evaluation. Weber (2005:70) believes that this form of internal and external accountability “signals the triumph of the government’s agenda”. Whilst the IQMS still maintains a hierarchical structure with all processes emanating from and leading back to the Department of Education, educators are co-opted into participating in its implementation by getting a buy-in from unions and thereby getting educators to participate in the process. I tend to agree with Weber (2005:70) that this represents the victory of management structures over historically evolved, democratic structures, particularly in the area of whole school evaluation.

Furthermore, the IQMS has marginalized two important constituencies, that is, parents and learners as pointed out by this educator:

I find that the IQMS hasn’t considered the learner who is an important cog in this. Because after all if you’re evaluating teachers it’s not too difficult to doctor a test which would appear that you are doing your work. But if one could get the opinions of the learners that would be a truer reflection of the teacher’s work. I would think that the learners would form the control part of it. Parents too should be involved in evaluating because at the end of the day it is the parents, you know, who are sending their children for education. (Educator 03)

Appraisal by students has been a controversial issue. For the most part covertly, students have always assessed their teachers at least informally. The literature, however, indicates that “some teachers contend that students, lacking in skills in training in instructional techniques and evaluation, should have no part in the process of appraisal” (Odhiambo, 2005: 409).

According to Learmonth (2000: 48-49) OFSTED inspectors in the United Kingdom are required to analyse samples of students’ work and to hold discussions with students about aspects of teaching and learning in schools. The potential power of ‘the student voice’ has been acknowledged by many schools and research projects. They have developed procedures of building ‘the student voice’ into school self-evaluation. Learmonth (2000: 51) is of the view that student input creates opportunities for students to “develop their views about teaching and learning, and other broader issues, and have them listened to by the school, are an obvious and desirable example of ‘practical democracy’ at work”.

5.2 Accountability in curricular activities

The analysis of educator interviews indicated that formalized procedures for the appraisal of educator’s performance are viewed by them as essential for accountability and quality improvement. Firstly, many educators are of the view that the IQMS acts as valuable “checks and balances” for educators as enunciated by the following educator:

I think it's important because sometimes as individuals, as humans we sometimes forget certain things, and there to keep checks and balances to ensure that you – you know – you're reminded that certain things have to be done and it has to be done in time. Sometimes we, uh, you know, we procrastinate, we say we'll do it tomorrow, tomorrow, but this keeps a check and then we have to get it done. (Educator 10)

I agree with the educators that the IQMS has brought about educator accountability in schools to a large extent. Prior to the implementation of the IQMS there was virtually no supervision of educator's work in schools. From my experience as a head of department during this era I observed that many educators underperformed in their duties. Some educators used the culture of non-compliance to hide their tardiness. Post 1994 and prior to the implementation of the IQMS educators were directed by some unions to neither allow inspectors to check their work, nor comply with the directives of the inspectorate. This culture of non-compliance filtered down to school level and educators also refused to be supervised by members of management.

The educators I interviewed have, therefore, grounds to state that the IQMS has forced educators to become accountable. I have observed that since educators are aware that they are going to be monitored, they engage in better planning and preparation of lessons, keep meticulous educator portfolios, learner records and supervise learner portfolios. The IQMS has made it mandatory for educators to account to their appraisers and this has no doubt supported management in

monitoring the work of educators and hence compelling educators to be accountable for their teaching. The tightening of legislation for appraisal in the past two years has impacted favourably in the increase of accountability.

Secondly, the new educator appraisal system makes educators aware of their responsibilities and compels them to become more accountable in their preparation and teaching since they are now being monitored by appraisers.

Well of course, I believe that, you know, educators who have been shirking in the past, with all due respect, who have been shirking, you know, their duties as educators in the classroom, who were ill-prepared to come into the classroom etc. – all right – uh, they will now actually become more aware of their role as educators in the classroom and, um, I believe that it will help them in their personal development and their goals as well.

(Educator 01)

The next two extracts are interesting in that two educators indicated that while the IQMS has made most of the educators accountable, they are nevertheless concerned that despite the “checks and balances” in the IQMS process, there are still a minority of educators who are able to continue with their tardiness.

Look, for teachers who are serious about their work, it does ensure accountability. But for those educators who are not so serious and not so motivated and focused, it doesn't. It's a wonderful sieve through which all their flaws were passed through and they still look good. (Educator 07)

From personal experience and from the institution - should I say like 80% of the people are accountable for what they do, the other 20% just go with the flow, and because we do so much of teamwork, so they tend to rely on the team or the manager that's providing everything. (Educator 11)

The above concerns of educators have serious implication for the IQMS. While on the one hand one of the purposes of the IQMS is to promote accountability through checking and measuring educator performance, on the other hand it does not have the capacity to deal with tardy educators. The IQMS policy categorically states that "there can be no sanctions against individual educators before meaningful development takes place" (ELRC, 2003: 10). This implies that the IQMS cannot be used a punitive exercise to deal with underperforming educators and therefore does not address the issue of making incompetent educators accountable to the system.

One educator described the accountability factor in the IQMS as a "prod" that led educators to reflect on their performance and seek improvement.

As I say, sometimes you forget why you're in a classroom, you forget your duty, you forget the pupil, you tend to take them for granted, and when you go through the IQMS ans they talk about pupil welfare, language, class neatness and so on. It sort of takes you back to college days and you sort of refocus yourself. I'm here to guide the pupil or to improve myself. (Educator 08)

The IQMS has assisted educators to be more accountable in their core business as the criteria for the seven performance standards clearly spell out what is required of the educator. In a study of educator appraisal in Kenya, Odhiambo (2005: 407) concluded that one of the perceived benefits of appraisal is that it acts as a reminder for the educators of what they are expected to do. Brennan, Frazer and Williams (1995:5) support the notion that self-evaluation assists educators 'being accountable' and 'seeking improvement'.

By identifying strengths and weaknesses, the institution, or department or course/programme team are able to see themselves as they 'really are', and this is a step towards being *accountable* to a range of internal and external authorities; and by building on strengths, and taking remedial action on weaknesses, *improvements* are intended to ensue.

(Brennan, Frazer and Williams, 1995:5)

5.3 Accountability in co- and extra-curricular activities

In the next extract the educator believes that the IQMS has helped educators to become more accountable to co-curricular and extra-curricular activities in schools and this has improved the quality of teaching and learning.

It did a great deal as regards to the extra-curricular and the co-curricular activities. In fact, it brought back the challenge in the area of extra-curricular activities because there was also a lull in that area as well as sports. In the past teachers were not willing to go down to the grounds to participate or to assist the learners but because IQMS has come about, the educators are trying to do something for themselves, as well as for the

learners, and I believe that it has done something in the sense that it has brought about a greater awareness. (Educator 01)

Prior to the implementation of IQMS there was reluctance on the part of some educators to work hard in respect of taking on duties beyond their classroom activities. Now that educators are aware that they will be rated for their contribution to the corporate life of the school, they are in many instances enthusiastic about involving themselves in co-curricular and extra-curricular activities. The IQMS has definitely compelled educators to become more accountable in aspects other than curricular activities.

In terms of their job description educators are required to organize and coordinate co-curricular and extra-curricular activities. By incorporating the above-mentioned activities in the performance standards for educators, the IQMS has through the power of legislation made educators accountable for these responsibilities. It is precisely this power of discourse which “generates, limits, and restricts educators in many ways by constructing certain possibilities for thought and action through the use of certain propositions and words” (Daniel, 2005: 766). In this way power is seen as diffused throughout the system. It is exercised from a distance through surveillance and ruling. Ball (1994: 260) asserts that power is exercised through its effects, through a “combination of micro-disciplinary practices and steering at a distance”. The IQMS looks at quality from a national and whole perspective (steering at a distance) but has also impacted on an individual educator basis, such as their participation in extra-

curricular activities (micro-disciplinary practices). The power of IQMS discourses can, therefore, have positive effects for learners and schools.

5.4 Call for external evaluation

Eight of the eleven educators were concerned that the spirit of transparency and fairness in the IQMS document did not manifest itself during the implementation phase as they experienced favouritism, bias and inconsistent application of criteria during the appraisal. These malpractices militated against the discourse of accountability and efficiency promoted by the IQMS. In the light of the above these educators felt strongly that there was need for some form of an external quality evaluation to check whether educators were accountable. The following responses of educators encapsulate the external accountability dimension.

You need a mediator, and of course someone coming from the outside into the school will be able to have, you know, a fair evaluation of the educator and perhaps even the scores would improve, and to the advantage of the educators. (Educator 01)

I think that would be a truer reflection in that problem areas would be ironed out. Well, for one, it would be an independent person – someone from the outside, and they would know exactly where the loopholes would be and to check that these loopholes are ironed out. (Educator 02)

The above educators are in favour of external evaluation as they believe that this might eradicate bias and inconsistency in internal evaluation and promote a

quality culture. Though the concerns of these educators resonate the feelings of most educators I have interacted with, it is yet to be seen whether external Whole School Evaluation (WSE) will address this issue. In the third year of the implementation of the IQMS most schools have not as yet been visited by the WSE unit. The intention of the DoE was that secondary schools will be evaluated more or less every three years and primary schools every five years because of the greater number of schools (ELRC, 2003: 27). This vision of the DoE has not materialized and consequently external whole-school evaluation and quality assurance which was to enable “external supervisors to provide an account of the school’s current performance and to show to what extent it meets national goals and the needs of the public and communities” (DoE, 2002: 3) is currently in a state of limbo.

As a manager I strongly advocate that there is a need for some form of external evaluation to validate the school’s internal self-evaluation although the literature is divided on this issue. I agree with the reasons postulated by Hargreaves (cited in Learmonth, 2000: 115) that self-evaluation of a school on its own is inadequate:

A school’s internal audit or self-evaluation ...looks an amateur enterprise. The teachers are not trained in the skills of inspecting and auditing; they lack a wider perspective and are inclined to a parochialism; their criteria for defining strengths and weaknesses are more likely to be implicit and closed; they strongly identified with their school, they cannot guarantee detachment in their judgement; any strengths they proclaim may be pure rhetoric; governors and parents would be foolish to take all they say at

face value.

From my experience as the chairperson of my school's IQMS committee and from my interaction with fellow school managers as well as from the experiences of educators interviewed, the following are some of the shortcomings of the IQMS during initial implementation: unrealistically high scores, bias and favouritism, inconsistent application of criteria during appraisal and the degeneration of the IQMS process into a paper exercise. As a result of this the IQMS is not fulfilling its objective of quality assurance and quality monitoring successfully. The very instrument that was implemented to assure accountability in schools is not meeting its accountability challenge. It is precisely to address the above-mentioned concerns that I believe that there is a need for some form of external evaluation in schools. By being aware that an external evaluation will take place to validate internal quality assessment, schools will be guarded against any form of malpractice and this may encourage compliance to the IQMS.

Wragg (1987: 16) is also of the view that in order to give a broader perspective, outsiders must be brought in, otherwise fresh practices will never be introduced following an appraisal exercise. He suggests that one option would be local authority advisers who are in any case already involved in counselling educators and Heads. In the case of the IQMS this would include subject advisers from the DoE who make up the WSE team. The second option would be to hire a group of people specifically for the assignment of appraising educators such as OFSTED model used in the United Kingdom.

Holt (1981: 154); however, does not subscribe to the above viewpoint as he is of the view that “external forms of school accountability will prove costly and contentious, and may lower teacher morale.” He states that external evaluation will foster an impoverished view of education and de-skill the educator at a time when his professional skills are more important than ever. One educator alluded to external accountability being an implied criticism of the quality of an educator’s work and lack of trust:

I would think that if the school level is done properly, there will be no need for an external person to come and moderate those scores. (Educator 05)

The IQMS has to be mindful of the above given the history of external inspections during the apartheid era. External inspections, commonly referred to as panel inspections, were vehemently rejected by educators as it was perceived as “largely undermining their professional integrity while contributing very little to their professional development” (Dispatch Online, 1998: 1).

Given the contentious nature of external evaluations, the question that needs to be answered is: Will school performance improve as a result of external accountability measures? Newmann *et al.* (1997: 62) refers below to a research completed in the United States, which may be of relevance to other countries following the external accountability model:

We have seen that strong external accountability is difficult to implement, and even when it is implemented, it can present serious obstacles to or undermine a school’s organizational capacity. We showed that when

highly prescriptive standards connected to high-stakes consequences are mandated by external authorities, this can deny school staff both the 'ownership' or commitment and the authority it needs to work collaboratively to achieve a clear purpose for student learning.

Although the educator in the next extract subscribes to external accountability, she is sceptical about this form of evaluation:

No fine. I mean, it's good – as long as the aim is development and not criticising the individual because, I mean you've got to understand that the educator has gone through vigorous training, right, and you know yourself. Now you don't expect an outside body to come there and criticise you.

(Educator 11)

The scepticism of the educators must be understood given the history of 'panel inspections' during the apartheid era which usually translated to a fault-finding exercise rather than a developmental experience for educators. Since the majority of the schools have not been subjected to external evaluation by the DoE as yet, it still remains to be seen by educators whether WSE is genuinely collaborative and developmental in nature as espoused by the IQMS policy document. The anxiety and suspicion of educators will not disappear unless the external evaluation is experienced and perceived by educators as a collaborative and supportive exercise.

McCormick (1982: 26) in his concluding report of a research project which investigated, by interviewing parents, educators, local authority officers, governors and politicians, various views on accountability made two pertinent points which are of particular relevance to the discourse of accountability. Firstly, the study concluded that accountability is a two-way process. Any external authority must, therefore, in satisfying its external obligations to maintain proper educational standards, also see itself as answerable to its educators and its schools, and must strive actively to sustain its supportive relationships with them. I believe that this is the challenge for the IQMS. The mindset of educators in respect of the external inspections of the apartheid era has to be changed. This can only happen if the IQMS is experienced by educators as a collaborative and supportive form of appraisal rather than one which encourages educators to comply with externally-determined checklists.

Secondly, McCormick (1982: 27) purports that it is possible to approach accountability as a process of mutual negotiation. He adds that such an approach must call for a gradualist and long-term strategy, based on careful consultation between the authority and its schools. While this approach could be expensive in time and effort, I believe that it would be a better approach than imposing a quick-fix solution against the wishes of the schools. Without the co-operation of stakeholders the DoE may achieve conformity, but without conviction and this may lead to the discourse of accountability articulated by the IQMS not achieving its intended objective.

5.5 Summary

The discourse of accountability was a prominent discourse which emerged from the data. This chapter shows how the IQMS aims to promote accountability which is a major shift from the social discourse of equity espoused by People's Education to the efficiency discourse of accountability. Whilst the IQMS promotes the technical aspect of accountability, the chapter questions the extent to which this truly promotes quality teaching and learning.

Chapter 6 - Discourse of Professional Development

6.1 Introduction

Research, insights from practice and common sense converge around the understanding that skilled educators have a significant impact on student learning. Effective continuing professional development helps educators continue enhancing their knowledge and skills throughout their careers. This chapter examines the ways in which professional development is discursively constructed by referring to the literature as well as data from educator interviews.

The professional development of educators involves training, updating skills and receiving advice on best practice. This continual updating of skills is in line with the discourse of lifelong learning and is linked to a commitment to raise standards, as well as to collaboration with other educators in reaching target and shared expertise. This commitment to self-improvement comes as much from the educators themselves as from the Department of Education and will be explored in the ensuing discussion.

The era is passing when it was assumed that a person equipped with a teaching certificate was prepared for lifelong service as an educator. The recent curriculum transformation in South Africa coupled with the calls for improving quality has necessitated that educators update and improve their skills through professional development. Moloi (2002: 2) believes that “in an ever changing

environment new learning capabilities will enable educators to respond creatively to both internal and external changes.”

In this study the term “professional development” is used as a generic term to include educator development, staff development and In-service Education and Training (Tomlinson, 1997: 27). Professional development is the process by which educators acquire the knowledge and skills for good professional practice at each stage of their career. Educators as professionals need to keep abreast of new developments in the curriculum, extend their expertise and acquire new competencies. Professional or staff development is, therefore, a process designed to foster personal and professional growth for individuals within a supportive organisational climate having as its ultimate aim better learning for students, and continuous self-renewal for educators and schools (Dillon-Peterson, 1981: 3; Hoyle, 1982: 4; Southworth, 1994: 34).

The Department of Education (1998b: 130-137) purports that In-service Education and Training (INSET) should be conceived as an ongoing process of professional development. INSET is thus seen as a process whereby educators continuously renew and update their skills, knowledge and attitudes during their career. The discourse of professional development as purported by the IQMS has been discussed in Chapter 2 and subscribes to one of the underpinning philosophies of the IQMS, that is, to provide support and opportunities for development to assure continued growth (ELRC, 2003: 4).

Educator interviews revealed that educators had different views about the IQMS providing the necessary professional development to that pledged by the IQMS policy document. Whilst most educators were receptive to the notion of professional development, they felt that the IQMS was not fulfilling this purpose adequately.

6.2 Self-evaluation

Educators who had positive attitudes to the IQMS tended to stress the opportunity provided by a formal scheme for facilitating educators' self appraisal. Comments from those interviewed included the fact that educators rarely have a chance to take stock of what they are doing. The IQMS has afforded educators an opportunity to carry out some measures of self-evaluation which they construed as useful to their professional development.

It gives us a chance for introspection. We all just think we are good, but when you go through these various criteria and questions and the rating scales, then you are able to assist yourself; exactly where do you fit in and how good a teacher are you. And then of course it gives you a chance to see where you are lacking and where your strengths are, and then you can see where your weaknesses are and where your strengths are. Perhaps you can go even further and assist your other colleagues, teachers from other schools. (Educator 04)

The following educator succinctly encapsulates the power of the discourse of professional development emanating from the IQMS:

By finding out our weaknesses we will most definitely want to improve in those areas – and that’s what the IQMS has done. (Educator 01)

Self-evaluation causes the educator to reflect on his/her practice and methodology. It makes the educator look at the long term. The belief is that this type of instrument promotes a sense of responsibility and encourages higher standards and is, therefore, an excellent method for professional development (Lengeling, 1996).

The concept of discourse relates to the influential role communicative practices play in creating the social world. In recognising that social processes are associated in the creation of meaning, discourses create a specific perspective for interpreting the world (Ovens, 2002: 3). In the light of the above discourses are essential constitutive elements that frame practices. The IQMS resonates the power of the dominant discourse of continued professional development and was a discourse used by most of the educators interviewed. Policy in general; and the IQMS policy in particular, possess the ability to appropriate legitimacy and therefore power (Konrad and Lenarcic, 2007: 868). Silver (1990: 7) confirms this by suggesting that policy is about “relationships of communication, power, exploitation, consensus, co-operation, competition, and structures, which are formed by those relationships and which impact upon them”.

If educators are to improve what they do as a result of any appraisal system, they must change their behaviour in some way. Real and lasting change only occurs

when an individual sees the need for it. Whatever power-coercive strategies are used, ultimately educators must make their own decision to do things differently. Consequently, self-appraisal has an important part to play; perhaps it is even more important than analysis by others (Wragg, 1987: 19).

Self-appraisal is an opportunity to reflect on own performance, therefore it is important for the appraisee to be honest and fair during this process. One educator articulated his concern in this regard:

Well I would say that, firstly, teachers are not honest enough with their personal growth plan because they don't want to create an impression that they have weaknesses. (Educator 02)

If the process of self-appraisal is to be valuable to both the educator and the school, then neither the educator's weaknesses nor her strengths and capabilities should be kept hidden. Only then can the appraisal system serve the educator in terms of professional development in a balanced way, and at the same time serve the school in terms of maximising the use of its most valuable resource: the educator (Horne and Pierce, 1996: 33). While the above might be true in the general discourse of professional development, the complexity of the integrated and combined nature of the IQMS is not allowing the development aspect of the IQMS to receive the desired attention. Using the same instrument, that is, Developmental Appraisal and Performance Measurement for two opposing goals seems to be the problem. Educators will obviously be reluctant to expose their weaknesses to the DSG which also carries out the Performance

Measurement aspect of the IQMS determining their salary progression. For this reason, it is understandable that the IQMS was constructed mainly by a discourse of compliance and partially by a discourse of accountability in the interview data, with only limited construction within the development discourse.

6.3 Peer Appraisal

For educators working in what is considered a solitary culture, collaboration with peers is thus another feature of improving practice. Deliberation among peers is a fundamental feature of professional development in any field. Collaborative evaluation is gaining popularity as an appraisal mechanism (Berliner, 1982; Brandt, 1996; Wolf, 1996). This model involves working with a colleague or mentor and has gained popularity among some educators interviewed.

Secondly, your peer is assessing you and you will accept positive criticism from your colleague better than from an outsider. Your subject adviser and people like that are not in contact with you daily, but your colleagues are in contact with you daily and they really know your true worth and they are best to judge your weaknesses and strengths. So for that reason I would say IQMS is very good. (Educator 04)

Classroom observation and critiques of educators' performance by other stakeholders are seen increasingly as a valuable component of an educator appraisal instrument (Strobbe, 1993). Involving peers in appraisal has two advantages. Firstly, the appraisal is done in a less threatening environment as compared to outside appraisers. Secondly, this type of appraisal can foster

communication and trust between the educator and colleague. The model of peer observation as an evaluation mechanism helps to improve the skills of educators through constructive feedback and discussion (Fullerton, 1993: 83).

Peterson (2000: 123) comments that evaluating the work of their peers is also a professionalizing activity for educators:

A sense of professionalism is strengthened with the idea of shared craft knowledge. Peer review makes it possible to exchange information and techniques. It makes an exemplary practice available for others to follow. Finally, the professional and political standing of teachers in the society is enhanced with self-regulation of peer review.

Although writing in the USA, Peterson's assertion is applicable to South African schools where there has been major policy transformation in the National Curriculum. Most educators were trained under the apartheid system and with the introduction of the Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS), the new curriculum for South African schools; the need for reskilling educators is incontestable.

This model of peer appraisal where the emphasis is on skills development, is also referred to as "pair mentoring" where educators work together, observe each other's lessons, deliberate on areas of mutual interest and plan future strategies (Cosh, 1999: 24). One educator was quite supportive of this type of appraisal.

I'd like to see the implementation of this mentoring, the buddy system and then using the strengths of certain educators to offset the weaknesses of the others. At the same time, I'd like to see, hopefully, team teaching taking place, which worked well previously. (Educator 02)

The popularity of peer appraisal among educators interviewed is understandable given the apartheid review experiences of many educators. In this study six educators indicated that, given the opportunity, educators have the knowledge and skills to make a significant difference in how their colleagues teach. This notion; however, is not shared by four educators who are concerned that educators may not be 'tough enough' to handle this responsibility that go hand in hand with making summative judgements about the quality of their colleagues' teaching performance (Anderson and Pellicer, 2001: 20-21).

Teachers are coming in just for the sake of saying I've done IQMS and I've got it on record. Yes this has been said, satisfied and so on and given in, but they don't really go out there with the idea of developing the educator. It's because you and I are friends, so you come listen to my lesson, I come listen to your lesson – for two minutes – just to say I was there, and that's it. (Educator 03)

Though this educator is discussing peer appraisal it is clear she is constructing this in a discourse of compliance rather than a discourse of development.

The uniqueness of the South African education context has to be taken into consideration to ascertain whether the use of peer appraisal is practical in all schools after all the IQMS policy is applicable to schools across the country. Whilst the IQMS calls for peer appraisal, there is a great variance between schools in South Africa. Some schools experience shortage of educators in certain subjects and as such do not enjoy the expertise of peers.

Look, when you have such a small staff like we have at the moment, sometimes a teacher is one out of his department, he doesn't have a peer. So you're going to get someone from outside of your department to evaluate you, who doesn't actually know the nitty-gritty of what you are about and doesn't understand the practical problems that you face. So he will not be able to give you the necessary support or feedback. (Educator 07)

The implication of the above quote is that the 'one size fits all' approach of the IQMS could compromise the chances of peer appraisal being constructed in a development discourse. Nolan and Hoover (2004: 7) state that a one-size-fits-all approach to teacher supervision and evaluation "makes no more sense than does a one-size-fits-all approach to teaching children and adolescents. Yet, remarkably, many school districts that advocate differentiated instruction for children take a one-size-fits-all approach to supervision and evaluation".

In my experience of the IQMS I have observed that educators are generally reluctant to have their colleagues as a peer on the DSG. While this study was

unable to ascertain why educators were reluctant to be appraised by their peers, it could be speculated that time constraints could be one of the reasons. Other reasons could be a lack of trust and faith in their colleague's expertise or to save embarrassment of being exposed to their colleagues. This concern was highlighted by one educator.

I think it would depend on the peer himself, how fair is the peer, how biased he is. Is he there to assist you? Or is he there just to say 'well I'm the boss'? It would depend entirely on the personality of the peer. There, perhaps, you know if I suggested we get another – a peer from another department, which would not be fair because he might not know our subject. (Educator 08)

Most educators interviewed shared the same sentiment as Educator 8 and were very reluctant to have a peer on their DSG. The above scenario is not consistent with studies carried out elsewhere, especially in the USA, which have concluded that educators were not reluctant to have their peers included in an evaluation panel (Shinkfield and Stufflebeam, 1995). One has to take into consideration that peer appraisal is a new concept for educators in South Africa and has the potential as a vehicle for transformation and growth. This cannot happen unless educators are trained in observation and evaluation techniques for them to properly evaluate their colleagues and if they have a shared understanding that this is a developmental process.

From the responses of educators in this study it is evident that there are mixed reactions over the use of peer review as an appraisal mechanism. Some educators see the value of peer appraisal while others choose not to select a peer in their DSG. This has implications for the IQMS as the peer forms an important component of the DSG, especially as many schools have heads of department who do not have the subject expertise to offer mentoring and support to all the subject educators in their respective departments as mentioned by the following educator:

The senior here doesn't know anything about my subject, so how is she expected to develop me. I am an Afrikaans teacher and the head of department is not familiar with this subject as she is an English educator. I am not saying that she is incompetent. She has a good knowledge of English, but she does not know of the curriculum changes that are taking place in my subject. (Educator 03)

In the above-mentioned case the peer could play a valuable role in mentoring and support.

6.4 Educator Development

Educators are part of a dynamic profession and must keep abreast of developments in matters relating to education (Poster and Poster, 1993: 1). Badenhorst *et al.* (1995: 144) concur that educators should be kept informed of the latest trends in their learning areas in particular, and in education in general. No member of the teaching profession can enter teaching and remain in it for

decades without updating their professional skills (Bell, 1988: 172) and the IQMS could be one way of identifying and managing this updating process. Most educators interviewed agreed that the IQMS has afforded them the opportunity to identify their strengths and weaknesses and has consequently encouraged them to update their skills.

Personally, I can assess myself and I know where I stand. I know my weaknesses and my strengths and I want to work towards my weaknesses. And professionally the IQMS has motivated me to carry on studying, to read articles, to enquire and to network. I always want to keep abreast.
(Educator 05)

The development discourse constructs quality appraisal as focussing “on improving the ability of employees to perform their present and prospective roles, through the identification of professional development needs and the provision of subsequent training or self-development opportunities” (Poster and Poster, 1993: 1). Most educators interviewed subscribed to the notion that the IQMS did provide them with the opportunity to identify their areas for development, but strongly criticised the IQMS processes for not being effective for improvement. They stated that administrators were rarely prepared to offer useful advice or provide an opportunity for learning.

I am going to be very frank here – we go through the formalities of the process itself but sitting down on a one-to-one with your DSG’s and your STD’s and actually working on the issues you’ve raised in your personal development plan is simply not happening on the ground. What happens

is that we submit all of the documentation, we go through the rule book scrupulously, but the thing is we don't do any follow-ups. The IQMS is a system which makes a teacher purely a utility and to be used as a tool for teaching in school, but not in terms of looking at a teacher as a human resource tool. It's failing in that respect. (Educator 06)

The South African Council for Educators (SACE) share the sentiments of these educators as they have made similar comments on the lack of support for professional development in South Africa.

To add salt to the wounds teachers are not provided with adequate support and professional development. The importance of teacher development cannot be overstated given the reality that most of our teachers were trained under the apartheid system which did not encourage professional autonomy and the involvement of teachers in policy matters. The conditions in which some educators are working are also characterised by inadequate infrastructure and high level of violence. Various authors have argued that governments are increasing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms which are not backed by support for educators. (SACE, 2006: 3)

In terms of the IQMS, educators are in control of identifying for themselves those areas for which they are most in need of development. The DSG and the DoE are responsible for educator and school growth. This has been discussed in Chapter 1. The discourse of professional development as purported by the IQMS

document is not satisfying the professional development needs of educators and school improvement adequately. The following excerpts resonates the feelings of most educators interviewed:

Our DSG's don't meet at all in my school. We merely put the scores on paper, we rush through the process, we submit it meet the deadlines, there's no DSG follow-up in terms of here are your weak areas, here's room for improvement or whatever. There's no discussion in terms of, okay, you've made your own frank assessment of the areas which you deem should be open for development. Those are not addressed by your DSG's. It just falls away. Once the paperwork is done the process falls away. (Educator 06)

Unfortunately the development part is lacking. You find that at the end of the year, you give yourself a score, your faults are ascertained. Come the next year there's no follow-up. It just fades away, so there's no follow-up really on the entire improvement part of it. (Educator 08)

Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995: 16) state that:

One of the dilemmas facing teachers then, and now, is the belief that, on the one hand, the evaluation function should lead to professional growth while, on the other hand, it provides a ready weapon for manipulation by administrators. What potentially should be good may be seen as functionally insidious.

6.5 Summary

This chapter considered professional development as a way in which the IQMS could be discursively constructed. However, whilst educators conceded that the IQMS afforded them with an opportunity to reflect on their skills, they were concerned with the lack of support for professional development from the Department of Education. The educators also expressed concern that honest reflection could compromise their appraisal ratings. It is clear from the preceding discussion that the IQMS in its current form as understood by educators in this study places emphasis on accountability over development aspects and this restricts the system's ability to enhance the quality of South African education.

Chapter 7 - Conclusion

7.1 Introduction

The purpose of this final chapter of this thesis is two-fold. Firstly, this chapter provides an overview of the preceding chapters. Secondly, it presents a synthesis of the key findings in this research and outlines some recommendations that follow from the investigation of the educators' perceptions of the Integrated Quality Management System in selected South African schools.

It is a reality that the apartheid education system was characterized by “extreme inequality, astonishing inefficiency, a lack of legitimacy in the eyes of both communities and industry, and highly authoritarian and ideologically loaded syllabuses” (Allais, 2007b). As a result the education system was “complex and collapsed”, with “dysfunctional schools and universities, discredited curricula and illegitimate structures of governance” (Chisholm, 2003:269). The new democratic government post 1994 acknowledged the need for overhauling the fragmented and unequal apartheid education system by ensuring that education played a role in reducing social inequalities. Many new policies were initiated to meet the transformational educational needs of the country. The IQMS was one of the initiatives that emerged after the dismantling of apartheid in response to the autocratic school inspection systems that preceded them. It was important that the new democratic environment evolved systems that recognized the need for educator and school development. For the first time in South Africa there is “a

legitimate system that aims at improving the quality of schools through proper research and agreed to legal parameters” (Smith and Ngoma-Maema, 2003:362).

This study considered the IQMS policy and processes against the backdrop of an emerging education system. Vidovich (2001: 15) tells us that when we look at any policy, we need to ask ourselves: “What struggles are occurring to influence policy? What struggles are occurring in the production of the text?” In addressing these questions, I showed how the current form of the IQMS was a necessary compromise to various theological factors.

This study argues that this compromise has meant that the current form of the IQMS results in an emphasis on accountability over development which restricts the system’s ability to enhance the quality of South African education. Whilst I acknowledge that this emphasis on accountability can be partly attributed to the apartheid context from which it arises, my concern is that the new system presents a tension between accountability and developmental processes which could result in surface compliance rather than genuine engagement.

7.2 Reflection on the preceding chapters

After an overview of the study and the current system of appraisal in South Africa in Chapter One, Chapter Two presented a literature review of the study and was divided into two parts. The first part of the chapter looked at different types of quality management systems and the theoretical underpinnings of these quality systems. After considering the prevailing tensions between the accountability and

the developmental model, the discussion argues that there is a fundamental difference in the purpose of the accountability and development models of appraisal, and there should, therefore, be a difference in the types of processes that should be undertaken within each model arising from these differences in purpose. A blunt instrument cannot be used to ensure accountability in educators and schools while encouraging reflective development at the same time. Different mechanisms are required to achieve these differing aims.

This chapter also looked at two case studies of educator appraisal models. Since there was a lack of research-based information on educator appraisal in developing African countries, a study of the appraisal schemes of the United Kingdom and the United States of America was deemed necessary to provide useful insights with regard to the evolution of these appraisal models as well as the challenges encountered during the development and implementation phases. The review of the UK and USA models revealed that appraisal is not a static process, but rather a dynamic one. Furthermore, these case studies demonstrated that the introduction of an educator appraisal scheme is a complex exercise as it evokes much controversy and debates. It is an opportune time to reflect on the development and implementation of the IQMS by considering the lessons learnt from the UK and USA experiences.

Finally, this chapter tracked the development of educator appraisal from the apartheid era to the development of the new educator appraisal model, the IQMS since the dismantling of apartheid in 1994. There is no doubt a tendency towards

more openness and transparency in the IQMS than the characteristic inspection model of the apartheid era. Mokgalane, Carrim, Gardener and Chisholm (1997: 33-34) emphasise that the developmental nature of the appraisal system makes it a transparent and open process since educators now have access to all the appraisal documents including their performance outcome or result. This is conducive to a non-threatening environment for conducting appraisal. With both internal school-based evaluation and Whole School Evaluation there is feedback and recommendations given to educators and schools unlike during apartheid where evaluation reports were confidential documents. However the way in which the sub-sections of the IQMS are collapsed means that there is little differentiation between the aspects that are purely for quality development and those that are about monitoring.

The crux of the matter is how to balance existing conceptions of development with accountability within the given fiscal constraints that require less government spending...current observations seem to suggest that the scales are tilting toward enforcing accountability. (Smith and Ngoma-Maema, 2003: 352)

Chapter Three considered the research design and methodology used to investigate the research question. This chapter details how the study was undertaken, how educators were selected for the interviews, the data collection procedures and instruments, and the method of data analysis, with discourses being the unit of analysis.

In Chapter Four the discourse of compliance was identified. This chapter shows that the IQMS emphasizes compliance with all the processes and regulations pertaining to the educator appraisal scheme in a surface, technicist way rather than developing reflective practices. The entire appraisal process is very 'top-down' in orientation and one is enticed to question the extent to which the new educator evaluation model in South Africa is truly different from the old system it is supposed to replace because "control, supposedly characteristic of the old paradigm, figures prominently in the new model" (Smith and Ngoma-Maema, 2003: 36). The compliance discourse promotes surface obedience to the process at the expense of educator growth and development.

In Chapter Five I alluded to the shift in discourse from equity, as was characterized by the People's Education and a vision for South African education that was articulated in 1994, to the 'efficiency' discourses of post-apartheid South Africa. Whilst the need for accountability was supported by many educators as they saw it as an attempt to address the collapse of the culture of teaching and learning, most educators viewed the IQMS as 'accountability led' rather than 'improvement led'.

There are recurring tensions in the literature as to whether quality appraisal is for professional development or for accountability. Is appraisal meant to be a supportive form of professional development or is it a device for assessing educator competencies, rewarding the effective and dismissing the ineffective?

In Chapter Six the discourse of professional development revealed that educator development was vital for providing quality education; however, in practice in schools where educators were interviewed, the performance development agenda was often subsumed by the accountability agenda.

7.3 Further Findings

The preceding discussion included some key findings in the study. The following discussion elaborates on further findings made.

7.3.1 Lack of capacity

It was mentioned in Chapter 1 that while various regional training workshops have been held, the main responsibility for IQMS training at the educator level is vested in the school principal. In most instances principals were not properly trained to perform their tasks. The result was that the training and guidance given to educators were inadequate, once-off, and often rather theoretical. Educators and appraisers alike were not clear about the purposes of the IQMS and how the single IQMS instrument could be used for three fundamentally different processes.

In addition to lack of training in the appraisal procedures, most appraisers and appraisees lacked training in aspects such as conducting interviews, gathering data, self-evaluation, interpretation of criteria, giving feedback and coaching. These incapacities often resulted in a lack of confidence and commitment in

undertaking the appraisal process. Furthermore, it was also a contributory factor to conflict, subjectivity and collusion.

The competence of evaluators was also questioned by educators. Educators were concerned about the evaluator's capacity to make a professional judgement concerning an educator's overall performance and competence. Nolan and Hoover (2004: 33) are of the view that an accurate judgement of poor teaching is possible without any knowledge of the content taught, for example, in an aspect such as classroom management. But they believe that making a defensible judgement that someone is a good educator is impossible without some understanding of the subject content being taught.

7.3.2 Time constraints

The availability of time was enumerated as the most inhibiting factor in the implementation of the IQMS. The procedures for the IQMS are too bureaucratically complex and time consuming. The administrative demands such as record keeping and form-filling actually subverted what should be the essential focus on quality teaching and learning. Time-tabling for the classroom visitations often created logistical problems as relief had to be considered to accommodate senior and peer appraisers. Furthermore, time was also required for pre-observation conferences and feedback sessions. The problem was exacerbated where seniors and peers served on several development support groups as they found it difficult to cope with the demands of the appraisal process.

7.3.3 Policy overload

A comment made by Fourie *et al.* on higher education cited in Strydom and Strydom (2004: 108) that “there needs to be recognition that institutions cannot do everything at once and that there is too much change into many areas in different levels of the higher education system” is also relevant and applicable to policy implementation in schools. The timing of the introduction of the IQMS coincided with the massive curriculum transformation that took place in post-apartheid South Africa such as the introduction of Outcomes Based Education (OBE), the Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS) and the new ‘matric’, the National Senior Certificate. The introduction of the IQMS at the same time meant an increased burden for schools. SACE (2006: 3) aptly sums up the impact of this policy overload in the following extract:

The new policies have also resulted in policy overload and intensification of teachers’ work. The policy overload has manifested itself through the proliferation of workshops and increased changes that teachers have to deal with. This has caused confusion and in some areas loss of confidence by some teachers.

7.3.4 Infrequency of Appraisal

A major concern was the infrequency of appraisals carried out in schools. The IQMS is supposedly not a ‘once off’ event but rather a process. However, most appraisal activities were left for the end of the year when summative evaluations were due for submission to the districts.

For pragmatic reasons, the observation of educators in practice is conducted only once per annum. The concern was that most people can put their best foot forward for the lesson observed and this would not give a true reflection of an educator's competence. The IQMS includes lesson observation as the main source of evidence for performance management purposes. Unless an evaluator takes the time to develop a comprehensive view of educator performance, the ability to make a defensible judgement of educator effectiveness as required by the IQMS is questionable.

7.3.5 Context and insufficient infrastructure

Nolan and Hoover (2004: 42) state that teacher supervision and evaluation “do not occur in a vacuum”. They take place within school and district organisational contexts and they sometimes vary considerable across districts. This is nowhere as true as in South Africa where there is a great variance between schools. These variances are multiple, such as educator-learner ratios, educator qualifications and even the presence or absence of electricity and running water. Smith and Ngoma-Maema (2003: 348) stress the need to contextualise quality processes to local conditions and criticise the importing of many of the OFSTED quality processes from the United Kingdom and warn against a ‘one size fits all’ approach.

7.3.6 Piloting

As discussed in Chapter 2, the pilot of the new educator appraisal system was conducted between 1995 and 1996 and covered a sample of only 96 schools

throughout the country. I believe that this pilot was rather expedient as it was rushed and lacked broader representation. Educators felt that the IQMS should have been piloted in all schools before final implementation so that all educators could get a feel for the instrument. Furthermore, the pilot would have elicited inputs from grassroots level across all schools. This would have ensured a better 'buy in' from all educators rather than it being rushed and imposed 'top-down', a characteristic of policy implementation during the apartheid era.

7.3.7 Complexity of the IQMS

The complexity of using one single IQMS instrument for three fundamentally different processes, that is, Developmental Appraisal, Performance Measurement and Whole School Evaluation, has created tensions in schools as each of these programmes has a distinct purpose. The tensions between these approaches undermine the developmental aspects of the IQMS. I believe that the mixing of low stakes developmental processes with high stakes appraisal functions is problematic in a fledgling educational system that still battles with the mistrust of the apartheid dispensation. It is, therefore, questionable whether one blunt instrument can perform these diverse functions.

7.4 Recommendations

7.4.1 Reconceptualising the IQMS

There is a need to separate performance evaluation from developmental appraisal, perhaps alternating these annually and using different people and structures for each so that the issues of accountability are addressed while 'a

safe space' is created for genuine engagement with developmental issues and also honest accountability to address shocking quality in some schools which currently get consistent "high performance" ratings. Given the amount of time which might be necessary in order to undertake a thorough appraisal, a better strategy might be to operate on a longer cycle of two or three years rather than having a full-blown appraisal every year.

7.4.2 Evolution and incrementalism in policy implementation

The Department of Education needs to address the issue of limiting policy overload and fatigue through policy prioritisation. A more evolutionary and incremental approach to policy introduction is suggested.

7.4.3 Need for capacity building

The cascade system of training is not achieving its desired aim of building capacity in educators to manage the IQMS. It is recommended that training should be conducted by officials of the Department of Education or by University Education Faculties through ongoing workshops and intensive courses that provide expert guidance to educators. Training should focus on helping educators become skilled and knowledgeable evaluators. Horne and Pierce (1996: 104; 106; 107) suggest that both appraisers and appraisees need extended skills training in negotiation, questioning, listening, feedback, recording and observation. This training is crucial in reducing anxieties and also in ensuring that the IQMS process is fair and objective.

7.4.4 Support for Professional Development

Professional development needs to form a central feature of the IQMS and not peripheral as it is presently viewed in schools. Firstly, at school level professional development must be informed by the personal growth plans of educators and addressed at school level. Secondly, where further support is required by educators and schools, these must be provided by district and or/provincial support teams of the Department of Education.

7.4.5 Review of the IQMS

Constant review of the IQMS is necessary at both school level and by the Department of Education in order to evaluate the extent to which policies and procedures are being adhered and to ascertain whether developmental programmes identified for individual educators and schools are followed through and are achieving their intended objectives.

7.5 Recommendations for further research

The limited research on the development and implementation of educator appraisal that is currently available in South Africa suggests that further research is essential. Based on the findings of this investigation of educators' perceptions of the Integrated Quality Management System, I would like to conclude by suggesting that the following research agenda:

7.5.1 The IQMS has been recently implemented in South African schools and it is in its third annual cycle. It is an appropriate time to undertake further investigation into the effect of the IQMS on educator efficacy. Such a study would

ascertain whether the IQMS is making an impact where it matters, that is, in the classroom. The study undertaken for this thesis suggests that the impact is variable and that the IQMS has brought various unintended consequences.

7.5.2 Given the context and variances in schools in South Africa left by the legacy of apartheid, the assumption of a 'one size fits all' system to educator appraisal would merit further investigation.

7.5.3 While considerable attention appears to have been given to the administration of the appraisal system, new competencies are required when implementing change that is intended to impact on the quality of teaching and learning. These new skills have been mentioned in 7.4.3. Further research on the preparedness of educators and managers to manage the effective implementation of the educator appraisal system in terms of these new competencies is necessary.

7.6 Conclusion

The introduction of the IQMS was viewed as a progressive step by the Department of Education and educator unions to enhance the quality of education after a period of instability and the breakdown of teaching and learning in the majority of schools in the 1990's. Building a quality education is important in a developing country such as South Africa. The IQMS with its concern with efficiency and accountability is a major shift from policy issues in the early post-apartheid period which was geared towards a discourse of "People's Education".

On the whole, I believe that the IQMS has made a positive contribution towards bringing about accountability in schools; however, the question of professional development remains a challenge. This study has revealed that the integration of the developmental and accountability model in the IQMS has undermined the ability of the system to do more than quality monitor the school sector. The current form of the IQMS results in an emphasis on the accountability over the development which restricts the system's ability to enhance the quality of South African education. I believe that South Africa is now ready for a separation of the development and accountability models through the unbundling of the IQMS.

Bibliography

- Adendorff, M., Gultig, J and Mason, M. 2001. Being a teacher. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- African National Congress Education Department. 1994. A Policy Framework for Education: Braamfontein.
- Allais, S. 2007b. The Rise and Fall of the NQF: A critical analysis of the South African National Qualifications Framework. Doctoral Thesis. University of Witwatersrand.
- Alvesson, M and Billing, Y.D. 1997. Understanding Gender and Organisations. Lodon: Sage Publications.
- Anderson, L.W and Pellicer, L.O. 2001. Teacher Peer Assistance and Review: A Practical Guide for Teachers and Administrators. Thousand Oakes: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Badenhorst, D.C., Calitz, L.P., Van Schalkwyk, O.J., Van Wyk, J.G and Kruger, A.G. 1995. School management: the task and role of the teacher. Pretoria: Kagiso.
- Ball, S.J. 1994. Politics and Policy Making in Education. Explorations in Policy Sociology. London: Routledge And Kegan Paul.
- Baloyi, C.R. 2002. The Role of the State in the establishment of a culture of learning and teaching in South Africa (1910-2004). Available at: libserv5.tut.ac.za:7780/pls/eres/wpg-docload.download-file.pdf.
- Becher, T., Eraut, M and Knight, J. 1981. Policies for Educational Accountability. London: Heineman Educational Books.
- Behr, A.L. 1984. New perspectives in South African education. Durban: Butterworth.
- Bell, L. 1988. *Appraising Teachers in Schools*. London: Routledge.
- Bennet, S. *Discourse Analysis: A Method for Deconstruction*, pp. 30-40, Chapter 15 in Williams, M. 1990. Understanding Geographical and Environmental Education: The Role of Research. Cassel.
- Berliner, D. 1982. Recognising instructional variables. In D.E. Orlosky (Ed.), *Introduction to Education*, pp. 198-222. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Bittel, L.R and Newstrom, J.W. 1990. What every supervisor should know? New York: McGraw Hill.

Bollington, R., Hopkins, D and West, M. 1993. An introduction to teacher appraisal. London: Cassel.

Boyd, R.T.C. 1989. Improving teacher evaluations. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 1 (7). Accessed on 25 July 2007 from: <http://PAREonline.net.getvn.asp?v=1&n=7>.

Brandt, R. 1996. On a new direction for teacher evaluation: A conversation with Tom McGreal. *Educational Leadership*, 53(6) 30-33.

Brennan, J; Fraizer, M and Williams, R. 1995. *Guidelines on self-evaluation*. London: Open University.

Bunnell, S. 1989. *Teacher Appraisal in practice*. Heinemann Educational Books. Oxford: Heinemann Educational Books.

Cassel, C and Symon, G. 1994. *Qualitative Methods in Organisational Research: A Practical Guide*. SAGE Publications. London: SAGE Publications.

Chambers, R. 1998. Public management: towards a radical agenda, in: Minogue, M., Polidina, C and Hulme, D. (Eds). *Beyond the New Public Management* (Cheltenham, Edward Elgar) cited in Smith, W.J and Ngoma-Maema, W.Y. 2003. Education for all in South Africa: developing a national system of quality assurance, *Comparative Education* 39(3), pp.345-365.

Charlton, B.G. 2002. *Audit, accountability, quality and all that: The growth of managerial technologies in UK Universities*. Accessed on 12 February 2007 from: <http://www.hedweb.com/bgcharlton/audit.html>

Chetty, D., Chisholm, L., Gardiner, M., Magan, N. & Vinjevold, P. 1993. *Rethinking Teacher Appraisal in South Africa: Policy Options and Strategies*. Johannesburg: Education Policy Unit of the University of the Witwatersrand.

Chisholm, L. 2003. The state of curriculum reform in South Africa: The issue of Curriculum 2005. *State of the Nation: South Africa 2003-2004*. J. Daniel, A. Habib and R. Southall. Pretoria: HSRC Press.

Christie, P. 1998. Schools as (dis)organisations: the 'breakdown of the culture of learning and teaching' in South African schools. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 28(3), pp.283-300.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. 1995. *Research methods in education*. Newbury Park: Sage.

- Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. 2002. *Research methods in education*. London and New York: Routledge & Falmer.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. 2004. *Research Methods*. London: Routledge & Falmer.
- Cosh, J. 1999. Peer observation: a reflective model. *ELT Journal: An International Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages*. 53 (1): 22-27.
- Creswell, J.W. 1998. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions*. SAGE Publications. London: SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J.W. 2003. *Research Design: Qualitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications. London: SAGE Publications.
- Crowl, T.K. 1996. *Fundamental of educational research*. 2nd Edition. USA: Brown and Benchman.
- Cullingford, C. 1997. *Assessment versus Evaluation*. London: Cassel.
- Cutcliffe, J.R. 2000. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. Blackwell Science Ltd. Oxford: Blackwell Science Ltd. 31(6). pp.1476 – 1484.
- Dale, R. 1989. *The State and Education Policy*. Oxford.
- Daniel, Y. 2005. *Canadian Journal of Education* 284 (2005): 763-783)
- Davidoff, S and Lazarus, S. 1997. *The learning school: an organization approach*. Kenwyn: Juta.
- Davies, B and West-Burnham, J (1997) *Reengineering & Total Quality in Schools*. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Denzin, N.K and Lincoln, Y.S. 1998. *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Denzin, K.D and Lincoln, Y.S. 2003. *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*. SAGE Publications: London.
- Department of Education. 1998. *A Policy Framework for Education and Training System in South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Department of Education. 1998b. *Norms and standards for educators*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Department of Education. 1999. *Developmental Appraisal for Educators*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

- Department of Education. 2000. *The National Policy on Whole School Evaluation*. Government Gazette, Vol. 423, No.22512. Pretoria.
- Department of Education. 2001. *Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Whole School Evaluation*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Department of Education. 2002. *The National Policy on Whole School Evaluation*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Department of Education & Culture: House of Delegates. 1989. Handbook for Principals. Durban.
- Department of Education & Culture: House of Delegates. 1993. E.C.Circular F of 1993: System of Achievement Recognition for CS Educators. Durban.
- Dillon-Peterson, B. 1981. Staff Development/Organisation Development. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria. Virginia.
- Dispatch Online. 1998. Tuesday, September 1, 1998. Teacher appraisal to replace schools' external inspections.
[http://www.dispatch.co.za/1998/09/01/south africa/INSPECT1.HTM](http://www.dispatch.co.za/1998/09/01/south%20africa/INSPECT1.HTM).
- Doherty, G.D. (1994) Developing quality systems in education. London: Routledge.
- Duke, D.L and Stiggins, R.J. 1991. Beyond minimum competence: Evaluation for professional development. In Millman, J & Darling-Hammond, L (eds). *Teacher evaluation. Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers*, 116-132. California. Corwin Press Inc.
- Durrheim, D. 1999. Research Design. In Terre Blanche & K.Durrheim (eds) *Research in practice*. Cape Town: UCT Press, 29-53.
- Earley, P. 1998. *School Improvement after Inspections?* London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Education Labour Relations Council. 1999. *Developmental Appraisal for Educators*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC). 2003. *Integrated Quality Management System*. Collective Agreement No.8. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Educators Workload Report*. Accessed on 22 September 2005 from:
www.hsrapress.ac.za.
- Employment of Educators Act, Act No. 76 of 1998. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Everard, K.B and Morris, G. 1988. *Effective School Management*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.

Everard, K.B and Morris,G. 1996. *Effective School Management*. Third Edition. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.

Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: the critical study of language*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. 2002. Language in new capitalism. *Discourse & Society* 13 (2)pp.163-66.

Fisher, M. 1995. *Performance Appraisals*. London: Kogan Page.

Fitz-Gibbon, C.T. 1996. *Monitoring Education: Indicators, Quality and Effectiveness*. London: Cassell.

Foucault, M. 1981. *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Fourie, M., Van Der Westhuizen, L.J., and Strydom, A.H. 2002. *Research Report on Institutional Audit in HE: Comparative analysis and contextualization*. (Bloemfontein, Centre for HE Studies and Development, University of Free State.

Fraenkel, J.R. and Wallen,N.E. 1990. *How to design and evaluate research in Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

French, P. *Quality – If it's not measurable, does it matter?* Paper presented at Australian Association for Institutional Research Conference 2002. Accessed on 12 February 2007 from: www.aair.org.au/jir/2002papers/French.pdf

Fullan, M 1992 *Successful School Improvement: The Implementation Perspective and Beyond*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Fullerton, H. 1993. Observation of teaching: guidelines for observers. In Jones, G & Rawnsley, S. (eds.), *Observing Teaching*. Birmingham: SEDA Publications.

Furusten, S. 1999. *Popular Management Books: How they are made and what they mean for organizations*. London: Routledge.

Gee, J.P. 2005. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. New York: Routledge.

Gitlin, A and Smyth, J. 1989. *Teacher Evaluation: Educative Alternatives*. New York: The Falmer Press.

Glickman, C.D.; Gordon, S.P and Ross-Gordon, J.M. (1998) *Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Goldberg, J.S and Cole, B.R. 2002. Quality Management in Education: Building Excellence and Equity in Student Performance, vol. 9, 4, pp.8 -22.

Gray, J and Wilcox, B. 1999. *Good school: Bad school: evaluating performance and encouraging improvement*. BUCHINGHAM: Open University Press.

Guba, E.G. 1990. *The Paradigm Dialog*. London: SAGE Publications.

Guthrie, J.W and Reed, R.J. 1986. Educational Administration AND Policy: Effective Leadership for American Schools. London: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Habermas, J. 1972. *Knowledge and human interests*. Translated by J. Shapiro. Boston: Beacon.

Hargreaves, D.H and Hopkins, D. 1994. Developmental Planning for School Improvement. London: Cassell.

Hartle, F., Everall, K and Baker, C. 2001. Getting the best out of performance management in your school. London: Kogan Page.

Hartshorne, K. 1992. Crisis and challenge: Black education 1910 – 1990. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, L and Newton,J. 2004. *Quality in Higher Education*. Vol. 10, No.2, July 2004.

Hattersley, M. 1992. The appraisal of headteachers. London: Cassell.

Henning, E. 2004. *Finding your way in Qualitative Research*. Pretoria: Van Shaik Publishers.

Hewton, E. 1988. The Appraisal Interview. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Hlatshwayo, V.S. 2002. *An investigation into the implementation of the Developmental Appraisal System in a former KZNDEC High School in the Inanda District of the KwaZulu-Natal Department of Education and Culture*. M.Ed. Thesis. University of Natal: Durban.

Holliday, A. 2002. Doing and Writing Qualitative Research. London: SAGE Publications.

Holt, M. 1981. Evaluating the Evaluators. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Hopkins, D. 1989. Evaluation for School Development. Milton Keynes. Open University Press.

Horne, H and Pierce, A. 1996. A Practical Guide to Staff Development and Appraisal in Schools. London: Kogan Page.

- Hoyle, E. 1982. *The Professionalization of Teachers: A paradox*. British Journal of Educational Studies.
- Ingvarson, L and Chadbourne, R. 1994. The career development model of teacher evaluation in valuing teachers' work. Melbourne: ACER.
- Iwanicki, E.F. 1991. Teacher Evaluation for school improvement. In Millman, J & Darling-Hammond, L. (eds) *Teacher evaluation. Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers*. 158-171. California: Corwin Press Inc.
- Jantjies, E.M. 1996. 'Performance-based teacher appraisal: from judgement to development'. *South African Journal of Education* 16(1): 50-7.
- Johnson, B and Christeen, L. 2000. Educational research: Quantative and Qualitative Approaches. USA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Jones, J. 1993. *Appraisal and Staff Development*. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Kogan, M. 1986. Education Accountability: An analytical overview. London: Hutchinson.
- Konrad, P. and Lenarcic, J. 2007. *Resistance, challenges to power and the impact of policy in systems implementation*. Victoria: School of Business Information Technology. Accessed online on 16 April 2007 from: csrc.lse.ac.uk/asp/aspecis/20070130.pdf.
- Kraak, A. 1998. Competing education and training policies: A systemic versus unit standards approach. Occasional Paper. Pretoria: HRSC Press.
- Kumar, R. 2005. *Research Methodology*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Kuzmanić, T.A and Sedmak, S. Globalization, Transition and the Discourse of Management. *Managing Global Transitions*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 2006.
- Kvale, S. 1996. *Interviews: An introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Kyriakides, L. 1999. The management of curriculum improvement in Cyprus: a critique of a 'centre-periphery' model in a centralized system, in: T. Townsend, P. Clarke & M. Ainscow (Eds) *Third millennium schools: a world of difference in effectiveness and improvement* (Lisse, Swets & Zeitlinger), 107 – 124.
- Kyriakides, L., Demetriou, D and Charalambous, C. 2006. Generating criteria for evaluating teachers through effectiveness research. *Educational Research*. Vol.48, No.1, March 2006, pp.1-20.

- Lacey, K. 1996. Performance appraisal and career planning. South Melbourne: Macmillan.
- Learmonth, J. 2000. *Inspections: What is in it for schools?* London: Routledge Falmer.
- Lengeling, M. 1996. *The complexity of evaluating teachers*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 399 822).
- Lubisi, R.C. Speaking Notes of the Superintendent-General of Education in KwaZulu-Natal at the Regional Principals' Meetings held on 23-26 January 2006.
- MacDonnel, D. 1986. *Theories of discourse: an introduction*. Oxford: Billing & Sons.
- Madaus, G.F ; Scriven, M.S and Stuffelbeam, D.L. 1987. *Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation*. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing.
- Marshall, C and Rossman, G.B. 1999. *Designing Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Mason, E.J. and Bramble, W.J. 1997. *Research in education: concepts and methods*. USA: Brown and Benchmark.
- May, T. 2002. *Qualitative Research in Action*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- McBride, R. (Ed.). 1989. *The In-service Training of Teachers*. London: Falmer.
- McCormick, R. 1982. *Calling Education to Account*. London: Heineman Educational Books.
- McGreal, T.L. 1988. Evaluation for enhancing instruction: linking teacher evaluation and staff development, in: S.J.Stanley & W.J.Popham (Eds) *Teacher Evaluation: six prescriptions for success* (Alexandria, V.A, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development), 1-29.
- McLennan, A. 2000. 'Education Governance and Management in South Africa, cited in ' Smith, W.J and Ngoma-Maema, W.Y. 2003 Education for all in South Africa: developing a national system for quality assurance *Comparative Education* 39 (3) p 345 – 365.
- Mertens, D. 1998. *Research methods in Education and Psychology: Integrating diversity with Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. London: SAGE Publications.

Mestry, R.; Grobler, B. R. 2002. The Training and Development of Principals in the Management of Educator. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, Vol. 30 Issue 3, p21-34,

Metcalfe, M. 1994. 'Towards a model for effective school management in South Africa with particular reference to Inspection and Advisory Services', in Swartz, R. 1994. *School Management, Teacher Development and Support*. University of Witwatersrand.

Mgijima, N. 2000. *The South African Model for Whole School Evaluation*. Retrieved on 25 August 2005 from: <http://education.pwv.gov.za>.

Middelwood, D. 1997. 'Managing teacher appraisal and performance in the United Kingdom,' cited in Middelwood, D. and Cardno, C. 2001. *Managing Teacher Appraisal and Performance*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Middelwood, D. and Cardno, C. 2001. *Managing Teacher Appraisal and Performance*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Mokgalane, E.; Carrim, N.; Gardener, M and Chisholm, L. 1997. National teacher appraisal pilot report. Johannesburg. Wits.

Moloi, K.C. 2002. *The School as a Learning Organisation*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Montgomery, D. 1999. *Teacher appraisal through classroom observation*. London: David Fulton Publishers.

Morgan, W., Gilbert, P., Lankshear, C., Werba, S and Williams, L. 1996. *Critical Literacy Readings and Resources*. Australian Association for Teaching of English. Sydney.

Muffoletto, R. 1993. *Schools and Technology in a Democratic Society: Equity and Social Justice*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology. New Orleans, LA.

Mulderrig, J. 2003. Consuming Education: a critical discourse analysis of social actors in New Labour's education policy. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*. Volume 1, Number 1. (March 2003). Accessed on 12 February 2007 from: <http://www.jceps.com/print.php?article=2>.

Muller, S. 2004. *Grapling with Quality*. A paper prepared for SACE 2004 World Teachers' Day. Special Edition. <http://www.sace.org.za/Sace/article.jsp?articleID=202>.

Mumby, D. and Clair, R. 1998. Organisational Discourse. In *Discourse as social interaction*, ed. T. van Dijk, 181-205. London: Sage.

- Musaazi, J.C.S. 1992. Theory and practice of educational practice. London: Macmillan.
- Myers, M.D. 2001. Quality Research in Information Systems. Accessed March 2006 from: <http://www2.auckland.ac.nz/msis/isworld/>
- National Education Policy Act, Act No. 27 of 1996. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Newmann, F.M; King, B.M and Rigdon M (*et al.*) 1997. Accountability and school performance: Implications from restructuring schools. Harvard Educational Review. **67**(1), 41-74.
- Newton, J. Views from Below: academics coping with quality. Quality in Higher Education, Vol.8, No. 1, 2002, pp. 39 – 69. Carfax Publishing.
- Nolan, J.R. and Hoover, L.A. 2004. *Teacher Supervision and Evaluation: Theory into practice*. United States of America: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Odhiambo, G.O. 2005. Teacher appraisal: the experiences of Kenyan secondary school teachers. Journal of Educational Administration. Vol.43 No.4, 2005, pp.402-416. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Ovens, A. 2002. Discourse communities and the social construction of reflection in teacher education. Accessed on 16 August 2007 from: www.ecu.edu.au/conferences/herds/main/papers/ref/pdf/Ovens.pdf.
- Parker, I. 1992. Discourse dynamics: Critical analysis of social and individual psychology. London: Routledge.
- Patton, M.Q. 1987. How to use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation. London: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Peterson, K.D. 2000. Teacher evaluation: a comprehensive guide to new directions and practices. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press Inc.
- Philips, L and Jørgensen, M.W. 2002. Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method. London: Sage.
- Pillay, S. 1991. A critical analysis of teacher evaluation procedure in Indian schools. Durban. University of Natal. Master of Education.
- Popkewitz, T.S. 1984. Paradigm & Ideology in Educational Research. London: The Falmer Press.
- Poster, C and Poster, D. 1993. Teacher Appraisal: Training and Implementation. London: Routledge.

- Rabinow, P., ed. 1984. *The Foucault Reader: An introduction to Foucault's Thought*. London: Penguin Books Limited.
- Riley, K.A. and Nuttall, D.L. 1994. *Measuring Quality: Education Indicators-United Kingdom and International Perspectives*. London. The Falmer Press.
- Robinson, V.M.J. 1992. "Doing critical social science dilemmas in control", *Qualitative Studies in Education*. Vol. 5 No. 4, pp.345-59.
- Rossmann and Rallis (1998) cited in Marshall, C and Rossmann, G.B. 1999. *Designing Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publication.
- SACE. 2006. *Towards excellence in Education*. Accessed on 25 October 2006 from: http://www.sace.org.za/article.php?parent=8&article_id=6
- Sallis, E. 1993. *Total Quality Management in Education*. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Schreiber, T and Moring, C. 2001. Codification of knowledge using discourse analysis. A paper presented at the 11th Nordic Conference on Information and Documentation. Royal School of Library and Information Science. Denmark.
- Scott, D. 1994. *Accountability and control in educational settings*. London: Cassell.
- Scully, M.A. 1998. What is Problematic about a Discourse called "Unproblematic"? *Organisation Science*, Vol. 9, No. 6. (Nov. – Dec., 1998): 750-753. Accessed July 2005 from: <http://links.jstor.org/>
- Sergiovanni, T.J and Starrat, R.J (1993) *Supervision: A Redefinition*. New York. McGraw-Hill.
- Seyfarth, J.T. 1999. *The Principal: New Leadership for New Challenges*. London. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Shah, C.G. 1985. *The Role of the Management Staff in the Supervision of the Instruction Programme in Indian Schools*. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of South Africa.
- Shinkfield, A.J & Stufflebeam (1995) *Teacher evaluation: Guide to effective practice*. Boston Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Shopsteward June/July 1996. *New appraisal system being developed*. Accessed August 2005 from: http://www.cosatu.org.za/shop/shop_0503.html.
- Silver, H. 1990. *Education, Change and Policy Process*. London: The Falmer Press.

Silverman, D (1998) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. London: SAGE Publications.

Skilbeck, M. 1995. Beyond borders: student performance standards in a global environment. *Educational Leadership*, 52 (6, International Supp.), pp. 1-5.

Smith, W.J and Ngoma-Maema, W.Y. 2003 Education for all in South Africa: developing a national system for quality assurance, *Comparative Education* 39 (3) p 345 – 365.

South African School's Act, Act No. 27 of 1996. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Southworth, G. 1994. 'The Learning School,' in Ribbons, P and Burridge, E. (eds). Improving Education promoting Quality in Schools. London:Cassel.

Storey, J. 1992. *Developments in the management of human resources*. Oxford: Blackwell Business.

Storey, J. 2001. Human Resource Management Today: An Assessment. In Storey, J. (ed.), *Human Resource Management, A critical text, 2nd edition*. London: Thomson Learning.

Strobbe, C. 1993. Professional partnerships. *Educational Leadership*, 51(42), 40-41.

Strydom, A.H and Strydom, J.F. 2004. 'Establishing Quality Assurance in the South African Context'. *Quality in Higher Education*. Vol.10, No.2, July 2004. Carfax Publishing.

Sullivan, S and Glanz, J. 2000. *Supervision that improves teaching*. Thousand Oakes: Corwin Press, Inc.

Sunday Times, 02 April 2006. Teachers inflate colleagues' ratings to ensure pay increases. p.11

Swartz, R. 1994. *School Management, Teacher Development and Support*. University of Witwatersrand.

Terre Blanche, M.; Durrheim, K & Painter, D. 2006. *Research in Practice: Applied methods for social sciences*. Cape Town: UCT Press.

The Daily News. 7 February 2006. Testing the teachers: Agreed system of evaluating performance not done. p.3.

The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. 1981. *Standards for Evaluation of Educational Programs, Projects, and Materials*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

- Thompson, R.L. 1990. *Constructive appraisals*. Marshall Publishing. London: Marshall Publishing.
- Thurlow, M and Ramnarain, S.2001. Transforming educator appraisal in South Africa in Managing teacher appraisal and performance: a comparative study. Middelwood, D and Cardno, C. (eds) London: Routledge Falmer.
- Tomlinson, M. 1997. *Managing continuing professional development in schools*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Turner, G and Clift, P. 1988. *Studies in teacher appraisal*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Van Dijk, T.A. *Discourse and Manipulation*. 2006. *Discourse and Society*. Vol.17(2). SAGE Publications.
- Vidovich, L. 2001. 'A Conceptual Framework for Analysis of Education Policy and Practices' in Australian Association for Research in Education.
- Vithal, R. & Jansen, J. 2001. *A manual for researchers in education and social sciences*. Landsdowne: Juta & Co. Ltd.
- Waghid, Y. 1996. 'Can a system of teacher appraisal in a changing South Africa be sustainable?' *South African Journal of Education* 16(2): 81-7.
- Wagner, R.B. 1989. *Accountability in Education: A Philosophical Inquiry*. New York: Routledge.
- Walliman, N. 2001. *Your research project*. London: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Weber, E. 2005. New controls and accountability for South African teachers and schools: The Integrated Management Quality Management System. *Perspectives in Education*, Vol. 23(2), June 2005. p.63-72.
- Weiss, E.M and Weiss, S.G. 1998. *New Directions in Teacher Evaluation*. Washington DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education. Accessed March 2006 from: www.eric.ed.gov
- West, M and Bollington, R. 1990. *Teacher appraisal*. London: David Fulton.
- Whyte, J. 1986 cited in Wragg, E.C. 1987. *Teacher Appraisal: A Practical Guide*. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Williams, C.G. 2003. *Teachers as leaders: The South African Experience*. University of Western Cape. South Africa.
- Wolf, K. 1996. Developing an effective teaching portfolio. *Educational Leadership*, 63(6), 34-37.

Wragg, E.C. 1987. *Teacher Appraisal: A Practical Guide*. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.

Wragg, E.C., Wikely, F.J., Wragg, C.M and Haynes, G.S. 1996. *Teacher appraisal observed*. London: Routledge.

APPENDIX A: THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. What is your overall impression of the IQMS as it is currently designed and implemented in schools?
2. What are some of the challenges you encountered in fulfilling the demands of the IQMS?
3. Have you personally benefited from being part of the IQMS appraisal process?
4. How did the IQMS contribute to your personal and professional growth?
5. Kindly comment on any aspect or aspects that you view as negative in the IQMS.
6. Do you see the IQMS impacting on the culture of learning and teaching at school?
7. What do you see as the strengths of the IQMS?
8. What do you see as the weaknesses of the IQMS?
9. One of the purposes of the IQMS is to ensure accountability on the part of the educator. Do you think that the IQMS is contributing towards educator accountability? Please elaborate.
10. What do you think can be done to improve the implementation of the IQMS at schools ?

APPENDIX B: PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

The Research Officer
For attention: Mr. Sibusiso Alwa
Research, Strategy, Policy Development and EMIS Directorate
KZN: Department of Education
Private Bag X9137
Pietermaritzburg
3200

PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

NAME : B.Biputh
PERSAL NO. : 10964886

I am an employee of the KZN: Department of Education and I am currently teaching at Foresthaven Secondary School. I am doing a doctorate in education and hereby apply for permission to conduct research. The research will be conducted in the schools listed (refer to copy). The research will be conducted in non-contact time and will not interrupt education programmes.

Please find enclosed the following documents:

1. Application letter
2. Research Proposal
3. Research instruments
4. Sample list of schools
5. Letter from DIT showing proof of registration for a doctorate

I thank you for your assistance and look forward to your favourable response.

Yours faithfully

MR.B.BIPUTH

13 Tensing Way
Everest Heights
Verulam
4340

Telephone: (W) 031 5051048
(H) 032 5334804

APPENDIX C: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FROM SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Dear Principal

I hereby request permission to conduct an interview with a level one educator in your school. The data collected will be used in my thesis for a doctoral degree in education. The title of the thesis is: *An analysis of educators' perceptions of the Integrated Quality Management System*. Permission to conduct the interview has been granted by the Department of Education.

The duration of the interview will be 45 minutes to an hour. The date and time of the interview will be negotiated with you and the educator concerned in order to avoid any interruption to the school education programme. I would like to assure you that all information gathered will be utilized for the purposes of this study only.

I would like to thank you for your assistance and co-operation.

Yours faithfully

MR.B.BIPUTH

Telephone: (W) 031- 5051048
(H) 032- 5334804

APPENDIX D: LETTER OF INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Participant

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study which is conducted for a doctoral degree in education. I am registered with the Faculty of Education at the Durban Institute of Technology and my supervisor is Dr Sioux McKenna, Acting Director of CHED at DIT. Her details are as follows: smckenna @dit.ac.za or 031-2042904.

The title of my project is *'An analysis of educators' perceptions of the IQMS'*. The purpose of this study is to gather data on educator opinions and perceptions on the current educator appraisal system, namely, the Integrated Quality Management System. Through this interview I am hoping to better understand how educators view the IQMS by listening to their experiences of the IQMS and by hearing educators express their views and opinions of the benefits and challenges of the IQMS. The results of this research study will be used towards a doctoral degree in education. Furthermore, the results may be used for writing papers for presentation at conferences or for publication in academic journals.

Your participation will include being interviewed for forty-five minutes to an hour. This interview will be audio-taped. Your responses will be treated confidentially as your name will not be used. Instead, the typed transcript of the interview will show a code number or a pseudonym in order to guarantee your anonymity. I will contact you in advance to negotiate a time that suits you for the interview as I am well aware of your demanding workload. I will give you a hard copy of the transcript of the interview should you so desire.

You have been randomly selected for participation in this study. Your participation is voluntary and no payment will be made to you. You may withdraw from the project at any time, for any reason, without penalty.

Once again, I would like to thank you for your participation in this study, Your co-operation is greatly appreciated.

Regards.

Barath Biputh

DECLARATION

I, (full name of participant) hereby confirm that I understand the contents of this document and the nature of the research project, and I consent to participating in the research project. I understand that I am at liberty to withdraw from the project, should I so desire.

Signature of Participant : _____

Date : _____

APPENDIX E: APPROVAL TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

Tel: 033 341 8610 Fax:033 3418612

Private Bag X9137 Pietermaritzburg

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION 3200

UMNY ANGO WEMFUNDO

DEPARTEMENT VAN ONDERWYS 2-8 Pietermaritz Street



PROVINCE OF KWAZULU-NATAL ISIFUNDAZWE SAKWAZULU-NATAL
PROVINSIE KWAZULU-NATAL

To: Mr B Biputh
13 Tensing Way, Everest Heights, Verulam. 4340

APPROVAL TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

Please be informed that your application to conduct research has been approved with the following terms and conditions:

That as a researcher, you must present a copy of the written permission from the Department to the Head of the Institution concerned before any research may be undertaken at a departmental institution bearing In mind that the institution is not obliged to participate if the research is not a departmental project.

Research should not be conducted during official contact time, as **education programmes should not be interrupted**, except in exceptional cases with special approval of the KZN DoE.

The research is not to be conducted during the fourth school term, except in cases where the KZN DoE deem it necessary to undertake research at schools during that period.

Should you wish to extend the period of research after approval has been granted, an application for extension must be directed to the Director: Research, Strategy Development and EMIS.

The research will be limited to the schools or institutions for which approval has been granted.

A copy of the completed report, dissertation or thesis must be provided to the RSPDE directorate.

Lastly, you must sign the attached declaration that, you are aware of the procedures and will abide by the same.

SUPERINTENDENT GENERAL
KwaZulu-Natal Department of Education

