

**VIEWS OF EDUCATORS ON DEVELOPMENT  
APPRAISAL SYSTEM IN VRYHEID DISTRICT  
OF THE KWAZULU-NATAL PROVINCE**

By

**TEMPERANCE PHUMZILE NKOSI**

Mini-dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF EDUCATION**

in the Department of Educational Management  
at the  
University of Zululand

**SUPERVISORS** : **DR M A N DUMA**  
**PROF R.V. GABELA**

**DATE SUBMITTED** : **JULY 2010**

**VIEWS OF EDUCATORS ON DEVELOPMENT  
APPRAISAL SYSTEM IN VRYHEID DISTRICT  
OF THE KWAZULU-NATAL PROVINCE**

By

**TEMPERANCE PHUMZILE NKOSI**

(i)

## **DECLARATION**

I, Temperance Phumzile Nkosi, hereby declare this dissertation:

“Views of educators on development appraisal system” represents my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by complete references.

---

T P NKOSI (MRS)

(ii)

**DEDICATION**

I dedicate this work to my only daughter  
Mbalenhle Precious Nkosi

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

In completion of this study, I would sincerely like to acknowledge and express my gratitude to God, the Lord and my Benner who gave me the power, strength, will and appreciation to the following special people:

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisors Prof R V Gabela and Dr M A N Duma for their constructive criticism, guidance and assistance throughout this study.

Secondly, I would like to direct my thanks to Mr Ronald Wilkinson who did proofreading in of my whole work.

Thirdly, I wish to extend my gratitude to my typist Mr Mxolisi Dlamini and who was ever available to type my work – even at awkward times.

Fourthly, I thank my principal Mr E J Mdlalose, all principals and all staff members of Mondlo and Mvunyane wards in Bhekuzulu district, who welcomed the distribution and completion of my questionnaires.

A special word of thanks goes to my colleagues Thabi and the late Selby Dlalisa, who were with me through thick and thin.

Finally, I furthermore extend my deepest gratitude to my late husband Philemon Muzikayise Nkosi for the support he gave me while doing my junior degree. My neighbours, Mr and Mrs Xulu, deserve my thanks for looking after my home while I was away on study. My sister Bongi and my late sister Nomsa for their unconditional support.

## **ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this study was to determine the nature of development appraisal system and views of educators on the new model.

Relevant literature was reviewed in order to determine the nature of development appraisal and to determine educator's views on appraisals in developing countries. The subject of this study was 100 primary educators from primary and secondary schools in Bhekuzulu circuit in Vryheid district.

The empirical investigation that was conducted revealed that a variety of appraisal models emphasized, amongst others that have been identified, teacher development as the main purpose of an appraisal. A positive attitude towards the implementation of appraisals and effectiveness in doing so realized the essence of goals of appraisal. The study revealed that appraisal can bring about renewal of classroom teaching, improve relationships with learners, and induce openness and sharing of ideas and problems. The empirical investigation revealed that most respondents have been appraised and that they realized the importance of this model.

The following major findings emerged from the empirical investigation:

Most educators had been appraised and that they realized the importance of developmental appraisal.

In South Africa, development appraisal represented the paradigm shift away from traditional appraisal system.

Development appraisals emphasise quality of education and assist in monitoring school objectives.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

NO.	CONTENT	PAGE
	Declaration	(i)
	Dedication	(ii)
	Acknowledgements	(iii)
	Abstract	(iv)
<b>CHAPTER ONE</b>		
<b>ORIENTATION</b>		
1.1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.2	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	2
1.3	THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	5
1.4	METHOD OF INVESTIGATION	5
1.4.1	Nature of research design	5
1.4.2	Literature review	5
1.4.3	Empirical survey	5
1.4.4	Empirical investigation	6
1.4.4.1	Questionnaire	6
1.4.4.2	Administration of the questionnaire	6
1.4.3.3	Population and sampling	6
1.5	DEFINITION OF TERMS	7
1.5.1	Appraisal	7
1.5.2	Development	7
1.5.3	Developmental appraisal	7
1.6	CONCLUSION	8
1.7	PLAN OF STUDY	8

## CHAPTER TWO

2.1	INTRODUCTION	10
2.2	THE CONCEPT OF APPRAISAL	11
2.3	THE PURPOSE OF TEACHER APPRAISAL	12
2.4	RATIONALE FOR DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL	13
2.5	APPRAISAL PRACTICES IN SELECTED COUNTRIES	14
2.5.1	Appraisal in the United States of America	14
2.5.2	Appraisal in Israel	15
2.5.3	Appraisal in the United Kingdom	16
2.5.4	Appraisal in South Africa	18
2.6	THE BENEFITS OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL	21
2.6.1	The organization	22
2.6.2	The manager	22
2.6.3	The employee	23
2.7	CRITICISM OF DEVELOPMENT APPRAISAL SYSTEM	23
2.7.1	Barriers to effective appraisal	24
2.7.1.1	Organisational barriers	24
2.7.1.2	Organisational management style	24
2.7.1.3	Political barriers	25
2.7.1.4	Interpersonal barriers	25
2.7.1.5	Common performance problems	26
2.8	DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL	27
2.8.1	Characteristics of developmental appraisal	28
2.8.2	Guiding principles of the new model	29
2.8.3	Development process	30
2.8.4	Developmental objectives	30
2.9	TYPES OF APPRAISAL	32
2.9.1	Review of some appraisal models	32
	(vii)	
2.9.2	Model of clinical supervision	34

2.9.3	Performance appraisal	36
2.9.3.1	Preparation	36
2.9.3.2	The interview	37
2.9.3.3	Follow-up	38
2.9.4	Four phase appraisal model	38
2.9.4.1	Preparation	39
2.9.4.2	Observation	39
2.9.4.3	Interviews	40
2.10	THE NEW MODEL FOR DEVELOPMENT APPRAISAL IN SOUTH AFRICA	40
2.11	APPRAISAL PANEL AND ROLES	41
2.12	THE DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL INSTRUMENT	42
2.12.1	Core criteria	43
2.12.2	Optional criteria	43
2.12.3	Additional criteria	43
2.13	ROLE OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT	44
2.13.1	The management plan	44
2.13.2	Educator training	44
2.14	EDUCATOR APPRAISAL AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT	45
2.15	CONCLUSION	45

## CHAPTER THREE

### METHODOLOGY, RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

3.1	INTRODUCTION	47
3.2	METHOD OF INVESTIGATION	47
3.2.1	Research Design	47
3.2.2	Instrumentation	48
	(viii)	
3.2.3	Population and sampling	48
3.2.3.1	Advantages of the Questionnaire	53
3.2.3.2	Disadvantages of the Questionnaire	53
3.2.3.3	Questionnaire construction	54
3.2.3.4	Pre-testing the Questionnaire	55
3.2.3.5	Request for permission	56
3.2.3.6	Administration of the Questionnaire	56
3.3	CONCLUSION	56

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

4.1	INTRODUCTION	57
4.2	BIOGRAPHICAL AND DEMOGRAPHICAL DETAILS	57
4.2.1	Age range of the respondents	57
4.2.2	Gender of respondents	58
4.2.3	Highest academic qualification	59
4.2.4	Teaching experience	59
4.2.5	School category	60
4.2.6	Settlement	61
4.3	PROVISION FOR APPRAISAL	61
4.4	THE VALUE OF DEVELOPMENT APPRAISAL	63
4.5	DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL PROCESS	66
4.6	CLASSROOM OBSERVATION	68
4.7	THE FOLLOW-UP PROGRAMME	71
4.8	OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS	73
4.9	CONCLUSION	76

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1	INTRODUCTION	77
5.2	OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH	77
5.3	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	78
5.3.1	Findings from the literature	78
5.3.2	Finding from Empirical Investigation	85
5.3.2.1	Gender	85
5.3.2.2	Qualification	85
5.3.2.3	Staff development	85
5.3.2.4	Appraisal personnel	85
5.3.2.5	Training or workshop	86
5.3.2.6	Value of appraisal	86
5.4	RECOMMENDATIONS	86
5.4.1	Recommendation 1 – Purpose of appraisal	86
5.4.2	Recommendation 2 – Staff development team (SDT)	86
5.4.3	Recommendation 3 – Planning appraisal	87
5.4.4	Recommendation 4 – Implementation process	87
5.4.5	Recommendation 5 – Feedback	87
5.4.6	Recommendation 6 – Democracy	87
5.4.7	Recommendation 7 – Transparency	88
5.4.8	Recommendation 8 – Training centers for appraisal and appraisees	88
5.4.9	Recommendation 9	88
5.5	CONCLUSION	89
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	90
	LETTER TO THE DEPARTMENT - APPENDIX A	
	QUESTIONNAIRE – APPENDIX B	90

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **1. ORIENTATION OF THE STUDY**

#### **1.1 INTRODUCTION**

Various Acts have been promulgated to transform the education system so that it conforms to the provisions of the new constitution of South Africa. These include the Labour Relations Act of 1995, which provides for the rights and interests of employers and employees; the South African Schools Act of 1996, which aims at the creation and management of new national schools, and the Employment of Educators Act of 1998, which deals with the appointment and promotion of educators and their terms and conditions of employment. It is against this background that the developmental appraisal system for the assessment of educators' performance has been devised.

The Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) is the body that introduced the aforementioned system and which suggested that the competences of educators at all levels needed to be appraised in order to improve the quality of teaching practice and educational management. These requirements were based on the fundamental principles of life-long learning and development.

The concept of a developmental appraisal system is different from the judgmental approach. It aims at the acknowledgement of the positive aspects of an educator's performance. Personnel appraisal is a process where a group or an individual is assessed to determine whether the appraised person or party has worked efficiently and has achieved the goals set for him/her/the group. Development appraisal seeks to build on the strengths of educators. By focusing on the positive aspects of an educator's performance, the developmental approach attempts to erode the negative impressions.

A statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the research methodology and a definition of terms are contained in the following items of this chapter.

## 1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The democratisation of South Africa highlighted the need to implement change in education. After the 1994 elections, the government put into place a number of policies and strategies to eradicate apartheid practices and to ensure equality in education.

One of the reform initiatives was the development appraisal system. Before the inauguration of the new democracy, the school environment was characterised by passiveness, a negative attitude, low self-esteem and a lack of supervision. The new government became concerned about the quality of education and sought possible solutions to improve teaching practices. Appraisal became necessary in order to assess the educators' performance. According to the appraisal system, teachers are accountable for their knowledge as well as for classroom activities. Appraisal is designed to create a climate of mutual respect, which is needed in the team building process. Self evaluation and team evaluation are seen as an inherent part of the development of teachers.

Fiddler and Cooper (1988) suggest various factors that are linked to success in appraisal. These factors include the level of subordinate participation and a constructive attitude on the part of the employee towards setting specific goals to be achieved. However, Millman and Darling-Hammond (1990) argue that a merit appraisal for payment purposes can cripple open communication and the constructive discussion that is expected to yield, on a voluntary basis, potentially adverse information to an appraiser who has control over pay increases.

Darling-Hammond (1990) states that teachers' attitudes and misconceptions with regard to developmental appraisal are mostly responsible for the negative impact that the appraisal system seems to have on them. Bollington, R, Hopkins, D. West,(1990) have identified a number of factors that people believe threaten the impact of appraisal. These factors include:

- Lack of appropriate knowledge
- Gap between training and appraisal
- To be appraised on a subject that one is not confident about

- Delays in the process
- A fear that some people are not very good at selling themselves.

Even though the school managers and teacher unions agree that appraisal is essential means to promote development, they disagree on the method and the content of the appraisal process.

Some teachers perceive performance appraisal as a threat to their job security. They believe that it will be used to find fault and to spot weaknesses. The fear of being caught induces anxiety and paranoia (Turner & Cliff 1985). Other educators may associate performance appraisal with judgmental appraisal, which can be used as a tool to get rid of weak teachers, or as a means whereby an individual can be affected by the overall performance of the institution Spangenberg (1994), for example, states that if a good performer is placed in a bad system, the system will de-motivate the educator. Contradictions of this kind can hinder the smooth functioning of development appraisal and cause school managers to become confused about which part of performance is to be credited: is it the educator's classroom performance or the attitude of the educator towards the school? Fiddler and Copper (1988) suggest that not all employees should be appraised with the same frequency. The appraisal system should state what exactly is to be appraised, and also state the reason and frequency of appraisal for each individual. It should be borne in mind that the school situation could be hampered by various factors, including a lack of infrastructure, uncooperative educators and a high rate of absenteeism due to illness caused by HIV/AIDS.

In the light of the foregoing observation, the study focuses on development appraisal rather than performance appraisal. This distinction is also made because educators tend to believe that appraisal based on performance is directed at fault finding and not at development. They may complain that they were never consulted and that their input was not even requested. Such a situation may result in doubt about the value of the appraisal scheme, especially due to the fact that some educators believe that the Labour Relations Council has ulterior motives for implementing appraisal.

The appraisal of teachers has a long history, country-wide. The reasons given for evaluating the performance of teachers have varied from personal desires to the state's desire to pay teachers according to the results of their teaching.

In the United Kingdom (UK), teachers viewed appraisal as a means by which teaching could be drastically reduced (Poster and Poster, 1993). According to Chetty, Chisholm, Gardiner, and Vinjeveld, (1993), the linkage of appraisal with promotion and pay led to resistance from teachers. Some teachers in the UK questioned the reasons why they had been identified for appraisal and have resisted the processes.

In South Africa an agreement has been reached in the Education Labour Relation Council (ELRS) (Resolution 8 of 2003) to integrate the development appraisal system, the performance measurement system and whole school evaluation so as to form an integrated quality management system that evaluates individual teachers for salary progression, grade progression, affirmation of appointments and that rewards and provides incentives.

Millman and Darling-Hammond (1990) argue that merit-pay appraisal can cripple open communication needs for constructive discussion of aspects of performance that might need improvement and they also believe that teachers can hardly be expected to volunteer potentially adverse information to appraisers who have control over pay increases.

**The following questions are pertinent to the focus of the study:**

- What are teachers' views towards the developmental appraisal?
- What is the role of Vryheid District educator appraisal as an aspect of performance management?
- What factors impede the implementation of appraisal in schools in Vryheid District?

### 1.3 THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the views of educators in Vryheid District on developmental appraisal and the effect that it could have on education. The objectives of the study are as follows:

- To investigate the nature and characterisation of the appraisal system as a tool for professional development
- To investigate and determine the views of educators with regard to appraisal
- To identify challenges associated with appraisal

### 1.4 METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

#### 1.4.1 Nature of research design:

The research design was descriptive in nature. The field survey was used as the research for this study because this method is considered to be best suited to a descriptive study of teachers and their views. In field survey the focus falls on the observation of (or the information elicited from) a target population or sample thereof. The questionnaire was issued in 100 schools of Mondlo and Mvunyane.

#### 1.4.2 Instrumentation

A questionnaire was designed with open-ended and closed questions and was pre-tested among teachers who were selected from the target population.

#### 1.4.3 Population and Sampling

The study was conducted among 56 schools located in Mondlo and Mvuyane wards of the Bhekuzulu circuit. The respondents consisted of three educators from school management teams and two educators from level one selected from 36 schools in the Mondlo ward and 20 schools were selected randomly from the Mvunyane ward of the Bhekuzulu district. Only 20 schools were selected from both Mondlo and Mvunyane ward. All school categories were represented. The respondents consisted of five

educators/respondents included a principal, a deputy principal, a head of department and two educators. Selection was done by the principals. The number of respondents was 100 (n=100) from a combination of 20 schools in the Mondlo and Mvunyane wards.

#### **1.4.4 Administration of the Instrument**

The questionnaire copies were delivered to the school principals of different categories of schools and were collected after completion by the researcher.

### **1.5 DEFINITION OF TERMS**

#### **1.5.1 Appraisal**

Appraisal is a means of promoting, through the use certain techniques and procedures. Appraisal refers to the organisation'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 (Poster and Poster, 1993).

Fiddler and Cooper (1990) define "appraisal" as the term used for the process by which an employee and his/her subordinate meet to discuss the performance of the employee. Appraisal implies making judgments and decisions on the quality or effectiveness of the performer. Accomplished its mission of providing a better service or product while at the same time enhancing staff satisfaction. (Wragg, Wikeley, Wragg, Haynes1996).

#### **1.5.2 Development**

Davidoff and Lazarus (1997) describe development as a "normative" re-educative strategy for managing change. Development is aimed at facilitating empowerment of people as well as the organisation, wholly for the purpose of optimising human fulfillment. Through the use of certain techniques and procedures, the organisation's ability is promoted to accomplish its mission of providing a better service or product while at the same time enhancing staff satisfaction. (Wragg et al,1996).

### **1.5.3 Developmental appraisal**

Development appraisal is the process by which an employer and its subordinates meet to discuss the work performance of the employee (Fiddler and Cooper, 1988). The process concentrates on improving individual performance in a formative and supportive way so as to facilitate further professional and personal development and growth (Department of Education, 1999). Watson (1976) defines the development of educators as activity that ensures the personal and professional development of the staff of a school. It identifies the role of the individual within the institution. This implies the need to devise processes for professional development which will attempt to secure the professional growth of the teacher while improving the performance of both the teacher and the school.

## **1.6 PLAN OF STUDY**

### **CHAPTER 1: ORIENTATION**

Chapter one is an introductory chapter that presents the problem statement, the aims of the study, the methodology to be used and which provides a clarification of the concept “appraisal” as well as the order in which the study is to be presented.

### **CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter provides a literature review containing theories relevant to the topic. It reviews the research work done by previous researchers and refers to the relevant literature on educator appraisal systems.

### **CHAPTER 3: METHOD OF INVESTIGATION**

Chapter 3 deals with research design and procedures and includes a combined questionnaire on the educator development appraisal system. It also provides a description of the empirical investigation.

## **CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION**

This chapter outlines the data analysis, presentation and interpretation.

## **CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.**

The last chapter provides a summary of the entire research project, as well as, the findings and recommendations of the study.

### **1.7 CONCLUSION**

Appraisal is necessary in the education system because it enables the educators to identify areas of strength in order to improve them; it also identifies areas where development is needed. The instrument used in appraisal covers many areas of performance, through self evaluation and peer evaluation.

## CHAPTER TWO

### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL

#### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

Appraisal is synonymous with assessment in the sense that it is an on-going process that allows educators to acquire or refine knowledge, skills and attitudes with the aim of facilitating personal and professional development. Staff members need to be appraised and assisted with aspects of work which are difficult to accomplish.

According to scholarly sources, there are several terms for appraisal: performance appraisal, performance review, evaluation, staff review, and development appraisal. Development appraisal concentrates on identification of individual development needs and subsequent training or self-development, and on improving the ability of the employees to perform in their present or future roles (Poster and Poster, 1991).

Fletcher (1996) states that development appraisal is designed to assist teachers in their development by helping them to see their shortcomings and to commit themselves to improvement. Fiddler and Cooper (1990) define appraisal as a systematic review of performance and potential as part of a full schema of personal, personnel and professional staff development. The main focus is on appraisal as the main activity whereby a manager engages in an appraisal process with a subordinate for whom he or she is in some sense accountable. The appraisal system in schools was introduced in 1999, but up to now there has been negligible progress regarding its implementation. Teachers have mixed feelings about the new system (The teacher/Mall and Guardian, July 1999). Evans and Ruelas (1982) view personnel appraisal as an important method of maintaining control over staff productivity. Kellogg (1972) suggests that the appraisal system may be the basis for counseling and coaching subordinates. The Department of Education has introduced developmental appraisal to develop competence in educators and to eliminate

weaknesses. Appraisal develops certain areas of teacher performance and this is achieved by the appraiser providing a model of good teaching while the teacher is observing.

On the other hand, performance appraisal may be a source of dissatisfaction for both the supervisors and subordinates in the organisation when the system is not perceived to help the organisation or the employee to meet important goals (Murphy, Jacko and Anhalt, 1993). The appraisal system should aim at assisting the growth and development of the organisation and its employees.

## **2.2 THE CONCEPT OF APPRAISAL**

There are various terms in the literature that are synonymous with appraisal, such as performance appraisal, assessment, review and evaluation. According to the subject literature, appraisal replaces an autocratic, judgmental and summative system, which does not consider the differing contextual factors that affect the educator's work. The developmental approach to appraisal seeks to build on the strengths of educators.

Shienkfield and Stufflebean (1995) classify appraisal into summative and formative forms. Summative evaluation is primarily concerned with products and information that will be of use to the bureaucracy, whereas formative appraisal is chiefly concerned with the professional development of the teacher and is process-oriented rather than product-oriented.

According to Poster and Poster (1993), appraisal is a means of promoting an organisation's ability to accomplish its mission and improving what it provides while at the same time seeking to maintain staff satisfaction and development. Cascio (1995) sees it as the systematic description of the job-relevant strengths and weaknesses of an individual or group. The purpose of appraisal lies in interpreting it as a system for career development and not as a device for performance reward, control and fault finding.

Shienkfield and Stufflebean (1995) define teacher appraisal as a system of assessment for the teacher's performance and qualifications in relation to the teacher's defined professional role. To summarise different definitions, appraisal can be regarded as a

process through which an individual is constructively evaluated to determine ability, accomplishment and need for improvement, to check whether organisational aims and objectives are met, to promote the professional development of an individual as a cyclic process, and to assess the individual's competency.

### **2.3 THE PURPOSE OF TEACHER APPRAISAL**

Appraisal provides information to support other human resource activities and serves as a communication channel between the employer and employee, through which clarity is obtained with regard to what exactly each party expects from the other (Gerber and Van Dyk 1998).

The following objectives of performance appraisal were identified:

- To help a manager decide what increases of pay shall be given on what grounds or merit.
- To determine the future use of an employee, for example, whether the employee shall remain in his or her present job or be transferred, promoted, demoted or dismissed.
- To indicate training needs, i.e. areas of performance where improvements would occur or appropriate training could be given.
- To motivate the employee to do better in his or her present job by giving him or her knowledge of results, recognition of merits and the opportunity to discuss work with his or her manager.

Jantjies (1996) identifies the following as the purpose of teacher appraisal:

- Improvement of classroom performance so as to promote effective teaching and learning.
- Accountability, which involves objective and internally defensive information about teacher performance.
- Assistance with decision-making about individuals, taking into consideration the school's context.

- Assistance with organisational decisions. There should be openness and collaboration regarding criteria for appraisal and how and why organisations are appraised.

## 2.4 RATIONALE FOR DEVELOPMENT APPRAISAL

Stufflebeam (1988) identifies the following aspects as the rationale for educator appraisal:

- It provides effective services to students and society and encourages and guides educators to serve all students more effectively by way of advancing the theory and practice of education.
- It contributes to educator success, which leads to greater enthusiasm in their work
- It serves as a vital planning tool for sound professional development experience and points the way to new learning for individuals as it is directly related to their needs.
- It defines educational goals, approaches, and role definitions and applies standards accordingly.
- It promotes sound evaluations and ensures rationality, fairness and defensibility of decisions

## 2.5 APPRAISAL PRACTICES IN SELECTED COUNTRIES

Educator appraisal is a contentious issue all over the world. In order to provide background on appraisal, some of the appraisal systems are discussed below.

### 2.5.1 Appraisal in the United States of America

The American educational system has experienced an increased demand for appraisal as from the late sixties. These demands were brought about by an urge for innovation in the schools, expectations for the "scientification" of educational work, and intensification of educational accountability.

Requirements and demands for accountability were directed to various levels of the educational system. As the national responsibility for education was limited, commitment to appraisal was delegated to state agencies and local school districts (Nevo, 1995).

The commitment to appraisal led to a complex relationship amongst the various levels of the American educational system. District policy regarding evaluation changed and was stated in terms of student achievement as demonstrated by test scores. School principals were asked to assume responsibility for implementing district evaluation activities in their schools. In many states, principals were also asked to evaluate educators on the basis of the achievements of their students.

Principals appraised educators as required by the district with much concern for priority and less concern for utility (Nevo, 1995). In a study of schools in the state of California it was found that:

- Principals were pleased to be involved in a controversial task of appraising educators on the basis of student achievement.
- Principals invested much energy in co-coordinating state-wide testing in their schools. Such testing was, however, believed not to be particularly useful for the improvement of student learning.
- Educators did not believe that standardised testing helps schools to improve, nor did it clarify school goals or provide useful feedback to educators and students.

Educators in the United States are periodically appraised because of promotion tenure decisions, recognition and rewarding of meritorious contributions and in aid of helping faculty and administrators take stock of their strengths and to discover possible shortcomings and thus prescribe remediation. The United States also wanted to develop a fair, valid and effective case for terminating those who are harmful to students or otherwise ineffective (Stuffelbeam, 1988).

### **2.5.2 Appraisal in Israel**

There is no formal evaluation requirement in Israel's educational system or any systematic mechanism to assess schools in a routine manner. Due to shortages of manpower and a lack of evaluation tools, the ministry of education evaluates schools in a superficial way.

The inherently centralised Israeli educational system was decentralised so as to empower schools, educators and local communities. School autonomy in the Israel's educational system was also associated with the trend towards professionalisation and increased educator participation in school decision making (Nevo, 1995). On the basis of these trends towards decentralisation and school autonomy, several schools developed an internal appraisal mechanism.

Some of the schools have argued that these internal appraisal mechanisms should be considered alternatives to external appraisal and should release them from inspection by the Ministry of Education. These schools needed freedom from external pressure in order to develop their innovative approaches and to focus mainly on formative evaluation. Such an approach could be served well by internal appraisal.

A survey of educators and principals on how they perceived appraisal elicited the response that they considered appraisal a legitimate means to exercise authority and to maintain discipline in schools. The school principals, however, seemed to be more appraisal-minded than the educators.

### **2.5.3 Appraisal in the United Kingdom**

According to Fiddler and Coorer (1990), appraisal is mentioned in a UK Government White Paper of 1983 as a device that would allow LEAs (Local Education Authorities) to build data on the capabilities of their teachers. Since then, the concept of appraisal was commonly used in the UK. Appraisal was viewed as a response to a desire to bring about

a greater degree of accountability in the public service. It was linked to attempts to develop the management of schools (Bradley et al, 1988). In 1986 the Secretary of State prescribed, by means of a decree, procedures and conditions under which a teacher could be appraised. Such legislation provided a common approach through which teachers in the UK could be appraised. The legislation established what became known as the National Appraisal Scheme. Certain pilot schemes conducted by LEA were viewed as innovations to teacher appraisal.

According to Stufflebeam (Bollington et al, 1990), recommendations for a successful appraisal process includes the formulation of objectives, honesty, two-way communication, effectiveness, realism, encouragement and a developmental approach. The appraisal process, according to the pilot study conducted by the LEAs, should be continuous.

The British Education Research Association's (BERA) publication of 1986 regards appraisal as the assessment of teachers. A coordinated appraisal scheme was instituted by six Local Education Authorities (LEA) in 1987 and the Government imposed conditions of service on teachers in the same year.

The coordinated appraisal scheme recognised the needs of both teachers and schools. The pilot schemes were facilitated by the National Development Centre at the University of Bristol and evaluated by a team from the Cambridge Institute of Education (Fiddler, 1995:96).

At the end of the pilot scheme of appraisal, the National Steering Group proposed and agreed to a national appraisal framework. A statutory instrument (containing the legal requirements) and an advisory circular were issued (House of Commons, 1991).

According to the statutory regulations 1991, the stated aims of appraisal are to recognise the achievements of school teachers and to help them to identify ways of improving their skills and performance. This strategy also helped to identify teachers' potentials for career development purposes, with the aim of helping them through in-service training.

There had been pressure on teachers to accept the performance appraisal scheme even before it was reviewed (Fiddler and Copper, 1991). The evaluative approach was associated with performance. However, in order to ensure that a developmental approach is maintained, the statutory scheme preferred a target setting approach to one of performance related to pay.

The basic appraisal process for classroom teachers includes the following stages:

- Initial planning meeting
- Classroom observation and feedback
- Collection of evidence
- Interview
- Written statement
- Follow-up action
- Review meeting and
- Starting on the next cycle

#### **2.5.4 Appraisal in South Africa**

The previous system of education in South Africa was racially fragmented with regard to governance and the appraisal system was judgmental in all the subsystems. All educators across the racially configured system were generally dissatisfied with the manner in which appraisal was conducted. Mestry (1999) identified the following problems in the previous system of appraisal: It was a top-down system; it led to an abuse of merit awards and too much secrecy surrounded the appraisal; it identified itself with the incompetence of principals and inspectors and was sometimes guilty of sexual harassment and discrimination against women. It was also used as a system for the promotion of candidates.

In white schools, appraisal was linked to merit assessment with permanent financial rewards as well as promotion (GDoE, 1998). During this era of political upheaval, appraisal was halted. Consequently, the schools were characterised by irresponsible behaviour, including absenteeism and drunkenness, while learners exhibited

manifestations of low self-esteem and poor interpersonal relationships. These circumstances were stressful for hard-working educators, especially because there was a lack of motivation and appreciation.

It became clear that there was a need for development of an appraisal instrument which would be acceptable and which would promote the development of competency among educators and contribute to the quality of public education in South Africa (DoE, 1999). Labour unions, provincial departments as well as the National Department of Education in South Africa agreed on the implementation of the development appraisal system in South Africa. A final agreement on the implementation of the new system was reached within the ELRC on 28 July 1998. The government proposed and put into place a number of other measures to provide quality education (Government Gazette, 1996). These measures included:

- New curriculum evaluation
- Whole school evaluation
- South African school legislation
- Norms and standards for education
- skills development legislation
- Performance appraisal

The new model for developmental appraisal is more concerned with the personal development of teachers as opposed to the traditional appraisal system where more emphasis was on checking teachers for compliance with government regulations (Chetty, Chisholm, 1993).

The appraisal system was largely inspection-oriented and was based on a bureaucratic system of management. According to Chetty et al. (1993), the nature of the appraisal process reflected the following:

- The system involved the inspectorate, who had the dual role of being concerned with and divided into management functions and services.

- Heads of department were expected to evaluate teachers while inspectors were to monitor the submission of these evaluations. This practice led to a judgmental rather than a developmental emphasis in the whole system.
- Instruments used in appraisal revealed features of monitoring and surveillance and not a developmental emphasis. Evaluations were done on the basis of checklists with pre-defined criteria, which were intended to be indicators of effective teaching performance. Teacher evaluation was practiced in context of problems in the schools. Principals were instructed to submit evaluation records to the Regional Director or the secretary without delay.
- There was no planning for the appraisal process. Consequently, no follow up programmes were in place. Appraisal was meant for collection of data for submission to higher authorities and neglected emphasis on the development of teachers as an ongoing, cyclic process.

In white schools and ex-DET schools, educator appraisal was linked to merit assessment with a permanent financial salary notch as well as promotion (GDoE, 1998). The system also had the following pitfalls:

- It was a top-down system
- Merit awards were given to a maximum of 7% of the educators
- It lacked transparency
- The merit awards were life-long

Between 1985 -1990 it became almost impossible for supervisors and subject advisors to go into black schools. There was a need for the development of an appraisal instrument which would be acceptable to all stakeholders and which would enhance the development of competency of educators and the quality of public education in South Africa (DoE, 1999). Educators were concerned that:

- The judgmental perspective of appraisal would pose a threat to their status;
- Control mechanisms would be applied; and
- The "weeding out" of poor educators would be a possibility.

On the 28th of July 1998 a final agreement was reached within the ELRC on the implementation of the above-mentioned system. This agreement is reflected in resolution number 4 of 1998, which was, in turn, based on an agreement that the overall nature of the appraisal system to be piloted should be maintained. The "instrument" to be implemented is "developmental" in nature only, and appraisal has to be tied to the nature of the job description of the specific level of the post. While the new model for developmental appraisal is currently being implemented in schools, there is a need to check whether the underlying principles of the appraisal are being observed.

Chauke (2001) examined appraisal in a study that was conducted in the Eastern Cape, the Free State, KwaZulu-Natal, the Northern Cape and Gauteng. The sample consisted of English and Afrikaans speaking educators, both on promotion post and level one. The findings indicated that the majority of the respondents were Nguni speakers and that they used English, which is not their mother tongue, as the medium of instruction. This had a negative effect on learners, resulting in poor performance. During more than one appraisal, Chauke found the educators to be incompetent, and he was of the opinion that they should be removed from the profession.

Rantau (2001) conducted a qualitative study on performance appraisal in primary and secondary schools located in the rural and urban areas of the Zeerust district. Like Chauke, Rantao included the item "compensation of educators' performance" in his study. The findings of both researchers indicate that educators supported merit awards as part of overall reward. The findings also indicate that, although most educators had not yet been appraised, their overall perception was positive with regard to appraisal.

Mogal (2002) conducted a study on appraisal within the Moretele district of Mpumalanga Province. The respondents were educators from primary and secondary schools. Unlike Rantau, Mogal reported that appraisal had been implemented in most schools and that teachers were experiencing appropriate assistance during the appraisal process, although no follow-up programmes were implemented to make the system cyclic and sustainable.

The studies referred to above show that the development appraisal system has been implemented in many schools and that educators have positive views on the subject because they have perceived the benefits of being appraised.

## **2.6 THE BENEFITS OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL**

One of the aims of a performance appraisal is to promote the development and professional growth of the organisation, the manager and the employee for the benefit of the customer.

### **2.6.1 The organisation**

Appraisal promotes greater satisfaction and confidence in a work situation. It also provides the organisation with the relevant information to identify talented employees who are important for the improvement of the organisation. Employers can manage employees more easily if they have accurate knowledge of the employee's performance. According to Bollington et al, (1990) appraisal improves teacher performance, increases job satisfaction and realises the standard and quality of teaching. Appraisal is about the development of the individual for the benefit of the organisation (Wragg et al, 1996: 105). Improvement of the performance of the individual is essential to the improvement of the organisation. According to Maxwell (1995) appraisal improves school management and contributes to a positive climate.

### **2.6.2 The manager**

Every member of staff has a manager to whom he/she is accountable for his or her performance. Performance appraisal is helpful in opening up communication between staff and management. If well conducted, performance appraisal can strengthen relationships between employees and management, but when not well conducted it can break the relationship. According to Dean (1991), appraisal helps the managers in planning in-service training and the professional development of teachers, individually and collectively.

During appraisal discussions, managers are given the opportunity to motivate employees by recognising good work and recommending remedial help for employees whose performance is not satisfactory.

### **2.6.3 The Employee**

Employees stand to benefit from open and transparent discussion and also from fair and consistent feedback. Performance appraisal provides employees with a vehicle for planning future development. Decisions made within the appraisal panel need to be reported back to the employee and accountability needs to be ensured (RSA 1998). Employees deserve to know what is expected of them. An employee's performance is therefore monitored and guided in accordance with organisational objectives. Where performance evaluation is continuous, standards and targets are set for employees to achieve.

## **2.7 CRITISISM OF DEVELOPMENT APPRAISAL SYSTEM**

Appraisal should be characterised by fairness and accuracy (Gerber and van Dyk, 1998) and the use of correct performance appraisal results. It must be handled with particular circumspection. An employee's self image, status in the work group, motivation, promotion, and career opportunities to perform are all affected by it.

Even with the best intentions performance appraisal can never be fully objective and accurate. The most important reason is that people have a limited ability to process information. In addition it must be remembered that organisations are political in nature and that many decisions, particularly those involving appraisal, are influenced by politics.

Some schools are reluctant to introduce the system because many teachers feel that "professionals" do not need to be appraised. They have a negative feeling from past appraisal systems. Educators complain of inadequate training and a shortage of training manuals in schools; they also complain about a lack of support from district officials (The teacher/Mall & Guardian, 1999).

### **2.7.1 Barriers to effective appraisal**

Appraisal is a process and it has barriers. These barriers need to be identified so that there can be a smooth flow of teaching. Barriers may be organisational, political or interpersonal in nature.

#### **2.7.1.1 Organisational barriers**

The reason for poor performance in schools may not be related to the teacher's performance, but to conditions under which teachers work. Teachers are held responsible for errors that may be the result of faults within the school (Cascio, 1998). For example, material resources may be lacking. The department creates a problem with regard to the delivery of books and stationery to schools. Fluctuating school enrolment creates a problem, which results in the redeployment of educators.

According to Deming (1986), managerial shortcomings of subgroups within the system may cause variations and problems in performance. Therefore judging teachers according to the output may not always be right. (Casio, 1998).

#### **2.7.1.2 Organisational management style**

The management style can hinder performance appraisal. According to Dennison & Sheron (1987), there are two assumptions, which underlie the management style of managers in relation to their subordinates. These assumptions are: The employees dislike work, have little ambition, want security and require coercing and controlling or threatening with punishment. Management becomes impatient, hard and insensitive to the emotional feeling of the employees. Management may lack empathy to the extent that they cannot see merit in whatever the employees do. It is this treatment of employees by their supervisors that leads to disillusionment and encourages absenteeism and dishonesty among workers.

The staff will seek responsibility when conditions are appropriate; they will exercise self direction and control only if they become committed to organisational objectives. Likewise, they will respond to rewards that are associated with goal attainment.

Where teachers are treated in accordance with the first assumption, the likelihood is that they will rebel against appraisal. A holistic approach to management – one which values consultation and the opinions of subordinates, go a long way towards promoting trust, which is the most needed element of success for every programme.

#### **2.7.1.3 Political barriers**

Management politics often play a role in deciding who gets what raise, promotion and demotion (Helrieged and Slocum, 1992). Certain managers use appraisal more as a human relation tool than what it is meant for. Rating their employees accurately is of no significance to their daily routines, but motivating them and rewarding them is significant. Some managers exercise great care not to cause problems for themselves; keeping everyone happy is their primary objective (Longemecker. Sims and Goia, 1987).

#### **2.7.1.4 Interpersonal barriers**

Darling (1990) states that a negative impact on teachers that is often related to development appraisal could rather be blamed on teachers' negative attitudes towards, and misconceptions about, the subjects. Lack of communication between supervisors and employees may lead to the false assumption that employees are being judged according to one set of standards only. Most supervisors claim that appraisal emphasises the supervisor's position by placing him or her in the role of judge, thus conflicting with the supervisor's role as a teacher and coach (Meyer, 1991).

Some educators are afraid of the appraisal system. As such they are unwilling to be appraised. Principals also drag their feet due to fear that they may be victimised by teacher unions.

### **2.7.1.5 Common performance problems**

#### **Lack of training**

According to Brew (1995), lack of necessary information in issues of appraisal is likely to bring about negative results for the organisation. The stakeholders must get thorough training about appraisal.

#### **Vague targets**

The appraisal system must have a reason to exist. Implementing appraisal without goals or without standards against which to measure performance will definitely yield poor results from the start, because there is no foundation for it (Bell and Day 1991).

#### **Unrealistic standards**

Standards are goals with motivating potentials. Standards that are reasonable but challenging have the most potential to motivate. Unrealistic standards are standards which are unreachable within a given period (Olivier (1985).

#### **Poor measure of performance**

An objective comparison requires that progress towards the attainment of standards be measurable. When measuring performance, one should be able to measure it anywhere from the start to the finish.

#### **Delays in the process**

Time management is the main determinant of success with regard to development appraisal in schools (Brew, 1995). Delay in the execution of appraisal is a waste of time.

#### **Rater errors**

Rater errors include rater bias or prejudice, which may result in a tendency to rate as "average," i.e. to stick to the centre when rating due to a fear of confrontation.

### **Lack of attention to follow-up**

Follow-up in staff appraisal is essential because development always needs monitoring. According to Hewton (1988), monitoring is a sensitive stage in staff appraisal. Follow-up must be done in a second meeting between the appraiser and appraisee (Tuner and Cliff, 1988). Standards must be communicated to the employee in order for performance evaluation to be effective. The use of weighting of multiple criteria as well as the frequency of evaluation also presents problems.

## **2.8 DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL**

Developmental appraisal is an on-going process that allows education to acquire or refine knowledge, skills and attitudes. It concentrates on the identification of individual development needs and subsequently on training or self-development - thereby improving the ability of the employees to perform in their present or future roles (Poster and Poster, 1991: 1) Such appraisal is concerned with the teacher's professional development needs and training opportunities in order to improve his/her performance in present and future roles. Fletcher (1996) states that development appraisal is used to help teachers develop by helping them see their shortcomings and commit themselves to improvement.

Developmental appraisal seeks to build on the strengths that the educators have. Using what positively exists in educators' performance, it attempts to erode the negative aspects of such performance by providing ways in which negative aspects may be responded to in a "developmental" way, on the basis of strengths that exists (ELRC, Manual DAS).

### **2.8.1 Characteristics of developmental appraisal**

The development appraisal system is based on the fundamental principle of lifelong learning and development. It consists of the following ongoing processes (ELRC, Manual DAS):

### **Reflective appraisal**

Reflective appraisal requires the educators to interpret and analyse the extent to which their performance meets the objectives of serving the needs of clients, with the intention of rethinking current practice.

### **Self appraisal**

Self appraisal is where the educators undertake self-analysis and introspection in terms of their own performance according to a client questionnaire. It results in institutional development plans followed by self-evaluation.

### **Peer appraisal**

Peer appraisal is the involvement of a colleague in assisting the appraisee to review his/her performance with a view to prioritised professional development needs.

### **Collaboration**

Collaboration occurs where educators work together to assist in problem solving.

### **Interaction with panels**

Relationships have to be developed between members so as to work together collectively to assist the appraisee to identify needs, formulate objectives, select professional development activities, and to implement such activities within time frames and to provide timeous feedback.

## **2.8.2 Guiding principles of the new model**

Guiding principles inform the basic nature of the appraisal system and they are binding for all those who participate in it (Department of Education, 1999). Without adherence to these principles the system will not operate. These guiding principles are:

- Democracy
- Transparency and
- Developmental principles

### **Democracy**

The process must be a joint effort conducted by a collaborative panel that should be inclusive of all stakeholders. Different views must be heard. A top down decision is not allowed.

The performance of educators will be looked at in a fair and balanced manner and the right to be heard should be applied.

### **Transparency**

Decisions that are reached must be clearly justified and argued for and be made explicit and stated openly. Everard and Morris (1990) state that subordinates as well as managers will listen to any criticism and use it as a basis for improvement.

#### **2.8.3 Development process**

According to the Department of Education (1999), the appraisal of educators is in essence a developmental process that depends upon continuous support. It is designed and intended to entrench strength, develop potential and overcome weaknesses. Educators must not be intimidated but should be supported in their professional growth.

#### **2.8.4 Developmental objectives**

The following are the objective of the appraisal:

- To counsel and coach subordinates so that they will improve their performance and develop potentials;
- To develop commitment to career opportunities and career planning;

## **Self-evaluation**

Self-evaluation is done by means of a checklist. Criteria for discussion between the evaluator and teacher are selected, including content, materials media, and the designated instructional procedures to accomplish the 201 Lesson objectives and the assessment of students' progress.

## **Pre-observation conference**

The evaluator will discuss some aspects of the activities that will be viewed. These activities include learning behaviours to be monitored, special characteristics of students to be noted and the particular teaching methods employed by teachers. The conference further orients teachers to evaluation, classroom responsibility and to formal classroom activities that are to follow.

## **Classroom observation**

Classroom observation is based upon factors arising from the pre-observation conference but not limited to it. Various approaches may be applied to classroom observation. The evaluator may use a topical data capture method that will require noting evidence of particular activities. On the other hand, if the clinical supervision approach is used, then the evaluator would need to discern whether the appropriate steps have been used. Mannat has suggested the following steps in classroom observation (Shienkfield and Stuffelbeam: 1995):

- To develop anticipated lesson outcome
- To state objectives and why they are important
- To provide input
- To check for comprehension; and
- To provide guided practice as well as independent practice

The evaluator records observations on two separate forms: The first will have non-judgmental and descriptive details useful for immediate advice and improvement. On the other form, summative data will be recorded in line with the extent to which the system requirements are being met – and they will correlate with the end-of-cycle summative form. More observations are encouraged since it is from them that feedback increases. The evaluator evaluates what has been observed to decide upon the main thrust of the discussion which is to follow.

### **Post- observation conference**

There is a need to review the decisions made at the pre-conference in order to have a good start for the post-evaluation conference. In analysing the lesson observed, the tone of the conference should be positive. The evaluator should amalgamate a direct, critical approach with an indirect approach, where perceptions and suggestions can be shared in order to accomplish the following:

- To motivate subordinates through recognition of achievement and support, and
- To strengthen supervisor/subordinate relations (Fiddler and Cooper, 1988)

## **2.9 TYPES OF APPRAISAL**

Performance appraisal is a process of evaluation and documentation of personnel performance in order to make judgments that lead to decision regarding promotions, rewards, probationary tenure and dismissal (Balrd, 1992).

Cascio (1995) sees performance appraisal as the systematic description of job relevant strengths and weaknesses of an individual or group. According to Dunham (1995), performance appraisal is concerned with the setting of achievable goals as well as feedback to staff on their performance. Of all the activities in the human resources general cycle, performance appraisal is arguably the most contentious and least popular among those who are involved (Bratton and Gold, 1994).

Appraisal of educators should lead to the identification of certain aspects that need to be developed; hence developmental appraisal.

### 2.9.1 Review of Some appraisal Models

Knowledge of different appraisal models is essential (Poster and Poster, 1993) in that a particular model represents the appraisal style that it has been adopted for. Alternatively it may borrow from any other types some aspects that it finds suited to its requirements.

The Teacher Performance Evaluation Model (TPE) by Mannat (Shienkfield and Stufflebeam: 1995).

Self Evaluation	
Pre-observation	Pre-observation data
Classroom observation	Working document
Post observation conference	Feedback session
End of cycle conference	Summative evaluation report
Job improvement	Job improvement target states report

At the conclusion of several observations, usually at the end of the year depending on the school district policy, the Teacher Performance Evaluation (TPE) cycle switches from a predominantly formative evaluation to summative evaluation.

#### **End of cycle evaluation**

The summative report reaches conclusions about how successful the teacher has been during the course of the year, taking into account out of classroom performance as well as classroom teaching, as both form part of the evaluation. The general framework of the summative evaluation report will determine the format to be followed. Most of the

material comes from the formal observation report. The report will be based upon work samples, lesson plans, job improvement targets, post-tests and the distribution of student marks. The keeping of a log or diary of a teacher's activity is essential so as to be in a position to make a complete and supportable statement in the summative report.

### **The job improvement targets**

Job improvement targets refer to that which the teacher attains or improves that relates to his/her job. The job improvement target sets a time limit in which the objective must be attained and it contains a criterion to be used to measure a teacher's success in reaching the target. The generalised teacher improvement goals are turned into precise measurable teaching objectives. Job target worksheets are created with spaces for components as follows:

- Job targets
- Activities and methods for reaching the objective
- Comments by the teacher being appraised and
- The evaluator's comments

### **2.9.2 Model of Clinical Supervision**

Cogan (1973) presents a totally compatible version with eight phases intended to be collegial, technically refined and intimate. These phases capture both the process and purpose of development appraisal.

#### **Phase One: Establishing a collegueship relationship with the teacher**

This phase consists of establishing a cordial, intense, mature and continuous relationship between the teacher and the supervisor. The teacher and the supervisor become equals to share what they can for the art of teaching, the end result being developing trust and their relationship to be true collegueship.

### **Phase Two: Planning with the teacher**

This phase is the test for a true supervisor. The planning of the lesson by the supervisor and the teacher is the most important phase for the objectives to be attained and outcomes to be reached. The planning involves identifying lesson objectives, subject matter, methods, learning material, evaluation means, instructional problems that may arise and a more intense preparation for approaching the lesson.

### **Phase Three: Planning strategies for observation**

This phase emphasises supervision as observation. The supervisor plays an important part in this phase, which is his/her responsibility. However, in planning for observation, the teacher has the advantage of knowing exactly what the supervisor will look for.

### **Phase Four: Observation instruction**

Here the actual observation of teaching occurs. The supervisor is in class with the teacher or student to observe instruction in the class.

The supervisor can take notes or use a video tape recording, concentrating on the aspects of teaching that has been agreed upon. Here observation will basically be focused on pupil-teacher interaction, objectives, problem solving behaviour in both the teacher and the pupils, behaviour involved in challenging evidence, and behaviour indicating that concept development is occurring, the teacher's subject matter knowledge and classroom management.

### **Phase Five: Analysis of teaching process**

The supervisor analyses carefully the learning-teaching process. The supervisor can work either jointly with the teacher or separately, the purpose being to identify the pattern of teacher behaviour.

### **Phase Six: Planning strategies for conference**

During this stage the teacher and the supervisor talk about what they want to accomplish during the conference and how they might accomplish it, determining the time, material needed for conferencing and where to conduct it.

### **Phase Seven: The conference**

The conference takes place for the purpose of sharing insight and information. Having planned the lesson together with the teacher, the supervisor already has some information about the teacher's general intentions. It is during this stage that formative evaluation comes to the fore, with some future recommendations. The worth of the conference depends on the help mutually given and the quality of improvements proposed.

### **Phase Eight: Renewed planning**

During this stage planning resumes for the next lesson so that the teacher may improve. As a result of supervision, weaknesses are identified and both parties agree on what the need is. The competence of the teacher and the supervisor plays a role in governing the extent to which the learning content should be planned at the beginning of the second cycle.

## **2.9.3 Performance Appraisal**

Bollington, Hopkins and West (1990) present the process of appraisal as preparation, interview and follow-up.

### **2.9.3.1 Preparation**

This stage involves training both inside and outside the school. The preparation stage prepares the appraisee and appraisers to come to the interview with their minds geared to discussing issues of substance. The first appointment between the teacher and the panel

sets the tone for the process. This stage provides both the appraisee and appraiser with knowledge of what to ask and say, which saves time and helps the process to maintain its purpose.

At the preparation stage a climate conducive to appraisal must be created. Involving those who will be appraised helps to eradicate suspicion, which might work against the real intentions of the appraisal process.

The teacher must be allowed autonomy in the entire process (Bollington et. al, 1990).

People involved in the process should assist in securing the success of the system by assessing the following:

- That all the participants thoroughly understand the mechanics of the system
- That evaluators are properly trained in the procedural and substantive use of the system
- That the evaluation distinguishes between the formative and the summative dimensions and
- That variety evaluation is a distinct priority.

### 2.9.3.2 **The interview**

The appraisal interview is at the hub of the appraisal process (Bollington Hopkins and West, 1990). Such an interview can be seen as a chance for uninterrupted and sustained discussion of past performance and future plans. It encompasses a review of success, the areas for development and constraints, target setting related to the present job, and general professional career development (Bollington et. al, 1990).

In the interview process, discussion covers the work done as well as the new targets since the previous appraisal. The targets set must be precise, realistic and amenable to monitoring. The interview will be the ideal occasion to identify ways through which targets can be accomplished (Bolling et.al, 1990). The system often fails to secure the

commitment of some participants due to the fact that some appraisers lack adequate training (Stenning and Stenning 1984).

Communication skills are essential elements of a successful interview process. Questioning and listening is included in communication skills (Adair, 1983).

### **2.9.3.3 Follow-up**

The follow-up process is seen as providing a formal opportunity to enhance the professional relationship developed between an appraiser and appraisee. Follow-up is regarded as a retrospective activity. The balance between retrospective review and forward planning has to be decided by the appraiser. Follow-up must be carried out in a second meeting (Turner and Cliff, 1988).

The following is a list of activities related to the performance appraisal process:

- Initial meeting between an appraisee and an appraiser
- Classroom / task observation and collection of the information
- Appraisee self-appraisal
- Appraisal interview and target setting
- Appraisal record
- Follow-up discussion / meeting between appraisee and appraiser
- Professional development activities

### **2.9.4 Four phase appraisal model**

The four-phase appraisal model, according to Bollington et. al. (1990), is divided into preparation, observation, the interview and follow-up. This four-phase appraisal model is diagrammatically represented as follows:

Table 2.1 Four phase appraisal model

Initial review meeting between appraisal and appraisee
Classroom task / observation collection of other data, appraisee self-appraisal
Appraisal interview, target setting, appraisal record reduced
Follow-up discussion / meeting between appraiser and appraisee, professional development activities

#### 2.9.4.1 Preparation

There is an initial meeting to set up the process and the range of approaches to gathering data on the teacher's performance, including classroom observation. Self-appraisal is encouraged to ensure that the process leads to promoter reflection. The preparation phase includes the following:

- Increased communication between the appraiser and the appraisee, which involves the setting of appraisal criteria
- Lowering of prescriptiveness of work tasks
- Agreement between the teacher and senior management in accepting the goals and means for appraisal

#### 2.9.4.2 Observation

Written and oral information is gathered and coupled to classroom observation, as agreed to by both parties.

### 2.9.4.3 Interviews

The interview is central to the process of appraisal and includes the following:

- A review of work done and targets achieved
- Setting targets for future jobs and professional development
- Identifying ways of achieving these targets
- Agreeing on a final record or statement of the appraisal process

## 2.10 THE NEW MODEL FOR DEVELOPMENT APPRAISAL IN SOUTH AFRICA

According to the Government Gazette Volume 404, No. 19767 (DoE), the new model for developmental appraisal in South Africa has the following features.

- Simplicity
- Feasibility
- Legitimacy
- Flexibility

The aim of the model is to facilitate the personal and professional development of teachers in order to improve the quality of teaching practice and education management (DoE, 1999). The following are some of the aims of the appraisal as embedded in the new model for developmental appraisal:

- To bring about optimal personal development of educators and thereby enhance the quality of the education system as a whole.
- To improve educative, teaching and management ability of educators through support and development programmes.
- To determine the competency of educators for purposes of optimal utilisation, merit promotion and corrective measures.

The new model for the developmental appraisal system has been based on democratic principles and on the need to remove the past bureaucratic and judgmental elements of the traditional appraisal system.

## 2.11 APPRAISAL PANEL AND ROLES

Cooperation between educators and their appraisers is of vital importance. Sergiovanni (1993) asserts that managers may not look forward to conducting appraisal, and the two most prominent reasons for this phenomenon are:

- The lack of training; and
- The use of inappropriate criteria and methods.

The Department of Education document (1999) states that the appraisal system must take into account the constitutional imperatives and ensure that the processes of democracy, transparency and collaboration are adhered to. In order to achieve this, an appraisal panel composed of at least four of the following people is necessary: the appraisee; a peer nominated by the appraisee; a union representative; a senior management level person (such as head of department), deputy principal and principal.

The appraisal is expected to:

- be objective, not subjective
- look at performance, not personality
- be supportive, not judgmental; and
- be sensitive

Other qualities, which are essential in any appraisal panel, are:

- clarity of expression, i.e. active listening
- questioning
- negotiation

- Ability to facilitate other's expression of feelings;
- Comprehension of the psychological interaction in the interview; and conducting the interview as successfully as possible for both parties (Pratt and Stenning, 1991).

In order to facilitate and manage the appraisal process, all schools falling under the Department of Education have to establish a staff development team (SDT), which comprises the head of the institution, the senior teacher and one or two educators. The SDT's function is to initiate, monitor and ensure that training takes place to improve the educator's performance. Decisions about the appraisee are made in this forum. All members of the panel, including the appraisee, sign the final appraisal report. Regular meetings, which must take place outside the formal school day, must be held to discuss the ways in which the appraisal will take place and a joint decision must be taken on the outcome of the educator's appraisal.

## **2.12 THE DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL INSTRUMENT**

Appraisal instruments include the basic procedures, methods and criteria through which the appraisal of persons will take place. These are the actual tools that are used in the appraisal of educators. The appraisal report consists of the forms filled in during the appraisal process. Additional information to be filled in includes prioritised criteria, identified needs, strengths of the teacher, suggested development plan and the suggested provider of the development programme. In order to record personal particulars, an appraisee completes a personal details form. The needs identification and prioritisation form provides the actual criteria which will be used in the appraisal of a particular educator. There are different criteria for different levels of educators, principals, heads of department, post level one educators and office based educators.

### **2.12.1 Core Criteria**

The needs identification process provides core criteria, which are those aspects of the educator's work that are essential for the realisation of professional practice. These criteria are standard, both locally and internationally (DoE, 1999).

With regard to post level one educators, the core criteria cover three essential areas namely:

- classroom expertise
- professional development and
- leadership and communication skills

The core criteria for heads of department are the same as for post level 1 educators with the exception of criteria that deal with responsibilities as well as professional development and leadership skills. The principal's and deputy principal's core criteria emphasize leadership, management, administration, budgeting and strategic planning skills (Hewton and West, 1992).

#### **2.12.2 Optional Criteria**

Optional criteria are criteria which are listed as core criteria but which may be made optional by the appraisal panel because of contextual factors at an institution.

#### **2.12.3 Additional Criteria**

Additional criteria are criteria which may be added depending on the needs of the institution or individual educator (DOE, 1999).

The professional growth plan is to be completed by the appraisee and this allows the educators to formulate their own objectives according to the criteria which have been prioritised.

### **2.13 ROLE OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT**

The school staff development team prepares a report on the appraisal in the institution and presents it to the staff at the end of the cycle. The report reflects the collective

professional development needs of educators in the school. In the event of a dispute, grievance procedures are to be followed.

### **2.13.1 The management Plan**

The school management team and staff members elect the staff development team which trains the staff. The staff members elect the appraisal panel, while the appraisees complete personal details form. The panel observes the educator in practice. The panel completes a Professional Growth Plan form with the appraisee and compiles a complete appraisal report (Motlhaba, 2003).

### **2.13.2 Educator Training**

A training programme for educators is necessary in order to ensure that they are able to provide maximum performance. It makes good organisational sense to link the review or appraisal to an in-service training provision, so that appropriate opportunities are offered for continuing staff development (Dunhan 1995). This is important as it takes account of factors such as knowledge changes, best practices changes as well as time, research and technological changes.

## **2.14 EDUCATOR APPRAISAL AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT**

Staff appraisal is carried out for different purposes. Pratt and Stenning (1991) identify the following management functions related to educator appraisal:

Control function: Emphasis on feedback so as to enhance management's information about individual performance in order that effective remedial action may be taken where appropriate.

Communication function: People must know where they started. Feedback is essential so that they can know how they are doing and how the organisation regards them as employees. Corporate planning function: Concern about individual performance, potential and development should be subsumed under super-ordinate concern about the

organisation's growth and development. Dean (1992) sees the role of any local inspectorate to be firstly monitoring, evaluating and reporting upon the quality of educational provision and standards of learning. In order to monitor educational outcomes the task may be reviewed to ensure accountability. Those responsible for management of appraisal in schools cannot simply set up the system and then merely hope it will run its course. Mechanisms need to be established to ensure that educators carry out appraisal as timetabled and in the manner agreed within the school (Wragg et al. 1996).

## 2.15 CONCLUSION

Various models proposed by different authors (Shienkfield and Stoffelbeam, 1995; Bollington et al., 1990) stress the importance of the pre-appraisal conference, the observation phase and the post-conference. Teachers have to meet in a pre-appraisal conference to prepare the observers as well as the teacher for observation. A contract is made of the rules and is not to be changed except by mutual agreement and to ensure an agreement for rationale and methods of observation.

Classroom observation should be carried out by the appraisal panel and data must be recorded so as to identify and diagnose strengths as well as areas in need of improvement. The appraisal panel decides jointly with the appraisee on the criteria to be followed.

Observation includes looking at learners' portfolios, the educator's lesson plans and at other records and documents for (or used by) the educator concerned. The results of the observation are discussed with the appraisee at an appraisal panel meeting.

A post-appraisal conference should be held to discuss the outcomes. The appraisee and the appraisal panel participate in a feedback conference. Together they review the observational data, encouraging the teacher to make his/her own judgment about teaching effectiveness. Overall agreements about the appraisal will be reached to the satisfaction of the appraisee. The appraisal report will thereafter be signed by all members of the appraisal panel in order for it to be valid. It is only through this feedback that it can be

determined whether further development is needed (or not needed) in an individual's performance.

Due to the need for improvement, abundant literature is available on development appraisal systems necessary to improve the assessment of educators and to improve professional standards in general. There is also a link between appraisal in the United States of America and South Africa.

The different appraisal models, such as clinical supervision, performance appraisal, the four-phase appraisal model and the new development appraisal system, all have common approaches in that educators have to meet in a pre-appraisal conference to discuss objectives, methods and contextual factors.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **METHODOLOGY: RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES**

#### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter discusses the method that was used as well as the steps taken to collect information on the views of educators with regard to development appraisal. An empirical investigation was conducted among primary and secondary schools in the Bhekuzulu Circuit of the Vryheid District.

A description as well as a motivation for the choice of research methodology is given in this chapter, which also describes the population, sampling methods, the data collection instruments and the research for this study.

#### **3.2 METHOD OF INVESTIGATION**

##### **3.2.1 Research Design**

According to Schumacher and Mc Millan, (1993), the research design refers to a plan for selecting subjects, research sites and data collection procedures in order to answer the research question(s). Subjects are the individuals who participate in the study; it is from them that data are collected (Schumacher, and Mc Millan, 1993). This study employed a descriptive research design. Such design was appropriate for determining the development appraisal in schools. A questionnaire was used to collect data from the subjects.

##### **3.2.2 Instrumentation**

According to Borg and Gall (1989), the questionnaire and the individual interview are the most common instruments used for data collection in social research. In this study the questionnaire was used as the sole research tool to collect data from respondents. This technique was chosen because it ensures anonymity and allows the use of standardised questions. Legotlo (1996) describes the questionnaire as the most important aspect of

data collection because it is the only way of communication between respondents and the researcher. It is a device which enables respondents to answer questions. Schumaker and Mc Millan (1993) state that questionnaires can be in the form of statements or questions, but in all cases the subject responds to something written. In this study the respondents were required to express their views in writing. Open-ended and closed questions were designed to probe educators' views on various post levels as well as on the extent to which they agree or disagree with certain statements relative to development appraisal systems. Short and easy questions were used for closed questions in order to avoid confusion among the respondents. In open-ended questions, the questions were clear and comprehensive. No negative items were used and biased questions were avoided.

### **3.2.3 Population and Sampling**

The population is the target group selected for the study. This study was conducted among 56 schools in the Bhekuzulu circuit. The schools were divided into the following categories, namely 35 primary schools, 17 secondary schools and 4 combined schools. The random sampling method was used in order to select subjects for the study. The number of schools required was 20 and included schools in the rural areas and in townships. Ten schools were selected from each area.

In the rural and township areas combined, selection was as follows: Five primary schools were selected out of 35 schools; three secondary schools out of 17 schools; and 2 combined schools out of 4 schools. The schools selected were labeled 001 - 020 for the sake of differentiation.

According to Schumacher and Mc Millan (1993), sampling is random if every number of the population has an equal chance of being chosen to be in the sample.

Table 3.1

Distribution of population per school

School	Sample population
01	6
02	4
03	6
04	4
05	5
06	6
07	4
08	6
09	6
10	5
11	5
12	5
13	5
14	5
15	4
16	5
17	5
18	4
19	4
20	5
<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 3.1 shows the distribution of the sample population per school. In each school, 5 educators responded to the questionnaire, as follows:

Principal

Deputy Principal and Head of Department: two educators.

The targeted number of respondents was 100 (n = 100)

Table 3.2

School	Sample population
01	4
02	4
03	2
04	3
05	2
06	5
07	5
08	3
09	2
10	6
11	5
12	-
13	4
14	3
15	2
16	4
17	4
18	5
19	-
20	2
<b>20</b>	<b>65</b>

Response rate of sample population per school

### 3.2.3.1 Advantages of the questionnaire

The mailed or posted questionnaire is the easiest form of conducting a survey with regard to an educational inquiry (Cohen & Manion, 1985). Legotlo (1996) identified the following advantages of mailed questionnaires:

- Travelling and subsistence costs are minimal.
- Respondents from all parts of the world could be reached.
- Respondents' names are not given.
- Information from thousands of respondents can be obtained within a month.

- There is little use of open-ended questions; as such the questionnaire is processed with ease.

In this study, some of the questionnaires were mailed to schools in order to minimise traveling costs.

### 3.2.3.2 Disadvantages of the questionnaire

Like other strategies for data collection, the postal survey has certain disadvantages such as the following:

- An excessive non-response rate is common.
- Impersonality may cause frustration to some respondents.
- Some respondents might have negative attitudes towards questionnaires.
- Availability of addresses of the sample population poses some problems.

The mailed or postal questionnaire is still commonly used to collect data, despite its disadvantages. Cohen & Manion (1985) and Borg & Gall (1989) have identified a number of aspects of design and layout that may be employed so as to secure a good response to mailed questionnaires; these are:

- The appearance of the questionnaire is vitally important. It must look easy to respond to and be attractive.
- Clarity of wording and simplicity of design are essential. Clear instructions should guide the respondent.
- The contents of the questionnaire should be arranged in such a way as to maximise cooperation.
- The practice of sub-lettering questions is a useful technique for grouping together questions that have to do with a specific issue.

- The wording of the self-completion questionnaire is of paramount importance and pre-testing is crucial to its success.
- Most of mailed questionnaires did not return. The response from the principals was that they did not understand what the aim of the questionnaire was.

### 3.2.3.3 Questionnaire construction

A well-designed questionnaire boosts the reliability and validity of the data to an acceptable level of tolerance. Even though the questionnaire is commonly used as a tool for data collection, there are some criticisms against its use.

Some of the rules for constructing a questionnaire listed by Borg & Gall (1989) are the following:

- Clarity: the items should mean the same to all respondents.
- Short items are preferable;
- Negative items should be avoided;
- Doubled-barreled items which require the subject to respond to two separate ideas with a single answer should be avoided, and
- Biased questions are to be avoided.

The researcher developed a questionnaire consisting of 21 items based on the issues raised in the literature on the nature and importance of development appraisal.

The questionnaire was divided into three sections.

In section A the purpose of the questions was to gather biographical details about each respondent in order to get to understand the background of the respondents.

Section B contains items that are used to assess the views of respondents. Each item requires the respondent to reflect his/her answer on a five-point scale, as follows: strongly agree; agree; undecided; disagree; and strongly disagree.

These questions were constructed in order to gather information about the process of the programme. The respondents were asked to indicate their views based on their knowledge and perception of the process.

Section C makes provision for respondents to comment and motivate their answers. This item requires the respondents to give their opinions on appraisal.

### **3.2.4 Administration of the Questionnaire**

#### **3.2.4.1 Request for permission**

The researcher applied to the Department of Education for permission to collect data from educators in the Mondlo and Mvunyane wards of the Bhekuzulu circuit. Such permission was granted.

#### **3.2.4.2 Pretesting the Questionnaire**

Pre-testing is the penultimate stage in the questionnaire method of gathering data and is considered to be one of the most important stages. The questionnaire can be administered to a few respondents so that its flaws can be identified and corrected (Balley 1982). The questionnaire was re-tested on fourteen respondents who were not part of the sample, no significant flaws were identified in the instrument.

#### **3.2.4.3 Administration of the main instrument**

The student delivered the questionnaire personally to sixteen schools and four copies were posted. Hand-delivered copies were given to principals of the schools to distribute to the respondents. In some school the management team numbered less than three persons and consisted of the Principal and Head of Department, whereas the management team in other schools was made up of more members, for example, the Principal, Deputy Principals and four heads of departments. The researcher collected the questionnaires from the school principals. In the process of conducting this study the respondents were assured that data collected will be treated with strict confidentiality.

### 3.3 CONCLUSION

This chapter provided a description of the empirical investigation. The questionnaire was selected as a means of data-collection due to the fact that it is an economical method, which is easy to administer and score. The open-ended questions assisted the researcher in receiving answers in the respondents' own words, thereby avoiding the problem of answers being suggested to the respondents.

In the next chapter the empirical investigation to determine views of educators on development appraisal will be discussed.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### DATA PRESENTATION ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

#### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents an analysis and interpretation of data collected for the investigation regarding the views of teachers on the development appraisal system.

#### 4.2 BIOGRAPHICAL AND DEMOGRAPHICAL DETAILS

##### 4.2.1 Age Range of the Respondents

Table 4.1 Age Range of the Respondents

Item	Responses	Percentage
Age	Frequency	%
Below 30	4	6
30- 35	18	28
36-40	13	20
41-45	15	23
46-50	9	14
51-55	5	8
56+	1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100</b>

From table 4.1 it is noted that 28% of the respondents were between 30 and 35 years of age and that only 6 respondents were below the age of 30 years, 20% of the respondents were between 36 and 40 of age, while 23% were between 41 and 45 years old. 14% of the respondents were aged between 46 and 50; 8% were aged between 51 and 55, and only 1% of the respondents were above 56 years of age. Age distribution, as reflected in the table, reveals that most of the respondents were fairly well experienced teachers.

#### 4.2.2 Gender of Respondents

Table 4.2 Gender of Respondents

<b>Item</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
Male	23	<b>35</b>
Female	42	<b>65</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 4.2 shows that 35% of the respondents were males, while 65% were females. The data indicates that female respondents (the majority) were mostly employed at primary schools and it is, traditionally, a fact that this category seems to have more females than males.

#### 4.2.3 Highest academic qualification

Table 4.3 Highest Academic Qualifications

<b>Items</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Staff categories</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
M+ 1 or below	5	<b>8</b>
M+2	-	<b>-</b>
M+3	27	<b>42</b>
M+4	18	<b>28</b>
M+6	12	<b>17</b>
M+6	3	<b>5</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 4.3 shows that 42% of the respondents had a three-year qualification (in the form of either diplomas or degrees), while 28% held higher diplomas or degrees. Only 8% of the respondents were unqualified. The data indicates that although most respondents held higher qualifications, they were not employed in management positions, and that most respondents were fairly well qualified and would have a good understanding of the appraisal system.

#### 4.2.4 Teaching experience

Table 4.4 Teaching Experience

Items	Responses	Percentage
Experience	Frequency	%
0-5 years	8	<b>12</b>
6-10 years	18	<b>28</b>
11-25 years	25	<b>38</b>
21-25 years	9	<b>14</b>
26+ years	5	<b>8</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 4.4 shows that 12% of the respondents had 5 years or less experience. Twenty eight percent of the respondents had 6 or more year's experience. The table shows that 38% of the respondents had more than 10 years experience, while 14% had experience of more than 20 years. Only 8% of the respondents had beyond 26 years of teaching experience. A significant majority of 70% respondents had between 6 and 20 years of experience. Educators with below 10 years of experience outnumbered those who had 26 or more years of experience. The data reveals that the respondents were fairly well experienced teachers and therefore able to provide valid responses with regard to developmental appraisal system. The services of experienced teachers are essential in maintaining and increasing satisfaction in the educational system.

#### 4.2.5 School category

Table 4.5 School Category

Items	Responses	Percentage
	Frequency	%
Lower Primary	23	<b>36</b>
Higher Primary	17	<b>26</b>
Combined primary	8	<b>12</b>
Junior Secondary	11	<b>17</b>
Senior Secondary	6	<b>9</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 4.5 shows that 91% of the respondents came from primary schools, while 9% hailed from secondary schools. Twenty schools were identified and sixteen questionnaires were delivered to them, while four were posted to the schools. Two schools failed to return questionnaires posted to them, while some of the questionnaires were returned incomplete.

#### 4.2.6 Settlement

Table 4.6 Settlement

Items	Responses	Percentage
Settlement	Frequency	%
Rural	29	45
Town / Township	36	55
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 4.6 shows that 45% of the respondents were attached to rural schools, while 55% hailed from towns/townships. This table confirms the rural characteristics of the school system in KwaZulu-Natal. The rural schools are beset with problems, including lack of infrastructure and large numbers of under-qualified educators. These factors impact negatively on the performance of educators as well as on the school system.

### 4.3 PROVISION FOR APPRAISAL

This part of investigation sought to establish the extent to which schools had been prepared for appraisal and how the process had been implemented.

Table 4.7 Implementation of development appraisal

#### 4.7 Responses with regard to implementation of appraisal

Items		Yes	No	Total
Do you have a Staff Development Team (SDT) in your school?	F	60	5	<b>65</b>
	%	93	7	<b>100</b>
Do you have an appraisal panel in you school?	F	61	4	<b>65</b>
	%	94	6	<b>100</b>
Have you been trained or attend a workshop on appraisal?	F	51	14	<b>65</b>
	%	78	22	<b>100</b>
Have you been appraised?	F	47	18	<b>65</b>
	%	72	28	<b>100</b>

Table 4.7 reveals that 93% of the respondents indicated that they had staff development teams at their schools, while only 7% reported that they did not have staff development teams.

This implies that there are members of staff who are responsible for personnel development, except in schools where educators had not attended workshops on appraisal. In most schools appraisal seemed to be appropriately dealt with because they had members of staff responsible for personnel development.

Table 4.7 also shows that 94% of the respondents indicated that they had appraisal panels at schools, while 6% of the schools had no appraisal panels. These responses suggest that preparation has been made for the appraisal process.

Table 4.7 furthermore reveals that 78% of the respondents had been trained in appraisal and that only 22% had not received any training. This response implies that most respondents have been exposed to the developmental appraisal system, which suggests a state of readiness. Respondents who have not received training cannot be expected to undergo appraisal. Such educators would also not be in a position to assess the significance of this process.

Table 4.7 also shows that 72% of the respondents have been appraised and that 28% have not undergone appraisal. This suggests that the respondents who had been appraised are equipped to provide valuable opinions on the appraisal system.

#### 4.4 THE VALUE OF DEVELOPMENT APPRAISAL

In this part of the study, teachers were interviewed in order to determine their perceptions about the value of appraisal and the reasons for being appraised.

Table 4.8 Value of development appraisal

Items		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	TOTAL
It can contribute to team building at school	F	44	13	2	4	2	<b>65</b>
	%	68	20	3	6	3	<b>100</b>
It can promote professional development	F	51	10	2	1	1	<b>65</b>
	%	78	15	3	2	2	<b>100</b>
It can promote the quality of education	F	46	10	5	2	2	<b>65</b>
	%	71	15	8	3	3	<b>100</b>
It can improve classroom activity	F	42	15	4	2	2	<b>65</b>
	%	65	23	6	3	3	<b>100</b>
It can improve examination results	F	43	10	4	6	2	<b>65</b>
	%	67	15	6	9	3	<b>100</b>
It is just a means for record purpose	F	18	10	2	19	16	<b>65</b>
	%	28	15	3	29	25	<b>100</b>
It can cause conflict in the work place	F	26	2	2	30	5	<b>65</b>
	%	40	3	3	46	8	<b>100</b>
It is a time-consuming process	F	56	6	1	1	1	<b>65</b>
	%	85	9	2	2	2	<b>100</b>
It should be accompanied by monetary incentives	F	21	7	2	17	18	<b>65</b>
	%	32	11	3	26	28	<b>100</b>

From table 4.8 it is noted that 68% of the respondents agreed strongly that appraisal contributes to team building, while 20% of the respondents agreed to the statement. The table furthermore shows that 3% were undecided about this issue; that 6.1 % disagreed; and that 3 % of the respondents strongly disagreed. The data reflects that most responses supported the value of appraisal in team building.

Table 4.8 also shows that 78% of the respondents strongly agreed that the development appraisal system can promote teacher development and that 15 % of the respondent was undecided about this issue. It is noted that 8% of the respondents agreed, while 3% disagreed and 3% of the respondents strongly disagreed. The responses indicate that most teachers had positive attitudes towards the appraisal system and its purpose.

Table 4.8 indicates that 46% of the respondents strongly agreed that appraisal can promote the quality of education; 23% of the respondents agreed; 8% were undecided, while 3% disagreed and another 3% disagreed strongly. The responses show that the 8% who were undecided have not been appraised. The table shows very strong support for appraisal as a means of improving the quality of education.

Table 4.8 reveals that 65% of the respondents agreed strongly that appraisal can improve classroom activity; 23% of the respondents agreed to this statement; 6 % were undecided; 3% disagreed and another 3% strongly disagreed.

The literature study shows that appraisal improves classroom activities. The majority of the respondents supported this. Table 4.10 shows that 67% of the respondents strongly agreed that appraisal can improve examination results; 15% agreed with this statement; 6% of the respondents were undecided; 9% disagreed, and only 2% strongly disagreed. The majority of responses imply that if appraisal is done on a regular basis, the students' performance will improve.

Table 4.8 furthermore shows that 28% of the respondents disagreed that appraisal is meant for record purposes; 15% of the respondents strongly disagreed with this statement; 3% agreed strongly, while another 3% agreed and 29% of the respondents

were undecided about this issue. The responses show that most educators attach value to the appraisal system and do not regard it as mere paper work.

Table 4.9 shows that 85 % of the respondents strongly agreed that appraisal can cause conflict in the workplace; 9% of the respondents agreed to this statement. Only 2% of the respondents were undecided about this issue while 2% disagreed and another 2% strongly disagreed. The implication is that if the assessment criteria are not agreed upon appraisal can cause conflict.

Table 4.8 furthermore shows that 86% of the respondents strongly agreed that appraisal is a time consuming process; 9.2% of the respondents agreed with this; 2% were undecided; a further 2% agreed and another 2% of the respondents strongly disagreed. The responses imply that appraisal is an additional task to schoolwork and that more teaching time is spent due to the long processes and the high volume of paper work.

#### 4.5 DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL PROCESS

In this section the preliminary steps in the appraisal process and the experiences of respondents in this regard are explored.

Table 4.9 Respondents pre- appraisal conference

Items		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	TOTAL
Criteria were clearly formulated	F	50	11	3	1	<b>65</b>
	%	76	17	5	2	<b>100</b>
Contextual factors were considered	F	36	15	10	4	<b>65</b>
	%	56	23	15	6	<b>100</b>
Pre-appraisal conference was transparent	F	41	15	3	6	<b>65</b>
	%	63	23	5	9	<b>100</b>
Procedures were clearly explained	F	25	20	10	10	<b>65</b>
	%	38	32	15	15	<b>100</b>
Core criteria were clearly set	F	26	30	5	4	<b>65</b>
	%	40	46	8	6	<b>100</b>

From table 4.9 it is noted that 76% of the respondents strongly agreed that criteria had been clearly formulated, while 17% of the respondents agreed to this statement. The data furthermore shows that 5% of the respondents disagreed with this, while 2% strongly disagreed. The responses suggest that appraisees were adequately involved in the pre-appraisal conference.

According to table 4.9, 55% of the respondents strongly agreed that contextual factors were taken into consideration; 23% of the respondents agreed with this; 15% disagreed and 6.2% of the respondents strongly disagreed. The responses signify that the appraisal process was not implemented but that consideration was taken of school factors that could either assist or be detrimental to the process of appraisal. The respondents who disagreed felt that appraisal disregarded contextual problems in schools.

Table 4.9 shows that 63% of the respondents strongly agreed that the pre-appraisal conference was transparent; 23 % of the respondents agreed; 5% disagreed and 9% of the respondents disagreed strongly. Although a large majority affirmed the openness of the appraisal process there were indications that some educators had reservations about the transparency of the pre-appraisal conference. It is possible that the outcome of the process was not fully explained and that some educators could anticipate negative consequences.

Table 4.9 shows that 38 % of the respondents strongly agreed that the procedures were clearly explained; 32% of the respondents agreed to this; 15% disagreed and 15% strongly disagreed. Among the respondents there were educators who had not undergone an appraisal process it is possible that the procedures were not well understood.

Table 4.9 shows that 40% of the respondents strongly agreed that the core criteria were clearly set; 46% of the respondents agreed to this; 6% agreed and only 8% strongly disagreed. The responses suggest that the core criteria are covered in the manual.

#### 4.6 CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

This section covers responses on the nature and importance of classroom observation as an aspect of appraisal.

Table 4.10 Classroom Observation

Items		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	TOTAL
It promotes adequate preparation by the teacher	F	32	24	2	7	<b>65</b>
	%	49	37	3	11	<b>100</b>
It monitors teacher competence	F	24	18	10	13	<b>65</b>
	%	37	28	15	20	<b>100</b>
It improves competence in teaching	F	45	15	3	2	<b>65</b>
	%	69	23	5	3	<b>100</b>
It helps to monitor school objectives	F	30	13	12	10	<b>65</b>
	%	46	20	19	15	<b>100</b>
Classroom management skills should be evaluated	F	30	12	12	11	<b>65</b>
	%	46	18	19	17	<b>100</b>
Learners in secondary school should form part of the panel	F	2	3	45	15	<b>65</b>
	%	3	5	69	23	<b>100</b>

Table 4.10 shows that 49% of the respondents strongly agreed that appraisal promotes adequate preparation by the teacher; 37% of the respondents agreed with this statement; 3% disagreed and 11 % of the respondents strongly disagreed. The responses imply that educators prepare thoroughly when they know that they are going to be appraised as opposed to other teaching activities.

Table 4.10 shows that 37% of the respondents strongly agreed that appraisal monitors the teacher's competence; 28% of the respondents agreed with this statement, while 15% disagreed and 20% strongly agreed. The data signify that appraisal monitors overall school effectiveness and evaluates educators' performance.

From table 4.10 it is noted that 69% of the respondents strongly agreed that appraisal improves confidence in teaching; 23% agreed, 5% disagreed and 3 % of the respondents strongly disagreed. The responses imply that appraisal identifies strengths and weaknesses for the purpose of helping teachers to improve their confidence in teaching.

Table 4.10 shows that 46% of the respondents strongly agreed that appraisal helps to monitor school objectives; 20% of the respondents agreed with this view, while 19% of the respondents disagreed and 15% of the respondents strongly disagreed. The data imply that both the appraisers and appraisees could make use of classroom observation to monitor school objectives.

Table 4.10 shows that 46% of the respondents strongly agreed that classroom management skills should be evaluated; 19% of the respondents agreed with this, while another 18.5% respondents disagreed and 17% strongly disagreed. The data imply that appraisal encourages teachers to achieve excellence in classroom.

Finally, table 4.10 shows that 3.1% of the respondents strongly disagreed that learners should form part of the panel; 5% disagreed with this suggestion, while 69% strongly agreed and 23% agreed. The data imply that most respondents view appraisal as professional development and that no learners should interfere.

#### 4.7 THE FOLLOW-UP PROGRAMME

Table 4.11 the follow up programme

Items		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	TOTAL
An adequate post appraisal conference	F	24	20	11	10	<b>65</b>
	%	37	31	17	15	<b>100</b>
The appraisee has an opportunity to explain teaching experience.	F	35	20	6	4	<b>65</b>
	%	54	31	9	6	<b>100</b>
Self- appraisal is done.	F	38	17	6	4	<b>65</b>
	%	59	26	9	6	<b>100</b>
The post appraisal conference is transparent.	F	28	21	7	9	<b>65</b>
	%	43	32	11	14	<b>100</b>
The appraisee receives constructively critical discussion.	F	20	10	15	20	<b>65</b>
	%	31	15	23	31	<b>100</b>

Table 4.11 shows that 37% of the respondents strongly agreed that an adequate post appraisal conference was held and 31 % of the respondents agree 17% of the respondents disagreed and 15% the respondents strongly disagree. The responses imply that evaluation with the appraisee was discussed and the difference between the appraiser and appraisee were resolved.

Table 4.11 it is noted that 54% of the respondents strongly agreed that appraisee has an opportunity to explain teaching experience, 31 % of the respondent agreed and 9% of the respondents disagreed and 6 % of the respondents strongly disagreed.

The responses imply that the atmosphere between appraiser and appraisee was relaxed. Table 4.11 shows that 59% of the respondents strongly agreed that self-appraisal was done, 26.15 respondents agreed and 9%ofthe respondents disagreed and 6% of the

respondents strongly disagreed. The responses signify that the appraisee had a chance to determine strengths and areas, which need development.

From table 4.11 it is noted that 43% of the respondents strongly agreed that post appraisal conference is helpful and 32% of the respondents agreed. Only 11 % of the respondents disagreed and 14% of the respondents strongly disagreed. The responses imply that post appraisal conference was the period of sharing information between appraiser and appraisee.

From table 4.11 it is noted that 46 % of the respondents strongly agreed that post appraisal conference is transparent and 35% of the respondents agreed while 11 % of the respondents disagreed and 8% of the respondents strongly disagreed. The data implies that appraisees were satisfactorily involved in the process.

Table 4.11 shows that 31 % of the respondents strongly agreed that appraisee received constructively critical discussion, 15% of the respondents agreed and 15% disagreed and 31 % strongly disagree. The data imply that the appraisers managed to achieve the aim of appraisal to develop educators.

#### **4.8 OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS**

In open-ended question, educators were required to give general comment on what benefits or obstacles do the development appraisal system have towards improving education. Their responses were ranked in order of frequency as follows:

- Factors that impede implementation of development appraisal in school

Table 4.12 Open ended questions

Factors	Frequency of factors	
	F	%
1. No obstacles	35	<b>54</b>
2. There is a huge gap between training and implementation	10	<b>15</b>
3. Lack of sufficient time to disseminate information from SDT to educators.	12	<b>19</b>
4. Educators tend to be more committed.	11	<b>17</b>
5. Limited time given to SDT to train educators have attributed to lack of knowledge to educators.	13	<b>20</b>
6. According to school management plan development appraisal clashes with examination period.	15	<b>23</b>

The respondents were asked to comment on the obstacles that hinders the implementation of the development appraisal, 54% stated that they had no obstacles, while 15% stated that the gap between training and implementation tend to be wide and 19% stated that lack of insufficient time could have attributed to lacking of knowledge to educators on what will be appraised and 17% stated that if development appraisal is conducted educators tend to be more committed which is time consuming, 20% respondents stated that the time they are given to train educators is so limited yet educators need thorough training, lastly 23% of the respondents stated that management plan shift development appraisal to the most hectic period of the year. The data implies that collaborative planning is necessary.

- Problems as you perceive as an appraisee

Problems	Frequency of problem	
	F	%
1. In Primary schools educators appraised even in learning areas they are not good at	26	<b>40</b>
2. In Secondary schools educators teaching special subjects have a problem in finding the peer.	7	<b>11</b>
3. The principles of development appraisal should be re-visited.	19	<b>30</b>
4. Development appraisal has potential to destroy relationship between management and educators.	31	<b>48</b>

In primary schools 40% of the respondents stated that they had been appraised even in the learning areas they are not good at and therefore they performed poorly and 11% respondents from secondary schools who teach special subjects stated that it was difficult to find a peer while 30% of the respondents stated that the principle of development appraisal should be re-visited and 48% stated that the process has potential to destroy the relationship between management and educators which could lead to confrontations. The data implies that breaking of relationship between managers and educators place at risk the success of development appraisal at schools.

- The benefits of development appraisal with regards to appraisee

Benefits	Frequency of benefits	
	F	%
1. It improves the standard and quality of teaching.	23	<b>36</b>
2. It improves the educator's professional skills.	15	<b>23</b>
3. It helps to identify educator's potentials for career development.	29	<b>45</b>

The respondents were asked to state their benefits from development appraisal, 36% respondents stated that the attitude towards appraisal was conducive to self-improvement in teaching and 23% of the respondents stated that their skills have improved and 45% stated that development appraisal helped them to know their potentials. The data implies that most respondents valued development appraisal.

- The benefits of development appraisal with regards to the school

Benefits	Frequency of benefits	
	F	%
1. It helps the school management team to diagnose school performance.	25	<b>38</b>
2. It promotes good results.	13	<b>20</b>
3. School objectives are easily monitored.	15	<b>23</b>
4. It leads to job satisfaction.	7	<b>11</b>

The respondents were asked to state the benefits of development appraisal for the school, 38% stated that it helps to diagnose school performance and 20% stated that it promotes good results while 23% stated that school objectives are easily monitored while 11% of the respondents believed that development appraisal leads to job satisfaction. The data implies that both educators and management are positive in the implementation of development appraisal in schools.

#### 4.9 CONCLUSION

This chapter outlined an empirical investigation that was conducted to determine the views of teachers regarding teacher appraisal as well as to determine, from the literature, the views of primary and secondary school teachers regarding performance appraisal.

The investigation indicated that developmental appraisal systems have been implemented in most schools; that teachers have adequate information with regard to teacher appraisal and that they are positive about appraisal. The respondents agreed that there were definite benefits to being appraised.

The next chapter provides the summary of the study and recommendations on how educators' views can be assisted in improving development appraisal.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION**

#### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

In this chapter a brief summary of the study is provided in order to present a global overview of the entire study. It furthermore presents major findings in the light of the literature review and provides the response of educators to the questionnaire on the development appraisal system as well as recommendations on how educators' views can be used to assist in improving the new model.

The conclusion will attempt to establish whether (and to what extent) the main research question has been answered.

#### **5.2 OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH**

In chapter 1 the problem was discussed and the research methodology was briefly explained. The emphasis centered on the fact that educator appraisal should contribute to the effective and professional development of educators. The problem statement, the methodology, the exposition and key concepts of the research were briefly discussed in this chapter.

Chapter 2 provided an overview of literature related to the topic of study. In accordance with the literature, appraisal was classified into summative and formative aspects. Although appraisal was defined in various ways, most definitions were in agreement about the nature of the developmental appraisal system.

The literature study was undertaken to determine what other authors had written about educator appraisal, the type of research that is available in this regard, and the implications that appraisal holds for educational managers. Apart from South Africa, educator appraisal systems in other countries (such as the United States of America, Israel, the UK and Botswana) were also dealt with in this chapter

In Chapter 3 an empirical investigation was conducted and the questionnaire, which served as a research tool, was distributed to the research sample.

Chapter 4 describes presentation and interpretation and how the empirical data was collected, grouped, analysed and interpreted. It emerged from the empirical investigation that most of the educators had a positive attitude towards the new model of educator appraisal.

## **5.3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

### **5.3.1 Findings from the Literature**

The development appraisal system was defined as a well-structured comprehensive professional plan designed to develop knowledge and skills in carrying out their roles effectively. This system was however implemented in a top-down bureaucratic way by departmental officials who were adequately trained. In some developing countries such as UK and USA (Chetty et al., 1993:18) to link development appraisal with promotion and pay led to teachers' resistance. In South Africa, teachers resented traditional and bureaucratic appraisal system and adopted development appraisal system but government has recently introduced Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS), which integrates development appraisal, performance appraisal and whole school evaluation. Performance appraisal will be accompanied by monetary incentives. It was found that, contrary to the expectations and anticipated views of educators that development appraisal have the following benefits:

- It brings effective class-room teaching.
- It provides the organisation with the relevant information to identify talented employees (cf. 2.6.1)
- It improves relationships, openness and sharing of ideas (cf.2.6.3).
- It provides consistent feedback to employees, which is critical to development.
- Employer can manage employees more easily if they have accurate knowledge of employees; performance (cf.2.6.1)

- It helps the managers in planning in-service training and professional development.(cf. 2.6.2)

There are also problems which could impede the implementation of development appraisal. The following problems have been identified:

- The development appraisal system is difficult to implement because educators had inadequate training and shortage of manuals in schools and lack of support from districts officials (The teacher/Mail and Guardian, 1999).
- Educators are held responsible for errors that may be the result of fault within the school.
- Fluctuating school enrolment result in redeployment of educators (cf.2.7.1).

## 5.4 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### 5.4.1 **Recommendation 1**

#### **Purpose of appraisal**

Schools must implement developmental appraisal in order to acknowledge positive aspects of the educator's performance. Appraisal should reveal the strengths and weaknesses of an educator so that areas in need of development can be given the necessary attention in order to boost educator's morale.

Teachers need continuous updating on the purpose of appraisal and for this reason there is a need for continuous workshops within the schools. There must be uniformity in the appraisal system, as designed in the development appraisal model. All parties must stick to the system designed by the Department of Education.

#### 5.4.2 **Recommendation 2**

##### **Staff development team (SDT)**

Each school must elect a staff development team. The role of the staff development team will be to initiate, co-ordinate and monitor appraisal in terms of the management plan.

#### 5.4.3 **Recommendation 3**

##### **Planning Appraisal**

During the induction period, all educators must take part in planning for appraisal because it requires sufficient time. Educators must know when and how appraisal is going to be conducted. All educators must be trained for appraisal.

#### 5.4.4 **Recommendation 4**

##### **Implementation process**

The implementation process should be democratic. The appraisee and the appraiser should meet and discuss the procedure, the structure and contents. The pre-appraisal conference is vital to the appraisal because it alleviates problems that might arise during the appraisal process.

School managers must give serious consideration to the guiding principle which informs the basic nature of the appraisal system and which makes the system operate effectively.

#### 5.4.5 **Recommendation 5**

##### **Feedback**

Feedback should be given at all times. The Education Department must intensify follow-up programmes on appraisal in order to avoid the collapse of the process. Professional relationships should be established to allow a climate that is conducive to feedback. The

appraiser should be diplomatic when awarding negative remarks because the aim is to develop and motivate educators.

#### **5.4.6 Recommendation 6**

##### **Democracy**

The appraisal process is collaborative. The democratic style of the appraisal panel must ensure that the appraisal is not autocratic. Democracy within the appraisal system allows for different views. An appraisee's performance must be examined in a balanced and fair manner. Decisions made within the context of appraisal need to be reported back to the educators consistently in order to ensure accountability within the appraisal panel.

#### **5.4.7 Recommendation 7**

##### **Transparency**

The guiding principles of the new development appraisal system also emphasises transparency. The first principle states that the process of appraisal should be open and transparent. Transparency prevents appraisal from being carried out in an unfair manner. All decisions need to be clearly justified and argued. Transparency enables educators to be confident about being appraised.

#### **5.4.8 Recommendation 8**

##### **Training centers for appraisal and appraisees**

The Department of Education should establish in-service training centers for appraisers and appraisees. It is unfair to be appraised by people who have not been trained or who have no knowledge of the subject that they teach. It is therefore very important for teachers to be sent for in-service training. Educators should attend a workshop for every change that is made to the appraisal system.

#### 5.4.9 Recommendation 9

Research needs to be conducted continuously on the issue of developmental appraisal in schools as research is able to improve the system of appraisal and to eliminate mistakes. Hardworking teachers should be credited to promote more hard work.

### 5.5 CONCLUSION

The new development system has been widely accepted by teachers as an appropriate replacement to the traditional system. The success of appraisal depends on the Department of Education, the district managers, circuit managers, school managers and all educators – as all have to work together towards the implementation of successful performance appraisal. The outcome of such commitment from everyone will significantly enhance educator appraisal, thereby ensuring the promotion of quality education in South Africa. Appraisal will help the principal to ensure that teachers know how to carry out assessment. Improvement in the performance of teachers will play a major role in boosting teachers' self-esteem. The implementation of the new model is in its initial stage and it appears that the process has not yet entered its second phase.

The government has succeeded in changing developmental appraisal from a system into a model that is integrated with performance appraisal and whole school evaluation. This promises to put an end to faulty teacher perceptions that reportedly view performance appraisal as a threat instead of a blessing.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adair, J 1983. Effective Leadership. London: Pan.
- Anderson, G C 1993. Managing Performance Appraisal Systems. Cambridge Mass: Blackwell Business.
- Anderson, R H and Snyder, K J 1993. Clinical Supervision: Coaching for Higher Performance. Lancaster: Technomin Publishing Company.
- Babbie, E 1989. The practice of social research. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Baker, J 1988. Causes of failure in performance appraisal and supervision: A guide to analysis and evaluation for human resources professionals. New York: Quorum.
- Bailey, K D 1982. Methods of social research. New York: The Free Press.
- Beare, H, Mullikan, R and Caldwell, B 1989. Creating and excellent school. London: Routledge.
- Bell, L and Day, C 1991. Managing the Professional Development of Teachers. Philadelphia: Open University.
- Bertram, C, Potheringham, R and Harley, K 2000. Curriculum studies: Learning Guide. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal.
- Blumberg, H H, Hare, A P, Kent, V and Davies, M F 1983. Small groups and social interaction. Volume 1, New York: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.

- Blunt, P 1983. Organisational Theory and Behaviour: An African perspective. London: Longman.
- Bollington, R, Hopkins, D and West, M 1990. An introduction to teacher appraisal. London: Cassel.
- Borg, W R L and Gall, M D 1989. Educational research: An introduction. London: Longman.
- Botswana (Republic) 1993. Report of the National Commission on Education. Gaborone: Government Printers.
- Bradley, H W et al. 1988. Analysis of questionnaire survey of teacher attitudes to appraisal. Cambridge: CIE.
- Carol Aubrey 1990. Consultancy in the United Kingdom. Durban University.
- Cascio, W F 1998. Managing human resources: productivity, quality of work life, profits. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Carr, C 1992. Smart training: The manager's guide to training for improved performance. New York McGraw-Hill.
- Chauke, R 2001. Educator appraisal as an aspect of educator: MEd implication for whole school evaluation. Med Mini-dissertation. Rand Afrikaans University.
- Chetty, D, Chisholm, L, Gardiner, M and Vinjeveld, P 1993. Rethinking teacher appraisal in South Africa: Policy options and strategies. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand..
- Cogan, L and Manion, L 1985. Research methods in education. London: Routledge.

- Cohen, L and Manion, L 1985. Research methods in education. London: Routledge.
- Colin Brock and Witold, L 1985. Cultural identify and Education Policy: British Library: Cataloguing.
- Conley, D T 1987. Critical attributes of effective evaluation system. Education leadership.
- Costello, R 1991. Government policy for the Professional Development of Teachers. Newton: Australia Council for Education Research Ltd.
- Darlington-Hammond, L, Wise & Pease, S R 1983. 'Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature'. Review of Educational Research. Volume 53: 285-328.
- Davidoff, S and Lazarus, S 1997. The learning school: an organizational approach. Kenwyn: Juta.
- Dean, J 1992. Inspecting and advertising: a handbook for inspections, advertisers and advisory teachers. London: Routledge.
- Deming, W E 1987. The merit system: the annual appraisal – destroyer of people. Paper presented at "A day with Dr W Edward Deming", University of Minnesota, St Paul, M.N.
- Dennison, W F and Shenton, K 1987. Challenges in educational management. London: Routledge.
- Department of Education, 1999. The developmental appraisal of educators. Pretoria: Government Printer.

- Dunham, J 1995. Developing effective school management: London: Harper and Row.
- Dyner, J 1979. Understanding and evaluation educational research. London: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Fidler, B and Cooper, R 1990. Staff appraisal in schools and colleges. Essex: Longman.
- Fletcher, J 1996. Conducting effective interviews. London: Clays.
- Gauteng Department of Education 1998. Whole school development a workshop for management team. Johannesburg: Government Printer.
- Gerber, P D, Nel, P S and van Dyk, P S 1998. Human resource management. Johannesburg: International Thomson publishing.
- Goldhammer, R, Anderson, R H and Krajewski, R H 1980. Clinical supervision. Special methods for the supervision of teachers. London: Haltrinehart and Winston.
- Helriegel, D and Slocum, J W 1992. Management. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Hewton, E and West, N 1992. Appraising primary head teachers. London: Open University Press.
- Hewton, E 1998. An approach to training for teacher and school management. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Humphrey, K 1992. Teacher self appraisal for development: reflections on a case study on a group of teachers. School organization.
- Jantjies, E M 1996. Performance based teacher appraisal: From judgment to development South African Journal of Education.

- Jones, J and Mathias, 1995. Training for appraisal and professional development. New Jersey: Cassell.
- Lawrence, E C, Vachon, M K, Leake, B H 1993. The Marginal Teacher: A step by step guide to fair procedures for identification and dismissal. California: Corwin Press.
- Legotlo, W M 1996. Some elements of research: Student handbook: Mmabato: University of North-West.
- Longnecker, C O, Sims, H P and Goia, D A 1987. “Behind the mask”. The Academy.
- Mestry, R 1999. The training and development of principals, in the management of educators. Johannesburg: Rand Afrikaans Universiteit
- Maxwell, E 1995. Appraisal gains at risk, a cash dries up. School organization.
- Meyer, H H 1991. ‘A solution to the performance appraisal feedback enigma’. Academy of Management Executive. 5(1): 68-76.
- Millman, J and Darling-Hammond, L 1990. The Handbook of Teacher evaluation. London: Sage Publication.
- Mogai, M J 2002. Educators’ perception towards performance appraisal. Mini-dissertation, University of North-West.
- Molly, H 1992. The appraisal of Head teachers: British Library.
- Murphy, K R, Jacko, R A and Anhalt, R L 1993. Nature and consequence of halo error. A critical analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology. (78: 218-225).

- Newton, E 1990. The appraisal interview. Philadelphia: University Press. Milton Keynes.
- Nevo, D 1995. School-based evaluation: a dialogue for school improvement. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Olivier, J E 1985. "Performance appraisal that fit" Personnel Journal.
- Poster, C and Poster, D 1993. Teacher appraisal: Training and implementation. London: Sage Publication.
- Pratt, K J and Stenning, R 1991. Managing staff appraisal in schools. Great Britain: Ipswich.
- Rantau, G S 2001. Teacher's perception on appraisal. Mini-dissertation. University of North-West.
- Robert, M 1982. Calling Education to account. Open University.
- Schumacher, S and McMillan, J H 1993. Research in Education a conceptual introduction. New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Schnetler, R S and Huber, V L 1990. Personnel and Human Resource Management. West Publishing.
- Sergiovanni, T J and Starratt, R J 1983. Supervision: Human perspective. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Shinkfield, A J and Stufflebeam, D 1995. Teacher evaluation: Guide to Effective Practice. London: Kluwer, Academic Publishers.

Simon, H and Elliot, J 1989. Rethinking appraisal and assessment. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Spangenberg, H 1994. Understanding and implementation performance management. Kenwyn: Juta.

Stenning, W R, Stenning, R 1984. The assessment of teacher's performance: some practical consideration in schools. Organisation and management abstract.

Stuffelbeam, D L 1988. The personal evaluation standards. London: Sage.

Turner, G and Cliff, P 1985. A first reviews and register of school and college-based teacher appraisal schemes. Milton Heynes: Open University Press.

Wragg, E C, Wikeley, F J, Wragg, C M and Haynes, G S 1996. Teacher appraisal observed. New York: Routledge.