

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

The Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) is the outcome of an agreement that was reached in the Education Labour Relations Council in 2003 (Resolution 8 of 2003). It integrates:

- the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) that came into being on the 28th July 1998, (Resolution 4 of 1998),
- the Performance Measurement System (PMS) that was agreed to on the 10th April 2003 (Resolution 1 of 2003), and
- Whole School Evaluation (WSE) (Chisholm, Hoadley, Kivulu, Brookes, Prinsloo, Kgobe, Mosia, Narsee and Rule, 2005:10).

In recent years there has been an increasing focus on the management of performance in South African schools. This concern with performance occurs at both organisational and individual levels. The basic purpose is to enhance and monitor the performance of schools. In addition to managing performance, the IQMS was seen at its inception as a system that could help in identifying the needs of teachers for support and development towards continued growth (ELRC, 2003:3). As there has also been a concern on the part of the Department of Education about organisational performance, this system also covers the monitoring of the overall effectiveness of schools and the promotion of accountability, which are the focus of WSE. WSE was a national policy to reinstate this supervision, and a monitoring mechanism which is now integrated within the IQMS.

The IQMS is part of a number of initiatives by the Education Ministry and the Department of Education to recognise and revise the nature of teacher education, and to transform teaching and learning to meet the demands of democratisation

and change. Chetty, Chisholm, Gardiner, Manam and Vinjevold (1993:3) argue that before 1994, the inspection system which was in place was characterised by bureaucratic control, and a regime of inspection that was autocratic, judgmental and summative.

This system was politically biased, arbitrary and open to abuse and corruption (Chetty *et al.*, 1993). This inspection was conducted by external supervisors from the Department of Education. Inspectors would come to schools without notifying even the principal in advance. Principals and teachers were often criticised in a destructive way, and the aim of Departmental officials was seen as fault-finding. Since 1994, different forms of inspection and evaluation strategies have been used, but educators were also unhappy about them.

Some of these strategies were criticised for being based on apartheid policies (Thurlow and Ramnarain, 2001:93). Profound dissatisfaction with the previous strategies on the part of teachers gave impetus to the reconceptualisation of this system. The need for such a reconceptualisation was endorsed by O'Day and Smith (1993), who argued for a systematic approach to reforms in the areas of teacher quality, development and monitoring. The IQMS then came into being and was to be implemented in 2004; however this did not happen, and teachers were just given their one percent monetary incentive (see page 6) for that year.

A range of structures is required for the implementation of the IQMS in each school:

- the Senior Management Team (SMT), that is, the Principal, Deputy Principal and Heads of Department;
- a Staff Development Team (SDT) which plans, oversees, co-ordinates and monitors the whole quality management process; and
- the Development Support Group (DSG), which for every teacher consists of his or her immediate senior and one peer of the teacher's choice (ELRC, 2003:8).

The IQMS combines three programmes:

- Developmental Appraisal (DA), which is the appraisal of individual teachers in a transparent manner with a view to determining areas of strength and weakness, and drawing up programmes for individual development.
- Performance Measurement (PM), which is the evaluation of individual teachers for the purpose of salary progression, grade progression, and affirmation of appointments, rewards and incentives.
- Whole School Evaluation (WSE), which is the evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the school, including the support provided by the district, school management, infrastructure and learning resources, as well as the quality of teaching and learning (ELRC, 2003:3; NDOE, 2000).

There are also various documents that form part of the IQMS: the Implementation Plan, the Instrument (which consists of performance standards for lesson observation and performance standards evaluating aspects that fall outside the classroom), as well as various related forms.

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

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

In designing the IQMS, the Department of Education sought to acknowledge

the difference between judgmental and developmental approaches to quality assurance in schools. The following table clearly illustrates these differences:

Table 1: The difference between judgmental and developmental approaches to quality assurance in schools

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

(Department of Education: 2002)

One of the guiding principles of the IQMS is to provide support for teachers' continued professional growth, thus there can be no sanctions against a teacher in respect of his/her performance before meaningful opportunities are provided for development (IQMS Manuals 1-2). However, the researcher's personal observation concerning the IQMS is that although this system might be well-intentioned, it requires re-visiting in certain areas such as the implementation process (advocacy, training and planning). The absence of effective capacity for implementation within the Department also appears to present obstacles to the success of the system. A strong implementation process needs to be put in place to deal with the problem. It is also apparent that the tool for measuring performance in the classroom must be applied at the same time as the WSE so that the teachers who uplift the standard of the school outside of the classroom are identified and their performance measured. This is because teachers tend otherwise to focus on classroom activities only,

ignoring the fact that the learner should be developed as a whole person, for example, through extra-mural activities.

The IQMS is intended to enable the development of the teacher as well as measuring the teacher's performance (ELRC, 2003:4). However, there are teachers who have received little or no training in the IQMS, and they are still struggling with the implementation of the system. Another huge problem faced by many teachers is the work overload that has been added by the IQMS, partly because they have to be evaluated in all the learning areas that they teach (Chisholm *et al.*, 2005a). In many schools there are often insufficient teachers for all the learning areas taught. As a result, commercial subjects may be taught by History teachers, for example. A question arises: How and where is a History teacher to be developed to enable him/her to teach Commercial subjects like Accounting, Business Economics and Economics? Is it fair to appraise teachers' performance in learning areas and subjects for which they have not been trained? Thus the IQMS is fraught with many obstacles that will hamper the effectiveness of the system. In other words, the Department of Education should do more to investigate and develop solutions for the problems that educators experience, in addition to measuring their performance.

According to de Clercq (2008:1), the teacher component of the IQMS makes problematic assumptions about teacher quality and improvement in South African schools. She further says that the current approach to teacher monitoring and development is inadequate, and that there is a need for a professional development plan which involves teachers and is supported by a high quality professional development staff. This is because one of the most problematic issues in the IQMS is the lack of capacity for educator monitoring, advocacy, training and moderation, and the system thus requires authoritative evaluators (Senior Management Team members) who are capable of making sound judgments.

The IQMS acknowledges, but is also still prone to, subjectivity; therefore it might happen sometimes that the IQMS structure unfairly disadvantages a particular teacher, thus de-legitimising the system. In addition, since the senior management of the school in South Africa is usually dominated by men, there is a possibility

of sexual harassment and exploitation of female teachers who are junior colleagues (De Clercq, 2008:17).

Another challenge that needs attention is salary and grade progression. The one percent monetary incentive has the capacity to change the outcome of the IQMS because many teachers will not genuinely evaluate themselves for development, but are more likely to focus on money (this may open the way to manipulation and fabrication). Thus, in order to qualify for progression, post level 1 teachers (teachers and senior teachers) need to get 56 points for salary progression and 78 points grade progression. Post level 2 teachers (Education Specialists and Heads of Department) must get 84 points and 118 points respectively, and post level 3 and 4 teachers (Principals and Deputy Principals) have to earn 104 points for salary progression and 146 points for grade progression (IQMS Manual for Educators: 6). This system focus on quantitative, “measurable” point-based ratings, with different status and earning levels requiring ever-higher ratings, is bound to result in educators focusing on the same targets, and giving themselves favourable points so that they qualify for progression. A further problem is that the IQMS criteria tend to encourage teachers to focus exclusively on classroom activities, ignoring the development of the skills and talents of learners outside the classroom, through extra-mural activities (De Clercq, 2008: 7).

Several aspects of the IQMS in the Butterworth District do not seem to be working. For example, since 2004 WSE is supposed to have been carried out in schools by the external supervisors from the district office and provincial office, but as of now there has been no such evaluation, although this is the end of the seventh year of implementation. There have also been no support and development in the district, (i.e. workshops) to assist teachers to improve in their areas of weakness. This raises questions as to the workability of the system.

In the researcher’s capacity as an IQMS co-coordinator and as a Site Steward, her responsibility at school includes facilitating the implementation of the IQMS. This study will offer her useful insights as to how teachers construct the IQMS.

In summary, the IQMS appears to have shortcomings, possibly both in the actual policy itself and in terms of obstacles to effective implementation such as:

- Work overload. The IQMS requires considerable meeting time, administration, and more documents to be filled.
- The use of IQMS for grade and salary progression could lead to manipulation and unfairness as teachers may not evaluate themselves authentically because of the direct connection between quantified, earned points and money.
- The possibility of and scope for subjectivity on the part of all participants.
- The possibility of sexual harassment or exploitation by senior managers.
- There have been criticisms of insufficient training for teachers.
- Apparent lack of capacity on the part of district officials.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The issue of teacher performance evaluation and appraisal has increasingly been the focus in South African schools. At the end of the apartheid era, there was, according to Chetty *et al.* (1993:2), “an urgent need to move away from the summative, authoritarian practices ...” of that era. Different inspection and evaluation strategies have been used before and after 1994, but teachers have not been satisfied with either the earlier or the later systems. Teachers needed a system that would solve the problems that had been experienced with all the previous strategies.

In 2003 the ELRC, which included the representatives of the organised teaching profession in South Africa, agreed to the IQMS. At its introduction, it was seen to be a system which would allow teachers to play a vital role in assessing their own progress, and which would integrate this with the necessary evaluation strategy for

the professional development of teachers and the monitoring of quality of teaching and learning in schools.

However, the IQMS does not seem to be working as it should. At the end of this study, late in 2011 and more than seven years since the introduction of the IQMS, there is not a single school in the Butterworth district that has been evaluated for the WSE, although this is supposed to be done in a three- or five-year cycle by the district officials. As far as it is possible to judge from personal experience, many teachers do not seem to understand the IQMS fully, and this has created new problems and tensions (see de Clercq, 2008:8). This implies that there could still be a serious problem as far as the performance of teachers and schools is concerned.

1.3 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The IQMS was seen by the organised teaching profession (the unions) and the Department of Education as the catalyst needed to bring about much-needed improvements in the education system. The purpose of the study is to investigate the IQMS phenomenon, chiefly from the point of view of the people who have to implement it: teachers, principals and district officials – and to attempt to draw lessons from their experiences.

This case study should contribute to the debate around the IQMS – whether the IQMS should be modified, or indeed whether there is a need for a different sort of appraisal and evaluation system to improve the quality of education in South Africa.

1.4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

To investigate:

- how teachers and principals understand the rationale and requirements of the IQMS, and to what extent they are in accord with these.

- to what extent the support and development aspects of the system meet teachers' needs.
- to identify possible lessons that may emerge from the teachers' experiences of and responses to the IQMS.

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study will be guided by the following research question and sub-questions:

Main question:

What is the experience of the teachers, principals and district officials in attempting to implement the IQMS?

Sub-questions:

- What are the teachers' and principals' understandings and perceptions of the instruments and mechanisms used to monitor and manage their performance?
- To what extent does the IQMS meet the needs of teachers for support and development?
- What lessons may be learnt from the teachers' experience of the IQMS and its implementation?

1.6 RATIONALE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The rationale of the study is that the advent of the IQMS has brought into being areas which are not yet thoroughly researched in South Africa, and has brought to light issues that can be interrogated with a view to generating improvement in the quality of teaching and learning in South Africa. Some shortcomings already seem

to have emerged in the IQMS policy and its implementation, but these have not yet been systematically studied in a range of contexts. The current study also suggests directions for further research in this area.

This study is significant for several reasons. First, the study will help to shed light on the appropriateness of the IQMS as a quality assurance system from the perspective of the schools and teachers. Some systems seem to be brought into schools without the benefit of extensive prior testing or verification.

Although it is focused on only one Eastern Cape district, this study will possibly help in determining how effective or ineffective the IQMS may be across South African schools. Secondly, it could make for better understanding and relationships between senior management and teachers in schools. Thirdly, the study is significant for readers in the state sector (schools and education), education non-governmental organisations, and the community of scholarship interested in quality management and the professional development of teachers.

1.7 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The proposed research is a case study of three different schools in the Butterworth district: a Primary School (PS) and a Junior Secondary School (JSS) – both in the General Education and Training (GET) Band – and a Senior Secondary School (SSS) in the Further Education and Training (FET) Band. The study also involved interviewing an official in the local District Office. The researcher is well acquainted with the relevant structures, people and issues in this district. She chose this district because she is working in it and it was thus economical to travel to schools within the same area. This saved both travelling costs and time.

Although the researcher does not see these schools as exceptional, she is not attempting to generalise beyond these schools or to make generalised propositions about South African schools. The research is based on in-depth interviews with a small and purposively selected sample of participants representing three groups:

teachers (the researcher interviewed three teachers from each of the three schools who had direct experience of the phenomenon being studied); the principals of the three schools, and the local district official concerned with the implementation of the IQMS.

1.8 DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

Quality Assurance: This involves measuring and evaluating performance to set standards, reporting results and taking appropriate action to deal with deviation (Ireland, 1991: CL-7).

Attitude is a learned predisposition to respond in a consistent manner with respect to a given object, or to act negatively or positively towards something (Kinick and Kreitner, 2006:27). In this study attitude means participants' feelings towards the IQMS.

Whole School Evaluation: A national policy to reinstate external supervision and monitoring mechanisms at school level. The policy was designed to help supervisors reach conclusions on the overall performance of the school, using agreed national criteria. The policy indicates ways in which very good schools should be recognised, and under-performing schools supported. WSE encapsulates school self-evaluation as well as external evaluation (Whole School Evaluation Policy, Vol.433, no.22512).

Developmental Appraisal (DA): Means judging the professional performance of the educator in order to facilitate personal and professional development in improving the quality of teaching practice in education management (Developmental Appraisal Document 3).

1.9 SUMMARY

This chapter introduced and highlighted the background of the study. The role of the Department of Education in involving other stakeholders in decision-making on the quality assurance system that is in place (the IQMS). This chapter also covers the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the research objectives, the research questions, the significance of the study, delimitation of the study and definitions of key terms.

The next chapter covers a literature study focused on performance management and appraisal and evaluation systems in general, and the performance measurement and appraisal system in South African schools. It will also involve the impact of the IQMS on teachers and principals.

CHAPTER 2:

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter reviews the concept of performance appraisal and its purposes in the context of teacher transformation, performance measurement and its rationale, and whole school evaluation. It also discusses the interface between teachers, professionalism and the IQMS.

The chapter goes on to present perspectives from the literature that relate to the theoretical underpinnings of teacher performance appraisal systems elsewhere, with critical reflections about training and implementation. It further explores the tensions and challenges in the IQMS as it has been designed, based on the “fundamental belief” that it:

- determines competences;
- assesses strengths and areas for development;
- provides support and opportunities for development to assure continued growth;
- promotes accountability; and monitors the institution’s overall effectiveness (ELRC, 2003).

2.2 THE ORIGIN OF THE IQMS AND TEACHER TRANSFORMATION

In 1996, the new Constitution of South Africa (Republic of South Africa, 1996) recognised the need for transformation and made it a legal imperative. The Policy Framework for Education and Training of the African National Congress (ANC, 1994) states that: “The reconstruction of education and training stands or falls with the morale, commitment and capacity of the national body of teachers and trainers.”

Within this broad context of transformation, according to Thurlow and Ramnarain (2001:1), the National Department of Education has refocused the vision and direction of the South African education system through a series of policy initiatives. One of these policies is the IQMS. The IQMS was agreed on by the Department of Education and teacher unions for the purpose of addressing some problems in the previous educator monitoring, inspection and evaluation system.

The research studies referred to by Taylor and Vinjevold (1999:13), as well as the National Department of Education (cited in de Clercq, 2008:7), indicated that one reason behind the expressed need for transformation was that teacher performance in South African schools remained low, and had contributed significantly to the poor learner results of the last decades. Chetty *et al.* (1993:23) on the other hand, argued that there was a need to move away from a summative, judgemental and authoritarian evaluation strategy which was largely inspectorial and bureaucratic, rather than promoting professional development, and that teachers attempted to overturn the negative, servile role that was constructed for and imposed upon them. According to Wadvalla (2005:38), teachers were not happy about the inspectorial and bureaucratic evaluation system which was in place, and they felt that there was a need for another instrument that would measure their performance through some kind of developmental appraisal.

Samuel (2008:16) argues that teachers commonly reject the performance measurement systems that are imposed by the Department of Education to measure their performance. He further states that the teacher evaluation systems that were in place in South Africa before 1994 were often seen as a device to control or even punish teachers. These systems were rejected by teachers, but the new system was initially accepted as good and transparent. It was believed that the IQMS would address many of the problems of the previous teacher monitoring and appraisal systems (de Clercq, 2008:13). Chetty *et al.* (1993:16) point out that “appraisal *per se*” was not rejected by the majority of teachers; they wanted appraisal to be part of their professional development, but not a mechanism for enforcing control. These systems were intended to improve the quality of teaching and learning through the

use of a legislative process. Gardiner (2008:22) maintains that the IQMS was seen as a victory for teachers, as it meant that they would not have to submit themselves to three different classroom evaluations for different purposes.

There is a perception that SADTU always objects to initiatives aimed at strengthening the education system in order to shield its members from being accountable. On the contrary, SADTU's *Educator's Voice* (2008:2) contends that there can be no job without supervision or evaluation. Their objection is that over ten years they have been exposed to three different systems: DAS, which was soon thrown out; Kader Asmal's WSE, which was also discarded in time; and the IQMS, negotiated with unions – now there is talk of the National Education Evaluation and Development Unit (NEEDU), which was due to start operating in 2009. It is increasingly evident that many directives from the central authorities of the National Education Department frame teachers as agents to be changed (Soudien, 2004:6).

From this assertion it is clear that teachers are at times constructed as “villains” who are not able to realise adequately the goals of a new education system (Samuel, 2008:17). This may seem surprising – why would teachers, particularly when organised as a union, act against their own interests? However, teachers understand how ideology and hegemony work – that the language and thought processes of dominant groups in society become the way of thinking of the dominated, so that the latter consent to their own disempowerment, and come to be partners in their own domination.

2.3 THE IMPORTANCE OF THE IQMS

Teachers actually wanted a uniform, national system of appraisal, developed constructively, which was open and equitable, school-based, and aimed at improving the quality of teaching and learning, most especially in the most disadvantaged schools (Biputh 2008:94). The IQMS was seen by teachers as a system that would help to identify the specific needs of teachers, schools and district offices for support

and development (ELRC, 2003:7). In addition, this IQMS would encourage teachers to reflect on their own practice, through which they can motivate learners more effectively to overcome the difficult obstacles which militate against learning and achievement (de Clercq, 2008:9).

When comparing the teacher developmental appraisal system in South Africa with other countries, we should note that Bartlett (2000:24) states that systems of teacher appraisal in Anglophone countries (such as United Kingdom (UK), United States of America (USA), Australia, New Zealand and Botswana) were debated and reviewed on the grounds that a carefully crafted approach was needed to yield positive results in an era of change. He further points out that within that period of debate, the general view of teaching in the USA up to the 1970's was that teachers had to transmit predetermined knowledge to learners through standardised, prescribed teaching procedures and methods. Teachers were treated much as if they were workers, who had to deliver 'teacher-proof' curricular content with specified syllabi and textbooks, and their performance was measured against that system.

2.4 PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING

The introduction of appraisal in education has been characterised by a concern for improved quality, a greater degree of accountability and more efficiency, as well as a move to develop teachers as professionals. In this context, appraisal is viewed as a form of in-service professional development, and as a means of identifying the weaknesses and needs of teachers for improvement in the quality of teaching and learning. It is not synonymous with performance evaluation.

Poster and Poster (1993:1) maintain that performance *evaluation* is a means of promoting, through the use of certain evaluative techniques and procedures focused on teacher performance, the organisation's ability to accomplish its mission of maintaining or improving what it provides. Van der Bank (2003:3) defines performance *appraisal* as a formative, developmental, negotiated, continuous and

systematic process intended to help individual teachers with their professional development and career planning.

Referring to schools, Sergiovani and Starrat (1993:38) define performance appraisal as a process designed to help teachers and supervisors to learn more about their practice; to be better able to use their knowledge and skills to better serve parents and schools; and to make the school a more effective learning community. Middlewood (1997:193) asserts that performance appraisal makes for professional satisfaction, helps teachers to fulfil professional obligations to learners and enables teachers to know how they are performing.

2.5 PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT (PM) FOR PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCY

Performance measurement focuses on improving the ability of employees to perform their roles through the provision of training and self-development opportunities. It involves the collection of data to determine the extent to which teachers have achieved the minimum acceptable levels of competence, or prescribed standards of performance (Duke and Stiggins, 1991:116). Guthrie and Reed (1986:34) state that the data may be used for awarding tenure to probationary teachers, identifying candidates for promotion to higher responsibility; improving individuals' motivation; dismissing or demoting the incompetent as well as rationalising deployment and re-deploying employees.

At the organisational level, performance measurement (PM) is designed to ensure credibility and uniformity in performance evaluation (Jantjies, 1996:17), but PM may also be linked to whole school improvement. The literature on teacher performance distinctly illustrates that when teachers and school management work jointly in integrating performance measurement processes for professional growth with school improvement efforts, both individuals and institutions improve (Iwanicki, 1991:160). For this to happen, both the appraisee and the appraiser need to establish a

common understanding of what is expected of each other. They both have to come to a common understanding regarding performance, capabilities and needs.

The IQMS process was designed by the Department of Education and teacher unions to achieve the best possible results for teachers, schools and ultimately learners, and its particular procedures would, it was assumed, be highly effective for improving teaching and learning. It was designed in such a way that every teacher should attain a certain number of points to qualify for grade and progression. The IQMS is not an isolated entity or event; it is meant to be part of the school daily routine, and therefore each teacher's duty must be clearly defined.

Milkovich and Boudreau (1988:89) assert that if an employee understands his or her job description well and is working under reasonable conditions, he or she will be likely to perform well. They also argue for the importance of performance management in building an effective and efficient organisation in the following ways:

- Performance improvement: Feedback about performance offers the employee, management and the human resources specialist the opportunity to take the appropriate steps to improve performance.
- Remuneration adjustments: Performance appraisal helps management to decide which employees qualify for salary adjustments.
- Placement decisions: Promotions, transfers and demotions are based on performance or expected performance. Promotion is often a reward for good performance.
- Training: Poor performance may indicate the need for training. Good performance indicates potential that should be developed further.
- Career planning: Feedback about performance provides important guidelines for specific career directions that can be investigated.
- Indication of shortcomings in the staff provisioning process: Performance

measurement can be a good indication of how effective the employment practice of the organisation is.

- Correcting inaccurate information: Poor performance may indicate erroneous job analysis information, or a faulty human resources management information system. If erroneous information is used to support decisions, wrong appointments and training may follow.

From these assertions it is clear that PM must be linked to the goals of the organisation, for example, good Grade 9 and 12 results in schools. However, it must also be emphasized that employees' needs must be taken into account; they must be able to communicate how they feel about their work, and feedback must be provided for their performance. Wadvalla (2005:84) argues that teachers are frustrated and worried by the high failure rate, poor achievement and errant behaviour of learners, and they ask themselves questions about how can they begin to know whether they are improving or not.

There is a common view emerging from the reviewed literature that the developmental purpose of PM must not be neglected in education because teaching seems to be a complex, multifaceted and multilayered activity in which all the necessary skills and professional knowledge cannot be mastered in a few years of initial training (Biputh, 2008:76).

In summary, it should be clear that the design of a PM system is of critical importance in managing and improving overall school performance. No matter how well the system has been designed, however, if it is poorly implemented, it is doomed to fail.

2.6 WHOLE SCHOOL EVALUATIONS (WSE)

WSE is a collaborative process of making judgments based on evidence of the holistic performance of a school measured against agreed national criteria

(*Government Gazette*, 2001:13). It is understood that external evaluation becomes more focused and effective where the preparation includes self-evaluation carried out periodically by the school, and where the outcomes or findings are then assimilated into a continuous annual cycle for school improvement planning. According to the ELRC (2003:9), WSE should take place in a cycle of three to five years, and be conducted by the district officials. These officials are required to have a thorough knowledge and understanding of the process and the criteria used for passing judgment before they attempt to do school evaluation.

According to the researcher's own knowledge and experience, no official from the provincial office has visited the schools in the Butterworth district for the purpose of WSE, which clearly indicates the poor implementation of the system.

2.7 THE IQMS, THE TEACHER AND PROFESSIONALISM

As mentioned above, teachers actually wanted a uniform, constructive, open and equitable system of appraisal to improve the quality of teaching and learning in schools. For the Department of Education and also for teachers, the main objective is to constantly improve the quality of learning and teaching, and for this teachers are all accountable to the wider community (ELRC 2003:14).

The state's challenge, however, is a much more complex one which contains a multiplicity of problems in education. These are spelt out in White Paper 3 (DoE, 1997:14) as follows:

- Promoting equity of access and fair chances of success to all, while eradicating all forms of unfair discrimination and advancing redress for past inequities.
- Meeting, through well-planned and co-ordinated teaching, learning and research programmes, national development needs for a growing economy operating in a global environment.

- Supporting a democratic ethos and a culture of human rights.
- Contributing to the advancement of all forms of knowledge and scholarship, and in particular addressing the diverse problems and demands of the local, national, Southern African contexts and upholding rigorous standards of academic quality.

These challenges, which may at times pull the state in different, even opposing directions, in fact form the background to the IQMS. The IQMS was accepted by teachers as a system that would help to identify their specific needs for support and development (ELRC, 2003:4) and at the same time help them to respond to greater demands for accountability. As SADTU's mouthpiece, *The Educator's Voice* (2009:2) stated, teachers need, as a profession, a better functioning and developmental evaluation system.

South African teachers during the 1970's and 80's were treated as workers who had to deliver a curricular content based on a specified syllabus and textbooks. Inspectors would come to evaluate teachers on the content taught without being notified in advance, and no feedback would follow. By contrast, the IQMS purports to encourage teachers to reflect on their own practices and on what they are supposed to "deliver", and how they can motivate learners more effectively to overcome the difficult obstacles which militate against learning and achievement in schools (de Clercq, 2008:9).

Milkovich and Boudreau (1988:187) assert that performance appraisal helps to satisfy the needs of both employer and employee by means of the following:

- Offering employees the opportunity to indicate the level and direction of their ambition
- Identifying areas where specific training is needed
- Offering managers the opportunity to show an interest in employee development

- Encouraging and recognising employees who have tried hard to perform well
- Communicating dissatisfaction concerning employee performance that is unacceptable to the employer.

Bartlett (2000:56) agrees that teacher performance appraisal is set to be a call for greater accountability, management and control of teachers' work, and an essential ingredient of school development which provides a framework to identify teacher's strengths and weaknesses. It is understood that no two teachers are identical in their experiences, personalities, training, competences and interpretations of their role, but the appraisal and measurement of performance will help teachers to reach the same basic level of capacity for effective learning and teaching. That is why teacher unions, SADTU in particular, insisted that teachers should support a performance appraisal and measurement system, and that senior management should adopt a developmental attitude in providing support to teachers, in line with their identified areas of development (*The Educator's Voice*, 2005:7).

Bartlett points out (2000:16) that schools in other countries such as Scotland and New Zealand develop their own internal systems of teacher appraisal which encourage a self-critical and self-developing approach for teachers and for school improvement (Bartlett, 2000:65; Cardno and Piggot-Irvine, 1997:78). This implies that teachers themselves are able to do development introspection as to their weakness and strong points.

This study concludes that there are reasons for the design of the IQMS other than the belief that most teachers do not behave as professionals and are not committed to their work. According to Steyn and Van Wyk (1999:32), there is a perception abroad that some teachers are lazy, unprofessional, uncommitted and only come to school to receive their salaries at the end of the month. They further state that professionalism and commitment work hand-in-hand for the better performance of the educational organisation. Teacher professionalism means that a wide range of knowledge, skills, attitudes, values and procedures are employed and kept in balance by teachers in the process of teaching (Darling-Hammond, 2005:67),

and therefore it demands *professional* accountability and responsibility, not just bureaucratic or market accountability.

The National Policy on Teacher Supply, Utilisation and Development (1996) entails that, in addition to the concepts, knowledge, skills and judgment required for professional practice, professionalism incorporates values and ethical commitment. The commitments of teachers, therefore, as members of a profession, should be shaped in terms of the ideals of the profession.

Talbert and McLaughlin (1994:9) in the same vein analyse teacher commitment according to the conditions identified with professionalism, where strong teacher communities promote shared norms of practice and enhance teachers' professional commitments. Being exemplary as to the ideals of the profession indicates a character commitment which is destined to satisfy the needs of the teaching and learning situation (*ibid.*)

Quality education can only happen when teachers are totally committed, and when they are empowered; and teacher empowerment is based on the assumption that employees must feel good and be proud of what they are doing (Fraizier, 1997:92). Unfortunately there is much in the post-apartheid situation and under-resourced schools that militates against teachers having such feelings. For instance, Taylor and Vinjevold (1999:85) show how unsatisfactory are the professional qualifications of many teachers, as well as their mastery of subject knowledge and pedagogical knowledge. de Clercq (2008:58) points out that learners and their circumstances also contribute to poor results, and these results may influence teachers' values and attitudes towards any form of performance monitoring. This defensiveness is worsened by the extensive challenges posed by the ambitious educational policies and regulations of the post-apartheid government.

It is evident that teachers are faced with challenges like unhealthy working conditions, insufficient resources (teaching and learning material), errant behaviour of learners, low salaries and the confusion that has been brought by Outcomes-Based Education (OBE), which has demotivated them (Chisholm and

Hoadley, 2005:6). Parker and Harley (1998:28) argue that OBE and the introduction of Curriculum 2005 represented a major change in teachers' work status, identity and demands. Therefore, most teachers, especially those from disadvantaged schools, still struggle to implement the National Curriculum Statement (NCS), the assessment protocol and alternative forms of discipline to corporal punishment.

Chisholm *et al.* (2005:38) provide another contributing factor that hampers development in education: that some teachers who were treated as workers, and acted for years as workers transmitting a "teacher-proof curriculum", struggle to negotiate the above-mentioned challenges effectively. For its part, SADTU argues (*The Educator's Voice*, 2005:5), "It is unfair to hold teachers accountable for poor learner achievement, and for that reason teachers resist this formal appraisal process (and more specifically the classroom visits associated with it), which they see as inappropriate to their work circumstances, and more about accountability than development."

There are situations that make teachers feel neglected by their employers and that their voices are not heard, as they feel that their working conditions are not conducive to effective teaching. This is why Jacobsen *et al.* (1981:34) point out that the teachers deserve better working conditions and more prestige.

Studies by Taylor and Vinjevold (1999; 2005:28) have shown how unsatisfactory the professional qualifications of many teachers are, as well as their poor mastery of subject knowledge and pedagogical knowledge. Evidence shows that a poor culture of teaching and learning subsists today in the majority of poorly functioning schools, and that South African learners' achievements are amongst the lowest in the world (Fleisch, 2008:23).

Thus, the IQMS was set in place to help address the problems of low learner achievement in South African schools. If the system is well-planned and implemented, undoubtedly it should benefit the school organisation for the better achievement of learners, as well as the personal and professional development of teachers. It will also ensure greater accountability, identify and co-ordinate

staff development needs, and channel individual effort into organisational goals.

2.8 TEACHER APPRAISAL SYSTEMS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM (UK)

Appraisal systems in developed countries such as the UK have been well documented, as they have been in existence for a long time and are under constant review. A study of such a system may provide useful insights as to what influenced their introduction and what challenges were encountered during implementation. Furthermore, it can provide a valuable conceptualisation of teacher appraisal and should serve as a point of comparison for understanding the current IQMS in South Africa, and also possibly offer some lessons learnt from experience for future practice and policy. The history of the development of the appraisal system in the UK is particularly instructive as it has to some extent served as a model for the IQMS.

In the UK, the early approach of teacher evaluation was based on the “inspectorial model”. According to Thompson (1990:10), the original approach to “appraisal” in England was a confidential report by an inspector. The teacher did not have access to such a report. However, the purpose and processes of school inspection in the UK have changed over time. Since the early 1990’s, the teacher appraisal system has shifted away from the inspectorial model to an almost professional development model and assessment for performance-related pay.

In 1976, James Callaghan (Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 1976 to 1979 and Leader of the Labour Party) made his famous Ruskin College speech which criticised the school curriculum as being inappropriate for the last quarter of the twentieth century. He called for the school curriculum to come under public scrutiny, and in order for this to take place, teachers had to become more accountable to interest groups outside the school, including parents and industrialists. Thus the pressure for formal teacher appraisal in Great Britain came into being. This no doubt roused the ire of teachers and their unions (Bell, 1988:3).

In 1977 Shirley Williams, the Labour Party Secretary of State for Education, argued in her Green Paper that if the education service was to give value for money, then a high priority had to be given to the establishment of standard procedures of advice, and where necessary, warning, to underperforming teachers. In 1983, Sir Keith Joseph, the Conservative Party Secretary of the State for Education under Margaret Thatcher, insisted that those managing schools had a clear responsibility to establish a policy for staff development based on the assessment of every teacher's performance. In 1986, Kenneth Baker, the then-secretary of State for Education, passed his new Education Act through Parliament which agreed to a national framework for the appraisal of education (Bell, 1988:4).

Over the years there have been a large number of appraisal systems devised by Local Education Authorities (LEAs), even more systems devised by individual schools influenced by management development training, and others that have been part of official pilot studies (Bollington, Hopkins and West, 1993:2; Bell, 1988:8). These various influences combined to create a case for teacher appraisal. The movement towards appraisal was given further impetus when the Department of Education and Science (DES) funded a study carried out by the Suffolk LEA. This study made recommendations on those principles and processes that appraisal should ideally encompass (Bollington, Hopkins and West, 1993:3). During the period 1987 to 1989, the DES funded the School Teacher Appraisal Pilot Study, piloting teacher appraisal in six LEAs. The outcome of this pilot was a National Framework for Appraisal, which in 1989 proposed the introduction of a national appraisal system concerned with the professional development of teachers and the good professional management of schools (Newton, 2002:29; Turner and Clift, 1988:19).

This began with awareness-raising of the aims, processes and links with school development plans. Teachers thereafter engaged in broad self-evaluation using job descriptions. This process afforded teachers an opportunity to introspect concerning their practices. After self-evaluation, appraisers and appraisees met at a pre-observation conference to set ground rules for the process, agree on dates and decide on focus areas. This was followed by classroom observation, which was

compulsory. After the classroom observation an appraisal interview was held to set targets for future development. Appraisees and appraisers met often thereafter to review progress on the targets. It is interesting to note that the IQMS has borrowed heavily from this model, as the IQMS processes are quite similar. This form of appraisal also served to improve communication in schools, and led to a greater sense of coherence and mutual understanding. It also encouraged teachers to work on and improve specific areas of their teaching, to the benefit of their learners.

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

- Lack of appropriate training, or a gap between training and appraisal
- Having an appraiser you don't have confidence in
- Failure to understand the process
- Delays in the process, for example, in giving feedback
- Too "cosy" appraisal
- Vague targets
- Lack of commitment from the principal, and
- Pressure from other concerns and innovations.

From the above contentions it is clear that whilst appraisal has much to offer to both the individual and the organisation, there are a number of factors that may threaten the success of an appraisal system. An awareness of these factors will better equip managers and appraisers to be successful in their planning and implementation of the appraisal system.

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

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

The above assertion suggests that schools need to be allowed the flexibility to adapt their appraisal process to meet their different management styles and structures, different approaches to learning and different self-experiences (Biputh, 2008:59). If this does not occur, then the appraisal system is reduced to “one size fits all”, and fails to serve effectively as a strategy for improvement (Wadvalla 2005:48).

2.9 MODELS OF APPRAISAL SYSTEM

This study is informed by the models of appraisal cited by Biputh (2008:55). He believes that appraisal for teacher improvement and appraisal for performance review or accountability is the key distinction in philosophical approaches towards appraisal. Poster and Poster (1993:1) also draw a distinction between the two trends of appraisal: one trend focuses on performance, the other on development. The South African form of appraisal seeks to combine these opposites. In the light of this important distinction, different models of appraisal are discussed as follows:

2.9.1 The Accountability Model of appraisal

The accountability model is based on the assumption that teachers should be held accountable to the public in order to ensure the provision of quality education. Sallis (1993:4) maintains that schools are part of their communities, and as such they must meet the political demands for education to be more accountable and publicly demonstrate high standards. Since education is directly funded by the treasury, schools, like other public sector organisations, are being called upon to provide evidence that they are accountable for their activities. The various stakeholders such

as the taxpayers, parents, school boards, and the state and national funding agencies want to know whether the personnel and organisations charged with the responsibility for teaching learners and for improving education are achieving all they should be achieving, given the investment of resources to support their work (Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam, 1987:28). According to Wagner (1989:16), the rationale behind the demand for accountability in education is, therefore, for greater effectiveness and efficiency, especially in view of rising costs in public services. Apart from the above-mentioned reasons, the increased demand for accountability in South African schools can be attributed to the absence of a uniform system of appraisal since the dismantling of apartheid. This issue will be explored further in the section dealing with the historical overview of teacher appraisal in South Africa.

McCormick (1982:27) discusses the nature of accountability under three broad categories: answerability to one's clients (moral accountability), responsibility to oneself and one's colleagues (professional accountability) and accountability to one's employers (bureaucratic or contractual accountability). Other proponents of the accountability model advance the following models: the Consumerist Model, the Self-Accounting Model and the Staff Development Model.

2.9.2 Bureaucratic Accountability Model

Becher, Eraut and Knight (1981:20) and Kogan (1986:35) state that bureaucratic accountability is typified by employment contracts, by means of which bureaucratic systems are established and employees are recruited. Wagner (1989:23) stresses that contracts are essentially agreements with teachers who are obliged to demonstrate what they are doing and what they are remunerated for. This form of accountability is hierarchical in nature, and is achieved by assigning responsibility for the oversight of subordinates by those holding supervisory positions. It is exercised through teacher evaluation and authoritative actions to direct the work of teachers (Seyfarth, 1999:104). It must be noted that whilst neither employment contracts nor teacher evaluation can guarantee marked improvements in teacher

performance, appraisal can, however, assist teachers to do a better job; however, the results depend as much on the teacher's desires to improve as on the supervisor's actions. I believe that this model might evoke negative reactions from teachers, as it may be seen as being judgemental and inspectorial.

2.9.3 Moral Accountability Model

According to Becher, Eraut and Knight (1981:21), moral accountability is of special importance in education because it pervades the teacher-learner relationship. Leaving aside legal obligations to the employer, the teacher is answerable to learners and parents in moral terms. Sallis (1993:4) feels that this is the moral high ground in education, where there is very little dissent. It is, therefore, the duty of teachers and administrators to have an overriding concern to provide the best possible educational opportunities to its customers and clients of the education services (learners, parents and the community). The longest teacher strike in the history of South Africa, which took place from 1st June to 29 June 2007, clearly showed that teachers are fighting for their right to a reasonable living salary and proper working conditions. The idea of teaching being a "calling" does not seem to be favoured in the same way in this generation (Biputh, 2008:83).

2.9.4 The Professional Model

Seyfarth (1999:20) asserts that this model depends on members of professional groups to protect the public interest, as is the case with, for instance, doctors and lawyers. It requires that teachers be well-informed in the most appropriate pedagogic practice, as they have a professional duty to improve the quality of education. Scott (1994:153) states that this model avoids the problem of managerial hierarchy by leaving educational decisions, except on issues on which they are contractually bound, to the judgment of the professional teachers or schools.

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

According to Biputh (2008:91), this model can help to bring about improvements in teaching practice, and a corresponding improvement in learner achievement. One of the philosophical approaches of the IQMS is a focus on improving the ability of employees to perform their roles through the identification of professional development needs and the provision of subsequent training or self-development opportunities.

2.9.5 The Consumerist Model

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

This supply-and-demand model has had major quality implications for South African schools, especially in the post-apartheid scenario. The dismantling of apartheid and the formation of a single national education department (and nine provincial departments) offered both schools and learners greater autonomy. While schools had the freedom to admit learners from any geographical location, irrespective of their race, parents had the right to select the school of their choice for their children. This transformation had a major impact on quality assurance in schools. Urban schools that were predominantly situated in more affluent areas saw an influx of learners from township schools, and this situation advantaged them. These schools could charge higher school fees and consequently had more teaching resources and more staff to ensure quality teaching and learning. On the contrary, many township and rural schools experienced a decline in their school population, which impacted on funding and staff establishment. As a result, teachers in these schools continue to struggle for adequate learning and teaching resources, as funding dwindles and the number of teaching staff is reduced.

2.9.6 The Self-Accounting Model

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

Biputh (2008) believes that self-evaluation as a method of appraisal does have the capacity to improve teaching and learning, but it can only be effective as a strategy for quality improvement if teachers are honest during self-evaluation. In a system like the IQMS, where there is a monetary incentive tied to the appraisal, there is

definitely a need for external validation of self-evaluation, to ensure fairness and quality.

2.9.7 The Staff Development Model

The staff development model focuses on improving the ability of employees to perform their present and prospective roles, through the identification of professional development needs and the provision of subsequent training or self-development opportunities (Poster and Poster, 1993:1). Musaazi (1992:197) supports this assertion, stating that teachers are part of a dynamic profession and must be kept abreast of developments in matters relating to education. Badenhorst *et al.* (1995:144) concur that teachers should be kept informed of the latest trends in their learning areas in particular, and in education in general. No members of the teaching profession can enter teaching and remain in it for several decades without frequently updating their professional skills for professional development (Bell, 1988:172).

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

Poster and Poster (1993:9), on the other hand, cover the main features of staff development by suggesting the developmental model, which:

- ensures that professional, collegial and evaluative authority lie within the profession;
- is concerned with accuracy and the maintenance of moral, ethical and professional values;
- recognises the value of peer appraisal of colleagues;
- is designed to enable shared responsibility for the achievement of objectives; and
- is concerned with ongoing professional development.

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

2.10 CHALLENGES OF THE IQMS IN A TROUBLED EDUCATIONAL SETTING

The researcher in this section discusses important obstacles in PM, DA and WSE in schools. Recent studies indicate that the implementation process of the IQMS requires that there should be proper planning on the part of all stakeholders (principals, teachers and district officials), unlike in the previous inspectorial and evaluation systems before 1994. It is clear that a well-planned appraisal system will benefit the organisation, apart from the personal and professional development of teachers, by channeling individual effort into goals, ensuring greater accountability, and identifying and co-ordinating staff development needs (Biputh, 2008:52).

According to Chisholm, Hoadley and Kivulu, (2004) the education system began to be reconstructed, and roles and functions of both teachers and

department personnel to be redefined. The idea of combining PM and DA was planned and introduced as a means of evaluating teachers for salary progression, grade progression, and professional development, affirmation of appointments, and rewards and incentives. This was to be done by means of the IQMS.

However, there are tensions and challenges that teachers experience in implementing the performance appraisal system. De Clercq (2008:8) concurs that the system has created new tensions and problems because of its problematic conceptual understanding of teachers, their status, work and what needs to be done to improve teaching practice.

Bartlett (2000:13), and Cardno and Piggot-Irvine (1997:6) state that PM and DAS seem to be managerial, judgemental and control-oriented exercises which undermine teacher's professional autonomy and inevitably causes teacher anxiety, stress and defensiveness. Winter (1989:45) states that conflict can easily develop into a procedure designed to be used to assist teachers in professional development, but which is also a management tool to identify those whose performance is above or below par.

A trend emerging from this review of the literature reflects that the Department of Education has defined teachers as "agents to be changed". Samuel (2008:8) argues that the transformation of the education system, new teacher evaluation policies and operational stipulations demand transformation from teachers without adequate recognition of "where teachers are".

Teachers were asked from 1998 to change from a content-based curriculum to the outcomes-based *Curriculum 2005*, and then again (just a few years later) to the significantly-revised but still outcomes-based *National Curriculum Statement*. They were also expected to adjust from an inspectorial monitoring and evaluation system, and accustom themselves to the WSE, DA and PM systems, and now to the IQMS. And now in 2012 there is the implementation of CAPS, which is shedding learning outcomes and assessment standards and criteria for the once-familiar aims and

topics that signal a return to a content-based curriculum. The Minister of Basic Education and Training, Ms Angie Motshekga, who pronounced OBE to be “dead”, also spoke of South African teachers suffering from “change fatigue” (*Curriculum News*, DoE, 2009).

Another frustrating element for teachers which tends to “intensify” their work, is that they have been expected to fulfil not just one but seven roles, some of which go beyond their classroom practice, including: “mediator; interpreter and designer of learning programmes; learning area/subject/discipline/phase specialist; assessor; leader/manager; administrator; researcher and lifelong learner; scholar; citizenship and pastoral role” (DoE, 2001:3). In this regard, it has been objected that too much work and too many roles have been expected of teachers (see Chisholm *et al.*, 2005). Narsee (2006:13) acknowledges difficulties that many teachers experience due to this overload and intensification of work, such as their poor experience of school clustering, which they perceive as merely a restricted way of providing professional support necessitated by the limited competence of district officials, which cannot address their (the teachers’) professional development needs.

In addition, teachers themselves have raised objections to the weakness of the current evaluation system in their schools (*The Educator’s Voice*, 2009:6). They argue that too many evaluators are coming into their classrooms armed with checklists that aren’t up to the task of capturing the complexity of what they might observe. It would be unrealistic to believe that a school will ever be able to achieve all the goals implicit in the appraisal system.

The above studies point to the key issues that contribute to teachers’ dissatisfaction with the IQMS.

2.11 PROBLEMATIC ASPECTS OF THE IQMS

2.11.1 Self-evaluation

The IQMS makes provision for teachers to evaluate themselves. Immediately after the initial advocacy and training, each teacher is expected to evaluate himself or herself using the same instrument that will be used for both DA and PM. This enables the teacher to become familiar with the instrument. Teachers should familiarise themselves with the performance standards, the criteria (what they are expected to do) and the levels of performance (how well they are expected to perform) in order to meet at least the minimum requirements for pay progression (ELRC, 2003). To be effective and to help the appraisee get the maximum benefit from the appraisal system, it is important for him or her to be honest and fair during self-evaluation (Horne and Pierce, 1996:33). Self-evaluation requires a detailed and honest critique of one's performance. Hattersley (1992:45) is of the opinion that problems arise when self-evaluations are written in the knowledge that they are going to be read by others and evaluated. According to Biputh (2008), self-confessed weaknesses are hardly likely to feature when appraisees are aware that their self-evaluation will be subjected to others' judgement.

Milkovich and Boudreau (1988:62) concur that self-evaluation requires the employee to evaluate his or her own performance, and that the value of self-appraisal as assessment or evaluation is doubtful. This implies that teachers might not evaluate themselves genuinely in this phase because of the monetary incentive that is attached to performance measurement. De Clercq (2008:42) echoes this concern, pointing out that incorporating grade and salary progression into teachers' professional development needs attention because the one-percent monetary incentive changes the outcome of the IQMS as teachers will not genuinely evaluate themselves for development, but are more likely to focus on money, which leads to corruption.

This poses a problem because teachers will tend to give themselves favourable points/scores without heeding that they need to be realistic and indicate their

shortfalls so as to receive authentically helpful feedback, development and more training to overcome deficiencies. At least one reason behind this response is that the advocacy, training, planning and implementation processes of the IQMS have not been carried out well, says de Clercq (2008:34).

The above views reflect the importance of self-evaluation in the IQMS because teachers' reflection on their own practices is meant to provide the grounds on which they will be assisted to work at improving their areas of weakness in teaching. West and Bollington (1990:21) support this view of self-evaluation as serving a positive and a useful purpose. In order to do so however, self-evaluation must:

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

2.11.2 Lack of competent moderators/evaluators

“Competence”, according to Karimulla (1997:6), refers to ability, or a state of being competent, that is, properly qualified, skilled and acceptable. It is a wide concept which embodies the ability to transfer knowledge and skills to new situations, and encompasses the evaluator's skill, capacity and credibility.

The word “competence” is applied to a person who exhibits “more than average acquired or native skill”, and therefore indicates adequacy rather than excellence in a particular task (Grobler and van der Merwe, 1995:2). To be competent means to be able to carry out the requirements of a specific task satisfactorily. Thus the

IQMS as a system on which the development of individual teachers and entire schools is meant to be gradually built, requires people who are at least reasonably skilled and able to carry out, jointly with other members of their particular structure, the tasks of evaluating and developing both institutions and the people who work in them – by no means a simple job.

Wadvalla (2005:45) asserts that there are few competent evaluators in the system, and that this creates a tension between the internal structures of the individual school and the external evaluation of the school. He further states that the personnel in these evaluative structures are often not trained and are not informed as to what the policy documents require, how to prepare for visits to the schools, how to observe lessons and teachers, and how to write constructive reports for the internal or external evaluations. This system still reinforces the bureaucratic, hierarchic evaluation that was used in the previous inspectorial systems that were discarded in South Africa after 1994. In the IQMS the evaluators are the principals and their heads of department for internal appraisal, and district officials and provincial moderators for external appraisal, or WSE (IQMS Manual: 3-6); however, these officials also appear not to have been thoroughly trained.

According to SADTU's *The Educators' Voice* (2008:2), teachers' viewpoint is that many subject advisors are not well-informed about what they are supposed to do in schools, either in terms of evaluation or of understanding and assisting teachers in interpreting the new curriculum. This teacher's union further complains about the lack of effective district or senior management support for the implementation of curriculum and assessment policies (SADTU, 2005:6). So the criticisms are aimed quite far up the ladder of responsibility in the Education Department.

Teachers argue that district officials require professional support for their work in training teachers to implement outcomes-based education (OBE) or to engage in collegial support relationships in schools (DoE, 2006). In addition, teachers raise unanswered questions such as, "How can somebody who does not understand the new curriculum evaluate us? Why are they not trained?" By 2006, it has been

indicated that most schools and districts still do not have the capacity and resources for such an ambitious appraisal exercise (Marneweck, 2007:2).

2.11.3 Composition of the IQMS

The ELRC (2003:5) states that the components required to implement the IQMS in schools are

- the School Development Team (SDT), which is made up of the principal, the whole school co-ordinator, and a democratically-elected post level one teacher;
- the traditional School Management Team (SMT), which consists of the principal, the deputy principal and the heads of department; and
- the Development Support Group (DSG), which includes a senior teacher, head of department and principal.

The SDT, together with the SMT led by the Principal, must monitor, co-ordinate and keep the records of the process. The SMT and SDT must also develop the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and the Personal Growth Plan (PGP) for individual teachers. The SIP should set the targets and time frames for school improvement using the WSE instrument, and progress must be monitored and measured against these targets. The SIP should be revised periodically, setting new goals or priorities which reflect the progress already made, and be submitted to the District Office for the purpose of planning in-service training and other programmes that are aligned to the needs for development identified in the SIP.

It has been said that the IQMS is designed to be all things to all people, but the fact that the structures required to carry out the IQMS in schools are the SMT, SDT, and the DSG, which all have to include senior teachers, heads of department and principal (ELRC 2003:5), seems to be unsatisfactory because it gives still more powers to the managers of the school.

Middlewood (1997:93) points out that the purposes of appraisal are:

- to build professional satisfaction (developmental),
- to fulfil professional obligations to learners, and
- to enable teachers to know how they are performing.

In this process of IQMS transition, the range of structures involved in the administration in schools is prone to being complex and problematic, and can lose sight of their purpose because of the number of roles and procedures, not all of them clearly defined (Gardiner, 2009:2).

Chetty, Chisholm, Gardiner, Megan and Vinjevold (1993) state that, “Apart from the ineffectiveness of the previous system of inspection by external inspectors, the internal appraisals by the principals or heads of department are done in a bureaucratic manner. They gave little genuine feedback, and did not encourage dialogue between staff and appraisers” (Wadvalla, 2005:64). The IQMS requires the SMT to assist in the broad planning and implementation of the IQMS, and to ensure that self-evaluation is carried out well in terms of the WSE policy (ELRC, 2003:6). The school managers are apparently also not informed about the IQMS (Weber, 2005:17). Therefore, a question arises: How are they going to perform their roles?

2.11.4 Immediate senior as an appraiser

The SMT, together with the SDT, will be responsible for liaising with the teachers as well as the District Office to co-ordinate the provision of developmental programmes for teachers. Teachers argue that the composition and the responsibility of the SMT and SDT are similar. They suggest that one structure could be scrapped from the system. Teachers have a fear of a personnel clash between junior employees and senior managers (Biputh, 2008:78).

Milkovich and Boudreau (1988:189) support the above view, pointing out the most

important disadvantages of having one's immediate senior as one's only judge, for example personal prejudice, personality clashes, or friendship that might hinder objective appraisal.

Chisholm *et al.* (2004:18) also oppose the hierarchical tendencies in the IQMS, stating that this system is a principal-driven one that still reinforces the hierarchies of control and line management which caused so many problems during the apartheid era. Seemingly, in this view of the hierarchical nature of school leadership, it is evident that the SMT plays a dual role – that of being an evaluator and a body whose work is evaluated. This complexity of reversal will also impact on the way in which school leadership views the WSE as part of the IQMS.

Weber (2002:18) points out that because the senior management in South African schools is usually dominated by men, there is a possibility of sexual harassment and exploitation of female teachers, who are usually junior colleagues.

The trends emerging from these studies reflect the rise in the political power of the bureaucratic manager who constantly demands improved performance, and the accompanying decline in the power of teachers (Altbach, 1998:37). Also, little attention has been paid to the gender relations between the more powerful senior management and junior colleagues in school. However, working against such tendencies is a tradition of school-based opposition that was initially aimed at the undemocratic, coercive features of apartheid education (Weber, 2002:14).

2.11.5 Absence of teachers during evaluation period

The ELRC (2003:8) states that when the teacher is absent for a prolonged period, for example, leave over six months, and the appraisal cycle cannot be completed for him/her, the DSG and the teacher should make a judgment as to their ability to achieve a meaningful evaluation that will be useful and must not disadvantage the teacher. This practice needs to be re-considered, as undedicated teachers will take

advantage of this provision. A question arises: How can a person be given points or scores without his/her performance actually being measured?

2.11.6 The language used in the IQMS

There has been considerable criticism of the language used in the IQMS. Gardiner (2009:2) states that Section A of the collective agreement purports that language has been compiled by a “spin-doctor” who used it misleadingly, thus terms like “philosophy”, “purpose”, “alignment principles” are aimed at convincing, rather than being truthful in the interest of education.

Chisholm and Hoadley (2004:13) might agree, having pointed out that the system had borrowed a number of concepts from abroad, such as “school effectiveness”, “school improvement” and “whole school development”.

Weber (2002:32) points out that the IQMS borrows heavily from an international language of business, introducing words like “accountability”, “performance management”, “self-monitoring”, “performance measurement”, “quality assurance” and “audits”, which are encountered in policy-making all over the globe today, and all of which seem familiar and innocent enough, even neutral. Yet, as Weber argues, these terms reflect the neo-liberal discourse that would have us all think of public institutions (such as schools and universities), and even of our individual selves, as competitive, profit-seeking businesses, and that would have us all happily accept the responsibility for constant watching and “policing” ourselves (self-surveillance and self-evaluation) in the interests of maximising the productivity of the institutions we work for.

Chisholm and Hoadley (2005:17) mention that the IQMS is designed to ensure the “quality” or “excellence” of education in South Africa schools. However, Van der Westhuizen (2000:16) describes the term “quality” as enigmatic – “quality terminology” such as “Quality Assurance” and “Total Quality Management”, is almost

always subject to different interpretations. While such terms are usually seen in a neutral light, the neoliberal use of the term “quality” is always linked to notions of internalised self-control and self-policing. Pirsig (1976:54) states that it is not easy to define “Quality”, or even to know whether and how it exists; however, as he says, you know it when it is absent.

2.11.7 Linking of the monetary incentive to performance

Mokgalane, Carrim, Gardiner and Chisholm (1997:18) argue that the implementation of the IQMS in South Africa depends largely on those who are expected to benefit from it: the teachers, the school and department officials who implement the system. The IQMS was accepted by all concerned, with the important financial incentive attached to it (Weber, 2002:16).

Different authors define incentive and its purpose differently. Chetty *et al.* (1993:23) point out that incentive can be classified according to different ways of motivating people to take a particular course of action. Managers perceive incentives as a reward for productivity, pay, benefits and employee compensation. The one percent monetary incentive in the IQMS changes its outcome, as teachers will not evaluate themselves genuinely because they mostly focus on money (thinking of themselves as businesses) rather than on being developed in their areas of weakness.

Towers (1996:45) is of the view that the objective of using performance appraisal ratings for salary and grade progression is in conflict with other performance appraisal objectives, especially those concerned with improving or correcting performance and with identifying employees’ areas of weakness for development. He further identifies possible negative consequences of linking financial incentives to performance measurement, as is done in the IQMS, such as:

- When pay and performance appraisal are closely linked, the pay issue may subvert the entire object of the appraisal.
- Employees may adapt their behaviour simply to target good ratings, rather

than to genuinely improve their overall performance.

- Employees may try to influence the appraiser by seeking to set lower, more conservative and more achievable personal goals, which may in the end be counterproductive for the organisation.

2.11.8 Teacher workload and accountability regimes

Principals argued (*The Educators' Voice*, 2009:1) that they have inadequate time for observing and evaluating their teachers. Teachers, on the other hand, express significant dissatisfaction as a result of an increasingly excessive workload (largely because of the advent of outcomes-based assessment and record-keeping) that has been added to by the IQMS, and that conflicts with their core responsibilities of preparation and teaching, according to the HSRC survey conducted in 2005 (Chisholm, Hoadley and Kivulu, 2005:13).

Similarly, the Parliamentary Education Portfolio Committee (2006:2) heard arguments that the training system for the IQMS implementation process was inadequate, especially in rural areas, thus adding to the system's time-consuming nature, and to teachers' workload pressure. As usual, it is the most disadvantaged schools, and ultimately the most disadvantaged learners, that suffer the worst effects of such problems. Chisholm *et al.* (2005:13) showed that significant differences were found between schools with regard to the time problem. For example, teachers in former white schools reported spending more time on teaching (19.11 hours per week) and other educational activities than teachers in former African schools (15.18 hours per week). Admittedly, teachers in black schools have been reported as suffering from particular work overload in their classes as a result of the many who teach multi-grade classes, and there are a variety of reasons for the lower number of "time-on-task" hours in these schools, but in such a context, the burden of IQMS activity, and its detracting from teaching time, must surely be felt all the more sharply.

It is also evident that class size and lack of resources is a highly significant factor in black schools. Recent studies show that many teachers are still faced with overcrowded classes (Weber, 2002:16). This situation results in teachers perceiving themselves as being deficient in their teaching, and as such many teachers are overcome by despair and despondency, and eventually they simply cease to care (Morrow, 2007). This can hardly be a fruitful or conducive context for developing the self-motivation envisaged by the advocates of appraisal systems such as the IQMS.

In addition, SADTU concurs that South African teachers have been suffering under policy overload – an endless supply of new policies – and also battling with the new curriculum (*The Educator's Voice*, 2008:3). A question arises: When will they have time to master all these obstacles and achieve better productivity? From the experience of business (which is supposed to provide the model for the public service, including education), it is clear that if one wants to improve or produce a better product, it is necessary to pay close attention to the productive processes, provide adequate working material and capacitation of personnel, and avoid overloading one's staff. It seems that despite the fact that institutions, organisations and even individuals are all supposed to become ever more "business-like", we are not all that good at learning some of the real lessons of business and industry.

Teachers today appear to be de-motivated because of their poor working conditions, and that affects their level of performance. It is clear that if an employee is not motivated, he or she is unlikely to perform well in any organisation, as motivation helps an employee to activate, direct and control his or her own behaviour, resulting in the achievement of intended goals (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982:15). It is evident that teacher's performance is hampered by work overload, poor working conditions and overcrowded classes, all of which are bound to contribute to poor quality teaching. It seems to be a sign of our times that the more we increase the demands of work and allow work conditions to deteriorate, the more effort, time and financial resources we put into "quality assurance", target-setting and self-evaluation systems such as the IQMS. As Chisholm *et al.* argue (2004:7), teachers are rendered bureaucratic rather than truly performative, with a focus on display and external

accountability.

A dominant theme emerging from the above studies is that it is not easy to implement accountability measures such as the IQMS, and that even when they are implemented, they can present serious obstacles to, or even undermine, a school's organisational capacity (Newman, King and Rigdon, 1997).

2.11.9 The instrument to measure and monitor teacher performance and the performance of the school

According to Jantjies (1996:51), a major problem that teachers experienced in South Africa during the apartheid era was the rating scale used to evaluate them in a top-down evaluation. This scale did not contain a record of what the teacher did or did not do that might have persuaded the person rating them to record a number for their performance – the rating process was not transparent, and inferences generally took place in the evaluator's head.

Waghid (1996:81) concurs with Jantjies that a numerical score fails to provide a record of any measurable proof of the teacher's performance, as the explicit task of the rater is to record a score so as to trace it back for relevant feedback. Waghid (1996:81) and Chetty *et al.* (1993:7) also contend that a numerical rating scale cannot justifiably claim to measure the efficiency of teachers because the main criteria concentrate on aspects such as personality, character and professional disposition.

There is no doubt that a system of evaluation that was characterised by so many deficiencies could only undermine teacher professionalism. That is why teachers opposed the hierarchical and authoritarian nature of the inspectorial system of the apartheid era. In 2003 both the Department of Education and teacher unions agreed to the IQMS as an evaluation and monitoring system based on teacher development.

The IQMS consists of three programmes which aim at enhancing and monitoring the performance of the education system. DA and PM are supposed to complement one another without needing to duplicate structures or procedures, and they both

have to be completed within one school year. Both are linked to WSE, which measures the overall effectiveness of the school, is performed by external evaluators, and makes no reference to individual teachers.

There are two different levels of evaluation: internal appraisal and external evaluation. These levels comprise of internal appraisal (Process A), and external evaluation for WSE (Process B). Process A consists of the establishment of structures, self-evaluation, the development of an instrument for lesson observation, actual lesson observation, and the formation of the DSG, which will make a report to the SDT for the purpose of planning school improvement. Process B consists of drafting an external evaluation plan, informing the school of the dates for conducting WSE, and actually conducting the evaluation. Chisholm and Hoadley (2005:23) state that both of these evaluation processes are important for every teacher, providing evidence of progress against targets set. These processes are illustrated in Table 2 on page 49.

According to Gardiner (2005:4), the fact that the IQMS uses a single instrument is problematic because it brings together DA, PM and WSE into one process. He further explains that teacher performance, identification of weaknesses and strengths, and WSE should not be measured with the same instrument.

According to *The Educator's Voice* (2008:2), teachers lamented that "The issue is the type of tool which can easily be subjective and used against us."

The tool to measure teacher performance and the appraisal system are characterised by the use of a rating method. Teachers are measured against the performance standards, and they have to achieve a minimum score so as to be recognised for the financial incentive. In this rating method, Post level 1 and senior teachers are supposed to get 78 points; Post level 2 teachers 118 points, and Post level 3 and 4 teachers 146. In South Africa the teacher is appraised for development, and performance is measured for the sake of grade or salary progression, and there should be a thorough knowledge of the job description in question on the part of both

Table 2: IQMS Processes

PROCESS A	PROCESS B
Establishment of structures	Drafting an external evaluation plan
Self-evaluation	Informing school about the dates for conducting external WSE
The development of an instrument for lesson observation	Advocacy and training
Lesson observation by the DSG	Informing the schools about the documents that will be required
Drafting of SIP	Preparation for WSE visit
Submission of documents to the district office	Observation and assessment of teachers and the school

the appraisee and the appraiser. The IQMS structures such as the DSG, SDT, SMT and appraisers also need a sound knowledge of performance standards, the content of the subject taught and rating.

It is problematic to expect appraisers to use one standardised instrument to evaluate teachers for both developmental purposes and rewards or sanctions. The researcher is of the opinion that the developmental part of the IQMS is to assist teachers in their areas of weaknesses. In this they need to provide a realistic self-appraisal, not an enhanced picture in order to advance their status or financial interests via grade and salary progression. That is why de Clercq argues (2008:14) that this exacerbates the already-difficult power relationship between appraisees, school-based appraisers and district appraisers.

The IQMS process may have a contribution to make towards the improvement of teacher performance in well-performing schools, but in low-performing schools the process is seen as a cumbersome, time-consuming and fruitless exercise which does not bring any benefit, and is therefore not treated seriously (Wadvalla, 2005:54).

2.12 SUMMARY

The literature review reveals that teachers have to endure poor working conditions, the errant behaviour of learners, low salaries insufficient resources in most schools, frequent curriculum changes, and evaluation systems that influence their attitudes and performance level negatively. This is an indication that the Department of Education is now faced with a problem – should it continue with the current technical improvements to the teacher monitoring and evaluation system?. Teacher appraisal was and still is a thorny issue for school leadership throughout the world. There has been much agreement in the National Department of Education that there is a need for an appraisal system that will be acceptable to teacher unions but will also enhance the competency of teachers and the standard of education in South Africa. However, a number of scholars and other critics have argued that this model for quality management in schools (the IQMS) holds no significant benefits for learners, education and schools, both because of various obstacles to its implementation which have already surfaced, and because of the inherent deficiencies it possesses.

The research methodology and design for this study will be discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The researcher is aware that the credibility of research depends on the appropriateness and trustworthiness of the research methods, participant selection, data collection and analysis employed in this research. This chapter aims to set out and justify the research methodology and design for this study.

3.2 RESEARCH PARADIGM

The main focus of the study has been to examine teachers' perceptions of the IQMS. Such a focus indicated that the study should be conducted within the interpretive paradigm. The interpretive paradigm attempts to describe and interpret peoples' feelings, meanings and experience (Terre'Blanche and Durrheim, 1999:123). An interpretive study is concerned with human action, assuming that people create their own subjective meanings as they interact with the world around them, assigning meanings to their world.

The interpretive paradigm encourages participant reflection, and thus allowed the researcher to gain insight into the teachers' opinions about the performance measurement system in their schools. This research focuses on how the selected teachers reacted, interacted, negotiated and constructed meaning within the social situation created by the IQMS.

The study gave teachers a chance to voice out their perceptions, understanding and experience of the IQMS. The teachers interpreted these, and their actions, in the form of words. Words are the medium through which most people come to

understand their situations (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994:34). The interpretive perspective makes sense of people's experience and perceptions by interacting with them and listening to how they construct their social world (Heedy and Ormrod, 2005:78).

According to Denzin and Lincoln (1998:27), the interpretive paradigm assumes a relativist ontology (there are multiple realities), a subjectivist epistemology (both researcher and research subject construct understandings), and naturalistic methodological procedures carried out in the natural world.

Working within this approach, the researcher used qualitative tools for data collection. The focus of the study was the teachers' understanding of their own experience and interpretation of reality with regard to the IQMS. However, the study also aimed to take the hidden effects of ideology and power in the IQMS into account.

The focus of this study is chiefly the investigation of teachers' perceptions of the IQMS in three selected Butterworth District schools. This study is based on responses from the teachers as to how they perceived their performance evaluation system, so it was therefore suitable to approach it using the interpretive paradigm.

3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN

A research design refers to the planned course that the research is going to take. The researcher used an interpretive research design to investigate the teachers' perceptions of their performance measurement appraisal system. Interpretive research design attempts to understand peoples' perceptions, perspectives, and understanding of a particular situation. In this type of design the researcher and the participants work together to arrive "at the heart of the matter" (Tersch, 1994:147). For instance, the researcher sought to answer the question, what is it like to experience the performance appraisal system? (see Tersch, 1994:146). In that part

of the research it was thus necessary to use not just an interpretive but a specifically phenomenological approach so that the participants could portray and tell for themselves “what it was like” to be in that particular situation (ibid), i.e. in implementing the IQMS.

Within this study design, the researcher chose to conduct three case studies. These case studies were conducted in three rural schools in the Butterworth District.

3.4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A qualitative method was chosen as the appropriate approach for this study. The researcher used this method because it is geared to a deep understanding of people’s views, thoughts and perceptions of their world, and the researcher interprets phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them (Heedy and Ormrod, 2005:52). Qualitative research also studies social phenomena in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of the meanings people bring to them in those settings. According to Denzin (1994:28), qualitative research is multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This methodology also involves the collection of a variety of empirical materials such as personal experience, life stories and interviews that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individual lives.

Carso, Galmore, Perry and Gronhaug (2001) assert that using a qualitative approach helps the researcher to gather data which provide a detailed description of events, situations and interactions between people and things. Patton (cited in Carso *et al.*, 2001) further explains that qualitative research is concerned with things that really happen in an organisation, as researchers and people experience them. Mwanje (2002) explains that qualitative methods focus on the analysis of information so as to generate qualitative explanations of social phenomenon, and are better suited to description, whether dealing with meanings or patterns of behaviour, as they tend to rely on a detailed and complex description of events or people. Qualitative

methodology is appropriate in this research since it is concerned with individual and group perspectives.

According to Haralambos and Holborn (1995:79), qualitative methods help the researcher to gain an in-depth understanding of a way of life, and of people's experiences, attitudes and beliefs. Likewise Neuman *et al.* (1999:87) agree that qualitative research in its broadest sense refers to research that elicits a participant's accounts of meanings, experiences or perceptions, and involves documenting real events, recording what people say, observing specific behaviours, studying written documents, or examining visual images. This method assisted the researcher in collecting data that were useful in providing an in-depth understanding of the involvement of teachers, principals and officials in the IQMS.

However, qualitative methodology has its limitations. Neuman *et al.* (1997:328) state that reports using this approach often contain rich descriptions and colourful detail instead of the formal, neutral tone to be found within statistics-based research. These give the reader a feeling for particular people and events in concrete social settings. They further explain that although the method follows no strict rules, researchers are cautioned that the research is not allowed to be mindlessly inventive. It is believed by many researchers that the qualitative approach has its weaknesses in terms of the possibility of the researcher being biased in the selection or interpretation of data, or adopting assumptions which might have been disproved if a quantitative approach had been used.

Researchers have to be unbiased in order to make appropriate judgments about the phenomenon being studied. This researcher has adopted this approach, transcribing the recorded interviewees' words into written text and thereafter giving it to the participants to confirm that the researcher has faithfully recorded what they actually said during interviews. The participants would thus help to establish the validity of the data so as to avoid bias.

3.5 DATA COLLECTION

This section aims to explain how the researcher collected data for the study. As indicated above, qualitative methods were used to gather data. Terre' Blanche *et al.* (1999:286) argue that whereas quantitative data are bits of discrete information which can be extracted from their context and analysed as numbers, qualitative researchers typically work with material that is richly related to its context and would lose its meaning if broken into discrete bits. Qualitative data collection can be understood as the administration of a qualitative research instrument (such as an interview schedule) for collecting data. Thus the researcher used interviews and document analysis in this study, as already mentioned above. The researcher collected data in two phases:

3.5.1 Pilot study phase

This phase deals with the piloting of the research instrument. Oppenheim (1992:45) describes piloting as the questions or other instruments which must be tried out among the population under investigation before the main data collection stage begins, in order to make sure that they work as intended. McBurney (1990:78) views piloting as a tentative, small-scale study in which the researcher aims to pre-test and consequently modify study design and procedures. The instruments piloted to teachers and a district official were interview schedules. As with the main study, pseudonyms were used in recording and reporting on the contributions of each participant to ensure confidentiality and anonymity.

The pilot study was also aimed at getting feedback from informants concerning their interpretation of the questions, and at discovering possible weaknesses, inadequacies, ambiguities and problems in the research instrument so that these could be corrected before the actual (main) data collection took place. Furthermore, the pilot study aimed to test the responses of the subjects against the method of data collection, and to give the researcher an opportunity to practise data collection in the

real situation before the main study began (Brown and Dowling, 1981).

The pilot study took place three weeks before the main data collection, that is, at the beginning of September 2010. The researcher conducted the pilot study in order to reduce errors that might emerge during the main data collection.

During the pilot phase, semi-structured interviews were conducted on the way teachers perceived and experienced the implementation of the IQMS. This helped the researcher in the selection of a sample for data collection.

The instrument that was used for the pilot study was improved before the main data collection phase. Improvements were based on an analysis of the responses from the pilot study. It became clear that some of the questions asked during the pilot phase were too general, and some others produced the same answers for different questions.

3.5.2 Main data collection phase

During the researcher's interviews with teachers, much of the information gained was elicited through the use of probes and follow-up questions. The use of probes helped to deepen the responses and to increase the richness of the data being obtained. This is supported by May (2002:206), who argues that:

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

Data were collected in September 2010 in all three schools, and in the District Office. In each school the data were collected in the form of in-depth, semi-structured interviews with teachers and principals, followed by document analysis.

3.5.3 Semi-structured interviews

According to Maykut and Morehouse (1994), interviews are a data production strategy in which the researcher moves beyond surface talk to a rich discussion of thoughts and feelings with the participants. In this research, in-depth interviews were conducted which put an emphasis on the depth and richness of information to be gained from the teachers under study. The in-depth interview is not a neutral tool, for at least two people create the reality of the interview situation.

A semi-structured interview is an interaction between interviewer and participant, an exchange of views between two or more people in which the interviewer has a general plan of inquiry but not a specific, exact set of questions that must be asked in particular words and in a particular order (Neuman *et al*, 1997:289). Semi-structured interviews are usually considered flexible and effective in eliciting in-depth responses, and this method enabled this researcher to probe for the participants' real perceptions of the role of the IQMS. In addition, Bogdan and Taylor (1984:77) argue that the success of the in-depth research interview depends largely on the person conducting the interview, so the researcher should have in mind the steps for conducting interviews effectively.

In this study the researcher used the semi-structured interview format, guided by Denzin and Lincoln (1994:361), who state that:

Semi-structured interviews are sometimes regarded as more or less structured interviews in which the interviewer is able to adapt the research instruments to the individuality of the participants. In this type of interview certain specific information is desired from all the participants, in which case there is also a highly structured section to the interview. Furthermore, the researcher asks these structured questions in the same way, unlike in unstructured interviews where the questions can be changed in sequence and wording.

The main focus of the interviews in this study was to see the world through the eyes of teachers and principals as the participants in the study. Maree (2007) contends that using interviews as a method of data collection helps the researcher to understand the participants' construction of knowledge and social reality.

The researcher used semi-structured interviews as the instrument appropriate to the research problem to elicit the participants' actual feelings, perceptions of and opinions about their performance appraisal system, as well as their understanding of the criteria that are used by the Department of Education to reward well-performing teachers. The researcher used an interview schedule with a list of questions to be asked orally, using English as the language of communication. The researcher tape-recorded the interviews, but also made field notes on all the responses in a notebook.

3.5.4 Analysis of documents

Analysis of documents refers to the perusal of written material such as books, records and policy documents that contain relevant data about the phenomenon the researcher wishes to study (Bailey, 1994:34). The researcher therefore intended to use this activity to corroborate, contradict or elaborate on the evidence received from the teachers (Maree, 2007:89). The focus was on any written communications that might shed light on the phenomenon being studied. The researcher scrutinised minutes of the IQMS meetings involving the teaching staff, teachers' files and school policies. The use of document analysis as a data collection method may be reliable in the sense that it may provide a truer indication than interviews of original meanings and intentions, so the above-mentioned documents were used to explore what had ensued in earlier discussions, and the teachers' conceptualisation of the IQMS in the selected schools. The importance of this is clearly acknowledged by Burgess (1984:98) when he states that documents may be a primary source of information as they have a direct relationship with the people, events and situations that are studied.

The minute book for teachers' meetings was the major document indicating the progress of the school. All major decisions taken were recorded. The minute books were in all cases neatly covered and the minutes were clearly written in English. The

researcher believes that these documents carried useful evidence of the school's progress (or otherwise) throughout the school year.

All the teachers' files from the three selected schools were neatly covered and orderly. In most cases the information contained in each file was clearly shown in a table of contents. Therefore, it became easy for the researcher to go through the participants' files.

A school's policy encompasses all the rules and regulations that should be followed in the school. This document is meant to be negotiated democratically to avoid any deviations from the decisions taken. All the expected practices and disallowed malpractices representing the school's intentions should be noted down in the school policy.

Since the research focus was specifically on written communication about the IQMS in schools, the following documents were also scrutinised in each school. They were accessible in all three schools, and in the case of the structures, they were displayed on the wall in the principal's office in two of the schools. Some of the documents that were available at the schools were:

- Year plan
- Files for each teacher
- IQMS manual for each teacher
- School Improvement Plan
- Written list of DSGs for each teacher.

In the District Office the following documents were also made available, and were scrutinised:

- District Improvement Plan

- Documents submitted by the schools
- Proof of teacher support and development
- List of schools supported and developed.

3.6 RESEARCH SAMPLING

Sampling is defined as a process of systematically selecting cases for inclusion in a research project (Neuman *et al.*, 1997:201). Bailey (1994:76) defines sample as a subset of the total population that is the focus of the study, and describes how the sample or subgroup is to be selected. The researcher opted to use non-probability sampling. This is appropriate for a small, qualitative study such as this one, since non-probability sampling avoids claiming to represent a wider population (Babbie and Mouton, 2001:34).

The researcher used a combination of purposive and convenience sampling for the research sites, and purposive sampling for the research subjects. Convenience sampling is sometimes called accidental or opportunity sampling. It is based on the availability of time, money, location, sites and participants (Babbie and Mouton, 2001:45). In this study, the researcher collected data in schools that were geographically accessible to her, but she also chose to visit three different types of state school (primary, junior secondary and senior secondary) because of the possibility that IQMS implementation may differ at these different levels of school.

3.6.1 Selection of sites

The researcher selected three schools which differed in their phase levels, on the basis of convenience sampling. These schools were: one Primary School (PS), one Junior Secondary School (JSS) and one Senior Secondary School (SSS). All these schools are situated in rural locations and fall within the Butterworth District. All these selected schools have teachers from diverse age groups (that is, teachers who worked under the apartheid era, and those who started working after 1994),

and with diverse educational qualifications.

3.6.2 Selection of the research subjects

In selecting the research subjects, the researcher used purposive sampling for her study. This means that the researcher selected her interviewees on the basis of having had direct experience of the phenomenon being studied (the IQMS).

The researcher chose three teachers from the staff list of each of these schools, checking only that those selected had direct experience of the phenomenon being studied. She also interviewed the principal of each of the three schools, and the Butterworth District official concerned with the implementation of the IQMS. In picking participants, the researcher used her own judgment about which participants to choose who might best meet the purpose of the study (Bailey, 1994). Thus, the researcher chose teachers from diverse levels of teaching experience and qualification. As a result, the teachers in each school who participated in this study were the principal, two teachers with more than fifteen years' teaching experience, and one teacher with less than fifteen year's' teaching experience. The minimum number of three teachers per school plus the principal gave the researcher an opportunity for extensive probing of every participant to express his/her detailed beliefs about experiences of the IQMS. In each school, semi-structured interviews were conducted with the above participants.

3.7 NEGOTIATION OF ENTRY INTO THE FIELD

The researcher negotiated entry into the field by means of letters of introduction. These letters were obtained from the University by the co-supervisor, and addressed to the District Office and the school principals, requesting permission to conduct the investigation among the school teachers, and with an IQMS district official.

The researcher also personally negotiated entry into all the relevant institutions, and to the Circuit Inspector of the district with the assistance of these letters. After

successful negotiations with the Circuit Managers and the school principals, the researcher went physically to contact the schools.

On the first visit to each of the selected schools, the researcher asked for permission to make a ten-minute presentation to all the school teachers in order to directly negotiate with them. The researcher personally explained the purposes, procedures and processes that were to be followed when conducting the study, and assured them that whatever they contributed to this research would be treated confidentially. The researcher also took the opportunity to show her student card to the teachers in order to allay fears that the researcher may be pretending to be a student researcher. Consent forms for participating teachers to sign were made available.

After discussion, most of the teachers seemed to be at ease with the researcher, some even teasing her and suggesting that she should try to get a better position in the District Office or Provincial Office rather than to stay in the classroom with better knowledge.

Teachers were content that the interviews afforded them an opportunity to voice their feelings and thoughts, about which they usually remained silent. They also felt that the current research would amplify their concerns to a broader audience such as to other colleagues, management teams, policy formulators and the Department of Education. The researcher interviewed the principals and teachers during school hours, but there was no disruption to the schools' programmes.

3.8 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY (TRUSTWORTHNESS) IN THE QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Miles and Huberman (1994:262-275) identify a number of ways of enhancing validity and reliability. These include weighing evidence, using extreme cases, making follow-up visits, replicating findings and asking the same set of questions to all participants. In addition, the researcher carefully transcribed recordings verbatim. The researcher went back to the participants to read to them what she

had transcribed in order to establish the validity and reliability of the data collected, and also to make corrections where the researcher might have misunderstood or misheard what the interviewees had said to her. However, this study also used a participant triangulation technique to enhance the validity and reliability of the data and findings by interviewing separately principals, teachers and a district official about the IQMS.

3.8.1 Triangulation

Participant or viewpoint triangulation is a process of data collection which involves looking at a phenomenon from more than one perspective in order to provide the researchers with additional information on the object of study (Mwanje, 2001). Triangulation does not prove that the researcher has got it right, but it does give confidence that the meaning of the data has some consistency across perspectives, and that the findings are not closely tied up with a particular perspective (“voice”) or method in collecting the data (Denzin, 1978).

Terre’Blanche *et al.* (1999:287) understand triangulation as a method that entails collecting materials in as many different ways, or from as many diverse sources, as possible. That is why the researcher collected data in this study from different participants’ positions, that is, one principal, three teachers from each of the three schools, and a district official. This was a way of enhancing reliability in the study. The use of document analysis in addition to interviews was also a form of methodological triangulation.

3.9 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In conducting this study the researcher made it a point that the research was conducted in a morally acceptable manner. In this way the researcher attempted to do “what is right” by behaving ethically (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1990:26-27). In this study the researcher was guided by three basic principles of ethics, namely, the

principle of mutual respect, the principle of non-coercion and the principle of non-manipulation (Guba, 1990:158). The researcher took steps to ensure that the research practice would not in any way cause harm to the participants.

The researcher took the rights and interests of those affected by the research into consideration without being judgmental. Prior to the interview, the participants signed the informed consent form which indicated that they were participating voluntarily. Furthermore, the participants were fully informed about the purpose, principles and procedures of the study.

The researcher protected the identities of those who participated in order to ensure confidentiality and anonymity through the use of pseudonyms for the study. She also ensured that she did not distort or misrepresent data, and she did not offer any incentives for participation in the research.

3.10 SUMMARY

This chapter presented the research design and methodology of the study used to investigate the research questions. This study is situated in the interpretative paradigm, as it is fundamentally concerned with individuals' experiences. The researcher used purposive sampling for thirteen participants in the primary, senior secondary school and the District Office. Data were collected primarily by means of semi-structured interviews and document analysis. This methodology chapter also explains measures taken to maximise validity, reliability and trustworthiness, and discusses ethical considerations.

In the following chapter, the data obtained in the manner described above are analysed and interpreted.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is to present data that have been gathered through the use of semi-structured interviews and document analysis aimed at investigating teachers' perceptions of the IQMS in the three Butterworth district schools. .

This chapter is structured as follows:

4.2: Profile of the participants

4.3: Analysis and discussion of data in response to the research question:
What is the experience of the teachers, principals and the district official in attempting to implement the IQMS?

4.4: Analysis and discussion of data in response to the research question: What are the teachers' and principals' understandings and perceptions of the instrument and mechanism used to monitor and manage their performance and the performance of their schools?

4.5: Analysis and discussion of data in response to the research question:
To what extent does the IQMS meet the needs of the teachers for support and development?

4.6: Analysis and discussion of data in response to the research question: What lessons may be learnt from the principals' and teachers' experience of the IQMS and its implementation?

4.7: Analysis of documents

4.8: Summary.

4.2 PROFILE OF PARTICIPANTS

4.2.1 Analysis of the biographical data of teachers, principals and District Official

The focus will be on the descriptive analysis of biographic data. Within the scope of this research, nine teachers and three principals from the three schools and one district official participated. As it has been indicated in Chapter 3, the sampling was purposive. Out of this sample more females than males participated because all the teachers in the selected primary school were females. Otherwise, in the other two schools the researcher ensured gender balance, that is, two males and two females were selected in each. Table 3 on page 66-67 clearly indicates how the selection of participants was done.

The participants were diverse in terms of teaching experience and educational qualifications. Table 4 on page 67 indicates this diversity. With regard to educational qualifications, two principals had obtained Matric plus 5 years of training (an Honours degree) and one principal had obtained Matric plus 4 years of training. One teacher participant had an Honours degree, and all the other nine teacher participants had obtained Matric plus 4 years of training. With regard to teaching experience, School

Table 3: Biographic profile of participants

Research sites	School level	Number of males	% males	Number of females	% females	Total
SCHOOL A	S.S.S.	2	50%	2	50%	4
SCHOOL B	J.S.S.	2	50%	2	50%	4
SCHOOL C	P.S.	0	0%	4	100%	4

DISTRICT OFFICE	IQMS COORDINATOR	1	100%	-----	-----	1
------------------------	-------------------------	----------	-------------	-------	-------	----------

A's principal had 28 years' teaching experience, School B's principal had 21 years, and School C's principal had 30 years' teaching experience; three teachers each had less than 10 years of teaching experience, four teachers had between 15-20 years, and two had between 20-39 years' experience. Table 4 sets out the teaching experience and qualifications of the teaching staff in detail:

Table 4: Teaching experience and qualifications

SCHOOL	RANK	TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN YEARS	QUALIFICATIONS
A: Teacher 1	Post level 1	15 years	M + 4
Teacher 2	Post level 1	19 years	M + 4
Teacher 3	Post level 1	7 years	M + 4
Principal	Post level 4	28 years	M + 5
B: Teacher 1	Post level 1	39 years	M + 4
Teacher 2	Post level 1	17 years	M + 4
Teacher 3	Post level 1	19 years	M + 4
Principal	Post level 3	21 years	M + 5

C: Teacher 1	Post level 1	8 years	M + 4
Teacher 2	Post level 1	36 years	M + 4
Teacher 3	Post level 1	3 years	M + 4
Principal	Post level 2	30 years	M + 4
District office	IQMS HEAD	3 years	M + 5

4.3 THE EXPERIENCE OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS AND DISTRICT OFFICIAL IN ATTEMPTING TO IMPLEMENT THE IQMS

4.3.1 The time factor

The study indicated that the participants do not implement the IQMS in a professional manner in their schools – a point that was mentioned by 9 out of 13 participants. Teachers stated that they would sit at the table with all the IQMS forms and fill in the forms for the district office so as to get the financial incentive, and also for the school to be recorded in submissions. Some of the teachers argued that time constraints are one of the main factors that inhibit the implementation of the IQMS, since the evaluation and monitoring system has been added to duties that already have to be performed by the teaching staff.

Another concern related to time constraints was that the same teachers, heads of department and principals are sometimes appointed to different appraisal panels in other schools as well as their own, which makes it difficult for the panel members to cope with the process.

I don't want this thing (Shaking her head) and we have no time for it. I prefer the old inspection system because this one is broader and demands

a lot of paperwork. And it increases our workload as we are very few here in our school. We are multi-grading, and I am a teacher here, a school principal as well as a peer for the principal of another JPS. How can I cope from this type of situation? (Principal 3).

Owing to the work overload that has been added to by the IQMS (Chisholm and Hoadley, 2005:8), some teachers are using teaching time to get their records up to date in order to please the appraisers, who are often interested in monitoring books and teachers' files. These teachers believe that appraisers are of the view that if the teachers' records are in order, then quality teaching and learning are taking place.

We do our files during tuition time so that when they are required by the committees, they are up to date. There are no free periods for this, and time is always against us. (Teacher 6)

Some teachers showed aversion to the IQMS by expressing a common concern that time constraints impacted negatively on the process. The IQMS process requires the formation of a number of formal structures, self-evaluation, classroom observation, pre-evaluation discussion, feedback-and-discussion, monitoring, moderation, records and reports of schools, the development of growth and improvement plans, and class visits:

I am not happy with the IQMS because it demands a lot, like many structures, self-evaluation, PGP, SIP, feedback, discussion of the points, and many more of which we have no sufficient time for that. (Teacher 9)

The IQMS is not functioning in the schools of my district. Teachers state that they do not understand the system, and others argue about more demands that lead to its ineffectiveness, like more paperwork and workload increase. (District Official)

4.3.2 The language of the IQMS

Another difficulty raised by the majority of the participants is that the language used in the system guidelines and procedures is vague, ambiguous, and unfamiliar to the teachers. Apparently, this adds to the burden of implementation, particularly in terms of the time factor.

The language used in the IQMS is unfamiliar – seemingly vague. This consumes a lot of time translating or simplifying it for better understanding. Or you need to read, read and read many times to understand.
(Teacher 5)

The language in the IQMS needs to be discussed and clarified by the masses. If you are alone, you read and understand it in your own way, but when you go to others, you get the other way of understanding.
(Teacher 6)

In the context of the above assertions, the concern of teachers is about misunderstanding the terminology in the system, and about the simplification and clarification of performance standards. The IQMS is time-consuming, in part because it is couched in unfamiliar and vague language, and in part because it demands a lot of paperwork and organisation.

4.3.3 Training

The participants also considered training as the most needed element for effective implementation of the IQMS, and felt that both teachers and SMTs at their schools were not sufficiently trained. This indicates that many implementation effort of new innovations and policies fail due to insufficient training. The teachers may have shared some of the responsibility for this, as the District Official pointed out:

When I visit the schools in my district I discover that teachers do not understand the IQMS, and they misinterpret the information from the

document. The reason behind this problem is because of their poor attendance in that training, and teachers showed lack of commitment as reflected by the early departure by those who attended the workshop.

Teachers differed with the District Official with regard to their common concern that they had insufficient time to master the concepts and requirements of the IQMS, and that their training had been poor.

I was totally not satisfied with the training, as one day was not enough to understand that document. The explanation from the trainers was not clear, and they were not fully informed. (Teacher 4)

Actually, I was not satisfied with the one-day training, and we have no time for it. I just accepted the IQMS, as it was said to be the system that was said could not be reversed, as it replaces the old inspection system. (Teacher 2)

I was not satisfied because I noticed that the trainers were not fully capacitated with the system. As I have already said, it was not easy to understand the entire document within a day, as the terminology was new and unfamiliar. I and my staff need more thorough training, and we have no time to unpack this in our school because we are short of staff. (Principal 1)

From the above concerns the researcher deduces that the success of the IQMS will be determined to a considerable extent by sufficient training. The trend towards decentralized school management in South Africa indicates that teachers need to be empowered to participate effectively in decision-making processes (Steyn, 1999:131). This is particularly true when it comes to the implementation of a new system like the IQMS.

Therefore, the implication of the above concerns is the need for teachers to be re-trained, or trained further, in the correct way of implementing and interpreting the IQMS. Almost all the teachers interviewed suggested the need for more

workshops. Such suggestions are based on the assumption that training is worthwhile only if properly executed, therefore the Education Department needs to take care to include adequate planning for the necessary training whenever it introduces new policies such as the IQMS. Perhaps it was due to the lack of sufficient training referred to above that most of the teachers criticised the language used in the IQMS as difficult and vague, some suggesting that it needs to be simplified and clarified, as it is another inhibiting factor that works against the IQMS being appropriately implemented.

4.4 TEACHERS' AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE APPRAISAL INSTRUMENT USED TO MONITOR AND MANAGE THEIR PERFORMANCE, AND THE PERFORMANCE OF THEIR SCHOOLS

In the interviews, the participants identified factors that hampered the IQMS process. The majority of teachers also said that they did not understand the IQMS, and perceived the instrument as neither realistic nor functional. When teachers and principals were asked individually, "What is your perception of the instrument or mechanism that is used to monitor and manage your performance and the performance of your school?" the following were some of the responses:

I don't think there is a problem with the IQMS if it could work the way it was designed. Teachers should be trained again so as to be knowledgeable about the system because the training was poor. Teachers do not understand the IQMS. It is not working. But I, personally, do not like the word IQMS – Liyadika eli gama iindlebe zam azilifuni (it is boring and I hate this word) because this instrument increases workload and is cumbersome. (Teacher 1)

I do not like the IQMS as the system to measure my performance and the performance of my school because it has got many demands that frustrate me, but how can I change it because each and every Department or

profession has got its own performance measurement appraisal system, but this one of ours, “Hayi – hayi”, it’s not good, and also not developmental in practice. (Teacher 3)

The IQMS could be effective if teachers could understand it thoroughly and the problems that make teachers unhappy be solved. The appraisal instrument seems to be the threat to me because every time the District Official gives me its forms I become unhappy. Surely it is because we do not know this thing (Principal 3).

All the other participant teachers (2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9) and principals 1 and 2 agreed that they did not like the IQMS because it is fraught with many obstacles such as an increase in workload, the fact that it requires more time because of the many forms that need to be filled in, the vague language used in the IQMS documents, and insufficient training.

Unpacking the reasons why almost all the teachers and principals believed that they did not like the IQMS, one participant uttered:

I was not satisfied with the training because I noticed that even the trainers were not fully capacitated about what they were presenting, with a document that had no table of contents. And as I have already said, it was not easy to understand that entire document within a day because the terms were new and unfamiliar to us; therefore we need more thorough training. Maybe if we can understand it better, we can change the negative attitude that we have. (Teacher 6)

A research study by Boyd (1989:3) expresses the same sentiment as we see in the above assertions and responses of teachers and principals. He sees one of the reasons for teachers’ perceptions of appraisal as being unproductive as the fact that teachers do not have an input into the evaluation criteria. He further asserts that, unlike other professionals such as doctors, lawyers and engineers, who control the criteria for entering and maintaining membership of their profession, teachers on the

other hand often do not have that privilege. Instead, systems like the IQMS appear to be handed down by their employers, even if their design has been negotiated with teachers' bodies.

The structures needed in the school for the implementation of the IQMS process are the SDT, which includes the principal, senior management and the teacher; and the DSG, which consists of one's immediate senior and one other teacher (peer). The leadership role of the SMT, SDT and DSG is one of the crucial factors that influence the effectiveness of the school organization.

The problem appears to be the fact that the IQMS structures encourage a bureaucratic, hierarchical style of management which is similar to that of the old inspection system. Teachers 2, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 showed dissatisfaction with these structures in practice, lamenting that in this system the principal is always the boss. Furthermore Teacher 2 said that he was reminded of the old style of inspection that had been discarded. As suggested by Teacher 8, an alternative for making the system effective would be to scrap the SDT structure.

I am not happy for the Principal to be the boss in this system as it was like this in the old inspection system, and I suggest that the SDT structure should be scrapped away. (Teacher 8)

This was also indicated by a significant number of participants who were not overly satisfied with the role played by the SDT in implementing the IQMS. This reveals that there are indeed some problems in the monitoring and control of this structure.

All the interviewed stakeholders involved in the above issues shared the same sentiment: that the design of the appraisal instrument needs to be revisited by the DoE to ensure better performance, and the improvement of the quality of teaching and learning. And it is therefore clear from the teachers' and principals' understanding and perception that the IQMS instruments should be "panel beaten" here and there so that it will not de-motivate teachers.

4.5 THE NEED OF SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS AND SCHOOLS WITHIN THE IQMS

The first stated purpose of the IQMS stipulates that the specific needs of teachers, principals and schools should be identified for support and development. From the researcher's interviews only two participants, a Mathematics teacher and a Geography teacher, admitted that they had been given teacher development training by the subject advisors, and then only once. All the other teachers had never been supported or developed in their areas of weakness.

I have never been supported nor developed in any learning area. No empowerment in my areas of weaknesses, and I need capacitation. For example, I have been allocated to teach EMS, which I had never been trained for. I have a problem, especially in the accounting part, (but) there is no other alternative because there are no sufficient teachers here in my school. (Teacher 4)

The IQMS process has clearly not improved teaching quality, and yet the researcher's interviews indicate a strong belief among many teachers that the system is too technical and theoretical. The Department of Education (DoE), it seems, is also aware that the IQMS is not achieving its desired objectives, and that it needs to review its approach to teacher appraisal by addressing issues which inhibit its implementation. As Principal 1 asserted, the DoE is aware that the system is not working:

This is 2011 now, but there have been no external whole school evaluators who visited my school. As a high school principal we have many challenges that we report time and again, but no feedback, no support, no development from our Department. And the Department officials used to call all the principals after Grade 12 results, especially when the schools are under the Matric Intervention programme (MIP), where we put all our concerns on the table, but until now (there have been) no feedback or follow-up programmes.

Another participant, Principal 2, echoed his colleague's response: "There have been no external whole school evaluators, and I can say nothing about it as I have never seen even the instrument."

Even the district official (IQMS Co-ordinator) concurred that "WSE has never been effective because there have been no Provincial directorates who have visited schools with the District Office co-coordinators for the IQMS. The issue needs to be refined and included under the IQMS section, not to have a directorate of its own at Provincial Office."

There is no doubt that any given quality assurance system "will always be affected by 'situational factors' and 'context', and that in the process of development and implementation, 'quality policy' becomes changed and subverted" (Newton, 2004:48). Newton adds that success in the application of a system may depend less on the rigour of application or the compactness of the documented quality system *per se*, important though that may be, and more on the use made of it by the relevant actors, and how the system is viewed and interpreted by them. It is clear that as a result of situational factors, the IQMS is interpreted differently by various schools, often because of non-capacitation, so development and support are required to be conducted for all schools by the Department of Education.

4.6 TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE FINANCIAL INCENTIVE THAT IS ATTACHED TO THE IQMS

All twelve teachers and three principals grumbled about the monetary incentive that was attached to performance measurement as the most hampering factor in the process of implementing the IQMS. They mentioned that their only motivation to comply with the IQMS process was the one percent monetary incentive which they received at the end of the process. One participant said that:

This monetary incentive is the major part that contributes to the ineffectiveness of the IQMS. This incentive should go away as it leads

to forgery and dodging; forces everyone to meet the required score so as to get money; creates corruption as teachers do not genuinely evaluate themselves for developmental purposes; and causes fights, hatred and quarrels when a teacher is told she does not deserve the scores he or she was awarded. (Teacher 6)

All the teachers and principals interviewed expressed opinions in a similar vein. This has major implications for the IQMS. Firstly, the very important part of the system (developmental part) that could develop and lead to effective teaching and learning in schools, and that is in any case under-emphasised (see 4.5 above), is further sidelined because teachers seem to focus on the monetary gain.

We do the IQMS just for the sake of getting money, nothing else. (Teacher 4)

Secondly, the teachers all expressed themselves in similar vein, that the one percent incentive was not enough for them as they were working very hard in producing the future citizens of South Africa, and all suggested that this financial incentive should be linked to a different aspect of remuneration:

It is totally unfair to be attached in the IQMS because it serves no purpose of development. It should be separated from this system and be attached to the bonus or yearly increment for it to be implemented professionally. (Teacher 5)

These teachers' views receive support from a quite different perspective. Fitz-Gibbon (1995:195) believes that performance-related pay is a waste of taxpayers' money. She is of the opinion that if you are measuring outcomes and feeding the information back, you have a monitoring-with-feedback system already in place. She further argues that if feedback alone produces improvements, why add performance-related pay? This clearly indicates that in some instances, performance-related pay opens the way to bias, favoritism, corruption, discrimination and harassment, especially of junior employees (Weber, 2005:18). Therefore, most teachers seem not to be in support of the monetary reward that is attached to the performance measurement..

4.7 ANALYSIS OF DOCUMENTARY DATA

The researcher analysed three sets of documents from each of the schools: the minute book for the staff meetings (teaching staff), the personnel files of all the teachers interviewed, and a counter book (note book) containing the school policy in each school. The documents were analysed to gain a sense of the actual implementation of the IQMS in the three schools. All three schools were in possession of the above-mentioned documents, and all three made them available to the researcher. The information contained in each set was relatively similar, probably owing in part to the fact that all the schools belonged to one circuit.

4.7.1 The minute book

The minute books for the staff meetings were functioning documents, as in each case they reflected all the staff meetings that were held in 2010. The information contained in the documents that was relevant to the topic included the following:

Allocation of duties: This involved class teachers – subject allocation as per phase or stream.

School committees: Sport committees, entertainment committees; cleaning committees, music committees and financial committees.

IQMS structure: In this portion, the researcher noticed that all Department of Education-recommended committees were available in School A and School C; the only exception was School B, where there was no grievance committee.

4.7.2 Teachers' personnel files

All the teachers' files from the three schools were broadly similar, neatly covered and kept in an orderly fashion. The information contained in each file was clearly shown in the table of contents, and the information was as follows:

- Copy of the teachers' identity document
- Curriculum vitae
- Academic certificates
- Marriage certificate
- Appointment letter
- Assumption of duties
- SACE certificate
- Duties to be performed in the school (class allocation; subject allocation and committees)
- Completed leave forms for the past year
- Copies of the IQMS (instrument, and individual committees and PGP's for different years). And there were documents with important school information in the office of each school.

4.7.3 The school policy

The school policy file contained different policies for the school activities and the manner of conduct of teachers and learners. These included:-

- Teaching time table.
- Assessment and moderation times such as how many written tests were to be conducted per month per class, class work per week, etc.
- How the principal and SMTs are to check and control the teachers' work.

- When the IQMS assessment is to be done.
- Committee names for IQMS structures.
- Conduct of teachers: punctuality, daily attendance and sobriety at work.
- Conduct of learners: how to deal with bad behaviour and punishment.

From the analysis of the above-mentioned documents, it emerged that both the teachers and the principals of these three schools had positive expectations and firm ideas about how to run the school effectively. Their ideas, planning and concerns indicated methods of improving the performance of teachers at the schools. It has been interesting that parents showed awareness of how to govern and control the behavioural actions of their learners. The information contained in all these documents showed not only how the improvement of teacher performance was monitored, but also how the schools were governed and managed in general. Thus from all the available documents in these three schools, the researcher attempted to scrutinize only those areas which were relevant to the IQMS.

4.8 SUMMARY

The analysis of the documentary data was combined with the data collected through the use of interviews. From all these data the information received in all three schools showed the IQMS calendar, and how and when teachers perform their duties in their schools. During the interview period, the researcher found that some teachers in School A and School C had similar perceptions and experiences pertaining to their performance appraisal systems. The preceding discussions illustrated that the IQMS presents many challenges, which need to be addressed by both the Department of Education and teachers themselves. Some of the main objectives of the IQMS seem to be sidelined because of the financial incentive that is attached to the system. Some teachers said that they complied with the IQMS by filling in forms and awarding themselves reasonable scores only to get money.

The IQMS seems to cause pressure among teachers because of the inadequate training that they have received regarding the implementation of this policy. It is interesting to note that teachers acknowledged that the IQMS could be effective if they could understand it better. They felt that obstacles that bedevilled the performance appraisal system should be resolved by the DoE.

The following chapter is a discussion of the study's findings.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF THE STUDY'S FINDINGS

This section provides findings, discussion and a summary of the study. As has been indicated earlier on, these findings emanate from the analysis of the researchers' data on the perceptions and experiences of teachers on the implementation of the IQMS. In the current study, data were obtained from semi-structured interviews and documentary analysis. In summarising the main findings, this chapter will also show how the reviewed literature assisted in analysing the data.

5.1 THE EXPERIENCE AND PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS AND DISTRICT OFFICIAL IN ATTEMPTING TO IMPLEMENT THE IQMS

It has been identified by the majority of the participants – teachers, principals and district official – that the IQMS is not being implemented in a professional manner in the schools. The findings reflect that the participants complain about time constraints, work load increase, unfamiliar concepts and language use in the policy documents, and insufficient training as key factors that inhibit the implementation of the system. These complaints clearly indicate that the participants are not happy with the system because of these problems. In addition, the findings determined that capacitation of the stakeholders with regard to the policy is necessary for effective implementation. This means that thorough training strategies for good implementation are needed so as to facilitate development.

This study also investigated teachers' perceptions and experience of using the instrument designed to measure their performance and the performance of their schools (IQMS). Its findings concluded that the instrument is fraught with many obstacles and that these inhibit the implementation of the IQMS.

The interviewees indicated that the IQMS requires the formation of many staff structures, which in turn involve a very lengthy process, and demand a lot of paperwork. For example, it requires a self-evaluation process, classroom observation, a pre-evaluation discussion, feedback and discussion, monitoring, moderation, the writing up and storage of records, including a report of the school, the development of a Personal Growth Plan and School Improvement Plan, class visits, democratic decision-making and administering the instrument itself. All this paperwork and all these meetings increase teachers' workload in schools. Thus the information gathered by the researcher indicates that the time constraints, increased paperwork, multiple structures and teacher overload that have been added by the IQMS itself hamper the implementation of the IQMS system. This finding is in line with Gardiner's point (2009:23) that the IQMS is the first reason for unease at the way in which the interests of the education system are given significantly more weight than the needs of teachers, and that as such the system is interested in the system, not in people.

5.2 TEACHERS' AND PRINCIPALS' UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE INSTRUMENT USED TO MONITOR AND MANAGE THEIR PERFORMANCE AND THE PERFORMANCE OF THEIR SCHOOL

The findings of this study reflect that teachers do not necessarily have a negative attitude towards being evaluated, as evaluation can enhance employees' competence and commitment to their work. It has been noted from previous studies that many teachers do not understand their performance measurement appraisal system. This study has also found that many teachers have a problem with the language that is used in the IQMS as being too vague, unfamiliar, misleading and ambiguous for them to easily understand. Even the district official agreed, as he has noted that teachers often misinterpret the information from the IQMS documents. The teacher-participants in this study also indicated that the system leans towards being overly technical and theoretical, and several suspected that the DoE was aware that the system was not achieving its desired objective.

Several interviewees described the IQMS as being a bureaucratic and hierarchical method of evaluation, some complaining that the system was principal-driven, and that it still reinforced the bureaucratic approach of the old inspectorial system.

Studies by de Clercq (2008) also mentioned that there are more possibilities of junior employees being the victims of sexual harassment by senior employees because the majority of principals in South Africa schools are men. The teachers perceived their principals as the ones who should ensure that every teacher embarked on the process of self-evaluation, received quality developmental support on an ongoing basis, and always reported their work. This can only be achieved through good leadership, good decision-making and the willingness to be held accountable.

When comparing this study with previous studies consulted, similar determinants of the performance measurement appraisal system were identified. For example, language as a key determinant was raised by the following research studies and press articles: Weber (2005); Chisholm and Hoadley (2005); Wadvalla (2005); SADTU's *The Educator's Voice* (2008) and (2009); and Biputh (2008).

Although the previous research studies consulted did not raise any concern pertaining to the issue of insufficient training in implementing the IQMS in the South African schools, this study has revealed that teachers, more especially those who were not trained by the Provincial Department, do not well understand the IQMS. The District Co-coordinator (the participant from the District Office) also argued that the IQMS is poorly implemented in the schools because teachers complain about the lack of suitable capacity-building. This clearly indicates that the training was unsatisfactory. The training and guidance given to the stakeholders was inadequate and once-off, and many teachers and principals were not clear about how the IQMS should be implemented. The implication was that teachers should be re-trained to achieve a better understanding and more thorough implementation of the IQMS.

Several interviewees also mentioned that teachers perceive the appraisal instrument as discouraging and reinforcing the bureaucratic style associated with the old

inspection system. Several teacher interviewees argued that the principals are always the dominant factor, and if it happens that the principal and his/her SMT members, as well as the SDT, are not in your favour, you are probably in serious trouble. This has been to some extent confirmed by other studies, which have found that since the senior management in most South African schools is dominated by men, there might be more chances of sexual harassment and the exploitation of junior colleagues. At any rate, the responses from the teachers indicated that the SDT and the SMT have similar compositions and roles with regard to the IQMS process, therefore one structure could be scrapped.

5.3 THE NEED FOR SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHERS AND SCHOOLS

The support and development of teachers and schools are the first stated purpose of the IQMS. However, during the interviews only two out of thirteen teachers and principals acknowledged that they had been developed professionally as a result of the IQMS – and only once each, in the Learning Areas Mathematics and Social Science. Teachers indicated that they had submitted their PGP's and SIP's to the DoE, but there had been no follow-up programmes for support and development in their areas of weakness, or in the areas of school needs and problems. This implies that there is a recurring question as to whether the performance measurement/developmental appraisal system is for professional development or for accountability. Biputh (2008), Weber (2005) and SADTU *Teacher's Voice* (2008) all state that teachers' professional development needs to be a central feature of the IQMS, not peripheral as it is presently viewed in schools; for example, the IQMS will not be effective for professional development if it is not informed by the personal growth plans of teachers and addressed at a school level *and* by the district at a later stage.

In addition to the lack of development in schools, teachers claim that they are still working under bad conditions, such as no libraries in their schools, lack of furniture, no flush toilets, broken classroom windows, errant learners' behaviour, and insufficient teaching resources. As a result, most teachers perceive the IQMS as essentially an instrument of control (Gardiner, 2009).

Teachers who were the participants during the research interviews also indicated that the system leaned towards being technical and theoretical rather than person-orientated and practicable. In addition, the DoE is also aware that the system is not achieving its desired objective. This is in large part confirmed by the non-performance of the external whole school evaluators of the Province, who have never visited the school from 2004 until the time of writing (SADTU's *The Educator's Voice* (2009) and de Clercq (2008) are of the same view. There is no doubt that the DoE must revisit the system, particularly with reference to the problems identified by the stakeholders in this study, before it is too late to achieve effective teaching and learning in South African schools.

5.4 THE MONETARY INCENTIVE THAT IS ATTACHED TO THE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

The complexity that arises from using one single instrument for two different purposes, that is, for Developmental Appraisal as well as for Performance Measurement, has created tensions among teachers. All thirteen research participants showed dissatisfaction with the monetary incentive that is attached to their performance measurement. They all clearly mentioned that they comply with the IQMS process only because of the one percent they will get at the end of the process. The teachers further noted that they do not genuinely measure their performance for development, as this will not earn them any money – they just award themselves reasonable marks, even if they do not deserve a pass mark. The majority of participants argued that even this one percent is not enough (too small) for them as they are the “mind engineers” of society. As yet, teachers

complain that it is therefore not viable to tie this monetary incentive to performance measurement in their profession, as they perceive it as a waste of taxpayers' money.

5.5 SUMMARY

The performance measurement and appraisal system (the individual part of the IQMS) is a “dipstick” for teachers in their profession. On its introduction, the system was seen as the best way to help teachers to reflect on their own practice for the sake of development. On its implementation, teachers are indicating that there are problems that have emerged and that frustrate them, which lead in turn to poor implementation and affect their performance negatively in schools.

The following are the factors which emerged in this research study as inhibiting the implementation of the IQMS policy:

- Time constraints
- The increase in teachers' workload brought about by the IQMS system itself
- The unfamiliar, vague and ambiguous language of the IQMS documents
- A lack of capacity (inadequate knowledge and understanding) on the part of teachers and managers for carrying out the IQMS successfully
- The linking of a monetary incentive to performance measurement
- The increased paperwork required by the IQMS
- The bureaucratic style of management encouraged and reinforced by the IQMS
- The multiplicity of structures required for the systems' implementation
- The cumbersome nature of the appraisal and monitoring instrument as

identified by the participants

- A lack of support and development for teachers and schools
- No visits by the Provincial DoE officials for the WSE from the inception of the IQMS.

Conclusions and recommendations will be outlined in Chapter 6.

CHAPTER SIX

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this final chapter is to draw recommendations and conclusions based on the findings from the investigation of teachers' perceptions and experiences of the Integrated Quality Management System.

6.2 OVERVIEW OF THE DISSERTATION

Chapter One provided a general overview of the study, and of the systems of inspection and appraisal operative in South Africa before and after 1994. The research was triggered by the continual changes in the inspection and evaluation policies and systems in the South African school system. The problem aroused the interest of the researcher, leading her to investigate and focus specifically on the implementation of the latest of these policies, one that was drafted with high hopes by the employer (the state) in conjunction with the organised teaching profession, and on how teachers themselves perceive and experience the quality assurance system that is currently in place, in the Butterworth District of the Eastern Cape Province.

The researcher undertook her study because of her position as an IQMS co-ordinator in the Butterworth District, and she hoped that by engaging teachers, principals and a district official in talking about their experience of the IQMS, she would shed light on the problems they identified.

In Chapter Two, the researcher explored other authors' theories and findings – what they say about performance management, appraisal systems and school evaluation,

locally and internationally, and how these have been researched.

Chapter Three outlined the research design and methodology used to investigate the research questions. This chapter details how the study was undertaken, how teachers were selected for the interviews, the data collection procedures and instruments, and method of analysing the data.

In the fourth chapter, the researcher analysed and interpreted the data from the chosen research sites. The analysed and interpreted data enabled the researcher to better understand how teachers perceive the IQMS and its implementation.

In Chapter Five, the researcher discussed the findings and draws some conclusions.

In Chapter Six, the researcher presents recommendations based on the findings of the study, including suggestions for further research.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Teachers in South Africa have experienced significant shifts in the evaluation systems applied to their practice and performance within a period of fifteen years. Namely, the inspection system before and after 1994; the Developmental Appraisal System which came into being in 1998 (Resolution 4 of 1998); Performance Measurement that was agreed upon in 2003 (Resolution 1 of 2003); and Whole School Evaluation and the Integrated Quality Management System which was agreed upon in the ELRC later in 2003 (Resolution 8 of 2003). Teachers appear to be frustrated and confused by this continual shifting. This is possibly reflected in their failure so far to comply wholeheartedly with the official implementation requirements of the IQMS.

The researchers' findings indicate that the IQMS and its implementation should be reviewed by the Department of Education in order to achieve its desired objectives. The most essential recommendation appears to be to separate the performance reward from the developmental portion. Meaning that the monetary incentive that

is attached to the IQMS should be phased out because it is a key problem militating against the effectiveness of the system. It has been recommended that the incentive be included with the annual increment or bonus. This would enable the system to be genuinely implemented as a developmental process.

The Department of Education also needs to address the issue of limiting the number of IQMS structures. For example, if the SMT is responsible for running the system, there should be no additional SDT structure. There is also a need to reduce the amount of paperwork involved to manageable proportions.

Another problem that teachers have in implementing the IQMS is a lack of capacity. It is recommended that adequate training should be conducted by the relevant Department officials through ongoing workshops. This training is necessary to reduce frustrations and demotivation among the stakeholders, and to enable teachers to become more familiar with the language used in the system.

The teachers have also raised the need for professional development as an essential requirement owing to the continuous curriculum changes in the education system of South Africa. Weaknesses should be determined in the Personal Growth plan, and be addressed at both the school level and district level. School problems and concerns should be identified in the School Improvement Plan, and be addressed by officials at the Provincial level.

6.4 AGENDA FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The Department of Education should consider conducting a study of the current evaluation system, looking at the in-service needs of teachers, followed by an investigation of the capacity-building structure.

6.5 CONCLUSIONS

After 1994, many policies were initiated for the transformation of education in South Africa. The IQMS was one of the policy initiatives that came into being after the dismantling of the old inspection system. The introduction of the IQMS was seen by all the stakeholders as the system that would enhance the quality of the South African education system and help to balance the imbalances of the past. The instrument initially found favour amongst stakeholders because it allowed teachers to be appraised and measured within the work context by internally based panels, and it would also give teachers the opportunity to be developed in their areas of weakness (ELRC, 2003, Resolution 4). There was no doubt at the time that the new system for quality management in schools held significant benefits for teachers and learners. However, teachers seem not to have accepted, or in some cases even understood, the current system.

It is significant and interesting to note that teachers appear to need to be evaluated in their work by means a system that will enable them to reflect on their own practice and performance, and assist them in professional development. Nevertheless this study has shown that the IQMS, though designed to achieve these very ends, is perceived by key stakeholders (teachers and other educators) as being fraught with many obstacles – some inherent, and others related to implementation, in some areas if not across the country. Therefore, this study constitutes a call to the Government to open up a debate around the issue of the current teacher and school evaluation system for the purpose of enhancing the effectiveness of South Africa's schools.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- African National Congress (ANC). (1994). *A policy framework for education and training*. Johannesburg: Education Department, African National Congress.
- Babbie, E. and Mouton, J. (2001). *Social Research*. Oxford. London.
- Badenhorst, D.C., Calitz, L.P., Van Schalkwyk, O.J., Van Wyk, J.G. and Kruger, A.G. (1985). *School management: The task and role of the teacher*. Pretoria: Kagiso.
- Bailey, K.D. (1994). *Methods of social research*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bartlett, S. (2000). The development of teacher appraisal: A recent history. *British Journal of Education Studies*. (3)48: 24 – 37.
- Becher, T., Eraut, M. and Knight, J. (1982). *Policies for Educational Accountability*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Bell, L. (1988). *Appraising teachers in schools*. London: Routledge..
- Biputh, B. (2008). *An investigation of educators' perspectives on the IQMS in South African schools*. Unpublished dissertation. Faculty of Education. Durban University of Technology. Accessed <<http://ir.dut.ac.za/handle/10321/352>> on 15-06-2009.
- Bloch, G. (2009). *The toxic mix: What's wrong with South African schools, and how to fix it*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Bollington, R., Hopkins, D. and West, M. (1993). *An introduction to teacher appraisal*. London: Cassel.
- Brown, A. and Dowling, P. (1998). *Doing research / Reading research*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Burgess, G. (1984). *In the field: An introduction to field research*. Unwin Hyman. Boston.

Cardno, C., Piggot-Irvine, N. (1997). *Effective performance appraisal: Integrating, accountability and development in staff appraisal*. Auckland: Longman.

Carson, D. (2001). *Qualitative marketing research*. SAGE Publications. London.

Chetty, D., Chisholm, L., Gardiner, L., Manam, N. and Vinjevold, P. (1993). *Rethinking teacher appraisal in South Africa: Options and strategies*. Johannesburg: Education Policy Unit, University of Witwatersrand.

Chisholm, L., Hoadley, U., Kivulu, M., Brookes, H., Prinsloo, C., Kgobe, A., Mosia, D., Narsee, H. and Rule, S. (2005a). *Educator workload in South Africa*. Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council.

Chisholm, L, and Hoadley, U. (2005b). *The new accountability and teachers' work in South Africa*. Paper prepared for Kenton conference, Mpekwani.

Darling-Hammond, L. and Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

De Clercq, F. (2008). Teacher quality, appraisal and development: The flaws in the IQMS. *Perspectives in Education*. 26(1): 1-17.

Department of Education, (1997). *White Paper 3: A programme for the transformation of higher education*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. (2000). *Norms and Standards for Educators*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. (2001). *Norms and standards for educators*. *Government Gazette*. Vol. 415 (20844). Cape Town: Government Printers.

Department of Education. (2006). *Towards quality education in general education and training*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. (2009). *Curriculum News*. Pretoria. Government Printers.

Duke, D.L. and Stiggins, R.J. (1991). Beyond minimum competence: Evaluation for professional development. In J. Millman and L. Darling-Hammond (eds.). *Teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers*. California: Corwin Press.

Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC). (2003a). *Resolution 4 of 1998*. Pretoria: Education Labour Relations Council.

Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC). (2003b). *Integrated Quality Management System, Collective Agreement No.8, 27 August*. Education Policy Unit, University of Witwatersrand.

Fleisch, B. (2008). *Primary education in crisis: Why learners underachieve in readings and mathematics*. Johannesburg: Juta.

Fraenkel, J.R. and Wallen, N.E. (1990). *How to design and evaluate research in Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Frazier, A. (1997). *A roadmap of quality transformation in education*. Boca Raton, Florida: St Lucia Press.

Freire, P. (1998). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who teach*. Boulder, Co: Westview.

Garvin, D. (1991). Building award really works. *Harvard Business Review*. 2nd Edition, Volume 7 pp 23-66.

G,robler, B.R. and Van der Merwe, M.P. (1995). *Educational Management 1. School organisation. Education Management 2 (Study Guides)*. Auckland Park: RAU College for Education and Health.

Guba, E.G. (1990). *The paradigm dialogue*. London: SAGE publications.

Guthrie, J.W. and Reed, R.J. (1986). *Educational administration and policy:*

Effective leadership for American schools. London: Prentice-Hall.

Hattersley, M. (1992). *The appraisal of head teachers*. London: Cassell.

Heedy, P.D. and Ormrod, J.E. (2005). *Practical research: Planning and design*. New Jersey: Pearson Education International.

Hensey, P. and Blanchard, K.H. (1982). *Management of organisational behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Horne, H and Pierce, A. (1996). *A practical guide to staff development and appraisal in Schools*. London: Kogan Page.

Ireland, D. (1991). *Quality management for projects and programmes*. Upper Darby, Pa: Oxford: The Project Management Institute.

Iwanicki, E.F. (1991). Teacher Evaluation for school improvement. In J. Millman and L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.). *Teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers*. California: Corwin Press. pp. 158 – 171.

Jacobsen, D. (2006). *Developing effective teacher performance*. London: SAGE.

Jantjies, E.M. (1996). Performance-based teacher appraisal: From judgment to development. *South African Journal of Education*. 16(1): 57 – 70.

Jones, J. (1993). *Appraisal and staff development*. London: David Fulton Publishers.

Karimulla, H. (1997). *Clarity as an aspect of tactful feedback: Implication for the management of teacher competency*. Unpublished mini-dissertation. Johannesburg Rand Afrikaans Universiteit.

Kinick, A. and Kreitner, R. (2006). *Organisational behaviour: Key concepts, skills and practices*. Cambridge: McGraw-Hill.

Kogan, M. (1986). *Educational accountability: An analytical overview*. London: Hutchinson.

- Madaus, G.F., Scriven, M.S. and Stufflebeam, D.L. (1987). *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation*. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.
- McCornick, R. (1982). *Calling to account*. London: Heineman Educational Books..
- Maree, K. (2007). *First steps in research*. Pretoria: Van Schalk.
- Marneweck, L. (2003). *Implementation of OBE: A case study of six schools in the Limpopo Province*. Unpublished doctoral thesis (PHD). Johannesburg: School of Education, University of the Witwatersrand.
- Morrow, W. (2007). *Learning to teach in South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Mathula, K. (2004). *Performance management: From resistance to the IQMS*. 3rd Educationally Speaking Conference, Warmbaths.
- May, T. (2002). *Qualitative research in action*. London: SAGE.
- Maykut, P. and Morehouse, R, (1994). *Beginning qualitative research*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- McCormick, R. (1982). *Calling Education to Account*. London: Heineman Educational Books.
- Mgijima, N. (2000). *The South African model for Whole School Evaluation*. Paper presented at the National Conference on Whole School Evaluation. 29-30 September. Gauteng: Caesar's Conference Centre.
- Middlewood, D. (1997). Managing appraisal. In D. Middlewood (ed.). *Managing people in education*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Quality data analysis: A source book of new methods* (2nd Edn). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Mokgalane, E., Charrim, N., Gardiner, M., and Chisholm, L. (1997). *National Teacher Appraisal*. Johannesburg: Pilot project.

Musaazi, J.C.S. (1992). *Theory and practice of educational practice*. London: Macmillan.

Narsee, H. (2006). *The common and contested meanings of education district in S.A.* Unpublished doctoral thesis (PHD). Pretoria: Faculty of Education, University of Pretoria. Accessed from upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd-03232006-094442/.../00front.pdf on 23-08-2010

National Department of Education (1998a). *Educators Act No.76*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

National Department of Education (1998b). *Manual for Developmental Appraisal for Educators*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

National Department of Education. (2001). *School Improvement Plan*. *Government Gazette*, Vol. 433 (22512) of the 28th July 2001.

National Department of Education. (2002). *An introduction to Whole School Evaluation Policy*. *Government Gazette*, Vol. 433 (22512). Pretoria: Government Printers.

National Department of Education. (2003). *Training manual for educators: Integrated Quality Management System*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

National Department of Education. (1996). *National Policy on Teacher Supply, Utilization and Development*, Pretoria: Government Printers.

Neuman, F.M., King, B.M. and Rigdon, M. (1997). *Accountability and school performance: Implications from restructuring schools*. *Harvard Educational Review*. **67** (10, 41-74.

Newton, J. (2002). Views from below: Academics coping with quality. *Quality in Higher Education*. 8(1). Carfax Publishing.

O'Day, J. and Smith, M. (1993). *Systemic reform and education*

opportunity. In S. Fuhrman (ed.). *Designing coherent education policy: Improving the system*. New York: Jossey-Bass.

Parker, B. and Harley, K. (1998). *Curriculum and teacher development in an outcomes-based qualifications framework: A study of South Africa in the 1990's*. Paper read at the 10th World Congress of the World Council for Comparative Education Societies. Cape Town: SAGE.

Poster, C. and Poster, D. (1993). *Teacher appraisal: Training and implementation*. London: Routledge.

Pirsig, R. (1976). *Zen and the art of motorcycle maintenance*. London: Corgi.

Sallis, E. (1993). *Total Quality Management in education*. London: Kogan Page.

Samuel, M. (2008). *Accountability to whom? For what? Teacher identity and the force field model of teacher development*. Volume 26 (2) 5-6.

Scheerems, J. (2000). *The school effectiveness knowledge base as a guide for school improvement*. London: Kluwer Publishers.

Schrag, F. (1995). *Teacher accountability A philosophical view*. Ph. Delta Kappan, 76 (8): 45-49..

Seyfarth, J.T. (1999). *The principal: New leadership for new challenges*. London. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Soudien, C. (2004). A new racial state. Exclusion and inclusion in education policy and practice in South Africa. *Perspectives in Education*. 22 (4): 45-67.

Republic of South Africa. (1996). *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

South African Democratic Teachers Union, (2001). *Declaration of SADTU National Education Policy Conference*, Available in

<http://www.sadtu.org.za/press/speeches/200124-4-2001,o.html>.> accessed on 27-07-2010.

South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU). (2003). The IQMS as a teacher evaluation system in South African Schools. *Teachers' Voice*. November – December edition.

South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU). (2005). Quality teachers for quality education training for a stronger teaching force. *Educator's Voice*. October – November edition.

South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU). (2008). Evaluation of Teachers at schools. *Educator's Voice*. June – July edition.

South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU). (2008). Teacher's Classroom Evaluation Checklist. *Educator's Voice*. April issue.

South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU). (2008). Who should teach the teachers? *Educator's Voice*. October issue.

South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU). (2009). Effective teaching by the effective teacher. *The Educator's Voice*. March – April.

Steyn, G.M. (1999). Professional development: A key to school management. *South African Journal of Education*. 3(19): 45 – 56.

Talbert, J.E. and McLaughlin, M.W. (1994). Teacher professionalism in local school context. *American Journal of Education*. 4(13): 23 – 34.

Taylor, N. and Vinjevold, P. (1999). *Getting learning right*. Johannesburg: Joint Education Trust (JET).

Thompson, R.L. (1990). *Constructive appraisals*. London: Marshall Publishing.

Thurlow, M. and Ramnarain, S. (2001). Transforming educator appraisal in South Africa. In C. Sardno and D. Middlewood (eds.). *Teacher appraisal and*

performance: A comparative approach. London: Routledge Falmer.

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

Van der Bank, A. (2000). *Appraisal for educators in South Africa: A threat or a challenge?* Available in <http://www.design.com.2000/pages/con.13htm>.

Van der Westhuizen, L. (2000). *Policy development of quality assurance: a critical perspective on past and future issues*. Oxford: SAGE.

Wadvalla, I. (2005). *The implementation of the IQMS in two different schools in Gauteng, Unpublished B.Ed. Hons project..* Johannesburg: University of Witwatersrand. Accessed from http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/.../thesis_rabichund_s.pdf?...1 on 21-07-2010.

Waghid, Y. (1996). Can a system of teacher appraisal in a changing South Africa be sustainable? *South African Journal of Education*. 16(2): 81 – 7.

Wagner, R.B. (1989). *Accountability in education: A philosophical inquiry*. New York: Routledge.

Weber, E. (2002). Shifting to the right: The evaluation of equity in the South African government's developmental and educational policies, 1990 – 1999. *Comparative Education Review*. 46(3): 261 – 290.

Weber, E. 2005. New controls and accountability for South African teachers and schools: The Integrated Quality Management System. *Perspectives in Education*. 23(2): 63 – 72.

Weller, L.D. (1995). School restructuring and downsizing: Using TQM to promote cost effectiveness. *TQM Magazine*, August 1995, 30-39.

West, M. and Bollington, R. (1990). *Teacher appraisal*. London: David Fulton.

Winter, R. (1989). Problems in teacher appraisal: An action research solution. In *Rethinking appraisal and assessment*, H Simons & J Elliot (eds). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Piloting

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The information in this interview schedule will be confidential. The names of participants and school names will not be identified.

(PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS)

SECTION A

Biographic Information

1.1 Name of school

1.2 Gender

1.3 Highest academic/professional qualification

1. What position do you hold in the school?

2. For how many years have you been in this position?

3. What were your majors in your diploma / degree?

4. What subjects / learning areas do you offer presently?
.....

5. Are you teaching the subjects/learning areas that you were trained for in your tertiary level?.....

6. If not, how do you feel to be assessed in those learning areas for grade and salary progression?.....
.....
.....

.....
.....
.....

7. For how long have you been teaching these learning areas?

.....

SECTION B

Advocacy

1. Has the advocacy for the IQMS been done in your district?

.....

2. Who conducted the advocacy?

.....

3. Has every teacher in your school heard about the advocacy?If yes,
How has it been done?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Training

1. Have you been trained for the IQMS?

When?.....

2. If yes, what was the duration?

.....
3. Who trained teachers of your school?

.....
.....

4. What documents were provided during training the IQMS?

.....

5. Did you understand how to use those documents?If yes, to what extent?
If no, what was the problem?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

6. What did you gain from the training?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

7. What did you dislike from the training?.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

8. To what extent were you satisfied with the training?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Implementation

1. Do you do self-evaluation as the requirement for the IQMS?..... If yes, Describe the purposes of the self-evaluation?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2. Are the performance standard used to measure your performance clear? If not, what is the problem?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3. Do you think the implementation process of the IQMS is done in a professional manner in your school? If yes, which steps do you follow when assessing yourselves? If no, please give explanation why do you feel that it is not done in a professional way in your school?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

4. When was the last IQMS assessment in your school?

.....

5. How do you feel about the monetary incentive that is attached to your performance measurement?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

6. What is your perception of the instrument or mechanism that is used to monitor and manage your performance and the performance of your school?

.....
.....
.....
.....

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Whole School Evaluation

1. Has your school been visited by the District Official for the IQMS?.....If yes, when was the last visit?..... What did they do?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2. What happened after the visit as far as the school needs, weaknesses, support and development of teachers are concerned?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

.....
3. What is your view about WSE?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

THANK YOU

SECTION C

CHECKLIST (Principals)

	YES	NO	REMARKS
1. Does every teacher in your school have : <ul style="list-style-type: none">• IQMS manual• Personal file• PGP			
2. Are the following IQMS structures in place in your school? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• DSG• Grievance committee• SDT• SMT			
3. Are there any temporary teachers that were assessed in your school?			
4. Has your school forwarded all the IQMS documents to the district office? Supply copies			

APPENDIX 2: Piloting

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The information in this interview schedule will be confidential. The names of the participants and school names will not be identified

DISTRICT OFFICIAL

SECTION A

BIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

- 5. Name of district
- 6. Gender
- 7. Highest academic/professional qualification:
- 8. What position do you hold in the district office?
- 9. For how long have you been in this position?

SECTION B

ADVOCACY

- 1. Has the advocacy for the IQMS been done in your district? If yes, who conducted it?
.....
- 2. Was every school in your district aware of it/informed about it? ...If yes, to what extent?
.....
.....

.....
.....
.....
.....

3. What challenges did you face during advocacy?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

TRAINING

1.1 Have you been trained on how to implement the IQMS? If yes, for how long have you been trained?Who trained you?.....

1.2 Were you satisfied with the training? (please explain)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

1.3 Have the teachers of your district been trained for the IQMS? If yes, what challenges did you notice from the training?

.....
.....

.....
.....
.....

1.4 Who trained teachers of your district for the IQMS?

.....

1.5 How many teachers were trained from each school?

1.6 What documents were provided during training?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

IMPLEMENTATION

1.1 How long have you been involved in administering the IQMS as a District Official?

1.2 Are there any schools that you visited for the IQMS this year?.....If yes, when was your last visit? Please give total number of schools visited this year.....

1.3 How often do you visit schools for the IQMS?.....

1.4 What challenges do you encounter when you visit schools?
.....
.....
.....

1.5 How have you addressed the challenges?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

1.6 What is your perception about the instrument that is used to measure the performance of the schools (WSE) (Please explain)

.....
.....
.....
.....

1.7 What can you say about you role of being an IQMS coordinator in your district?.....

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

THANK YOU

SECTION C

CHECKLIST (District Official)

	YES	NO	REMARKS
1. Do you have copies of the following documents : SIP i. DIP ii. PGP iii. WSE form			
2. Do schools return the IQMS documents to the District office?			
3. Do you still have a list of schools to visit This year?			

THANK YOU

APPENDIX 3: Letter of permission

Faculty of Education
School of Post Graduate Studies
Cnr Fleet Street and Cambridge Street
East London and Alice

The Principal

.....

Sir/Madam

Re: Seeking permission to conduct Research

This is to confirm that Mrs. Nombulelo Ntshewula, student number 200805474 is a M.Ed. candidate at the University of Fort Hare being supervised by Mr Mike Adendorff. His research topic is “Teachers’ perceptions and experience in the implementation of the IQMS”. In the fulfillment of her programme she needs to conduct research from August to September 2010, and has identified your school as one of her research sites. Kindly grant her permission to do so.

Yours sincerely

Dr N. Duku (Head of Department (M.Ed. Programmes))

APPENDIX 4: Consent Form

NTSESHE J.S.S.
P.O. Box 196
NGQAMAKHWE
4990

TO: THE PARTICIPANT

.....
.....
.....

CONSENT FORM FOR MRS NTSHEWULA'S PARTICIPANTS

I fully agree that I will be the participant of Miss Ntshewula's research study. I promise that I will provide her with the necessary information which will be of help to her study. I am fully aware that I will be bound by the ethics of this research exercising confidentiality as required by this study.

Signed aton this Day of2010

Signature of Participants Date

Signature of the researcher Date

APPENDIX 5: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The information in this interview schedule will be confidential. The names of participants and school will not be identified

(PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS)

SECTION A

Biographic Information

1.1 Name of school

1.2 Gender

1.3 Highest academic/professional qualification

What position do you hold in the school?

For how many years have you been in this position?

What were your majors in your diploma / degree?

What subjects / learning areas do you offer presently?
.....

Are you teaching the subjects/learning areas that you were trained for in your tertiary level?.....

If not, how do you feel to be assessed in those learning areas for grade and salary progression?.....
.....
.....
.....

For how long have you been teaching these learning areas?

.....
.....
.....

SECTION B

Advocacy

Has the advocacy for the IQMS been done in your district?

Who conducted the advocacy?.....

Has every teacher in your school heard about the advocacy?If yes, How has it been done?

.....
.....
.....
.....

Training

Have you been trained for the IQMS?When?.....

If yes, what was the duration?.....

Who trained teachers of your school?

.....

What documents were provided during training the IQMS?

.....

Did you understand how to use those documents?If yes, to what extent? If no, what was the problem

.....
.....
.....
.....

What did you gain from the training?.....

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

What did you dislike from the training?.....

1.8 To what extent were you satisfied with the training?

.....
.....

Implementation

Do you do self-evaluation as the requirement for the IQMS?..... If yes, Describe the purposes of the self-evaluation?

.....
.....
.....
.....

Are the performance standard used to measure your performance clear? If not, what Is the problem?

.....
.....
.....

Do you think the implementation process of the IQMS is done in a professional manner in your school? If yes, which steps do you follow when assessing yourselves? If no, please give explanation why do you feel that it is not done in a professional way in your school?.....

.....
.....

When was the last IQMS assessment in your school?

.....
.....

How do you feel about the monetary incentive that is attached to your performance measurement?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

What is your perception of the instrument or mechanism that is used to monitor and manage your performance and the performance of your school?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Whole School Evaluation

Has your school been visited by the District Official for the IQMS?.....If yes, when was the last visit?..... What did they do?

.....
.....
.....
.....

What happened after the visit as far as the school needs, weaknesses, support and development of teachers are concerned?

.....
.....
.....
.....

What is your view about WSE?

.....
.....
.....
.....

THANK YOU

SECTION C

CHECKLIST (Principals)

	YES	NO	REMARKS
Does every teacher in your school have: IQMS manual Personal file PGP?			
Are the following IQMS structures in place in your school? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DSG • Grievance committee • SDT • SMT 			
Are there any temporary teachers that were assessed in your school?			
Has your school forwarded all the IQMS documents to the district office? Supply copies.			

APPENDIX 6

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

DISTRICT OFFICIAL

The information in this interview schedule will be confidential. The names of participants and school names will not be identified

SECTION A

BIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

- 2. Name of district
- 3. Gender
- 4. Highest academic/professional qualification:
- 5. What position do you hold in the district office?
- 6. For how long have you been in this position?

SECTION B

ADVOCACY

- 1. Has the advocacy for the IQMS been done in your district? If yes, who conducted it?
.....
- 2. Was every school in your district aware of it/informed about it? ...If yes, to what extent?
.....
.....

.....
3. What challenges did you face during advocacy?
.....
.....
.....
.....

TRAINING

1.1 Have you been trained on how to implement the IQMS? If yes, for how long have you been trained?Who trained you.....

1.2 Were you satisfied with the training? (please explain)

1.3 Have the teachers of your district been trained for the IQMS? If yes, what challenges did you notice from the training?
.....
.....

1.4 Who trained teachers of your district for the IQMS?

1.5 How many teachers were trained from each school?

1.6 What documents were provided during training?

IMPLEMENTATION

1.2 How long have you been involved in administering the IQMS as a District Official?

1.2 Are there any schools that you visited for the IQMS this year?.....If yes, when was your last visit? Please give total number of schools

visited this year.....

1.3 How often do you visit schools for the IQMS.....

1.4 What challenges do you encounter when you visit schools?

1.5 How have you addressed the challenges?.....

1.6 What is your perception about the instrument that is used to measure the performance of the schools (WSE) (Please explain)

.....

1.7 What can you say about your role of being an IQMS coordinator in your district?.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

THANK YOU

SECTION C

CHECKLIST (District Official)

	YES	NO	REMARKS
Do you have copies of the following documents : SIP DIP PGP WSE form			
Do schools return the IQMS documents to the District office?			
Do you still have a list of schools to visit This year?			

THANK YOU