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SINOPSIS

Die eerste hoofstuk in die onderhawige studie is gewy aan 'n agtergrondsbeskrywing van die navorsingsprobleem. Sodoende het die rol van terugvoering by evaluering onder bespreking gekom. Die klem het in hierdie verband daarop geval dat terugvoering tot die doeltreffendheid en die professionele ontwikkeling van onderwysers moet bydra. Skrywers soos Grobler en Van der Merwe (1995: 4) sluit hulle by hierdie mening aan en onderstreep dit dat terugvoering onderwysers moet ondersteun om doelwitte te stel en dié doelwitte te bereik. Hierbenewens is die probleemstelling, doel, metodologie, uiteenstelling en sleutelbegrippe van die navorsing ook kortliks bespreek.

Hoofstuk 2 behels 'n oorsig van literatuur wat op die geloofwaardigheid en objektiwiteit van terugvoering betrekking het. Gemeld literatuurstudie is om die volgende redes onderneem:

♦ Om te bepaal wat ander auteurs se mening omtrent terugvoering is.
♦ Om te bepaal welke tipe navorsing ten opsigte van objektiwwe terugvoering beskikbaar is.
♦ Om te bepaal in welke mate onderwysbestuuders objektiief is wanneer hulle aan onderwysers terugvoering moet gee.

By die inwin van bogenoemde inligting is die doel van terugvoering en die gepaardgaand gedrag wat met geloofwaardige en objektiwwe terugvoering geassocieer word, bespreek.

Hoofstuk 3 is gewy aan 'n bespreking van die navorsingsmetodologie, welke aspek die vraeys en respondent, die populusisteekproef en die verwerking van die data by die voltooiing van die vraeys ingesluit het.
In hoofstuk 4 is die empiriese data ingewin, gerangskik, ontleed en geinterpreteer. Die instrument wat hiervoor gebruik is, het geblek geldig en betroubaar te wees. Hipoteses is ten opsigte van alle onafhanklike groepe formuleer, waarna die gemiddelde tellings van die onderskeie groepe met mekaar vergelyk is. Die meningsverskille tussen twee onafhanklike groepe is danky die toepassing van die Student t-toets blootgelê. Die variansie-ontleding (ANOVA) is gebruik om die verskille tussen drie of meer onafhanklike groepe bloot te lê. Die verskille tussen die onderskeie pare groepe se gemiddelde tellings is met behulp van die Scheffe-toets ondersoek.

Vervolgens 'n bespreking van die bevindinge van die onerhawige navorsingsprojek.
CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION

There has been a concern among academics as to what factors constitute the competence of the teacher. This study forms part of a greater ongoing research project concerning teacher competence and its assessment. The project focuses on researching teacher opinions on teacher competence identified by the initial research of Grobler and Van der Merwe (1995: 2) who identified the following factors of teacher competence namely:

* the learning environment;
* professional commitment;
* order and discipline;
* educational foundation;
* reflection;
* cooperative ability;
* effectiveness; and
* leadership.

Feedback on the assessment process also consists of group research projects on each of the following components namely:

* credible feedback;
* tactful feedback;
* invitational feedback;
* culturally sensitive feedback; and
* transparent feedback.

This particular research project is part of the research undertaken regarding credible feedback during assessment.
Credible feedback has been conceptualised to consist of the following aspects namely:

* integrity;
* knowledgeability;
* objectivity; and
* transparency.


This mini-dissertation focuses on the role of objectivity in credible feedback and how this can possibly enhance the management of teacher effectiveness.

1.1 BACKGROUND

The present curricular reforms in South Africa need, among other things, to consider changing the appraisal system of teachers. This is so, because of its failure to achieve the intended purpose of appraisal which is to bring about professional, instructional and organisational development, thereby improving the quality of education as a whole (Chetty, Chisholm, Gardiner, Magau and VinjeVold, 1993: 3). The reasons attributed to this failure are as follows:

- the bureaucratic structure of the educational institutions;
- improper appraisal procedure of teachers;
- incompetence of the appraisers;
- abuse of merit awards; and
- irrelevance of some evaluation criteria.
The previous appraisal system took place in the context of a separate development policy: a policy that was strongly rejected by the majority of the black people from its inception because of its negative consequences on the education of the large majority of teachers (Hartshorne, 1993: 128-134).

The major features of this policy were firstly, the existence of nineteen Departments of Education, each with its own curriculum that differed substantially in norms, standards and quality from others. This fragmentation culminated in the differing experiences of teachers within these Departments caused by the lack of uniformity across the Departments (Chetty et al., 1993: 3). The Department of Education and Training for example, probably had the lowest quality of education which could be the result of the poor qualifications of the majority of teachers in this Department. Secondly, this fragmentary division of the educational Department was further compounded by the disparities in the resource provision (Thembela, 1986: 78). Some Departments, for example, White Departments, were better resourced while others like African Departments were poorly provided in terms of financial, material and human resources. They therefore operated under serious constraints such as a chronic shortage of material, operating funds and shortage of teachers, especially well qualified ones. The incompetence of the majority of appraisers could also be attributed to this shortage of resources as these persons lacked sufficient knowledge and appraisal skills.

After this brief precusory background, it is necessary to clarify some of the concepts which will be used in this research essay.

1.2 CLARIFICATION OF CONCEPTS

It is necessary to clarify some concepts in order that the correct meanings be attached to these concepts. Objectivity will be the first concept to be clarified.
1.2.1 Objectivity

Blaine & Sanders (1987: 46) state that objectivity requires that evaluation information be "scientifically objective" that is, it uses data collection and analysis techniques that yield results reproducible and verifiable by other reasonable and competent persons using the same technique. Although this is the experimental definition of objectivity, the same principle of objectivity can be applicable in teacher evaluation. This is so because most approaches in educational evaluation assume that the evaluator should be impartial towards the evaluatee. This implies that the evaluator should try to suppress personal biases from influencing his/her findings and judgements during the evaluation process. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English (1978: 414) provides the following synonyms for objectivity: fairness, honesty, unbiasness, flexibility, impartiality and reliability.

1.2.2 Feedback

According to Visser (1995: 1), feedback is the formal interview or informal talk between a manager and his subordinate on observed performance on the basis of collected and interpreted information. This involves affording the subordinate the opportunity of talking about his/her own performance and also to state obstacles that prevented him/her from performing better. Similarly, the manager is also afforded the opportunity to state what assistance could be offered to improve the performance of the subordinate. Schemerhorn, Hunt and Osborn (1994: 564) see feedback as the process of telling someone else how one feels about something the person did or said or about the situation in general. Therefore in the context of this research feedback is the process of the educational manager telling the teacher what was observed and allowing the teacher the opportunity of responding.

1.2.3 Competence

Competence is a wide concept which embodies the ability to transfer the skills and knowledge to new situations within the occupational area. It encompasses organisation and planning of work, innovation and coping with non-routine activities.
It includes those qualities of personal effectiveness that are required in the work place to deal with co-workers, managers and clients.

Competence can also be defined as the demonstrated capacity to perform in ways that are regarded as satisfactory (McIntyre, Littleton and Long, 1979: 117). According to this view, competence refers to actual performance at measured level of quality. It also refers to actual patterns of behaviour that are observable, at least under certain conditions and at certain times.

The word "Competent" is applied to someone who exhibits "more than average" acquisition or native skill in performance of some work or operation. To be competent means to be able to carry out the requirements of a specific task and implies that this completed can be rated objectively as being either satisfactory or unsatisfactory (Grobler & Van der Merwe, 1995: 2). Although competence may suggest expertise in a complicated field, it may indicate adequacy rather than excellence (ibid).

Competence can also be defined as a cluster of integrated knowledge, skills, values and attitudes (Cotep, 1994: 10).

What these definitions have in common is that all of them refer to those characteristics of individuals which affect their performance in their work roles.

1.2.4 Credible


Credibility in education evaluation is the function of many aspects including:

- knowledge of the technical aspects of teaching;
- years of classroom experience;
- years of experience in the school and school district;
- knowledge of subject matter; and
- familiarity with the teachers/classroom and students' situation (Duke & Stiggins, 1986:22).

The following section will illustrate how the structure of the former appraisal system has contributed to the problems within this system.

1.3 BUREAUCRATIC STRUCTURE

1.3.1 Exclusion of teachers from decision making

The problems cited above were complicated by the bureaucratic structure of the previous appraisal system. The structure had the following common features, namely, it was top-down, closed, hierarchical and authoritarian.

This point of view is supported by Stake (1988: 29) when he expresses his concern about the appointment of appraisers. Stake (ibid) argues that all the appraisers are drawn from the senior or middle management. These persons, are not directly involved in the teaching situation. They therefore lack valuable content knowledge in the majority of areas they observe. The ideas expressed here imply that teachers' contributions as professionals are not taken into consideration.

Evaluation systems are only credible where teachers are considered to be a professional resource rather than the object of bureaucratic scrutiny (Wise and Darling-Hammond, 1994 & 1985: 28). The nature of bureaucratic evaluation becomes clearer when compared with professional evaluation as Wise and Darling-Hammond have done.
In professional evaluation, teachers plan, conduct and even evaluate their own work. They analyse the needs of their students. As they conduct instruction, they modify their strategies to make sure that their instruction meets the needs of their students. Supervision of teachers is conducted largely to ensure that the correct standard of practice is being employed (Wise and Darling-Hammond, 1994 & 1985: 30).

In bureaucratic evaluation on the other hand, curriculum planning is done by administrators and specialists: teachers are to implement a curriculum planned for them. Supervision of teachers is conducted by supervisors whose job is to make sure that teachers are implementing the curriculum and the procedures of the district. Teachers do not plan or inspect their work: they merely perform it (Wise and Darling-Hammond, 1994 & 1985: 30).

The comparison of bureaucratic and professional evaluations drawn by Wise and Darling-Hammond, is sufficient to expose the problems inherent in bureaucratic evaluation. The evaluation does not benefit the teacher, the evaluator or the organisation. It seldom shows any outcomes such as the special recognition of the teacher, the termination of his or her employment, the improvement of the curriculum or deployment of staff development resources to meet the teachers' specific instructional needs. This ritual of teacher evaluation, as Wise and Darling-Hammond (1994 & 1985: 29) refer to, exists to satisfy the bureaucratic imperative that every teacher be observed by the supervisor every year.

Expressing the same point of view (Chetty et al, 1993: 2) argues that in the case of Black teachers, appraisal has been concerned with efficiency and social control rather than professional development. Thus, the narrowly defined jobs, formal communication channels which are the characteristics of efficiency, discourage teachers from trying new methods of teaching or pursuing new ideas. According to Robbins (1989: 403) efficiency that is not coupled with effectiveness, stifles the creativity of evaluator as well as that of the evaluatee.
From the preceding discussion, it is evident that bureaucratic evaluation which was the feature of the former South African appraisal system largely excludes the involvement of teachers in the evaluation process. Evaluation is taken to be the task of inspectors, principals, heads of departments and subject advisors. Teachers on the other hand are constantly being evaluated informally by the students and parents and formally by the inspectors, subject advisors and management teams of the schools.

According to Rossouw (1992: 112) the literature on teacher evaluation reveals that principals are seldom evaluated by their superiors who rarely visit the schools. Most evaluations are based on informal feedback. Thus, these evaluations do little to assist the principals in strengthening their job performance in order to make their schools effective.

In education, except at tertiary level, principals are normally not evaluated by their subordinates. This deprives them of the useful information needed for their development. Cascio (1995: 291) argues that subordinates interact on a daily basis with their principals. They therefore know the extent to which their principals delegate, communicate, plan, lead, organise and control the school. This interaction provides the principal with useful feedback. The two-way process of evaluation discussed in this section, is one of the many things that are lacking in the South African evaluation system, hence we see a system that develops neither the principal nor the teacher. Rossouw (ibid.) therefore suggests that the daily interaction between the principals and teachers should be used when evaluating principals.

In addition to the above, a one-way process of evaluation is often coupled with personal biases which lack objectivity. This does not rule out the notion that all individuals possess personal biases but an evaluation which includes the judgements of several competent evaluators is likely to contain an increase in the feedback information aimed at improving instruction, that is, it is likely to be more objective.
Although the evaluators have the power and authority to evaluate teachers, they often do not receive special training on evaluation. They are therefore often as unskilled as their subordinates concerning the evaluation process. As a result of this lack of evaluation skills, the evaluators are likely to encounter such problems as the inability to observe, analyse and interpret the performance of teachers accurately. Another problem, is the evaluator's inability to communicate the appraisal information in an objective and constructive manner with the ratees (Cascio, 1995: 97). Thus, these deficiencies in evaluation are likely to render the evaluator incompetent.

According to Chetty et al, (1993: 3) teachers have the following criticisms of the appraisal system:

- incompetence of the appraisers;
- irrelevance of some evaluation procedures;
- arbitrariness of scores given for appraisal; and
- absence of contextual factors in the appraisal system.

Closer scrutiny of these criticisms indicates two important aspects, namely, that:

- the teachers do not trust the evaluators and have no confidence in the appraisal system; and
- there is a problem with the feedback received from the evaluators.

Because feedback is such a vital aspect of teacher evaluation and is an inherent reason for the failure of the previous evaluation system it is now briefly discussed.
1.4 FEEDBACK

The evaluation process is not complete without feedback. Mention must be made here that this should not just be a mere ritual, but must be one that will contribute to teacher effectiveness and to the development of teachers professionally. Grobler and Van der Merwe (1995: 9) emphasize that feedback should help the subordinates to set and achieve goals. In the South African situation, feedback is rarely given to both teachers and management in the schools. If it is given, it is usually of low quality (Grobler and Van der Merwe, 1995: 4).

The result of this low quality feedback, is that weaknesses identified during the observation session are normally not remedied. No strategies are suggested in order to improve the performance of the teacher. Instead, the evaluation report is given to the teacher to attach his/her signature without any clarification. Walklin (1991: 159) recommends that a post observation conference should be used to turn weaknesses into strengths by suggesting alternate approaches that could be adopted by the teachers to overcome their problems.

Credible feedback has been discussed as the possible means to instructional effectiveness. This is not, however, the only purpose of teacher evaluation. Evaluation could also be conducted for possible merit awards and promotional purposes. This is the area which sparked off a general dissatisfaction in all the departments mainly because of the secrecy surrounding the merit awards. The criteria as to how one qualifies for the awards was seldom clearly explained. This mismanagement of the feedback process as well as the many problems discussed above resulted in teachers losing confidence in the appraisal system, hence the credibility of the teacher evaluation system was questioned. The consequence of this was the suspension of the appraisal activities of the inspectors, principals, subject advisors and heads of departments by the National Education Union of South Africa (NEUSA) in April 1990.
The above discussion demonstrates some of the problems in the former South African system of teacher evaluation which, among other things lacked the following:

- transparency;
- credibility;
- objectivity;
- knowledgeability; and
- integrity.

(Grobler and Van der Merwe, 1995: 9; Cascio, 1995: 97; Stake, 1988: 29)

The problem of this research project as discussed above may be summarised by a statement of the problem.

1.5 PROBLEM STATEMENT

In the light of the preceding information, it appears as if the problem of this research project can be summarised by means of the following questions, namely:

- What is competent feedback and how is it constructed?
- What is the nature of credible feedback as an aspect of competent feedback?
- How can objectivity enhance credible feedback?
- Which evaluator behaviours are associated with objectivity as an aspect of credible feedback; and
To what extent can objectivity as an aspect of credible feedback be used to enhance the feedback process and subsequently teacher effectiveness?

Having outlined the research problem, it is now necessary to state the aim of this research project.

1.6 AIM OF THE RESEARCH

In view of the problem formulated above, the general aim of this research project is to:

- Investigate the components of competent feedback and show how these aspects can enhance the management of teacher competence.

In order to achieve the general aim of the project it is the aim of this group to:

- Investigate the constructs of credible feedback and indicate how this could enhance teacher competence.

In order to achieve this aim of the group, the specific aim of this research essay dealing with objectivity as an aspect of credible feedback is to:

- Investigate the nature of objectivity as an aspect of credible feedback.
- Determine whether objectivity can serve as an aspect to enhance credible feedback.
- To examine teacher opinions with regard to the behaviours associated with objectivity as an aspect of credible feedback as demonstrated by their educational managers.
In view of the preceding problem and aim statements, the method envisaged in order to research the problem of teacher competence can now be discussed.

1.7 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The aim of this investigation is descriptive, that is, to describe a phenomenon, in this case feedback with specific reference to credible feedback. In order to describe feedback, a literature review will be used to elucidate feedback competence in an effort to clarify the main aspects of this concept. Furthermore literature about credible feedback as a contributory factor to teacher competence will be investigated. More specially this script will concentrate on objectivity as an aspect of credible feedback and how this can possibly improve the effectiveness of the teacher.

In addition to the preceding literature review, an empirical study will be undertaken. A structured questionnaire will be compiled using the literature research as a basis in an effort to obtain teacher opinion regarding objectivity as an aspect of credible feedback.

1.8 EXPOSITION

The research will be structured as follows:

- Chapter 2: Literature review on credible feedback and objectivity in feedback.

- Chapter 3: Research design, development of the research instrument and sampling will be discussed.

- Chapter 4: Tabulation of the findings.

- Chapter 5: Summary and conclusions on the findings, recommendations and a reflection on the research will be done.
1.9 SUMMARY

In this Chapter, the importance of research on teacher competence and its assessment was discussed. The necessity of the feedback process in this assessment, its credibility as well as objectivity as an aspect of this process was postulated and the research problem stated.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The first chapter of this research essay provided the background and motivation for a study on objectivity as an aspect of credible feedback and its implication for the management of teacher competence. As a first step in the investigation of this phenomenon, a review of literature will be undertaken in the present chapter.

This chapter will focus on the following aspects

- what is competent feedback?
- what is credible feedback?
- characteristics of credible feedback;
- behaviours associated with credible feedback;
- nature and essence of objectivity when giving feedback;
- behaviours associated with objectivity when giving feedback; and
- conclusion.

In educational as well as in other organisations, the competence of the employees is measured among other things through the evaluation process. This measure should provide evidence of whether or not the intended results have been achieved and the extent to which the employees have achieved those results (Armstrong, 1995: 345). This could be a basis for generating feedback information which could be used by both the evaluators and the subordinates. The success of this development strategy however, can be ensured by providing competent feedback.
2.2 WHAT IS COMPETENT FEEDBACK?

Competent feedback occurs when the evaluator demonstrates sufficient and suitable skills, knowledge and expertise when giving feedback after the evaluation process. Feedback is said to be competent when it exhibits the following characteristics - clarity, correctness, courteousness, conciseness, completeness and continuity (Rabey, 1994: 87). This suggests that the evaluator should have had the appropriate qualifications, training and experience for teacher evaluation. In addition, the evaluator should be able to demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively the outcome of the evaluation in such a way that the subordinates can understand and accept the need to change their performance behaviour where necessary.

Competent feedback can also be said to be the result of various aspects of feedback, one of which is the credible feedback.

2.3 WHAT IS CREDIBLE FEEDBACK?

Credible feedback can be said to be the result of two factors, that is, the credibility of the person giving feedback and the credibility of the evaluation process. Both these factors are essential when giving feedback for, they contribute to the improvement of teachers' instructional effectiveness. The initial task of the evaluator then, is to establish a degree of credibility among his/her subordinates and colleagues so that their potential suspicion and resentment of the evaluation process, could be minimised.

2.3.1 Evaluator credibility

The acceptance of the evaluator by his/her subordinates can be earned through possessing certain qualities which determine evaluator credibility. These include among other things, the evaluator's expertise, professionalism, sensitivity to the needs of the organisation, teachers and students, trustworthiness, efficient and effective performance (Valentine, 1992: 56).
If the evaluators are not viewed as credible, the subordinates may be uncooperative and resist the evaluation process, and this can affect the performance of the subordinates. The evaluator therefore should be seen by the subordinates as a source of information. Thus, the evaluation should be conducted and managed by persons with appropriate skills, qualifications, expertise and experience so that the evaluation results are respected and accepted. Such qualities can enable the evaluator to provide the kind of feedback that is likely to be credible. The credibility of the evaluator alone is not enough. There is also a need for the credibility of the evaluation process which, if provided according to the required standards would probably contribute to competent feedback.

2.3.2 Characteristics of credible feedback

Feedback on teacher evaluation should be credible so that it could help develop human resources and the organisation as a whole. Through credible feedback, teachers are encouraged and assisted to become competent educators (Joint Committee on Standards for Education, 1981: 46). Writers who have made a contribution in this area (Blaine & Sanders, 1987: 402; Cascio, 1995: 299; Louis, Balkan, Cardy, 1995: 281; Visser, 1995: 6), have agreed on the following characteristics of credible feedback.

2.3.3 Specific rather than general

Feedback that is expressed in general terms such as "your performance is poor", does not clearly indicate to the subordinate what specific behaviour is perceived as "poor". The subordinate therefore, is unlikely to change the behaviour leading to "poor" performance.

By being specific, the evaluator offers clear feedback to the subordinate concerning the observed performance (Cascio, 1995: 299). This enables the subordinate to know exactly which behaviours need improvement.
The effect of feedback can also be determined by the length of time between the observations made and the giving of feedback.

2.3.4 Immediate feedback

Feedback is most effective to the subordinate when it is given at the earliest opportunity after the relevant event. Delay in feedback allows thought and recollection to blur with the passage of time. When feedback is immediate, subordinates are likely to have a desire to show that they can meet performance criteria to overcome their obstacles (Luis, Balkin & Cardy, 1995: 281). Walklin (1994: 160), states that feedback and knowledge of results, reinforce and produce faster learning. Feedback also makes the correction of errors easy, provided it (feedback) is received soon after the evaluation. Similarly, when feedback has been given immediately after the evaluation, the evaluator is able to comment on the outcome of evaluation and offer advice so that the repetition of the undesirable behaviour may be avoided in future.

At the same time, if the required standard of performance has been achieved by the subordinate, the evaluator has the opportunity to reinforce that behaviour at the appropriate time. This reinforcement in turn would motivate the subordinate to achieve even higher performance (Robbins, 1989: 64). People are likely to engage in a desired behaviour if they are timely and positively reinforced to continue such behaviour.

2.3.5 Frequent feedback

Feedback that is limited to a comprehensive, once a year performance review with subordinates is unlikely to help them develop on the job. It may even hinder their growth rather than developing it. It is advisable therefore, that feedback be given on a day to day basis particularly with poor performers or new employees. This is where informal feedback plays an important role.
Informal feedback forms part of the ongoing communication between the supervisor and the subordinates and is therefore an integral part of the supervisor's day to day activities. In addition to the formal feedback that the subordinates receive at specific times, they should also be continuously informed of their progress, successes or shortcomings in the execution of their activities (Visser, 1995: 6). It is only when the subordinates know how they are performing in the process of achieving their objectives, that they will be aware of possible problems and know when they are successful or not.

The following guidelines provided by Visser (ibid), illustrate how feedback should be given:

- Don't delay, discuss problems before they become a crisis.
- The more regularly this is done, the greater its effect on people's motivation to achieve their objectives.
- Exercise good judgement by not giving feedback of a sensitive or negative nature in the presence of other staff members.
- Like formal feedback, informal feedback should also be honest, open and specific.
- Don't keep positive comments or compliments for the formal interviews, give them spontaneously.

It is important to stress here that the evaluators should take these points seriously. They should provide regular feedback to all the employees, as failure to provide such feedback, may result in continued poor performance as well as loss of commitment to the objectives of the organisation.

The effect of the above characteristics of credible feedback would probably be minimal if the feedback which is provided by the evaluator is not constructive.
2.4 PURPOSE OF CREDIBLE FEEDBACK

Credible feedback has the following purposes:

- Encouraging and supporting educators and their organisations to fulfil their goals and responsibilities.
- Providing educators with information that enriches their professional self knowledge.
- Conveying information collected and interpreted on employees' performance during performance observation.
- Affording the subordinates the opportunity to talk about his/her own performance and also to make mention of obstacles that prevented him/her from performing better and what assistance the evaluator can possibly offer.
Creating the opportunities where the supervisor and the subordinate can agree on the follow-up and remedial steps to be taken on the basis of feedback information (Visser, 1995: 1). Cascio (1991: 273) states that lack of performance feedback keeps individuals in the dark about how others view their performance. This, according to Cascio (ibid), breeds doubts and frustration and may even allow little problems to mature into big ones. It is therefore essential that feedback is being given to avoid such problems.

Mention must be made here that the behaviour of the evaluator also plays an important role in providing credible feedback. The evaluators have to exhibit certain behaviours that are relevant to credible feedback. In the following section, such behaviours are discussed.

2.5 BEHAVIOURS ASSOCIATED WITH CREDIBLE FEEDBACK

2.5.1 Providing of informal and formal feedback

The formal feedback interview normally has three phases, namely, a preparatory phase, an interview phase and a post interview phase. Each of these phases has a number of important aspects. The task of the evaluator is to adhere to the sequence of these phases as each of them contributes to the credibility of feedback (Visser, 1995: 2). The evaluator should bear in mind that informal feedback is as important as the formal one. It contributes to the continuous improvement of teacher performance. So, when giving feedback, he/she should consider giving informal feedback as well.

It is important to note that, whether formal or informal, both the evaluator and the subordinate should participate actively during the feedback session.
2.5.2 Encourage participation of the stakeholders

Credible feedback entails the sharing of information rather than simply rendering advice. Sharing the information between the evaluator and the subordinate has the following advantages:

- the subordinate feels that his/her ideas are genuinely welcomed by the supervisor;
- the subordinate may believe that the interview was a constructive activity; and
- participation encourages the belief that some current job problems were cleared up and the future goals were set (Cascio, 1991: 103; Gerber, & Van Dyk, 1988: 451).

This participation satisfies the subordinate's need for involvement in the affairs that affect him/her. For the effective participation, the subordinate must be prepared for the evaluation.

2.5.3 Encourage subordinate preparation

Subordinates who spend more time prior to the appraisal interview, analysing their job responsibilities and duties and problems they encounter on the job, are more likely to be satisfied with the appraisal process and more likely to be motivated to improve their performance (Cascio, 1991: 103).

Criticisms are welcomed when they are intended to build rather than destroy the subordinate.

2.5.4 Avoid destructive criticisms

Destructive criticism is general in nature. It is often delivered in a biting and sarcastic tone and often contributes to poor performance caused by the lack of motivation. Gerber & Van Dyk (1988: 452), provides the following consequences of destructive criticisms:
It produces negative feelings among the subordinates and can initiate conflict between the evaluator and the subordinate.

- It reduces the preference of the individual to handle future disagreement with the supervisor.

- It has a negative effect on self-set goals and on a feeling of self-confidence. It is therefore important to give feedback in a manner that communicates acceptance of the subordinate as a worthwhile person.

The evaluator should keep in mind that feedback is intended to be helpful. It should therefore, be tied to specific development plans to capitalize on strengths and minimise performance weaknesses.

Agreeable goal setting is also an important behaviour of credible feedback. Therefore, it should not be ignored when feedback is provided.

2.5.5 **Set mutually agreeable goals**

At the end of the interview session, both the evaluator and the subordinate need to set mutually agreeable goals to improve the performance of the subordinate. The evaluator should remember that setting specific and challenging goals, provides clarity to the subordinate of what is expected of him/her and this can lead to high levels of performance. Setting of agreeable goals is not enough. Unless the progress is monitored, these goals are unlikely to be achieved.

2.5.6 **Continue to communicate with, and assess progress towards goals regularly**

Periodic checking of progress towards goals through planning encourages the subordinate to perform effectively (Cascio, 1995: 301).

Regular assessment of goals is an important behaviour associated with credibility, but effective communication is no less important.
2.5.7 Effective communication

Many communication problems can be attributed to misunderstanding that takes place between the evaluator and the subordinate. These problems are less likely to occur if the evaluator permits a two-way process of communication between himself/herself and the subordinate. In communication, feedback means ensuring that the communicator gets a message back from the receiver which tells him/her how much has been understood (Armstrong, 1988: 621). To ensure effective feedback, the evaluator should ask a set of questions relating to the information given to the subordinate, to determine whether or not the information received by the subordinate has been correctly interpreted. Alternatively, the evaluator could invite questions from the subordinate. The type of questions that the subordinate would ask, would give a clear indication as to whether he/she has received the information as intended.

Having provided a description of behaviours that are associated with credible feedback, it is now necessary to discuss the importance of objectivity during the feedback process.

2.6 OBJECTIVITY IN FEEDBACK

Most approaches to educational evaluation expect the evaluators to exercise objectivity when giving feedback. The supporters of this point of view, (Piper and Elegart, 1979: 78) expect the evaluators to exercise a considerable effort, trying to prevent their personal biases from influencing their findings and judgements. Piper and Elegart (ibid), argue that objective information is more precise and less influenced by the evaluator's personal values. It can therefore be expected to influence the behaviour of the observed teacher to the desired standards. However, there seems to be very few writers who support this point of view.

As against the above point of view, there is a general consensus among the majority of writers that there is no evaluation that is completely free of the evaluators' biases.
Patton (ibid), for example, asserts that objectivity in evaluation is unattainable for the following reasons; firstly, objectivity assumes a single reality to which evaluation must be isomorphic, which means that objectivity is a one-perspective criterion.

Secondly, it assumes that the evaluator can deal with the subordinates in a non-reactive and non-interactive way. It is therefore an absolute criterion. What Patton and other writers are suggesting, is that the evaluators should be aware of their potential biases that often influence the outcomes of the evaluation, and they (evaluators), cannot divorce themselves from the evaluation process. According to Blaine and Sanders (1987: 47), evaluators conceal their hidden values and biases of which they are unaware because even the choice of data-collection techniques and instruments is not value-neutral.

When one thinks of other roles of the evaluator in the evaluation process, for example, interpreting information, drawing up of conclusions and determining the outcomes of evaluation, it becomes unlikely that the evaluator could not have influenced the outcome.

What then should be done, given the fact that there is nothing like complete objectivity? Should the evaluators just allow the biases, prejudices and values to freely distort their findings and judgements? The answer is probably no. The rest of this chapter will attempt to show how some of these factors can be partially controlled. Before this could be achieved, the evaluator needs to have a deeper understanding of performance measures.

2.7 TYPES OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Cascio (1995: 74), has classified performance measures into two general types, namely, objective and subjective measures.
Objective performance measures includes production data, that is, outcomes or the results of performance. It does not focus on behaviour, but rather on the outcomes or results of the behaviour. Nevertheless, there seems to be some degree of overlap between behaviour and results (Cascio, 1995: 75). Although objective measurements seem to be attractive, theoretical and practical limitations often make them unsuitable. For example, the results may be influenced by the factors that are beyond the control of the observed teacher. These include, lack of financial and material resources, for example, books, photocopiers, absenteeism, late coming and early leaving of the students and most importantly, lack of parental involvement in education. It is worth mentioning here that the objective of performance appraisal, is to judge an individual's behaviour, not factors beyond his/her control because the subordinates are unlikely to change these factors. It is therefore unfair to judge the individual's performance on the basis of the outcomes alone. The correct approach then is to measure the behaviour rather than the outcome.

Subjective measures on the other hand, depend upon human judgements and are prone to certain kinds of biases associated with rating processes. In addition, Cascio (1995: 76), argues that subjective measures of performance may be relative, that is, comparisons are made among a group of subordinates or it may be absolute which means that the subordinate is described without reference to others. Regardless of their nature, subjective performance appraisals seem to suffer frequently from various behavioural barriers that limit its effectiveness.

It is evident from the above discussion that both subjective and objective measures have limitations. Despite such limitations, the success of the evaluation process, depends, among other things, upon the objectivity of feedback given to the subordinates. It is then the responsibility of the evaluator to be aware of the characteristics of objective feedback, so that, such characteristics could be used as a checklist when feedback is provided to the individual. These characteristics will now be briefly discussed.
2.8  CHARACTERISTICS OF OBJECTIVE FEEDBACK

2.8.1  Accuracy

Objective feedback should be accurate. This is intended to ensure that the evaluation will reveal and convey adequate information about the performance behaviour of the subordinate (Patton, 1982: 241). One of the skills that the evaluator should possess, is the ability to measure the performance of subordinates accurately. This accurate measuring enables the evaluator to make correct decisions about the subordinates' performance. Armstrong (1995: 460), believes that an appraiser who cannot correctly measure the performance of his/her subordinates, cannot improve it. This is true, because inaccurate measurement is not likely to lead to correct decision making. Instead, it could be the result of biases that are often found in performance appraisal. In addition, this could also be the reason why, feedback does not normally provide information leading to correct decisions about subordinates' performance. Accuracy is thus an important aspect of objective feedback but fairness is no less important.

2.8.2  Fairness

Objective feedback must be fair and impartial. This means that all the sides of the case are presented before the final decision is taken. The evaluator must make certain that nothing will distort his/her presentation of the information by making every effort to control bias when giving feedback. According to the Joint Committee (1981: 90) evaluation should be complete and fair in its presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the object under investigation, so that the strengths can be built upon and the weaknesses addressed.

Verbal and written evaluation reports should be open, direct and honest in their disclosure of pertinent findings (Blaine & Sanders, 1987: 353).
Feedback should be acceptable so that it can gain the support of those who will benefit from it.

The appraisal interview must be relevant to the job in question.

Feedback should be sensitive to the needs of the subordinate.

This implies that performance appraisal should be capable of distinguishing between effective and ineffective performers. It sometimes happens that employees who are working hard, are rated no different from the worst employees. When this happens, the employees will not be motivated and this can reduce their performance.

Feedback must be reliable, that is, it must be consistent. Appraisal interviews made by independent raters should agree closely even if they are given from different perspectives such as supervisors, peers or subordinates.

The characteristics discussed in this section seem practical. However, the evaluators are often confronted with problems when implementing these characteristics.

2.9 PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH OBJECTIVITY IN FEEDBACK

With regard to the structured formal performance appraisal process, the evaluators often encounter some problems related to classroom observation. Unless these problems are guarded against, the performance appraisal process is unlikely to be successful. Cooper (n.d.: 80), provides the following problems, the evaluators encounter during observation and the post-observation interview.

2.9.1 Lack of agreement regarding what is to be observed

In most cases, the evaluator and the subordinate normally do not agree on what is to be observed. This causes frustration and anxiety on the part of the subordinate. To guard against this, the evaluator and the teacher to be observed need to arrange a pre-observation conference, the purpose of which firstly, is to discuss the particular lesson and reach a consensus regarding what the evaluator would be observing.
Secondly, what information will be collected, and what instrument will be used to gather such information (Cooper, ibid). If this pre-observation conference has not been arranged, the evaluator and the subordinate may have different expectations. Thirdly, the subordinate has to be provided with formal guidelines which clearly specify the policies and procedures of personnel evaluation (Joint Committee, 1981: 28). Clearly written purpose, criteria and procedures outlined in the evaluation manuals serve the following purposes:

- increase the likelihood that the performance expectations will be understood;
- that uniform standard of judgement will be applied;
- that evaluation will be fair;
- that the evaluation results will be respected; and
- that the employees will have confidence in the evaluation (Joint Committee, ibid).

Another problem is the effect of the observer.

2.9.2 Effect of observer on the behaviour of the teacher and of students

The presence of a stranger like a supervisor, inspector or principal in the classroom, affects the behaviour of the teacher and of the students. While the teacher may be anxious, the students may have questions about the ability of the teacher to teach them, and they can even lose concentration. To lessen this, the supervisor should visit the classroom frequently so that his/her presence will not be seen as that of a stranger.

2.9.3 Generalisation from the inadequate sample of behaviour

As supervisors are busy people, it is not always easy for them to observe teachers frequently. They are often tempted to generalise from inadequate samples of behaviour. This could be avoided by visiting classes frequently so as to have enough
samples of behaviour to generalise from. Another aspect influencing objective feedback is that of biased ratings.

2.10 BIASED RATINGS

Besides classroom observation problems, evaluators often encounter problems related to biased ratings. Cascio (1995: 66), provides the following possible causes of biased ratings:

- inadequate observation by the rater;
- inadequate opportunity on the part of the subordinate to demonstrate proficiency in performance;
- personal biases or prejudices on the part of the rater; and
- inability to distinguish between effective and ineffective performers.

It is the responsibility of the evaluator to minimise these problems so that they do not influence his/her decisions on ratings.

Despite these problems, ratings are commonly used by the evaluators. The use of ratings assumes that the human observer is reasonably objective and accurate (Cascio, 1995: 296). In practice, however, this is not the case. Raters subscribe to their own sets of expectations about the people. These biases produce rating errors that deviate between the "true" rating that an employee deserves and the actual rating assigned to the employee.

The following are some of the most common types of rating errors provided by Cascio (1995: 297):
**Halo effect**

Raters who commit this error assign their ratings on the basis of a "good or bad" impression of ratees. An employee is rated either high or low on many aspects of job performance because the rater knows that the employee is high or low on the specific aspect.

**Restriction of range error**

The second rater error is the restriction of range error. In this error, the supervisor restricts all his or her ratings to a small portion of the rating scale. The supervisor tends to rate all workers equally. Gomez-Mejia, Balkin and Cardy, (1995: 268), provide three forms of restrictions common in rating namely

- leniency error or restricting observed employees to the high portion of the scale;
- central tendency error or restricting observed employees to the middle portion of the scale; and
- severity error or using only the low portion of the rating scale.

Such ratings lack honesty, fairness and accuracy. Employees end up being frustrated and demotivated because of lack of objectivity in the appraisal process. The above rating problems and observation problems, are possibly an indication that evaluators have a problem in achieving a reasonable degree of objectivity in the performance evaluation process. This is not surprising, as many authors cited above, have questioned the complete objectivity in the evaluation process. However, this does not imply that no attempts should be made to control these biases. Even the behaviour of the evaluators can contribute to the reduction of these biases.

Having discussed the problems associated with objectivity when giving feedback, the following section will focus on behaviours associated with objectivity when giving feedback.
2.11 BEHAVIOURS ASSOCIATED WITH OBJECTIVITY WHEN GIVING FEEDBACK

2.11.1 Humane Considerations in giving feedback

When giving feedback, some evaluators forget that feedback has an impact on those individuals who are receiving it. It is advisable therefore that the evaluators take appropriate steps to protect the rights of all the employees. Feedback must be communicated as carefully and as professionally as possible (Blaine & Sanders, 1987: 357). This does not mean that the truth should be distorted for fear of undermining the rights of those that are involved in the evaluation process. However, when a negative feedback has to be delivered, it should be described in a straightforward, factual and frank manner (Blaine & Sanders, 1987: 358). It seems easier for employees to accept negative information when it is presented positively. Change cannot be managed properly without understanding the feelings of those that are affected by it (Armstrong, 1988: 616). It is therefore, important to mention here that, feedback has to be a two-way process. The subordinate has to be given an opportunity to respond, especially if the information is viewed as unfair. This means that the subordinate must express himself/herself openly without fear of victimisation by the supervisors.

To be able to make objective decisions, the evaluator should be prepared to listen to what the subordinate has to say.

2.11.2 The evaluator must be an active listener

By being an active listener, the supervisor demonstrates a genuine interest in the subordinate's ideas. This could be achieved through the following behaviours suggested by Cascio, (1995: ibid) namely
• taking time to listen;
• discouraging interruptions;
• communicating verbally and non-verbally (for example, by maintaining eye contact);
• watch for verbal as well as non-verbal cues regarding the subordinate's agreement or disagreements with the supervisor's feedback; and
• summarising what was said and what was agreed upon.

One advantage of evaluator's active listening is that the subordinates are likely to perceive feedback as fair and accurate. Another means of improving objectivity is the careful recording of observations made.

2.11.3 Recording observations

The aim of recording observations, is to gather detailed information about the performance of the employee. This has to indicate how well the teacher has met the established criteria. (THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION of ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, 1988: 7), suggests methods on how the supervisors should record the observations. Firstly, only facts and concrete data that are supported by examples, should be recorded. Although it is not an easy task, judgements should be avoided as much as possible because they often fail to deliver messages that the teacher can put into practical use.

Secondly, the evaluators should record information as specific behaviours. Narrative method is suggested as the most effective one because it gives an objective picture of exactly what has been seen and heard by the observer (THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION of ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, ibid).

In addition to careful recording of observations made, organisational ethics also have a role in objective feedback.
2.11.4 Maintain ethical standards

Legally, the evaluator is governed by laws regarding access to data and protection of human subjects. Therefore, he/she should demonstrate professional behaviour during all aspects of evaluation. This includes demonstrating knowledge of laws regarding protection of the employee, and freedom of access to the information (Blaine & Sanders, 1987: 404). Another behaviour which is associated with objectivity, is that of judgement.

2.11.5 Judge performance rather than personality

Supervisors should judge the performance of the subordinates not personalities. This is so, because they (supervisors) are unlikely to change the subordinates' personalities. The more supervisors focus on the personalities of the subordinates rather than on aspects of job-related behaviour, the lower the satisfaction of both subordinates and supervisors and less likely will the subordinate be motivated to improve his/her performance (Cascio, 1995: 103). While judging the behaviour of the subordinate, the evaluator should also exercise a certain degree of objectivity.

2.11.6 Be objective

The evaluator should open discussions on how to respond to problems. The most effective way of solving problems is the use of the critical evidence technique. With this method, the supervisor lists every effective and ineffective behaviour of the subordinate. At the end of the appraisal period, these incidents are categorised and rated by the supervisor. This method, eliminates biases in respect of the employee's recent behaviour. It also enables the evaluator to arrive at a positive or negative rating, in view of specific incidents of behaviour (Gerber & Van Dyk, 1988: 447). It is worth noting that the success of the objectives set by the evaluator and the subordinate, may depend on the support given to the subordinate. One way of providing such support is by mentoring.
2.11.7 Mentoring

The mutual objectives set by the evaluator and the subordinate should be reviewed periodically so that appropriate changes could be made. This can be achieved through a mentoring process. Mentoring is the process of using specially selected and trained individuals to provide guidance and advice which will help to develop careers of the protégés allocated to them (Armstrong, 1995: 549).

Mentoring aims at complementing learning on the job, which must always be the best way of acquiring the particular skills and knowledge the job holder needs.

Armstrong (ibid), states that a mentor provides the protégés with the following benefits:

- advice in drawing up of self development programmes;
- guidance on how to acquire the necessary knowledge and skills to do the job;
- help in tackling problems and projects by not actually doing them for the protégés;
- information about the culture of the organisation; and
- coaching in specific skills such as managerial skills, for example, leadership, communication and time management.

It is important to note here that the results of feedback should be used to strengthen problem areas and thus increase effectiveness and fairness of feedback (Joint Committee, 1981: 117). Having provided a description of behaviours associated with objectivity in feedback, it is now important to discuss the behaviour of the evaluator when dealing with ineffective teachers.
2.12 DEALING WITH AN INEFFECTIVE TEACHER

It does happen sometimes that, despite all the provisions made to assist the teacher, repeated failure on the part of the teacher persists. According to Piper and Elegart (1979: 110), the failure can be attributed to the fact that the teacher

- does not understand the objectives of the appraisal;
- is unable to monitor the objectives of the appraisal process; and
- is unwilling to cooperate.

In such situations, the frequency of observation needs to be increased in order to provide as much feedback as possible. However, should the problem continue even when the evaluator's support is provided, the evaluator may advise the teacher to resign voluntarily, so that, his/her chances of being employed elsewhere may not be jeopardised. But before that, the supervisor must have accumulated numerous examples of the teacher's shortcomings to demonstrate patterns of deficiencies (Piper & Elegart, 1979: 99).

There are certain factors that must be excluded before the teacher should be advised to resign namely:

- It must have been proven beyond reasonable doubt that the teacher was evaluated by a trained and competent supervisor.
- Factors that are beyond the control of the teacher, must have been excluded, for example, was the teacher provided with sufficient material, financial and human resources?
- The employee should have been given a reasonable period for possible improvement to occur.

If there is clear evidence of inherent incapability such that an opportunity to improve is most unlikely, the employee can fairly and lawfully be advised to resign or change the career (Armstrong, 1995: 364).
2.13 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the main findings of this literature review, can be summarized in terms of teacher competence, credible feedback and objectivity in feedback.

Competence is a concept which embodies the ability to transfer the skills and knowledge to new situations within the occupational arena. It includes those qualities of personal effectiveness that are required in the work place to deal with colleagues, managers and students. To be competent means to be able to carry out the requirements of a specific task and it implies that this competence can be rated objectively as being either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Competence may indicate adequacy rather than excellence.

Credible feedback plays an essential role in enhancing teacher competence. It requires the credibility of both the evaluator and the evaluation system. It has to be conducted by the expert evaluators who are professional and trustworthy. These persons should demonstrate efficiency and effectiveness in performance appraisal.

Formal feedback is effective when it is specific and given immediately after the observation phase. Both formal and informal feedback must be constructive, direct, open and honest. Destructive criticisms have to be avoided as much as possible. Instead, negative feedback must be given frankly. The supervisors must assure the subordinates of their willingness to assist them (the subordinates) to overcome their problems.

It has been found that feedback that is limited to a comprehensive, once a year performance review with subordinates is not helpful. Informal feedback forms part of an ongoing communication between the supervisor and the subordinates and should therefore be an integral part of the supervisor's day to day activity.
Despite the general consensus among the majority of authors, that there is no evaluation that is bias free, evaluators are expected to exercise a considerable degree of objectivity. Both subjective and objective measures have limitations. Subjectivity depends upon human judgements and are prone to certain kinds of rating biases. Objectivity focuses on the results of performance which may be influenced by the external factors which are beyond the control of both the observer and the subordinate. The correct approach is to judge the behaviour not the outcome or personal traits. Objective feedback is fair, accurate, direct, honest and impartial.

The preceding review of literature has provided a theoretical basis for the next phase in the research undertaken in the present study. In the next chapter, an exposition of the empirical research will be undertaken.
CHAPTER 3

3.1 INTRODUCTION
The literature study in chapter two formed the framework for the empirical study. The specific aim of this study was also highlighted in chapter two as objectivity as an aspect of credible feedback: implications for teacher competence. A brief discussion of the design of the research instrument now follows.

3.2 THE INSTRUMENT OF RESEARCH

3.2.1 The Design of the Questionnaire
The design of the empirical investigation was a structured questionnaire consisting of 106 open ended items (see Appendix A). The items were based on research done by Van der Merwe & Grobler(1995). This research indicated that feedback competence was designed around the theoretical constructs of

- invitational feedback;
- credible feedback;
- tactful feedback;
- transparent feedback; and
- culturally sensitive feedback.

Subsequently groups of students were assigned to investigate each of the above constructs of feedback competence in greater detail. This resulted in 106 questions designed to obtain the perceptions of members of the teaching profession as to how often educational managers demonstrate certain behaviours pertinent to feedback.

Although this particular research paper deals with objectivity as an aspect of credible feedback all the questions formulated by this group are represented in Table 3.1. The questions relevant to objectivity are indicated by means of an asterisk:
### TABLE 3.1

**ITEMS ASSOCIATED WITH CREDIBLE FEEDBACK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STD DEV</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F74</td>
<td>Suggest corrective steps in order to eliminate your errors</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F97</td>
<td>Gives the impression that his/her appraisal of you will not be influenced by others (for example, by superintendents or members of political parties)</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F75</td>
<td>Creates an atmosphere of trust because of unimpeachable behavior</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F96</td>
<td>Indicates a willingness to constantly search for new ideas pertaining to teacher appraisal.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Indicates that clarity of expression is vital during appraisal.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F95*</td>
<td>Gives you the opportunity to express your opinion openly without having it held against you.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F86</td>
<td>Conducts the whole process of appraisal in an incorruptible manner.</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F55*</td>
<td>Gives you the impression that hidden agendas will not come to the surface during the appraisal process.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>Allows members of a union or teacher association to be present during the appraisal interviews.</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F103</td>
<td>Makes use of expert knowledge to demonstrate how certain difficult concepts should be taught.</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F48</td>
<td>Leaves you with the impression that teachers are appraised in exactly the same way.</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F47</td>
<td>Gives you the impression of complete Frankness about your appraisal</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F46*</td>
<td>Allows you to study the assessment criteria thoroughly before you are appraised.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F73*</td>
<td>Uses questions to determine whether the two of you have interpreted the explanation in the same way.</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F85</td>
<td>Makes use of a Mentor to assist new teachers with suggested improvements.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F59</td>
<td>Points out your errors by using specific episodes or behaviours.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F60</td>
<td>Displays evidence that favourites gained and unfair advantage.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Discuss with you how a particular teaching competence was judged.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F83*</td>
<td>Allows personal differences between the two of you to cast a shadow over the assessments.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F84</td>
<td>Ensures that you receive a draft copy of your rating for you to study before the feedback interview takes place.</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Items involved with objectivity as an aspect of credible feedback  
SD = Standard deviation

Having displayed the various items involved in credible feedback only those items with asterisks will now be discussed in this research paper.

3.2.2 Discussion of objectivity as an aspect of credible feedback

Each question was formulated in such a way that the respondents could indicate how often an educational manager demonstrates a particular behaviour, for example:

In your opinion, when providing feedback, how often does the educational manager:

*Give you the opportunity to express your opinions openly without having it held against you

Giving feedback in the evaluation process, involves a change of behaviour, especially of the subordinate. Armstrong (1988: 616), stresses that change cannot be managed properly without understanding the feelings of those that are affected by it (see 2.11.1 p.32). This item investigated the involvement of the subordinates in the feedback process. It particularly focussed on the rights given to the subordinates to express themselves freely.
The mean score of 3.05 and the rank order of 51, suggests that educational managers sometimes give the subordinates opportunity to express themselves openly. Open communication channels are important in the feedback process because they reduce tension between the evaluators and the subordinates. The educational managers are therefore encouraged to maintain this two-way process of a communication system and need to indulge in this behaviour much more often.

*Give you the impression that hidden agendas will not come to the surface during the appraisal process

The item was based on the views of Blaine and Sanders (1987: 47), who maintain that the objective evaluators conceal their hidden values and biases (see 2.6 p.25).

The mean score of 3.00 and rank order of 68 suggest that educational managers do not conceal their values and biases often enough. This item can enhance objectivity if the educational managers could earnestly conceal their values and biases and it is thus important that they make every effort to remain unbiased.

*Allow personal differences between the two of you to cast a shadow on the assessments

The literature in the preceding chapter revealed that errors in ratings are caused among other things, by the personal biases or prejudices on the part of the evaluator (Cascio, 1995). The item was intended to determine how differences between the evaluator and the subordinate can influence the decisions of the evaluator when giving feedback.

The mean score of 2.75 and the rank order of 92, indicate that differences between the evaluator and the subordinate, do cast a shadow over the assessments. To avoid this situation, the educational managers need to exercise a great deal of objectivity by judging the performance of the subordinate rather than concentrating on the differences that exist between them. Educational managers thus need to have a particularly transparent procedure of evaluation as this could allow personal differences to be resolved.
**Allow you to study the assessment criteria thoroughly before you are assessed**

The importance of the pre-observation conference was emphasised in chapter two by (Cooper n.d.: 80 and the (Joint Committee, 1988: 28). (See 2.9.1 p.28). These authors maintain that such a conference is necessary for enhancing a consensus between the evaluator and the subordinate, establishing a common understanding of what is expected of both the evaluator and the subordinate and providing the subordinate with formal guidelines.

This item was intended to elicit responses which would specify the behaviour of the educational managers regarding the pre-observation conference and its purposes.

The mean score of 2.96 and the rank order of 77, indicate that the educational managers only occasionally discuss lessons to be observed and procedures to be followed with the subordinates prior to observation. This item was ranked rather low and the mean is below 3.0 which is an indication of the important role this item has in the feedback process. It is, however, essential that all teachers should have access to the assessment criteria before assessment occurs and educational managers need to ensure that this happens. It is therefore, the responsibility of educational managers not to ignore this item when giving feedback. Clearly written guidelines for implementing personnel evaluation policies should be developed and be accessible to all the employees.

**Use questions to determine whether the two of you have interpreted the explanation in the same way**

Armstrong (1988: 621), states that to ensure the correct interpretation of feedback, the evaluator should ask a set of questions relating to the information given to the subordinate. This item was based on the views of the above author to investigate whether or not educational managers make efforts in ensuring that the feedback they give to the subordinates is interpreted correctly.

The mean score of 2.94 and the rank order of 79 displayed in Table 3.1, indicate that educational managers seldom ask questions from the subordinates to ensure correct
interpretation of feedback. This view is further emphasised by (Gomez-Mejia, Balkan and Cardy, 1995: 467) who argue that communication is not effective unless the receiver is able to decode the message and understand its true meaning. When questions are not asked, the information given to the subordinate may be misinterpreted and this does not lead to any solution of the problems encountered during the evaluation process.

3.3 THE EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION

3.3.1 Respondents

Respondents were chosen from a random sample at various post levels of the teaching profession. It was felt that perceptions of the teachers at the various post levels relative to teacher competence should vary and hence it was important to sample as wide a range of post levels as possible (see Section 2 of the questionnaire).

3.3.2 Biographical details

The following biographical details were requested:

Gender, post levels, age, teaching experience, highest educational qualification, province in which you are presently teaching, religion, primary or secondary school, mother tongue, gender of the principal of your school, attendance of pupils, attendance of teachers and image of your school.

It was reasoned that these aspects could be related to feedback competence and could influence teachers perceptions on how often educational managers demonstrate such behaviours.
3.3.3 The Research Group

Questionnaires were distributed to a random sample of members of the teaching profession especially in Gauteng and Kwa-Zulu Natal. However, teachers from the other Provinces were also involved. A random sample of schools were selected on the grounds of their accessibility to members of the research team and all Provinces except the Provinces from the Cape were represented in the sample.

After the random sample of schools had been identified principals were approached in order to obtain their co-operation. The questionnaires were handed to principals by a member of the team and personally collected again after completion. Cooperation in most instances was excellent and this enabled a good return of questionnaires to be obtained.

3.3.4 Return of Questionnaires

The following figures summarize the information relevant to the questionnaires:

* Feedback Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HANDED OUT</th>
<th>RETURNED-USEABLE</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE RETURN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>74,4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaires were now sent to the statistical consulting service of the Rand Afrikaans University where the data was transcribed and processed.
3.4 SUMMARY

In this chapter a description of the empirical investigation was provided. The questionnaire was discussed and the course of the research was indicated. In Chapter 4 the following aspects will receive attention:

♦ reliability and validity of the instrument, and

♦ some aspect of the data flowing from the statistical analysis will be examined, tabulated and interpreted.
CHAPTER 4

AN ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION
OF A SELECTED SAMPLE OF EMPIRICAL DATA

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Due to the limit imposed on the length of a research essay a detailed discussion of the
various statistical techniques is impossible. Hence the discussion will be limited to the
following

- a discussion on the validity and reliability of the research instrument;
- a comparison of the independent pairs by stating appropriate hypotheses and
  interpreting the statistical tests involved;
- a comparison of one the independent groups containing three or more groups by
  stating the hypothesis and analyzing the appropriate statistical data; and
- a discussion of the differences between the factor mean scores between the various
  independent groups.

4.2 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

To ensure content validity the questions were designed within the framework of the
relevant theory using the eight constructs described by Van Der Merwe and Grobler
(1995). Several experts from the Department of Educational Sciences and from the
Statistical Consulting Service of the Rand Afrikaans University also reviewed the
questionnaire to judge the relevancy of each item.
The construct validity of the instrument was investigated by means of successive first and second order factor analyses performed on the 106 items. The first order procedure involves a principal component analysis (PCA1) followed by a principal factor analysis (PFA1). These procedures were performed using the BMDP 4M programme (Dixon, Brown, Engelman, Frane, Hill, Jenrich & Toporek, 1985:448-454) in order to identify a number of factors which may facilitate the processing of the statistics.

The ten factors obtained from the first order analysis were now used as inputs for the second order procedure. This consisted of a PCA2 with varimax rotation and orthogonal axes followed by a PFA2 with dobloimin rotation.

These procedures resulted in the 106 items being reduced to two factors namely:

- Feedback competence consisting of 95 items with a Cronbach-alpha-reliability coefficient of 0.984 with no items rejected. The 95 items can thus be regarded as one scale with a maximum value of 95 \times 5 = 475 and a minimum scale value of 95 \times 1 = 95; and

- Unethical feedback consisting of 11 items with a Cronbach-alpha-reliability coefficient of 0.734. This reliability coefficient was regarded as being too low and hence this factor was not used in any of the analyses. The factor on unethical feedback was thus discarded.

The factor named feedback competence is, however, valid with high reliability and could thus serve as a basis for evaluating the feedback competence of the educational manager. Thus any weakness in the feedback competence of the educational manager can be determined and appropriate training given. Now that the validity and reliability of the instrument has been established the appropriate statistical analysis can be discussed.
4.3 HYPOTHESES

Hypotheses were formulated in respect of all the independent groups. The comparison of two independent groups will now follow.

4.3.1 Comparison of two independent groups

At the multivariate level two groups can be compared for possible statistical differences by means of Hotelling's $T^2$ test. This implies that the vectors of the mean scale scores of the groups are compared in respect of the two factors taken together. Should a significant difference be found at this multivariate level then the Student $t$-test is used in respect of the variables taken separately.

As only one factor is involved in feedback, tests at the multivariate are unnecessary and Hotelling's $T^2$ is dispensable and the $t$-tests are sufficient to point out any significant differences between the various groups.

As an example of a comparison of two groups possible differences between the opinions of the males and females in respect of feedback competence will now be discussed.
4.3.1.1 Differences between the males and females relative to feedback competence

### TABLE 4.1

**COMPOSITE HYPOTHESES WITH MALES AND FEMALES AS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differences at the single variable level</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>There is no statistical significant difference between the mean scale scores of males and females in respect of feedback competence</td>
<td>Student t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hat</td>
<td>There is a statistical significant difference between the mean scale scores of males and females in respect of feedback competence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.2

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALES AND FEMALES REGARDING FEEDBACK COMPETENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Factor average</th>
<th>p-value (Student)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback competence</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>295.97</td>
<td>0.2253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>302.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M = Male (N = 349)
F = Female (N = 767)
** = Significant at the 1% level
*  = Significant at the 5% level
Mean for feedback competence = 300.35.

Tables 4.2 indicates that there is no statistical significant differences (p = 0.2253) between the mean scale scores of males and females in respect of feedback competence. The null hypothesis H0 cannot thus not be rejected. In respect of the feedback competence of educational managers there is thus no significant statistical difference in the perceptions of males and females. Females do, however, have a factor average which lies above the mean average for feedback competence.
4.3.2 Comparisons of three or more independent groups

In respect of three or more independent groups differences are investigated by means of ANOVA (analysis of variance) in respect of feedback competence. The mean scale scores are compared and should any differences be revealed the Scheffé test is used to investigate any differences between the various pairs of groups involved.

As an example of differences between three or more groups the various post levels are considered.
4.3.2.1 Differences between the various post level groups in respect of feedback competence

**TABLE 4.3**

**COMPOSITE HYPOTHESES WITH POST LEVEL GROUPS AS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differences at the single variable level</td>
<td>Post Level</td>
<td>HoA</td>
<td>The average scale scores of the four post level groups do not differ from one another in a statistical significant way in respect of feedback competence.</td>
<td>Anova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaA</td>
<td>The average scale scores of the four post level groups differ from one another in a statistical significant way in respect of feedback competence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HoS</td>
<td>There are no statistical significant differences between the average scale scores of the four post levels when compared pair wise in respect of the following factor namely:</td>
<td>Scheffé</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>PAIRS OF GROUPS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback competence</td>
<td>HoS. AB</td>
<td>HoS. AC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences at the single variable level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Levels</th>
<th>HaS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>PAIRS OF GROUPS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Competence</td>
<td>HaS. AB</td>
<td>HaS. AC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4.4

**SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE POST LEVEL GROUPS IN RESPECT OF FEEDBACK COMPETENCE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>FACTOR AVERAGE</th>
<th>P VALUE ANOVA</th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>BD</th>
<th>CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Competence</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>295.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>302.76</td>
<td>0.0206*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>313.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>319.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A - Teacher = 764
B - Merit Teacher = 161
C - Head of department = 120
D - Promotion Post = 71

** = 1% level significance
* = 5% level significance

Using Tables 4.3 and 4.4 it follows that HoA is rejected at 5% level of significance. The deduction can be made that there is a statistical significant difference between the average scale scores of four post level groups A, B, C and D in respect of feedback competence. The null hypothesis HoA is thus rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis HaA.

Although there is a significant difference when comparing the four groups at the multivariate level no significant differences could be found when comparing the groups pair-wise. Thus HoS cannot be rejected.
The various independent groups with their respective factor mean scores are represented in Table 4.5.

**TABLE 4.5**

**MEAN SCORES OF SOME OF THE INDEPENDENT GROUPS IN RESPECT OF FEEDBACK COMPETENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE FEEDBACK COMPETENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>295,97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>302,35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Type</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>305,28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>294,39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Level</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>295,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers with merit awards</td>
<td>302,76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heads of Department</td>
<td>313,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Promotion Posts</td>
<td>319,94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Qualification</td>
<td>Lower, Std 10</td>
<td>323,32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>300,84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers' Diploma</td>
<td>298,02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma, Degree, Degree plus</td>
<td>287,96**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>292,02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KwaZulu</td>
<td>327,08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>294,52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Language</td>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>303,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>283,48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sotho</td>
<td>8295,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nguni</td>
<td><em>319,40</em>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>*280,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of Pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>310,78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>298,890**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>255,54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>313,92**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>293,74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>249,22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td>322,10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>308,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>273,21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbing</td>
<td></td>
<td>239,97**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = Significant difference at the 1% level
* = Significant difference at the 1% level

Due to limitations of length, this table will only be briefly discussed.

4.4 BRIEF DISCUSSION OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FACTOR MEAN SCORES IN TABLE 4.5

The various factor mean scores obtained by the independent groups in respect of feedback competence are summarized in Table 4.5 and it is necessary to briefly explain the differences observed. First the independent group will be cited and this will be followed by a brief discussion.

* Gender - women have a higher factor mean score in respect of feedback competence than men do. Women thus have a more favorable opinion about the feedback of educational managers than men do.
* School type - educators who have gained most of their experience in primary schools have a higher factor mean score and differ from the scale score of secondary school educators at the 5% level of statistical significance. Primary school teachers thus have a more favorable opinion about the feedback competence of educational managers than do secondary school teachers. This is probably due to the fact that secondary school teachers are subject specialists and it is more difficult to convince such a wide variety of subject experts of your feedback competence, as educational manager.

* Post level - although no significant differences occur between the factor mean scores of the various groups there is a direct proportion between the factor scores of the various post level groups and the feedback competence of educational managers in the sense that the higher the post level the higher the factor mean score of the feedback competence. It is expected that teachers with merit awards, heads of departments and educators occupying promotion posts above that of head of department will have the perception that educational managers provide competent feedback as these groups probably mostly had reasonably positive experiences concerning feedback.

* Highest qualification - educators with an honours degree or higher qualification have the lowest factor mean score and differ from the teachers with the lowest educational qualification on the 1% level of statistical significance. Teachers with the lowest qualifications also differ from the other two groups at the 5% level of statistical significance. There is an indirect proportion between the various qualification groups and the feedback competence of educational managers in the sense that teachers with the lowest qualifications have the highest factor mean score whereas educators with the highest qualifications have the lowest factor mean score. Educators who are well qualified are probably well versed with the many intricacies of feedback and it is expected that they should have the opinion that educational managers are not as competent at providing feedback as they should be.
*Province* - in KwaZulu Natal educators have the highest factor mean score and differ from educators in Gauteng and other provinces at the 1% level of statistical significance. This significant difference could be due to the fact that teachers in rural communities do not easily criticize persons in positions of authority as this is against the normative system prevalent in rural communities. On the other hand the collaborative competence of the KwaZulu educational managers has been shown to be high and it is possible that KwaZulu teachers perceive their educational managers as competent providers of feedback (see research project on teacher competence, 1996).

*Home language* - Nguni speaking educators have the highest factor mean score and they differ statistically significantly from teachers with English as home language at the 1% level. Nguni speaking educators also differ at the 5% level of statistical significance from the Sotho, Indian and Tsonga speaking groups. The high factor mean score of the Nguni group corroborates the finding in respect of the provinces given above. It is of interest to note that the Afrikaans speaking educators have the second highest factor mean score and they thus also perceive their educational managers as possessing feedback competence. It could also be that Afrikaans speaking educators have a high regard for persons in positions of authority and hence will not readily criticize educational managers.

*Attendance of pupils* - educators with the perception that pupil attendance at their schools is good have the highest factor mean score and differ from those groups who perceive pupil attendance to be average and poor at the 1% level of statistical significance. There is also a direct proportion between the attendance of pupils and the feedback competence of educational managers and it is possible that teachers perceive the attendance of teachers in their schools to be good because the feedback given by the educational manager is of high quality.
*Image of the school* - there is a direct proportion between the feedback mean scores and the image of the school as indicated by the fact that teachers who perceive the school image to be excellent also perceive educational managers to be competent in respect of feedback. On the other hand, teachers who perceive the image of the school to be disturbing, are of the opinion that the feedback given by their educational managers is not up to the standard of the other groups. Educators who perceive the image of their school to be excellent have the highest factor mean score and differ from the average and disturbing groups at the 1% level of statistical significance. Teachers who perceive the image of the school to be average also differ at the 5% level of statistical significance from the factor mean score of teachers who believe the image of their school to be disturbing. Competent feedback is all about effective communication and it could be that teachers view the image of the school as disturbing because of a lack of communication on the part of educational managers (see project on managerial communication in schools, 1996).

The two successive factor analyses performed on the 106 items in the questionnaire thus indicate that feedback competence has construct validity. The statistically significant differences highlighted in the discussion above indicates an ability to distinguish between groups that are known to differ from one another. This corroborates the findings of the factor analysis and indicates that feedback competence has construct validity.

Competent feedback should thus consist of the following aspects namely it should be

- invitational in nature;
- credible;
- tactful;
- transparent; and
- culturally sensitive.
4.5 SUMMARY

In this chapter an analysis and interpretation of some empirical data was undertaken. The construct validity of the research instrument was investigated by means of two successive factor analyses which reduced the 106 items to just two factors namely:

* Feedback competence consisting of 95 items with a reliability coefficient of 0.984; and
* Unethical feedback consisting of 11 items with a reliability coefficient of 0.734. This factor was discarded from the analyses as the reliability coefficient was deemed to be too low.

An instrument which has construct validity should also be able to distinguish between groups which are known to differ from one another. It can be seen the data in Table 4.5 that many of the groups which one expects to differ significantly from one another do indeed differ in their perception of feedback competence.

The limited scope of a research essay rationed the research to a comparison of one example of two independent groups and one example of three or more independent groups. Hypotheses were set and multivariate statistics were used to analyze and interpret the data.

From the research conducted it can be concluded that feedback competence consists of a single construct. This factor has a construct validity with a high reliability and could thus serve as a basis for measuring and developing the feedback competence of educational managers. Competent feedback after all has the potential of producing winners because “feedback is the breakfast of champions.”

In Chapter 5 a summary of the research will be given. Important findings will be discussed and recommendations will be made.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The general aim of this research project was to investigate the components of competent feedback and how these can enhance the feedback process. Each component was further investigated by a group of researchers to determine its role in the feedback process.

The specific aim of this research essay was to determine the role of objectivity in feedback and how this can possibly enhance the management of teacher effectiveness. This was achieved by procuring teacher opinions and determining the role of objectivity in enhancing teacher effectiveness.

The significance of this topic was as a result of the increased problems of competence related to the evaluation system. The managers in attempting to provide instructional effectiveness to teachers, were restricted by many problems related to the evaluation system. One of these problems was the possible lack of objectivity of the educational managers when giving feedback.

The topic was chosen to equip educational managers so that they are able to make objective and accurate decisions about the performance of their subordinates. Another reason was to help teachers change their negative perceptions regarding the evaluation system.

This being the final chapter, it is necessary to reiterate the important points of this research project under the following headings, namely:

- summary;
- important findings;
- recommendations; and
- conclusion.
5.2 SUMMARY

The first chapter provided the background to the research problem. The role of feedback in evaluation was discussed. The emphasis fell on the fact that feedback should contribute to the effectiveness and the professional development of teachers. Authors such as Grobler and Van der Merwe (1995: 4) also subscribe to this view and maintain that feedback should assist teachers in setting and achieving their goals. The problem statement, the aim, the methodology, the exposition and the key concepts of the research were briefly discussed.

Chapter 2 provided an overview of literature related to credibility and objectivity of feedback. The said literature study was undertaken to determine

- what other authors say about feedback
- the type of research that was available on objective feedback
- the extent to which educational managers were objective when giving feedback.

In gathering the data, the purpose of feedback, the behaviours associated with credible feedback and behaviours associated with objective feedback also came under discussion.

Chapter 3 dealt with the research methodology, which aspect included the questionnaire and its respondents, the population sample and the processing of data on completion of the questionnaire.

In chapter 4, the empirical data was collected, grouped, analyzed and interpreted. The instrument used was found to be valid and reliable. Hypotheses were formulated in respect of all independent groups, whereafter the mean scores of the various groups were compared with one another. The differences in opinions in respect of two independent groups were uncovered through the application of the Student's t-test. The analysis of variance (ANOVA), was used to uncover the differences between three or more independent groups. The differences between the mean scores of the various pairs of groups were uncovered by means of the Scheffé test. Following this brief summary are the findings of the research project.
5.3 FINDINGS

5.3.1 Findings in Respect of Objectivity

The findings of this research essay are based on objectivity as an aspect of credible feedback and the implications for the management of teacher competence. The various items used in the questionnaire to determine the perceptions of teachers in respect of the objectivity of the educational manager when providing feedback, will now be discussed.

5.3.1.1 Item F 95 Table 3.1

When giving feedback, the educational managers should aim at changing the work-related behaviour of the subordinates to the desired norms and standards of effectiveness. However, the success of this, depends partly on the managers' understanding of how their subordinates feel about the proposed behavioural changes. Unless the subordinates are given the opportunity to express themselves openly, the required change of behaviour is unlikely to occur. This two-way process of communication is important for two reasons, namely, it is required to achieve the co-ordinated results of teacher performance and to promote cooperation between the evaluators and the subordinates.
An examination of questionnaire responses presented in Table 3.1, indicated that to some extent, the evaluators are aware of the importance of giving the subordinates the opportunity to express themselves openly.

5.3.1.2 Item F 58 Table 3.1

There is a general consensus among the majority of authors that there is no evaluation that is completely free of the evaluators' personal biases. These authors maintain that even the choice of data-collection techniques and instruments is not value-neutral. However, it is important to note that objectivity in evaluation is the hallmark of professional evaluators. Every effort therefore, must be made to control biases when presenting evaluation reports.

The educational managers should suppress their hidden agendas in order to guarantee neutrality and objectivity. They should also struggle to ensure that carefully collected and analyzed data are not later distorted intentionally or unintentionally in its presentation.

Objective information is more precise and less influenced by the evaluators' personal values. It can therefore be expected to influence the behaviour of the observed teachers to the desired standards of performance.

5.3.1.3 Item F 46 Table 3.1

The pre-observation conference between the evaluator and the subordinate, should be one of the important aspects of the evaluation process. It provides the opportunity for the evaluator and the subordinate to have a common understanding of what is to be observed. In this conference, the subordinate is provided with an opportunity to study the assessment criteria thoroughly before he/she is assessed.

The educational managers have been somewhat negligent of the importance of the pre-observation conference and of making formal guidelines accessible to the
subordinates prior to the evaluation process. They seldom seem to discuss the lessons to be observed and procedures to be followed with their subordinates before they are assessed. The advantage of this aspect is that, knowing what is to be observed and the procedure to be followed, may help the subordinate and the evaluator to avoid problems that might arise during the evaluation process.

It can also equip the evaluators and the subordinates with the necessary precautionary steps to reduce the possible effect of such problems. Clearly written guidelines for implementing personnel evaluation policies, should be developed and be made accessible to all the employees.

5.3.1.4 Item F 73 Table 3.1

Communication is not effective unless the receiver is able to decode the message and understand its true meaning. The basic problem in communication during the feedback process is that, the meaning which is actually received by the receiver may not be what the other person had intended to send. To ensure effective feedback, the evaluator should ask a set of questions relating to the information given to the subordinate, to determine whether or not the information received by the subordinate has been correctly interpreted.

This research revealed that educational managers only occasionally, ask questions to ensure the correct interpretation of feedback. Failure to promote this two-way system of communication may result in communication breakdown. Because of the strong possibility of misinterpretation, communication should include opportunities for feedback from the subordinates. In this way, the evaluator can clarify the message if its true meaning has not been received.

5.3.1.5 Item F 83 Table 3.1

Differences that exist between the evaluator and the subordinate can lead to the distortion and inaccuracy of the information about the performance of the subordinate. An examination
of the respondents' responses on this item in Table 3.1, revealed that these differences do cast a shadow over the assessment process. It must be noted that most approaches in education expect the evaluators to exercise objectivity at all times when conducting the evaluation (Piper and Elegart, ibid). Thus, the educational managers should control their personal grudges to prevent themselves from influencing their findings and their judgments. This can be prevented if data and judgments can be obtained from the multiple sources as this enhances the probability of objectivity occurring.

5.3.2 Important Empirical Findings in Respect of Feedback Competence

The two successive factor analyses performed on the items in the questionnaire resulted in the 106 items being reduced to two factors, namely:

♦ Feedback competence consisting of 95 items with a Cronbach-alpha-reliability coefficient of 0.984 with no items rejected.

♦ Unethical feedback consisting of 11 items with a Cronbach-alpha-reliability coefficient of 0.734. This factor was discarded on the grounds of the reliability coefficient being too low.

With regard to feedback competence the various factor mean scores obtained by the independent groups in respect of feedback competence are summarized in Table 4.5 and it is necessary to briefly highlight the differences observed.

* Gender - Women have a higher factor mean score in respect of feedback competence than men do. Women thus have a more favourable opinion about the feedback of educational managers than men do.

* School type - Teachers who have gained most of their teaching experience in primary schools, have a higher factor mean score and differ from the scale score of secondary school teachers at the 5% level of statistical significance. Primary school
teachers thus have a more favourable opinion about the feedback competence of educational managers than secondary school teachers do. This can probably be attributed to the fact that secondary school teachers are subject specialists. The principals in attempting to assist the teachers to improve their effectiveness are probably restricted by their lack of proficiency in some subject areas in which their teachers are experts.

It is therefore more difficult for them to convince such a variety of subject experts of their feedback competence. Unless they (Principals) can make use of the departmental heads and the subject specialists to assist them in evaluation, they may always suffer criticisms from the high school teachers.

* **Post level.** Educators occupying promotional posts and those with merit awards, have a more favourable opinion about the feedback of educational managers than do educators occupying teaching posts. However, there seems to be a slight difference in the extent to which each group has a favourable opinion about the feedback competence of the educational managers. The higher the group is in the management hierarchy, the more favourable is their opinion about the feedback competence of the educational managers.

* **Highest qualification.** Educators with high educational qualifications are critical of the feedback competence of the educational managers. The reasons attributed to these criticisms are probably due to the fact that highly qualified educators are well versed with the intricacies of feedback. The principals thus, need to acquire appropriate skills concerning the evaluation and also demonstrate transparency by involving all the educators in the decision-making on issues related to evaluation, including feedback. This will enhance the competence, credibility and objectivity of the evaluator as well as of the evaluation system as a whole.

* KwaZulu Natal educators have a more favourable opinion of the feedback competence of their educational managers than educators from Gauteng and other Provinces. Principals from Gauteng thus need to take the necessary steps to change
the perceptions of the educators regarding their feedback competence. This could be achieved through transparency, tactfulness and credibility (see 4.4 p.58).

* **Home language.** While Nguni speaking educators have a more favourable opinion about the feedback competence of their educational managers, the English speaking educators are critical of the feedback competence of their educational managers. Educational managers also need to be sensitive of cultural differences in their schools.

* **Pupil and teacher attendance** seem to be determinants of school climate. There is a relationship between these determinants and the feedback competence of educational managers (see 4.4 p. 58). The principals need to manage these determinants properly in order to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the schools.

5.4 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The main aim of this research project was to investigate objectivity as an aspect of credible feedback and its implication for the management of teacher competence. In order to realize this aim, a literature review was undertaken and this served as a foundation upon which the empirical research was based. The recommendations prompted by this research will now be briefly discussed.

5.4.1 **Recommendation 1**

Rater judgments are subject to various types of biases: leniency, severity, central tendency, halo effect, contrast and recency errors. To improve the reliability and validity of ratings, rater training is necessary for the following reasons:

- to reduce or eliminate judgmental biases;
- to improve the observational skills of the evaluators; and
• to improve the ability of the raters to communicate appraisal information in an objective and constructive manner to their subordinates. Emphasis must also be placed on training the raters to observe the behaviour of the subordinate accurately. To improve the value of the appraisal interview, systematic training of evaluators is essential.

5.4.2 Recommendation 2

Evaluators are credible to the extent that they exhibit technical competence, substantive knowledge, experience, integrity and public relation skills. Since there are few individuals who possess all these characteristics needed for particular observation, it is often necessary that evaluation be done by a team of persons who collectively possess these characteristics.

5.4.3 Recommendation 3

Teachers should be involved in all the phases of evaluation. Any evaluation programme that does not reflect the interests, concerns, aspirations and the needs of the teachers is likely to fail. At the same time teachers must have a positive attitude to make the system work. Teaching must be regarded as a skill to be learned. The participants therefore must be willing managers of their own development who are ready to consider, explore and practice new teaching skills.

5.4.4 Recommendation 4

Principals seldom receive formal evaluation from their superiors. Their evaluation is based on informal feedback. This form of feedback does little to assist them in strengthening their job performance. It is therefore recommended that the principals should be continuously and formally evaluated so that they can improve their effectiveness regarding evaluation.
5.4.5 Recommendation 5

The concept of Total Quality Management (TQM) which has a positive contribution on co-operative and objective ability should be adopted by the principals. This will ensure improvement of the quality of education. It can be improved by using, for example, the participative evaluation approach.

5.4.6 Recommendation 6

Research is necessary so that the best possible appraisal system which maximises the objectivity of the educational manager can be devised.

5.5 CONCLUSION

This research essay has established empirically that credible feedback could have a positive effect on teacher competence. It also emphasized the important qualities that evaluators need to possess in order to provide competent and objective feedback that will enhance the instructional effectiveness of teachers. The role played by the credibility of the evaluator as well as that of the evaluation process also proved to be significant in enhancing the quality of education.

The writer therefore, interprets the results of this study as supporting the contention that objectivity as an aspect of credible feedback is crucial in enhancing teachers' professional development.
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Dear Madam/Sir

The professional development of teachers is an aspect which directly concerns you. It is thus vital that we obtain your opinion regarding this aspect as it is a REAL CONCERN OF TEACHERS AND EDUCATIONAL MANAGERS in the new Educational dispensation.

A questionnaire is one of the most effective ways of ELICITING TEACHER OPINION and we are committed to the fact that without your opinion the information is not credible. Please bear the following in mind when you complete the questionnaire:

* Do not write your name on the questionnaire - it remains anonymous.

* There are no correct or incorrect answers in Section E. This is not a test of your competence. We merely require your honest opinion in order to obtain reliable and trustworthy data.

* Your first spontaneous reaction is the most valid. So work quickly and accurately. Do not ponder too long over any particular question item.

* Please answer ALL the questions (questions are printed on BOTH SIDES of the page).

* If you would like to change your response to a question do so by clearly crossing out the incorrect response and circling your intended response.

* Please return this questionnaire to the PERSON FROM WHOM IT WAS RECEIVED, AFTER HAVING COMPLETED IT.

Thank you once again for your assistance.

Yours faithfully

PROF. J B SMITH

PROF. K P DZVIMBO

DR B R GROBLER

DR M P V D MERWE

MS. S SCHALEKAMP

FC/BRG

DYNAMIC FOCUS ON THE FUTURE
SECTION A PERSONAL INFORMATION

Circle the applicable code or fill in the number where necessary.

EXAMPLE FOR COMPLETING SECTION A

QUESTION 1: Your Gender?
If you are a male then circle as follows:

Male:........................................... 1
Female:........................................ 2

YOUR PRESENT POST LEVEL

Teacher without merit award.................. 1
Teacher with merit award(s).................. 2
Head of Department.......................... 3
Deputy Principal.............................. 4
Principal....................................... 5
Higher promotion posts...................... 6

HOW OLD ARE YOU (IN COMPLETE YEARS)
(e.g. thirty five years 3 5)...

NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE
(IN COMPLETE YEARS)
(e.g. five years: 0 5)
2.

**YOUR HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION**

- Lower than Std.10
- Standard 10
- Post school Diploma
- Teacher’s Diploma
- Teacher’s Diploma - Further Education Diploma
- Bachelor’s Degree
- Bachelor’s Degree + Teacher’s Diploma
- Higher Post Graduate Diploma

**PROVINCE (In which you are presently teaching)**

- Gauteng
- Northern Province
- Mpumalanga
- North-West Province
- KwaZulu-Natal
- Free State
- Northern Cape
- Western Cape
- Eastern Cape

**WHICH IS YOUR RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT?**

- None
- Christian
- Islam
- Hindu
- Jewish
- Other(Specify)
8. **SCHOOL WHERE GREATER PART OF YOUR TEACHING EXPERIENCE WAS GAINED (MARK ONE ONLY)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school (Grade 1 to Std.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school (Std.6 to Std.10)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **WHICH LANGUAGE DO YOU REGARD AS YOUR MOTHER TONGUE? (Choose one option only)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndbele</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Sotho</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sotho</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swati</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tswana</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xhosa</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other African</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **THE PRINCIPAL IN YOUR SCHOOL IS A:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(15-18)
IN YOUR OPINION HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE SCHOOL ATTENDANCE OF THE PUPILS IN YOUR COMMUNITY?

Excellent........................................ 1
Average............................................. 2
Poor.................................................. 3

IN YOUR OPINION HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE SCHOOL ATTENDANCE OF THE TEACHERS IN YOUR COMMUNITY?

Excellent........................................ 1
Average............................................. 2
Poor.................................................. 3

HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE IMAGE OF YOUR SCHOOL IN THE COMMUNITY?

Excellent........................................ 1
Good.................................................. 2
Average............................................. 3
Disturbing......................................... 4

SECTION B

Mark your opinion by circling the appropriate number/code on the scale provided for each question. Give your answer on a 5 point scale where:

1 means never;
5 means always; and
2 to 4 means somewhere in between

EXAMPLE

In your opinion when providing feedback how often do Educational Managers:

Assist you in analysing your lesson behaviours?
never [ ] 1 2 3 4 5 always
MARK YOUR OPINION BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER ON THE SCALE PROVIDED FOR EACH QUESTION

IN YOUR OPINION, WHEN PROVIDING FEEDBACK TO YOU, HOW OFTEN DO EDUCATIONAL MANAGERS:

1. Show that knowledge of the duties of a teacher is important?
   never 1 2 3 4 5 always (22)

2. Advocate the use of local music to enhance creativity?
   never 1 2 3 4 5 always (23)

3. Discuss with you how a particular teaching competence was judged?
   never 1 2 3 4 5 always (24)

4. Ensure that the meaning of the feedback is understood through discussion and consensus?
   never 1 2 3 4 5 always (25)

5. Convey an attitude that people "work in order to live" and not that people "live in order to work?"
   never 1 2 3 4 5 always (26)

6. Ask you for your opinion about the appraisal process?
   never 1 2 3 4 5 always (27)

7. Indicate that maturity in teaching is just as valuable as academic qualifications?
   never 1 2 3 4 5 always (28)

8. Indicate that conflicts should be resolved by means of compromise and negotiation?
   never 1 2 3 4 5 always (29)
6.

IN YOUR OPINION, WHEN PROVIDING FEEDBACK TO YOU, HOW OFTEN DO EDUCATIONAL MANAGERS:

9. Allow you to see your appraisal report?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Indicate that clarity of expression is vital during appraisal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Give you a written report that is a true reflection of your classroom performance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. Leave you with a feeling that your efforts will be sufficient in order to attain your goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Ensure that teacher achievements are announced to all the relevant stakeholders?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Demonstrate that harmony is more important than direct confrontation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. Reveal a greater respect for teachers married to political figures in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. Encourage you to build on your achievements in the belief that success breeds success?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. Indicate a sincerity to assist you with your professional development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
7.

IN YOUR OPINION, WHEN PROVIDING FEEDBACK TO YOU, HOW OFTEN DO EDUCATIONAL MANAGERS:

18. Encourage teachers to inspire their students with an enthusiasm for the teaching profession?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(39)

19. Allow a member of a union or teachers' association to be present during appraisal interviews?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(40)

20. Also discuss your future career with you giving concrete examples of how you can gain promotion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(41)

21. Encourage teachers to use methods of self-appraisal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(42)

22. Encourage you to bring reality to the teaching situation in the form of authentic cultural possessions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(43)

23. Indicate that the way you dress is important for your status as a teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(44)

24. Withhold information from you which could affect your promotion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(45)

25. Avoid facial expressions which indicate anger, displeasure or hurriedness?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(46)

26. Encourage you to use creative teaching techniques?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(47)
8.

IN YOUR OPINION, WHEN PROVIDING FEEDBACK TO YOU, HOW OFTEN DO EDUCATIONAL MANAGERS:

27. Make every effort to ensure that the appraisal be perceived as being fair?
   never | 1 2 3 4 5 | always
   (48)

28. Manage to enhance the view you have of yourself?
   never | 1 2 3 4 5 | always
   (49)

29. Show a thorough knowledge of the complexity of teacher appraisal?
   never | 1 2 3 4 5 | always
   (50)

30. Demonstrate the ability to give constructive criticism?
   never | 1 2 3 4 5 | always
   (51)

31. Ensure that good teaching performance is followed by personal recognition and praise?
   never | 1 2 3 4 5 | always
   (52)

32. Keep feedback short and simple so that the teacher is not overwhelmed?
   never | 1 2 3 4 5 | always
   (53)

33. Provide you with an accurate report of your performance?
   never | 1 2 3 4 5 | always
   (54)

34. Show a tolerance that various cultures have a different awareness of the importance of time?
   never | 1 2 3 4 5 | always
   (55)

35. Emphasise that there are different levels of status in the school?
   never | 1 2 3 4 5 | always
   (56)
IN YOUR OPINION, WHEN PROVIDING FEEDBACK TO YOU, HOW OFTEN DO EDUCATIONAL MANAGERS:

36. Highlight the importance of work-related values in getting teachers to accept responsibility?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(57)

37. Reveal that people and warm relationships are important?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(58)

38. Take care to emphasize only the positive aspects and avoids the negative all together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(59)

39. Use simple language in order that no ambiguity exists regarding the appraisal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(60)

40. Show that learning to think in terms of "we" is more important than thinking in terms of "I"?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(61)

41. Give advice which is mostly prescriptive in nature?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(62)

42. Demonstrate an awareness that access to information and resources are important for your professional growth?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(63)

43. Indicate a confidence in teachers by allowing you to compare your self-evaluation with that of the management team?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(64)

44. Leave you with no doubt in your mind that the purpose of the appraisal was your professional development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(65)
10.

IN YOUR OPINION, WHEN PROVIDING FEEDBACK TO YOU, HOW OFTEN DO EDUCATIONAL MANAGERS:

45. Indicate an attitude of accessibility should you wish to discuss any identified problems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(66)

46. Allow you to study the assessment criteria thoroughly before you are appraised?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(67)

47. Give you the impression of complete frankness about your appraisal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(68)

48. Leave you with an impression that all teachers are appraised in exactly the same way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(69)

49. Indicate that the necessary resources which you need to teach effectively will be provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(70)

50. Give feedback which is balanced so as to benefit both the school and the individual teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(71)

51. Ensure that any criticism is supported by appropriate facts and specific examples?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(72)

52. Advocate that any money received by the school as a result of good performance by an individual should be shared by everyone on the staff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(73)
IN YOUR OPINION, WHEN PROVIDING FEEDBACK TO YOU, HOW OFTEN DO EDUCATIONAL MANAGERS:

53. Show a sensitivity that some cultures regard direct eye contact as disrespectful?

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

54. Reveal that good teaching is about caring and sharing?

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

55. Ensure that any system of external moderation of marks is clearly explained to the teachers?

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

56. Assist you in analysing your lesson behaviours?

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

57. Attempt to avoid prejudice of any kind when appraising teachers?

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

58. Give you the impression that hidden agendas will not come to the surface during the appraisal process?

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

59. Point out your errors by using specific episodes or behaviours?

never 1 2 3 4 5 always
IN YOUR OPINION, WHEN PROVIDING FEEDBACK TO YOU, HOW OFTEN DO EDUCATIONAL MANAGERS:

60. Display evidence that favourites gained an unfair advantage?

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{never} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline
\text{always} & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

(13)

61. Set challenging yet attainable teaching goals together with you?

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{never} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline
\text{always} & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

(14)

62. Indicate that teaching experience is just as valuable as academic qualifications?

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{never} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline
\text{always} & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

(15)

63. Show an appreciation that the educational system of the past has left the majority of teachers with a shortage of teaching skills?

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{never} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline
\text{always} & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

(16)

64. Demonstrate that good academic performance in the school is the product of the group as a whole?

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{never} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline
\text{always} & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

(17)

65. Point out that it is important that a teacher be punctual?

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{never} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline
\text{always} & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

(18)

66. Respect the confidentiality of your assessment by not talking to other teachers about it?

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{never} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline
\text{always} & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

(19)

67. Indicate that teachers should be involved in setting their own standards of work?

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{never} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline
\text{always} & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

(20)

68. Emphasize the importance of personal example of the teacher in classroom life?

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{never} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline
\text{always} & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

(21)
IN YOUR OPINION, WHEN PROVIDING FEEDBACK TO YOU, HOW OFTEN DO EDUCATIONAL MANAGERS:

69. Use the appraisal report as a tool for advancing the professional growth of the teacher?
   
   never 1 2 3 4 5  always  

   (18)

70. Allow adequate time after feedback so that you can master any suggested new skills?
   
   never 1 2 3 4 5  always  

   (19)

71. Listen to your opinion as well during appraisal sessions?
   
   never 1 2 3 4 5  always  

   (20)

72. Tell you in a direct way what improvement in behaviour is required?
   
   never 1 2 3 4 5  always  

   (21)

73. Use questions to determine whether the two of you have interpreted the explanations the same way?
   
   never 1 2 3 4 5  always  

   (22)

74. Suggest corrective steps in order to eliminate your errors?
   
   never 1 2 3 4 5  always  

   (23)

75. Create an atmosphere of trust because of unimpeachable behaviour?
   
   never 1 2 3 4 5  always  

   (24)

76. Leave you with a distinct impression that you are making a meaningful contribution to the success of the school?
   
   never 1 2 3 4 5  always  

   (25)

77. Discuss your specific areas of weakness with the aim of providing in-service training?
   
   never 1 2 3 4 5  always  

   (26)
IN YOUR OPINION, WHEN PROVIDING FEEDBACK TO YOU, HOW OFTEN DO EDUCATIONAL MANAGERS:

78. Ensure that criticism is directed at the particular incident observed and not at the person?
   never □□□□□ always □□□□□ (27)

79. Allow you total access to your appraisal report?
   never □□□□□ always □□□□□ (28)

80. Assist teachers to set educational goals before assessing them?
   never □□□□□ always □□□□□ (29)

81. Allow teachers to retain responsibility for the poor performance of his/her students?
   never □□□□□ always □□□□□ (30)

82. Give you the opportunity to respond to your assessment report?
   never □□□□□ always □□□□□ (31)

83. Allow personal differences between the two of you to cast a shadow over the assessment?
   never □□□□□ always □□□□□ (32)

84. Ensure that you receive a draft copy of your ratings for you to study before the feedback interview takes place?
   never □□□□□ always □□□□□ (33)

85. Make use of a mentor to assist new teachers with suggested improvements?
   never □□□□□ always □□□□□ (34)

86. Conduct the whole process of appraisal in an incorruptible manner?
   never □□□□□ always □□□□□ (35)
15.

IN YOUR OPINION, WHEN PROVIDING FEEDBACK TO YOU, HOW OFTEN DO EDUCATIONAL MANAGERS:

87. Ensure that you are absolutely sure as to the purpose of the appraisal?

| never | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | always |

(36)

88. Demonstrate an awareness that most people wish to participate in the formulation of policies which affect them?

| never | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | always |

(37)

89. Keep important information from you during the appraisal process?

| never | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | always |

(38)

90. Discuss the appraisal procedure thoroughly before any appraisal occurs?

| never | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | always |

(39)

91. Arrange workshops where teachers can become familiar with all aspects of the appraisal process?

| never | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | always |

(40)

92. Demonstrate respect for certain cultural traditions as for example the way some people dress during a period of mourning?

| never | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | always |

(41)

93. Assist teachers in overcoming weaknesses by developing an action plan with the teacher concerned?

| never | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | always |

(42)

94. Allow you to record your opinion of your assessment alongside that of management?

| never | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | always |

(43)
16.

IN YOUR OPINION, WHEN PROVIDING FEEDBACK TO YOU, HOW OFTEN DO EDUCATIONAL MANAGERS:

95. Give you the opportunity to express your opinion openly without having it held against you?
   never 1 2 3 4 5 always
   (44)

96. Indicate a willingness to constantly search for new ideas pertaining to teacher appraisal?
   never 1 2 3 4 5 always
   (45)

97. Give the impression that his/her appraisals of you will not be influenced by others (for example by superintendents or members of political parties)?
   never 1 2 3 4 5 always
   (46)

98. Clearly state which aspects of teaching have been evaluated?
   never 1 2 3 4 5 always
   (47)

99. Allow you to be evaluated by a neutral person should you disagree with the appraisal report?
   never 1 2 3 4 5 always
   (48)

100. Ensure that nothing is said that may offend you?
    never 1 2 3 4 5 always
    (49)

101. Provide an atmosphere of warmth and acceptance where one can get an accurate view of your performance?
    never 1 2 3 4 5 always
    (50)

102. Allow you to be represented on the assessment panel by a person of your choice?
    never 1 2 3 4 5 always
    (51)

103. Make use of expert knowledge to demonstrate how certain difficult concepts should be taught?
    never 1 2 3 4 5 always
    (52)
17.

IN YOUR OPINION, WHEN PROVIDING FEEDBACK TO YOU, HOW OFTEN DO EDUCATIONAL MANAGERS:

104. Share your assessment with you in the presence of a colleague of your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(53)

105. Explain how a particular teaching behaviour was judged?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(54)

106. Share all the data collected with you during the appraisal process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(55)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PATIENCE AND KINDNESS IN COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE