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ABSTRACT

Principals play a significant role in creating conditions that are conducive to effective learning and teaching that affects the quality of instruction in schools. One of the means to gauge the effectiveness of principal leadership is through their performance appraisal. Therefore, clear performance expectations and the appraisal of principals become important for judging schools’ effectiveness. This study investigated the nature of performance appraisal for principals in the Landak region of Indonesia from the perspectives of both principals and superintendents.

An interpretative approach was applied in this qualitative study involving in-depth investigation of perceptions, experiences, practices and challenges related to principal appraisal from the perspectives of four school principals and four superintendents located in the Landak Education Authority in Indonesia. This study used two research methods to collect the data: semi-structured interviews and documentary analysis. Semi-structured interviews were used to obtain principals’ and superintendents’ perceptions and experiences of their role and appraisal of principals. Documentary analysis was used to understand the espoused purposes and practices in the policy context of principal appraisal in Indonesia.

This study reveals that the Indonesian principal’s role is multifaceted and complex, and that the espoused purpose of principal appraisal policy in Indonesia is twofold: to achieve both accountability and development. This study reveals that principals feel that their appraisal is geared more toward developmental purposes than accountability purposes, while superintendents confirm that principal’s appraisal serves dual purposes. This study also reveals that the principal appraisal practice in the Landak region is a mere formality to meet the demands of bureaucracy. The study also found there were some challenges in principal appraisal in the Landak region associated with geographic location, complex instruments, political influence, and lack of communication and trust.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Background

Literature on educational leadership and management appears to be in agreement that principalship is the second most important aspect related to improving student learning outcomes (Leithwood, Louis, Wahlstrom & Anderson, 2010; Robinson, Hohepa & Lloyd, 2009). Principals play a significant role in creating conditions that are conducive to effective learning and teaching both for students and teachers, which eventually affects the quality of instruction in schools. Cardno (2012) and Marzano, and Waters and McNulty (2005) argue that principal leadership influences student achievement through direct and indirect leadership activities because principals are prime leaders who set the tone of the workforce. Therefore, the effectiveness of principals in performing their roles needs to be the focus of attention to ensure quality teaching and learning at the schools they lead.

Rationale

My research topic is “The nature of performance appraisal for principals in the Landak region of Indonesia”. My research problem derives from my experiences of working under several principals with mixed leadership capabilities. My curiosity led me to my research problem which focuses on the nature of performance appraisal for principals to understand how principals are appraised to determine their overall performance, so they can be retained as school principals, and whether or not appraisal has had an impact on their roles in terms of career and development. Dean (2002) argues that effective principal leadership performance needs principals who are capable in some areas of competency. Dean (2002) argues that leadership in schools primarily comes from the principals because major responsibilities lie with them and therefore, he further believes that effective performance of schools depends highly on principals’ leadership. To know whether or not the principals have met the expectations is done through evaluation or appraisal of performance. In Indonesia, appraisal of principals is clearly defined
and regulated through the *Ministerial Decree No. 28 Year 2010* which mentions that principals are appraised by school superintendents every year against the national standards for principals stipulated in the *Ministerial Decree No. 13 Year 2007*. The Ministry of Education of Indonesia (2012) has also issued a *Guideline Book for Appraising Principals*. Appraisal is supposed to be conducted every year and the cumulative review of the four-year appraisal is used as a key consideration for promotion and decision making (Ministry of Education of Indonesia, 2012).

Cardno (2012) and Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) argue that, appraisal activity is complex and difficult because it involves judgment about someone’s performance and when it comes to judging people’s performance, the nature of people is defensive to avoid conflicts and protect their self-esteem and respect. This situation creates challenges or problems in the process of appraisal. Also, in some cases, appraisal of principals is a problem because of the micro political situation, so the appraisal process tends to become a mere ‘tick-box’ exercise or just an administrative function. This is similar to where Cardno (2012) describes appraisal might become a tool for bureaucratic control rather than a tool to assess performance to improve practice. This view is also supported by Forrester (2011) who argued that “Indeed, performance management can be regarded primarily as a form of control, not for incentivising individuals” (p. 7).

The Ministry of Education of Indonesia (2013) and the Ministry of Religious Affairs of Indonesia (2011) conducted a competency baseline study in collaboration with the Australian Aid Agency and the Asian Development Bank to find out the overall competence of principals and superintendents in Indonesia based on the *Ministerial Decree 13* (Ministry of Education of Indonesia, 2007), and to assess the impact of the 2010 Interim Presidential Staff Strengthening Programme (INPRES) on participating school principals and superintendents. The study also aims at analysing continuing professional development needs for principals and superintendents. The baseline study was conducted within a year with a large sample of principals and superintendents in seven provinces in Indonesia with a total number of 55 districts participating in the study. The number of respondents
participating in the study was 4973 (4070 principals and 903 superintendents). The baseline study (Ministry of Education of Indonesia, 2013) found that most principals’ and superintendents’ competencies were below the expected standards. Most principals and supervisors were only competent in social skills and personality but were not competent in supervision and managerial instruction to support learning. The baseline study even found that some principals and supervisors did not understand, and did not have copies of ministerial regulations which describe their roles, and suggested that superintendents and principals need to be intensively trained. Furthermore, the baseline study (2013) suggested the need for a new performance management system for principals and superintendents since there are problems with current performance management system processes. In short, a performance appraisal system for principals in Indonesia is clearly defined but not effectively conducted in Indonesia.

In an Indonesian context, after 1998, decentralisation became the focus of the reform. Principals were then appointed by local leaders and this made principalship a political position rather than a professional one and this might be one of the reasons for the incompetence. Sumintomo, Jiang, Sheyoputri, Misbach and Jumintono (2015) found that there was a high level of political interference in the appointment of principals in Indonesia where principals are not recruited based on professional competence but rather on personal relationships. Therefore, it is timely to explore the nature of performance appraisal for principals in an Indonesian context to understand the purposes, practices and challenges of principal appraisal so that it can be decided whether or not principals and superintendents understand their roles and have met the expectations of the regulations.

**Research Aims and Questions**

This research study explores the nature of performance appraisal for principals in the Landak region, Indonesia. The aim is to understand how the appraisal is conducted and how principals and superintendents perceive it regarding the purposes, practices and challenges or concerns of conducting effective appraisal
for principals to improve performance. Raihani (2008) also asserts that school leadership in Indonesia lacks research and exploration to understand its context and nature. A performance appraisal of principal study can reveal the gap between intended practice and reality.

The aims of this research study are:
1. To examine the purposes and practices of performance appraisal for principals in the Landak region, Indonesia.
2. To investigate the concerns or challenges superintendents and principals encounter in implementing performance appraisal for principals in Landak region, Indonesia.
3. To suggest improvements in the implementation of performance appraisal for principals.

**Research Questions**

This study seeks to answer these four questions:

1. What are the purposes and practices related to performance appraisal for principals in the Landak region?
2. What are the perceptions of superintendents regarding performance appraisal for principals in the Landak region?
3. What are the perceptions of principals regarding the challenges in implementing their performance appraisal in the Landak region?
4. What are ways to improve the process of principal appraisal in the Landak region?
Thesis Outline

Chapter One
This chapter presents the research topic of principal performance appraisal in Indonesian secondary schools, explains the rationale of why the research study needs to be conducted and presents the research aims and questions of the study.

Chapter Two
This chapter provides a critical review of literature covering the international perspective of principalship, an Indonesian perspective of principalship, principal performance appraisal in three countries, namely the United States, Indonesia and New Zealand, and challenges of conducting principal performance appraisal in secondary schools.

Chapter Three
This chapter provides an overview of the research methodology and a rationale for adopting an interpretative research paradigm for this study. Participant selection is also discussed along with an explanation of the two data collection methods. Issues of how data are analysed and how validity is achieved, as well as ethical issues, are discussed in this chapter.

Chapter Four
This chapter presents the findings in this study. Findings are presented in two sections where the perspectives of principals and superintendents regarding the purposes, practices and challenges of principal appraisal in an Indonesian context are described.

Chapter Five
This chapter presents a discussion of the findings from the research study and integrates the findings with the relevant literature. The themes that emerged from data analysis are discussed in relation to the research questions. Conclusions are reached that are relevant to each theme. Limitations of the study are commented on and recommendations for future practice and for further research are made.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction
This chapter provides a review of literature on the following themes: demands of the principal’s role and expectations, accountability for role performance, performance appraisal of principals and challenges in effective performance appraisal of principals. These themes are discussed in this chapter to confirm the relevance of the research questions that guide this study that is concerned with the nature of principal appraisal in an Indonesian context.

Demands and expectations of the principal’s role
An international perspective of principalship
Dean (2002) argues that leadership in schools comes primarily from principals because major responsibilities lie with principals. Furthermore, he believes that the effective performance of schools depends on principal leadership. The literature on educational leadership takes a firm stance on the importance of leadership for the success of a school by arguing that leadership is second only to teaching in having an impact on improving students’ learning outcomes (Leithwood, Harris & Hopkins, 2008; Cardno, 2012). However, the role and the responsibility of a principal is always complex and daunting because it needs a wide range of leadership and managerial skills to perform it well.

Kowalski (2010) argues that in an information-based and reform-minded society, the nature of schools is complex because the schools need to serve three frames to function well: the legitimate, the social-political and the moral-ethical frames. The complex nature of schools has changed the landscape for principals (Kowalski, 2010). Green (2000) also asserts that in the 21st Century, being headteachers or principals is far more complex because the role of principals or headteachers is intermeshed in three areas: leadership, administration and management. Principals in today’s era need to cope with the three areas to perform their role.
successfully. Green (2000) argues that principals need to be able to become leaders, managers and administrators simultaneously to perform their duties effectively. Cardno (2012) argues that principalship takes both leadership and managerial skills to succeed since principalship accountability is now heightened and under scrutiny from government and society.

Contemporary principals are faced with mounting competing tasks on a day-to-day basis. This complex role is due to the need to satisfy demands from different stakeholders of educational organisations (Goodwin, Cunningham, & Childress, 2003; Catano & Stronge, 2007; Ginsberg, 2008). Catano and Stronge (2007) comment that initially the job expectations of principals were limited to responsibility for the academic programmes in schools and their primary task was to effectively manage school operations by attending to facility issues such as scheduling and building maintenance. The role of principals was then expanded to instructional programmes and thus principals are seen as instructional leaders in the schools.

Instructional leadership gained popularity in North American education in the 1970s and 1980s when the effective school movement emerged to meet the demand for improved quality of instruction to boost students’ learning outcomes and to increase school accountability (Hallinger, 2009; Horng & Loeb, 2010). Jenkins (2009) argued that instructional leadership rose to prominence again due to the demands of raising students’ academic standards which forced principals to pay more attention to the instructional aspects of the school. Various scholars have defined the term somewhat differently, emphasising various aspects. Gurr, Drysdale, and Mulford (2010) define instructional leadership as any activity in which a principal is involved to improve instruction using a wide range of methods, such as classroom observation, teacher coaching and principal direct instructional intervention.

Alternatively, Bush (2007) offers a somewhat different view in defining instructional leadership in which he emphasises the indirect influence of the principal on teachers and the school’s learning culture rather than influencing the process itself in improving instruction. Bush (2007) also noted that for
instructional leadership to be effective in improving instruction, three strategies need to be implemented: modelling, monitoring and learning. While differing slightly, the above definitions of instructional leadership have the same focus on improvement of instruction or the centrality of instruction as the main responsibility of school leaders.

Catano and Stronge (2007) argue that the work of school principals nowadays is even more complex since reform in education is a constant phenomenon, with increasing demands of many stakeholders. Many schools today face increased scrutiny both from internal and external evaluations. They argue that today’s principal’s role needs them to be able to switch between the roles of manager, disciplinarian, facilitator, transformer, instructional manager, expert and agent of change, and to perform all these roles at the same time. Ginsberg (2008) noted that principals are faced with the difficult process of decision making, have experienced emotional turmoil in their leadership practices and urge principals to be well-prepared to perform the roles and not panic in facing dilemmas. Cardno (1999) noted the need of support for principals to cope with the expanded role.

Goodwin, Cunningham, and Childress (2003) also expressed the view that the role of principalship has changed rapidly and become more complex. The changing role has caused a shortage of principals because few aspirants are wanting to apply for principalship. One principal in the study argued that “the current role of the principal is all encompassing” (p. 32). There is little doubt that principals are under stress due to many demands (Goodwin, et al., 2003). Clifford, Sherrat, and Fettes (2012) also argued that today, the principal’s responsibilities and roles have changed drastically so that it is almost impossible for a single leader to play all the roles effectively. They even found that in a single district there could be varieties of activities done by principals in different types of schools. The changing conceptions of principalship have embraced many facets such as traditional manager, supervisor of standards, adaptive leader, instructional leader and leader among leaders (Clifford, et al., 2012).

Literature on educational leadership argues that to be effective instructional leaders, principals need managerial skills (Cardno, 2012). Therefore, today
expectations of principals are often grounded in the assumption that the day-to-day managerial functions of the school need to be performed efficiently to meet expectations (Catano & Stronge, 2007; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). Ng and Szeto (2016) assert that principals are experiencing isolation, alienation and frustration due to the multifaceted demands of their role of leading schools. DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2003) argued that principalship has always been a demanding job which is more than a full-time job. They argued that rapid changes in education have expanded the role of principals to a level where it is hard to cope and this makes teachers reluctant to take up the post. They found that many principals currently in the job want to retire in the next decade due to the ever-changing demands of the role. DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2003) describe that principals are at a crossroads due to the demands to become instructional leaders and effective managers.

The international literature of principalship is important in this study as a lens to analyse and observe whether principalship in an Indonesian context is experiencing the same phenomenon where the principal’s role is changing rapidly with increasing demands and accountability. This study, then, relates the findings on the Indonesian principal’s role to the international perspective of principalship to understand the nature of principalship in Indonesia in practice.

**The Indonesian principal’s role**

Because Indonesia falls into the category of a developing world country, the literature that focuses on principalship in these countries throws light on some general features that could be relevant to this study. Oplatka (2004), in his review of principalship in developing countries found that principalship is marked by several specific characteristics such as the general view that principalship is a mere administrative function. He also noted there was a lack of pro-active management and there was a tendency to autocratic leadership rather than to a participative leadership style.

In the context of Indonesia, after the revised *Local Autonomy Law* (House of Representatives of Indonesia, 2004), more power and responsibility was given to
the local government to handle the funding of schools which requires principals to
take on more functions in their role, making it more managerial in nature. Sumintomo, Na Jiang, Sheyoputri, Misbach, and Jumintomo (2015) argue that, since the shift of role and focus of principalship in the country, the government of Indonesia began to standardise the principalship position in which aspiring principals need to get a certificate of eligibility before becoming principals. Sofo, Fitzgerald and Jawas (2012) also note that there was a shift of role for principals since the government introduced the term “School Based Management” in 2006. Since then principalship in Indonesia has been more geared toward managerial and instructional roles with greater accountability, particularly in terms of financial resources because the central government started to allocate more funding to schools, and principals are held accountable to the Local Education Authority. School-based management is the decentralization of authority from the central government to the school level in which schools are given much more freedom to run the schools (World Bank, 2008).

The role of principals in Indonesia is a complex and demanding one. Raihani (2008) also articulated that, in addition to managerial and leadership skills, principals of successful Indonesian schools consider religious and cultural values to be important for their leadership practice. Being amanah (trustworthy) and ikhlas (giving and surrendering to God’s will) is important to be effective instructional leaders or principals. Kolu (2015) found that most principals and teachers supported the implementation of instructional leadership in Indonesian education systems and found that instructional leadership in Indonesia was successful when there was a high level of collaboration among teachers, principals, students and stakeholders.

The role of principalship in Indonesia today is considered an important one because it determines the success of schools and student learning in general. This can be seen from the National Professional Standards issued by the Ministry of Education under the Ministerial Decree No. 13 (Ministry of Education of Indonesia, 2007) which states that the roles of principals as motivator, manager, supervisor, facilitator and an agent of change.
According to *Ministerial Decree No. 28* (Ministry of Education of Indonesia, 2010), to be eligible to become principals, teachers need to meet requirements such as being religious, having an undergraduate degree with an education major, being under the age of 56 years when first appointed in the post, having never been convicted of a crime, have been teaching for at least six years and have received a IIIC teachers’ rank (adult teacher category), and finally receiving good appraisal reports in two consecutive years while being a teacher. When teachers meet all the requirements to be eligible for principalship, they can be then appointed by a letter of appointment issued through the Local Education Authority.

**Performance standards**

According to the *Indonesian Secondary School Principal Professional Standards* (Ministry of Education of Indonesia, 2007), there are five areas of competency which define the role of principalship in Indonesia. The first is personality. Principals are expected to become role models for society in terms of religious values, integrity, open-mindedness, maturity of emotion and spirituality and have the talent to lead an educational institution.

The second is managerial skills. Principals need to possess the ability to plan school goals, develop organisations, manage school resources, adjust to change, create a culture of learning, manage teachers and staff to achieve optimum learning outcomes, liaise with communities around the schools, manage curricula and instruction, have financial skills, have information system skills and be able to support teachers and staff to improve learning experiences, use technology information systems to facilitate learning and monitoring and evaluate the delivery of curricula and instruction.

The third is entrepreneurship skills. Indonesian principals are expected to have skills in creating innovations to develop school programmes, work hard to create effective learning organisations, have high motivation to achieve success in performing the school principal’s role and never give up in facing hardships and problems in running the school more effectively.
The fourth is supervision skills. Indonesian secondary principals are expected to have skills in conducting academic supervision to develop teachers’ professionalism, evaluate teachers’ performance using proper approaches and techniques and follow up the results of academic supervision with proper professional development programmes.

The fifth is social skills. Principals are expected to be able to work with other parties in communities to develop school effectiveness, participate in social and communal activities and finally have a sense of empathy toward others and organisations.

Understanding the literature of the Indonesian principal’s role and areas of competence in this study is relevant to understand the espoused policy on demands and expectations of becoming a principal in Indonesia. The demands as stated in the policy are important in this study because the principal is appraised against the demands stated in the Professional Standards issued by the Ministry of Education of Indonesia. Professional Standards for Principals is the basis for appraisal and the job descriptions of principals. Through understanding the Indonesian principalship literature, the study can examine whether principals understand the roles they play or not.

Judging role performance: accountability and appraisal

The idea of accountability in the public service sector is nothing new (Brundrett & Rhodes, 2011; Anderson, 2005; Darling-Hammond, Wilhoit, & Pittenger, 2014). Brundrett and Rhodes (2011) argue that accountability in the United Kingdom can be traced back to the nineteenth century with the establishment of Her Majesty’s Inspectorate in 1839. Accountability is a complex and a slippery concept because it can mean different things to different people in different contexts (Normore, 2004; Levitt, Janta, & Wegrich, 2008). Normore (2004) defines being accountable through reporting, and states “we could imply that she/he is obligated to give a report, description, explanation, justifying analysis, or some form of exposition of reasons, causes, grounds, or motives for what we have observed” (p. 57). Brundrett and Rhodes (2011) define accountability as “a relationship in which
one party has an obligation, contractual or otherwise, to account for their performance of certain actions to another” (p. 22). The language of accountability is pervasive in the world of education. Moller (2007) defines accountability as “having to answer for one’s action, and particularly the result of those actions” (p. 2) and argues that accountability is a multifaceted and multi-layered concept implying a relationship of control between different parties and has a connection to trust and is defined by distinctive and evaluative procedures to improve the quality of education. However, Moller (2007) also argues that the concept of accountability is an elusive term and may be difficult to put into practice.

The notion of quality and accountability has been a major issue in the education reform which has been influenced by the values of neo-liberalism emphasising “performativity” (Mercer, Barker & Bird, 2010; Ambrosio, 2013; Anderson, 2005; Keddie, 2015). Altrichter and Kemethofer (2015) describe that sweeping accountability pressures in some European countries for instance were caused by the notion of quality as reflected in some international tests. The search for quality education has put in place new regimes of inspections for schools to make sure that expected outcomes can be achieved. Brundrett and Rhodes (2011) argued that since the 1980s, schools and other educational organisations have experienced an unprecedented degree of government intervention in terms of the curriculum that is taught and the ways in which educational establishments are monitored. Jennings and Lomas (2003) argued that the New Public Management trend led to the greater use of performance management in public service including in the education sector to ensure effectiveness, efficiency and quality.

Stake and Schwandt (2006) argue that quality can be achieved by measuring someone’s performance to explicit criteria or standards. In other words, Stake and Schwandt (2006) assert the need for people who are accountable to be able to tell whether there is quality in the duties they perform. One of the ways to make people accountable for what they have performed is through performance management which is appraisal or evaluation of performance. Appraisal is conducted so that people can show that they produce quality and demonstrate accountability in performing their duties. Schools are social organisations which
are responsible to many stakeholders. Due to the need of schools to work with and to serve well their stakeholders, schools are accountable organisations.

Appraisal is one of the means for evaluating accountability and has been common across organisations including educational organisations. Appraisal in performance management is related to three functions: induction, ongoing appraisal and professional development of staff (Cardno, 2012). Gaziel (2008) suggests that performance assessment as an administrative function has become an important domain in education because of the emphasis on quality of learning and teaching in educational organisations. Jefferson (2010) argues that the performance appraisal of principals has a greater importance to the organisation because principals or school leaders set the tone of the workplace and influence the morale and thus the productivity of the employees and directly manage resources that affect the productivity of organisations. Principals are prime leaders in schools and nowadays they are faced with many competing demands from various stakeholders of educational organisations (Cardno, 2012). Catano and Stronge (2007) comment that from local to national levels, stakeholders scrutinise the performance of schools and thus principals are responsible to various competing demands at the same time. Furthermore, they also noted that the governments also demand more accountability from schools to meet the standards imposed by legislation to achieve effectiveness.

The literature on the accountability movement in education is pertinent in this study to understand the relation between accountability and appraisal in education in which appraisal serves as a means of accountability. The heightened scrutiny of principals through appraisal shows that accountability has changed the landscape of the principal’s role and it is relevant here because this study seeks to reveal the purposes and practices of appraisal in the accountability movement context.
Performance appraisal of principals

Defining appraisal and purpose

Performance appraisal is an element of a performance management system located under the umbrella of Human Resource Management (Rudman, 2010; Cardno, 2012). Macky and Johnson (2003) believe that in many contexts, performance management has several meanings, including a narrow meaning similar to performance appraisal. Cardno (2012) reminds us that there are several terms which are related to performance appraisal such as performance assessment, evaluation and review. Macky and Johnson (2003) refer to performance appraisal as the same thing as performance review which is one of the main elements of a performance management system and they argue that many academics regard performance appraisal as a substitute term for performance management. Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) propose that evaluation is an umbrella term which describes any activity where the quality of provision is subject to systematic study. Thus, evaluation’s scope is vast and it encompasses a wide range of activities of which appraisal is one.

Performance appraisal is an important dimension of professionalism to ensure accountability and quality (Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005; Bush & Middlewood, 2005). Macky and Johnson (2003) define performance appraisal as “the process of evaluating an employees’ job performance, providing feedback on that evaluation, and determining outcomes for the employee in terms of remuneration, promotion, training, discipline, future goals setting and so on” (p. 301). Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) describe appraisal as “a complex evaluative activity that involves making qualitative judgment about performance, once the competency is established” (p. 15) and it is concerned simultaneously with improving the quality of that performance. They further argue that assessment is different from appraisal because appraisal is not comparing teachers or headteachers’ performance based on standardised criteria or a competency checklist, but focuses on judging the value of individual teachers or principals based on a negotiated job description containing specific agreed performance expectations. In short, performance appraisal is about measuring the progress of someone’s job toward negotiated expectations.
The Ministry of Education of Indonesia (2012) defines performance appraisal for principals as a set of processes for collecting, analysing and interpreting authentic data about what has been performed by principals against performance standard indicators to measure effectiveness by comparing the reality to the agreed performance programme. Forrester (2011) also defines performance appraisal as “a process originating in the private sector which has subsequently been adopted by the public sector into an audit mechanism for improving the performance, productivity, accountability and transparency of public services” (p. 5). Mercer, Barker, and Bird (2010) define performance appraisal as “systematic examination of an employee’s performance for whatever purpose” (p. 139). Nusche, Laveault, MacBeath and Santiago (2012) define performance appraisal as “the evaluation of individual teacher to make a judgement about their performance” (p. 8).

Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) and Cardno (2012) argue that an effective appraisal needs to serve two purposes, accountability and development aspects, meaning that appraisals’ purposes are to make people accountable for their performance in terms of whether or not they have met the agreed expectations and also to figure out what support and training is needed for the appraisee to improve their performance in the future. Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) believe that these two goals of accountability and development are interdependent and inseparable in effective appraisal. Jennings and Lomas (2003) noted that there was a debate in schools since the inception of performance appraisal as to whether it serves an accountability or developmental function. Cardno (2012) believes that the two purposes need to be integrated effectively to benefit both the individual and the organisation, but she further argues that to be able to integrate the dual purposes, the appraisal process needs to take place in a professional, open and trustworthy context where both appraisers and appraisee work together to develop the appraisal process. Bush and Middlewood (2005) assert that imposed appraisal or external appraisal are very unlikely to be able to create such a context.

After examining current literature on principal appraisal, Gaziel (2008) found that there are at least seven approaches to principal appraisal: result or outcome-based, standard-based, personal qualities, role based, key behaviours of effective
principal, principal efficiency and subordinates’ satisfaction. These approaches are based on which criteria or data, principal appraisal is taken from. According to Gaziel’s (2008) study, principals in Israel believed that the purpose of appraisal is more for professional development than for decision making, showing that more than half the principals viewed that appraisal was to improve practice rather than for decision making and public accountability. The study also revealed that superintendents in Israel today were more interested in score results and students’ data than school processes, even though the superintendents claimed that they considered many aspects in the appraisal process.

**Process of principal appraisal**

Different countries may have different processes and procedures for appraising principals depending on contexts. For the purpose of this thesis, the literature focuses on three countries, the United States of America (USA), Indonesia and New Zealand, to understand how principals are appraised or evaluated. The decision to choose the USA as an example was made because of the similarities of principal appraisal between the Indonesian education system and American education system, particularly in terms of the process of principal appraisal. The similarities are the presence of the superintendent’s role in appraising principals both in Indonesia and the USA, the function of a local education authority which supports and supervises superintendents and principals in carrying out the roles and the three phases of the principal appraisal process.

**The United States Processes**

Murphy, Goldring and Porter (2014) argue that, although principal appraisal can take multiple shapes and components, at the very core of it, principal performance appraisal must have robust guiding principles and the right content in order to be effective. Brown-Sims (2010) argued that there are several strategies that need to be considered in conducting effective performance appraisal (evaluation) for principals in the context of the USA. Firstly, establishing a clear set of
expectations and goals for the appraisal or evaluation covering what aspects will be assessed, who will appraise or provide feedback, how the findings of the appraisal will be used and how the process of appraisal will be done. Secondly, using valid and reliable assessment measures and helping to inform principal development needs. Finally, the appraisal of principals needs to be based on research-based standards and the need to use multiple sources of data and tools to collect holistic evidence about principal performance.

Anderson and Turnbull (2016) found that, in the USA, every district has its own regulations and procedures for how principals are evaluated and appraised. From their study of principal evaluation in several states (Maryland, New York, Florida and Colorado), they noticed that there are several phases which are repeated in those states though they might have different wording for each phase. The first phase is goal setting. Principals’ self-assessment and goal setting was the first step in four districts where principals determine and pick which of the district standards they should have to meet. The second phase is evidence collection. To collect evidence, superintendents in four districts spent considerable time in schools and they were expected to collect a variety of evidence from a variety of sources to investigate and rate principals’ professional practice. The third phase is assigning principal ratings. Anderson and Turnbull (2016) argued that there were no clear-cut procedural rules about how superintendents used evaluation/appraisal evidence to determine principal ratings. Superintendents have significant control and power to determine ratings of principal appraisal because they are given full discretion is assigning values to each of the measures. One district superintendent explained:

“We do not have a lot of rules or metric around how to look at the data. We provide a lot of guidance and we do a lot of training and calibration but it is not like if a certain of families feel a certain way about a school then translates into a lower score in community leadership” (p. 27).

Principals’ ratings are determined by superintendents based on the discretionary power they have to rate principals based on their evaluation data and evidence. The fourth phase is providing formal feedback to principals. Superintendents or
supervisors then explained to principals about their appraisal rating and provided feedback on how to improve performance. Principals in the study by Anderson and Turnbull (2016) admitted that they received some form of feedback, either verbal or written, on the results of the appraisal.

Principals who received a low rating and score must follow an action of improvement plan because the principal appraisal system in their evaluation system requires principals to improve their performance. District leaders also admit that there are no hard and fast rules about the improvement process and to some extent an evaluation result or appraisal might lead to dismissal.

**Indonesian Processes**

According to the Ministry of Education of Indonesia (2012), appraising principals is the responsibility of the head of the Local Education Authority (LEA) which in practice is delegated to superintendents. The appraisal of principals must be conducted in accordance with the regulations and guidelines prepared by the Ministry of Education using 360 appraisal approaches or multisource appraisal feedback. According to the *Guideline for Appraising Principals* in Indonesia (Ministry of Education of Indonesia, 2012), there are three phases of the principal appraisal process: preparation, evidence collection and confirmation, and appraisal rating and reporting. The first phase is preparation. In this phase, the Local Education Authority assigns a competent and professional team consisting of at least two superintendents to appraise a certain school principal. Afterward, the assigned superintendents will notify the principal through a letter that she/he will be appraised enclosing the criteria, standards, data and requests for documents that will be appraised. The superintendent then examines and observes the authenticity of the documents to verify their validity to be used for the appraisal. The principal sets the semester and annual programme plan and objectives together with the superintendents.

The second phase is appraisal implementation through data collection which includes two steps: early year cycle and end of year cycle. Early in the year, the
superintendent requires the principals to do a self-appraisal process including the need for principals to appraise themselves using the principal appraisal instruments. The superintendents are also required to investigate further by doing impromptu visitations during school hours to check for evidence and obtain teachers’ perspectives on how school is run.

At the end of the year, the superintendent will come to reconfirm with the principals what outcomes and expectations have been met and have not been met based on the performance agreement. The process of appraisal confirmation needs to follow procedures as stated in the guidelines such as principals are required to present before the superintendents the relevant criteria or standards they have achieved. After calculating the scores in the instruments of appraisal, the superintendents must determine the average rating for the principal appraisal ranging from very good, good enough, fair and inadequate. The final score for the principal appraisal is determined by how many “yes” and “no” answers are given in the instruments and the verification of the evidence by superintendents. The score will then be calculated using the formula: final score is the total score achieved by the principal times 100 and then divided by the highest maximum total score in the instruments.

The result of the appraisal will be converted to a range of categories in the conversion table of appraisal rating for principals. The result of the four-year cycle of appraisal for principals will be calculated in a form for a principal appraisal signed by the head of the Local Education Authority and the total score needs to reach a certain score depending on what rank the principal is going to be promoted to. According to the Guideline for Appraising Principals (Ministry of Education of Indonesia, 2012), the score needs to comply with another regulation issued by the State Minister of Civil Apparatus and Empowerment on rank promotion.

New Zealand Processes

In New Zealand, the responsibility of appraising the principal lies with the Board of Trustees which is the employer of the principal (NZSTA, 2005). According to
Good Practice Framework (Ministry of Education of New Zealand & NZSTA, 2008) and Guideline for Board of Trustees (NZSTA, 2005) in managing principal appraisal, the appraisal of principals starts from the process of hiring and ends with the result of the appraisal. Basically, the appraisal process of principals in New Zealand follows an annual cycle.

According to Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) and Good Practice Framework (Ministry of Education of New Zealand, 2008), the process of principal appraisal in New Zealand consists of three phases. The first phase is setting up the process. This phase is where principals and the Board of Trustees negotiate a performance agreement which lays out the expectations and standards which principals have to meet. Since the process of appraising is a cycle, the previous performance agreement can be revised, drafted and discussed with the Board of Trustees and then performance agreement documents are tabled and agreed. Both parties need to agree to the performance agreement because the performance agreement will become the basis for the principal appraisal.

The second phase is monitoring, data collection and communication. This phase is when the performance of the principal is recorded and gathered through various means by the appointed appraisers. This process is a continuous and year-long process involving many different stakeholders in the school such as teachers, students, parents and the principal.

The final phase is the appraisal interview and reporting. This phase is where board and principal talk about the principal’s performance in an interview. The interview is more a process of confirmation on the gathered data and to get the principal’s perspectives on the data. This phase ends with the drafting of the appraisal summary which then becomes the final appraisal rating with recommendations for the principal.

Effective Principal Appraisal
Shelton (2013) argues that any principal appraisal or evaluation should assess how well a principal demonstrates key leadership actions and behaviours rather
than assess knowledge and traits. Shelton (2013), in her review of the legislative approach to principal evaluation in the USA, suggests that principal appraisal or evaluation needs to involve principals directly in the process of designing the appraisal; be educational so that appraisal results in learning for both parties; be connected to district and state systems; be fair, rigorous and equitable; use multiple sources of data and categories; communicate results and evidence to principals openly, consistently and with transparency; and provide training and support for principals and principal appraisers. Kavanagh, Benson and Brown (2007) emphasize the importance of fairness in the performance appraisal process where they argued that fairness of performance is influenced by participation in the process, neutrality of the supervisors and knowledge of the appraisal system. They believe that fairness is vital to the success of performance appraisal.

Some authors (Piggot-Irvine 2003; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno 2005; Clifford & Ross 2012; Bush & Middlewood 2005; Caruth & Humphreys, 2008) argue that there are several key features of effective appraisal from years of research. The key features of effective appraisal are:

- integrated development and accountability approach meaning that the dual purpose is met
- using objective information meaning that appraisal is using valid data
- a confidential and transparent process in which the process is clear and transparent for both appraisers and appraisee
- clear in terms of goals
- procedures with genuine intent for improvement
- setting deeper objectives where the appraisee can plan to learn and to do small research projects to deepen learning
- quality time which ensures enough time and process for appraisal
- separation of the discipline process from appraisal because it can jeopardize trust and openness
- developing educative interactions where participants’ productive conversations take place to do double loop learning
Also there must training for conducting appraisal so that it is not a one-day approach.

**Impact of principal appraisal**

Many authors argue (Cardno, 2012; Piggot-Irvine & Cardno 2005; Bush & Middlewood, 2005) that effective performance needs to be able to serve the dual purposes of appraisal. In practice, Fuller, Hollingsworth and Liu (2015) found that the practice of principal appraisal in the United States does not always meet its purposes and the system of principal evaluation itself needs to be improved. Principal appraisal is designed to have an impact on principal leadership practice so that it can enhance the learning outcomes of the students. Research on principal appraisal impact is still limited and it usually falls into two categories of impact: that appraisal affects the practice of principal leadership and improves it, and principal appraisal does not provide beneficial feedback and does not affect and improve practice since it is a waste of time. Furthermore, Fuller, Hollingworth and Liu (2015) also argued that little or almost no research explained how principal appraisal can improve practice, even though it does improve practice, and they also argued that the process of appraisal for principals is administered inconsistently regarding observational components. Research showed that there is a paucity of evidence that any of the adopted measures provide an accurate indicator of principal effectiveness that affect students' learning outcomes (Fuller et al., 2015).

A study conducted by the Education Review Office (2014) on principal appraisal in New Zealand described that principal appraisal could contribute to three key aspects: the principal’s own development, staff and school development and improving student achievement. However, the findings showed that only a quarter of the three aspects was evident in the schools they studied and that appraisal was geared more toward principal or staff development. Piggot-Irvine (2000) has argued that teachers and managers (principals) found the introduction of performance management (appraisal) to be positive for their profession. Piggot-Irvine’s (2000) findings challenged the common idea that increased accountability
in education can reduce commitment and increase fear in schools. However, Piggot-Irvine also (2000) described that while policy in appraisal was in place and it was planned for, in practice it could be a mere formal tick-box activity as well, and Piggot-Irvine (2003) concurred that appraisal did not really play a significant part in professional development programmes when there were negative issues to be dealt with.

Mendel (2017) found that 85% of principals who participated in the principal pipeline study felt that their appraisal was worthwhile and many of the new principals also felt that the process of their appraisal was fair (65%) and they also contended that the appraisal criteria and measures reflected the complexity and the breadth of their roles which is in striking contrast to past research on principal appraisal. Mendel (2017) also asserted that in the principal pipeline study, principal appraisal was designed by and for principals where superintendents were intensively involved in a dialogue where both are intentional and committed to perform effective principal appraisal. Chapman (2008) in her study of New Zealand principals also discovered that most principals felt that their appraisal experiences were positive to improve performance. The principals also perceived that their appraisal was beneficial to reflect on practice and progress and helped them learn to appraise staff. Though not all principals perceived that the process of appraisal was important for their professional development, some felt that the process helped them to notice what aspects to be developed (Viramontez, 2011).

In contrast, Brady’s (2012) study on the practices of principal evaluation in ten districts in Southern California found that most principals in the study perceived that principal evaluation did not influence their leadership practice and principals felt that they had received little meaningful input in the process of appraisal. Principals also felt that they needed to engage more in regular conversations with superintendents to discuss professional development and expectations so that alignment between the two can be made. The principals in Brady’s (2012) study believed that principal appraisal was predominantly used as a summative process with little formative feedback in the process. Fuller et al. (2015) described that many principals in the study of principal appraisal found their appraisal was
superficial and simplistic, and provided little useful feedback on how to improve practice. Fuller et al. (2015) also assert that most of the principal appraisal results in the United States were used to make decisions for accountability rather than development such as determining payment and careers.

Goldring, Cravens, Murphy, Porter, Elliot and Carson (2009) assert that principal assessment or appraisal is an integral part of standard-based accountability systems and school improvement. They argue that when performance appraisal for principals is designed appropriately, executed proactively and implemented properly it can enhance leadership quality and improve organisational performance at three levels of learning: individual, collective and organisational. However, they also found out that principal appraisal or evaluation in the United States used instruments that measure very limited coverage of leadership behaviours that ensure rigorous curriculum and quality instruction which are linked to school improvement to enhance students’ learning. The study also asserted that there was a lack of justification and documentation in the process of appraisal or evaluation in terms of using psychometric assessment.

Goldring et al. (2009) found that many principals felt that their appraisal was positive, accurate and consistent with job expectations. However, fewer found that the appraisal process was relevant to enhancing their motivation and improving their performance since critical behaviours to influence students’ achievement were not emphasized in the instruments. Harper (2016), in her case studies of six principals in the USA found that principals felt that their appraisal was emphasizing too much on evidence particularly on students’ data and principals felt that their appraisal was not impactful on their professional growth. The impact of the process on the overall practice was also little, indicating a lack of meaningfulness. Sun and Youngs (2009) described that principal appraisal could affect and enhance principal learning-centred leadership if appraisal was geared toward professional development and accountability at the same time and aligned the principal appraisal with goal-setting and curriculum design in the schools.

Condon (2009) found that principals felt that they did not completely trust the formal process of their appraisal and the motives of their superintendents and also
discovered that principals in the study perceived that, in general, their appraisal did not improve their performance and did not promote professional growth because the feedback was subjective. For instance, the performance appraisal instruments did not measure how principals solved conflicts in the schools and principals in the study also believed their appraisal was for accountability purpose and political influences and pressure have also influenced the ways superintendents appraise them (Condon, 2009). Fuller et al. (2015) also suggest that the result of principal appraisal cannot be used to make a high-stakes decision such as termination or dismissal because it would be unethical and unwarranted since school contexts are different and there are lot of other variations that need to be considered in the process of appraisal. They also suggest to the states to keep doing an ongoing data and evidence collection through the year and there is a fair and open process of principal appraisal. In addition, the appraisal result should be used more to design support and professional development for principals (Fuller et al., 2015).

Yavuz (2010), in his study of principal appraisal in Turkey found that a considerable amount of supervisors’ time was spent on checking documents. Principals in the appraisal process also perceived that the superintendents were not competent enough to appraise them. Yavuz (2010) found that principals felt that the feedback given to them during appraisal was not useful and they felt that superintendents could not evaluate them objectively in terms of guiding, orientating and improving their performance. This problem, he argued, could be caused by a lack of competent supervisors in the Turkish context. The principals also felt there was a lack of time allocation in the process of appraisal. Gaziel (2008) found in his study of principal appraisal in Israel that paradoxically principals felt that their appraisal was a waste of time even though they admitted that 75% of the appraisal process was helpful.

The principals in Yavuz’s study (2010) also explained that they were not well-informed about the criteria being used to appraise them and that they found that superintendents relied heavily on the document checking process when appraising them. Goldring, Mavrogordato and Haynes (2015) argued that principals in the
USA had different responses toward the use of multiple source appraisal data when used to appraise them. They found that principals either made changes to improve their performance or made excuses and then created cognitive dissonance when their teacher feedback did not meet their self-rating evaluation. Reeves (as cited in Stronge, 2013) argued that principal appraisal failed to enhance motivation and improve performance because principal appraisal is not aligned with professional standards which can produce role conflict that can make principals confused as to which aspects they needed to focus on.

Gaziel (2008) found an interesting paradox in his study of principal assessment in Israel. He found that, although almost all principals thought the assessment process was helpful, 75 percent of the principals argued that their performance appraisal was a waste of time. The study by Gaziel (2008) suggests that the impact of principal assessment toward their performance was shallow because principals believed that the process was inconsistent and a waste of time. They also had negative perceptions toward principal assessment because they viewed assessment as summative in nature and not formative. There is a difference of understanding between supervisors and principals on the purposes, processes and effectiveness of principal assessment.

Fuller, Hollingworth, and Liu (2015) also found that none of the existing efforts had documented that the principal appraisal or evaluation allows evaluators or policymakers to make valid and reliable inferences about principal effectiveness. Muenich (2014) studied the perceptions of principals in Minnesota about their principal appraisal or evaluation and found that principals felt that their past appraisal process was fair and consistent. However, half of the principals questioned the value of their appraisal in relation to their professional growth and when asked about whether they agreed or not to include students’ achievement data as one of the sources for appraisal, most principals agreed to that idea, but principals also did not fully support a higher percentage of students’ data proportion in their appraisal rating (Muenich, 2014).

Casavant, Collins, Stark, Candless and Tencza (2012) found in the study of principal evaluation in New England in the USA that there was no correlation
between the goals they had developed in the beginning of the year and the summative evaluation at the end of the year. Principals in the study also perceived that the evaluation instrument did not encompass the vast scope of their work in which they identified that some of their critical tasks were not included in the appraisal instrument such as safety and preparedness for students’ well-being (Casavant et al., 2012). To improve the process, principals in the study suggested that the appraisal process needs to be more of a dialogue with regular visits and the need to understand the context of the culture between superintendents and principals (Gaziel, 2008). Murphy, Goldring and Porter (2014) found that majority of principal appraisals in the USA were perfunctory without much impact on performance and improvement. The outcome of appraisals was also not used as input for decision making, being merely a formality.

This study seeks to understand the nature of principal appraisal in an Indonesian context to see whether principal appraisal has an impact on the performance of principals. Understanding similar studies which have been conducted in an international context can shed light for the researcher as the basis for understanding principal appraisal in Indonesia and whether it has an impact to the performance of principals in general.

**Principal development**

Cardno (2012) suggests that in order for professional development to be holistic, it needs to ensure that it caters for teachers and managers, meets school-wide, team and individual needs, is strongly linked to achievement of strategic goals, is underpinned by sound principles of educational leadership and is organised as a planned and cohesive programme. In her model of holistic professional development, Cardno (2012) places performance appraisal as a central element of the model in which through performance appraisal results, schools or leaders can design professional development programmes which can meet the needs of the individuals and teams. Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) argue that professional development both for teachers and managers can be divided into four categories: school development, curriculum development, management development and
personal development. Performance appraisal in this model should be able to integrate the dual purposes of appraisal: accountability and development. Cardno (2012) argued that principal appraisal should inform principal professional development programmes since appraisal is the centre of professional development which is linked to strategic goals and sound educational leadership literature.

Anderson and Turnbull (2016) have argued the need for superintendents and principals to have training for the process of appraisal that is consistent so that effective principal appraisal can take place. Principal appraisal in the USA has been used more as a means of accountability rather than professional development which is shown by 77% of principal appraisal results being used to make high-stake decisions such as termination and sanctions (Fuller, Hollingworth & Liu, 2015). In the context of principal appraisal, holistic professional development needs to stem from the performance appraisal outcome and to which extent the appraisal outcome has been used to design professional development to meet the need of principals to cope with their day-to-day duties (Cardno, 2012). Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) believe that the performance appraisal outcome should be a basis for policymakers to design relevant professional programmes because through the appraisal process can be found what areas need to be paid attention to improve performance and effectiveness.

Clifford and Ross (2012) believe that effective appraisal should inform professional development to improve learning and performance. They argue that appraisal results can spark learning and reflection that affects principal leadership performance. Peterson (2012), in his study of professional development programmes provided by state and non-profit organisations in the USA found any professional development programmes for principals needed to meet structural arrangements and cultural arrangements touching on many aspects of principalship. Furthermore, Peterson (2002) argues the need to link professional development programmes to state initiatives and certifications to be more effective for practice. Moreover, Guilfoyle (2013) argued that principal evaluation is very important for principal professional development because principal evaluation or
appraisal can provide specific and actionable feedback and opportunities for professional growth throughout each principal’s career. In Indonesia, appraising principals is the task of school superintendents located in the Local Education Authority. In the Ministerial Decree of appraising principals, it is stated that the appraisal of principals is a part of the Indonesian national goals to achieve quality education. Peterson (2002) describes some professional development programmes in the USA where he stresses the importance of providing evaluation training as one part of professional programmes for new principals.

Clifford and Ross (2012) argued that current principal appraisal or evaluation in the USA is not positioned to support principal learning and there is a need to have a break from past practices of principal appraisal. Furthermore, they found that principal appraisal has limited value for feedback and professional development and is inconsistently administered across states. In the context of Indonesia, it is clearly mentioned that appraisal outcome will be used as a consideration in designing professional development programmes that suit the needs of principals (Ministry of Education of Indonesia, 2012). However, the training and preparation of principals is handled and conducted by an independent institution called the Education Quality Assurance Institute which is under the Ministry of Education and little research has been conducted on the connection of appraisal and professional development of principals.

Understanding the literature on the principal appraisal and principal development is relevant for this study as a tool to analyse whether or not principal appraisal in an Indonesian context has an impact on the performance of principals and to see whether professional development programmes for principals are tailored to the appraisal outcome since this study seeks the impact of principal appraisal practices for the principals. Through this study, a temporary conclusion can be reached based on the superintendents and principal’s perspectives about principal appraisal impact in an Indonesian context.
Challenges in effective appraisal of principals

Appraisal activity is always fraught with tensions and problems because appraisal is about judging others’ performance (Cardno, 2012). Effective appraisal needs to serve the dual purposes of appraisal: accountability and development (Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005; Cardno, 2012). On one hand, appraisal is conducted to meet the organisational goals to improve performance. On the other hand, appraisal is used for career development and payment rise. However, Wilson (2002) argued that performance appraisal is very unlikely to be able to serve these dual purposes because it is difficult for appraisers to act as a judge while at the same time trying to be a helpful counsellor. Wilson (2002) also noted that political nature and bias are inherent in appraisal because it requires judgment and power control over the appraisee.

Forrester (2011) noted that performance appraisal has put many teachers and principals under pressure because appraisal has been used as a tool of bureaucratic control to punish or reward them and serves as a panoptic system to monitor teachers and principals so that they are always feeling under detailed scrutiny. Appraisal, if not properly conducted, can put relationships at stake because appraisal can also be used as part of accountability on which promotion and reward are based (Cardno, 2012). Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) describe that “appraisal is a very threatening activity because it focuses on what we do and involves making judgements” (p. 66). Furthermore, Lashway (2003) asserted that principal appraisal is inherently difficult because the nature of principalship is complex, ambiguous and highly contextual, therefore creating standard procedures that can work in all situations is almost impossible.

According to Cardno (2012), the nature of people is defensive in appraisal processes to avoid others knowing their weaknesses and to prevent unpleasantness. People involved in appraisal processes tend to avoid threats and conflict to secure a relationship. In addition, Oldroyd (2005) argues that appraisal activity can be very stressful and fearful when the appraisal is not carried out skilfully and properly with competence and capacity. Middlewood and Cardno (2001) also assert that appraisal challenges people on two different levels: the
organisational level with the purpose of improving organisational performance and the individual level with the purpose of improving individual performance while maintaining a personal relationship and individual well-being.

There are many different challenges in the process of conducting appraisal both for the appraisers and appraisees in the literature. For appraisal processes in general, some authors (Mondy & Mondy, 2012; Prowse & Prowse 2009; Davis, 2011; Appelbaum, Roy & Gilliland, 2011; Ahmad & Bujang, 2013) argue that there are some challenges which can occur in the process of appraisal, such as individual and collective cultures, cultural differences and their relationship to leniency psychometric errors, and trust and open relationships, subjectivity of the organisations, fairness, direct bias, indirect bias, competency, devolution, authoritarianism, political, religious and social issues, knowledge of the appraisal system, informal and incidental and ongoing appraising and informal data collection.

For the purposes of this study, I will present some challenges or concerns of principal appraisal in general and specific contexts of educational organisations which are relevant to understand the nature of principal appraisal in Indonesia. The first challenge of principal appraisal is objectivity. Some authors (Mondy & Mondy, 2012; Middlewood & Cardno, 2011; Yavuz, 2010; Murphy, Goldring & Porter, 2014; Ahmad & Bujang, 2013) argue that appraisal processes lack objectivity caused by unclear criteria and processes. Half of the principals in Yavuz’s study felt that they were not appraised objectively by the superintendents, and the relationship between principals and superintendents influenced the appraisal outcome. Middlewood and Cardno (2001) assert the need to have clear role clarification and expectations of principals so appraisal can be done effectively and objectively. In addition, Murphy, Goldring and Porter (2014) found that a common pitfall in the USA is unclear rubric with a mere set of checklist rubrics with little linkage between evidence and judgment that can cause subjectivity.

The second challenge of principal appraisal is central tendency. This happens when superintendents tend to give incorrect scores to principals by marking them to near average or middle of a scale to avoid giving extremely high or low scores
in a system where principal appraisal is used as a tool to determine pay rise and promotion. Mondy and Mondy (2012) and Davis (2011) argue that central tendency happens when appraisers do not want to jeopardise the payment of appraisees to secure relationships. In short, the superintendents do not want to create problems or conflict with the principals.

The third challenge of principal appraisal is competence of superintendents. To conduct principal appraisal effectively, the superintendents must be properly trained and competent in the appraisal system. The National College for Teaching and Leadership (2015) and Viramontez’s (2011) research found that there was a need to train superintendents to improve their competence. Piggot-Irvine (2003) and Appelbaum, Roy and Gilliland (2011) argued that training on appraisal is both needed for the appraisers and appraisees to familiarise them with the appraisal system in order to be more open in the appraisal process. Superintendents in Viramontez’s (2011) research received no training to conduct appraisals for principals. In Indonesia, the baseline survey conducted by the Ministry of Education (2013) also found that in general school superintendents in Indonesia lacked competence and training. Piggot-Irvine’s (2005) study found that training of appraisers impacted the process of principal appraisal in 25 schools in Northland, New Zealand where appraisers felt they had more courage and openness to discuss problems. Lawler, Benson, McDermott, and Sitzman (2012) also noted that training of appraisers and appraisees is also emphasized to make the process of appraisal is more effective.

The fourth challenge of principal appraisal is achieving transparency, openness and trust. Effective performance appraisal depends on mutual respect and trust between superintendents and principals (NCTL, 2014). Tran and Bon (2015) in their study of principal appraisal in the USA found out that there was such a lack of openness and trust between superintendents and principals that principals perceived that superintendents could be biased in scoring. Walker, Kutsyuruba and Noonan (2011) assert that trust and respect is fragile in an environment with increased accountability. Walker et al. (2011) noted that it is hard for principals to trust and be open to administrators or superintendents.
The fifth challenge is identifying and interpreting performance information and data. The National College for Teaching and Leadership (2014) found that there was a need or concern that when superintendents and principals agreed on which data and evidence are used to appraise them in the appraisal that there is no bias in the process. Triwiyanto (2015) in his principal appraisal study in Indonesia also noted that many principals in the study were confused about which criteria were used to appraise them. Triwiyanto (2015) suggests superintendents need to have a discussion and coordination with the principals so that they can come to an understanding of the appraisal system and what data and information are required for the appraisal. Chapman (2008), in her search of effective principal appraisal in New Zealand also stated that congruity of principals and boards’ understanding of the appraisal system (knowledge of the appraisal system) affects effectiveness of the principal appraisal. Casavant et al. (2012) and Stronge (2013) found that some principals in their study were confused over what kind of evidence was sought in the process of appraisal and there was a little clarity on the specific criteria of evidence due to lack of detailed indicators in the instruments.

The sixth challenge is commitment and cooperation. Both superintendents and principals need to value principal appraisal as an important part of their duties; thus, they need to have a strong commitment to the process of appraisal. They need to consider the appraisal process as vital to the success of appraisal and commit to work together to ensure effective processes are taking place. The National College for Teaching and Leadership (2014) argues that superintendents (appraisers) and principals who are committed to the process of appraisal and regard appraisal as vital to the success of schools, tend to have an effective appraisal which affects the performance. Appelbaum, Roy and Gilliland (2011) also contend an open relationship is vital as both appraisers and appraisees need to cooperate regularly by having regular contact so that they create the appraisal process as more of a dialogue than a formal summative process.

The seventh challenge is appraisal discomfort and fear. Doing appraisal creates discomfort because it involves judging others. Mony and Mony (2012) argue that the considerable documentation shows that the performance appraisal system
neither motivates individuals nor effectively guides their development. Mondy and Mondy (2012) emphasize the need to have proper design of appraisal and process to deal with this challenge. Cardno (2001) in this sense argues that this discomfort leads people to avoid conflict and be nice to each other in the process of appraisal to secure the relationship. Superintendents in Viramontez’s (2011) study also found it difficult to tell principals about things they were not doing right. Most superintendents admitted that appraising principals objectively and telling them that some things are not correct is difficult.

The eighth challenge is geographic locations of the schools. Triwiyanto (2015) in his study of appraisal in East Malang Indonesia found of that geographic locations of the schools influenced the process of appraisal. Triwiyanto (2015) asserted that differences in terms of school resources (teachers, facility and location of schools) have also affected the fairness of principal appraisal. Schools located in remote areas are hard to reach and thus superintendents rarely come to conduct appraisal for principals. In Australia, Stokes, Stafford and Holdsworth (1999) in a survey on rural and remote education found that schools in remote areas faced lack of provision and access due to location. The lack of provision was caused by lack of cost and transport and income support. Thus, remote schools lack access, quality and provision. Carron and De Grauwe (1997) also found that in some developing countries there was clear absence of supervision in some remote schools from superintendents, due to transport, communication and cost. Furthermore, the Asia Foundation in their report (n.d.) on Indonesian basic education suggests the need for governments to provide better transport for rural areas that they can increase school participation in rural areas or villages and provide better school supervision from the local government.

The ninth challenge of principal appraisal is the sporadic process of data collection. Triwiyanto (2015) found that superintendents’ visitations to schools was more of a coincidence without a clear schedule and lack of preparation. He also found that principals were unwilling to comply with the principalship regulations in Indonesia. This also happens in the USA in which (Toler, 2006) in her study of principal appraisal in the state of Virginia found out that from 91 school divisions
with more than 1407 principals asserted that 67% of the schools had procedures in place for regularly reviewing and appraising principal performance. However, 33% of schools in the study did not have appraisal procedures for principals, though the state of Virginia had mandated appraisal in 1972.

The tenth challenge of principal appraisal is the political nature of education. Gaziel (2008) noted that political influence exerted in the process of appraisal is clearly felt by principals where they expressed a concern that many parents and political members expressed their complaints directly to superintendents without consulting principals and thus superintendents might not get honest and forthright communication and this can influence the outcome of the appraisal (Gaziel, 2008). Sweinstani (2016) in her study of the decentralization effect of education management in Indonesia argued that decentralization has brought different interpretations of policy in local districts and this can bring politics into education. Furthermore, Rosser, Wilson and Sulistiyanto (2011) in their study of the political nature of public services in decentralised Indonesia contend that political interests play a role in the local district budget on public services in Indonesia. Most local leaders would invest more on education for example when the local election is near and the sole determinant for this decision is to maintain and advance the political careers of the local leaders. Carron and De Graauwe (1997) contend that supervision is influenced by the political nature of the environment. They noted that in some countries such as Thailand, Ghana and Greece school supervision has been politicised in which school inspectors or superintendents played a political role. In the USA, Davis, Kearney, Sanders, Thomas and Leon (2011) noted that principals felt the outcome of their appraisal was compromised by the influence of a small number of disgruntled parents or opinionated individuals.

The final challenge of principal appraisal is the complex nature of principal appraisal instruments. Some principals feel that the appraisal instruments are complex and there are too many items which require a lot of evidence and documentation. They find it hard to cope with such complex instruments while performing their duties as principals. In a study conducted by Collins (1999) in
two secondary schools in New Zealand, the principals felt that the appraisal judgement was complex requiring multiple elements to be considered in their work as teaching principals. This view is also supported by Hamilton, Engberg, Steiner, Nelson and Yuan (2012) who found out that principals in Pittsburgh felt that collecting rubric documentation requires an excessive amount of paperwork and the performance standard rubric contains so many items and components that they cannot possibly address them all.

Summary
This chapter presented a literature review on the international perspective of principalship and principalship in Indonesia. The chapter then goes on to describe performance appraisal in the USA, Indonesia and New Zealand regarding its process and impact. Finally, it presents some common challenges faced by both principals and superintendents in the process of conducting school principal appraisals in secondary schools in several contexts.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

Introduction
This chapter presents an explanation of research epistemology and research methodology, and provides a rationale for the adoption of an interpretive approach for this research study. The choice of two methods of data collection, semi-structured interview and documentary analysis, are also discussed in relation to relevant literature. This chapter also outlines how data was collected and analysed through the application of thematic coding analysis. Issues concerning the validity of the study and ethical issues in conducting the study are also addressed.

Epistemology
Every research study aims to contribute to a greater understanding of the field, educational research is no exception. Creswell (2012) argues that educational research plays an essential role in contributing to education in several ways: contributing to research knowledge, informing policy debates and improving current educational practice.

What can be considered knowledge and how knowledge can be discovered are subjective issues. People have different thoughts and views on what can be called “legitimate knowledge” and how to discover that knowledge. All research is influenced by the way researchers view what knowledge or reality are and what the nature of knowledge is. These views are called paradigms (Bryman, 2012; Creswell, 2007; Scotland, 2012). Creswell (2007) argues that “research design process begins with philosophical assumptions that the inquirers make in deciding to undertake a qualitative study” (p. 15). Researchers bring their own paradigms, sets of beliefs, to the research project and this informs the process of conducting and writing the qualitative study.

Scotland (2012) and Creswell (2007) argue that a research paradigm consists of ontological and epistemological assumptions which justify the methodology and
methods of the research. Kuhn (as cited in Villiers & Fouche, 2015) noted that a paradigm as “a set framework that makes different assumptions about the social world, about how science should be concluded and about what constitutes legitimate problems, solutions and criteria of proof” (p. 126). Davidson and Tolich (2003) assert that questions of ontology and epistemology are philosophical questions which are central to all social research. Ontological questions are concerned with the nature of social entities, whether social entities can be considered objective entities that have a reality external to social actors, or whether they can be and should be considered social construction built up from the perceptions and actions of social actors (Bryman, 2012). Scotland (2012) argues that ontology deals with the study of being, in terms of what constitutes reality and whether the reality exists or not. Questions of epistemological assumptions deal with the nature of knowledge, of how knowledge can be acquired and where knowledge can be found. Davidson and Tolich (2003) argue that epistemological questions deal with the question of what can be called “legitimate knowledge”. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) argue that epistemological assumptions are concerned with how knowledge can be created, acquired and communicated.

Davidson and Tolich (2003) and Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2011) argue that there are two common competing paradigms in the pursuit of knowledge regarding research inquiry: positivism and interpretivism. Davidson and Tolich (2003) define positivism as a paradigm which likens social science to natural science requiring an organised method for combining deductive logic with precise empirical observations to study human behaviours to predict general patterns of human activity.

Interpretivism, on the other hand, is a paradigm which views social science as forms of interaction which involve people making sense of their world in the process of interactions. The emphasis of interpretivism is on how people create meaning and maintain their social worlds. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) argue that interpretivism stresses the importance of the subjective experience of individuals in the creation of meanings in their efforts to understand phenomena and reality around them. They further argue that interpretivism puts an emphasis
on the unique understanding of individuals rather than the general or universal ones. Interpretivism believes that the world is subjective and relative, rather than an objective external reality. In short, interpretivism argues that people are involved in constructing meaning and their understanding of the world and reality.

**Methodology and Research Methods**

Scotland, (2012) and Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) define methodology as the strategy or plan of action which lies behind the choice and use of methods. Thus, methodology deals with why, what and from where, when and how data is collected and analysed. Guba and Lincoln (2005) argue that methodology deals with questions about how researchers find out whatever they believe can be known. The methodology employed in this study was qualitative in nature and data was analysed qualitatively because the data this study seeks was in the form of conversation and documents.

Research instruments are the tools by which data collection is conducted (Bryman, 2012). Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) argue that research methods are instruments and techniques employed by researchers to collect data and how data will be interpreted. The two research methods which were used to collect the data in this research were semi-structured interviews and documentary analysis. Semi-structured interviews were used as the primary tool in data collection in this study and documentary analysis was used as a secondary tool to enrich the data. By employing two data collection tools, it is hoped that the validity of this study can be increased.

This research study aims to explore the nature of performance appraisal for principals from the perspectives of principals and superintendents. In other words, this research tries to seek understanding of the perceptions of those involved in the appraisal in the forms of words, stories and experiences. In this sense, this means that this research study explores how principals and superintendents make meaning of their experience of appraisal interactions in the process of having and conducting the appraisals. Thus, the nature of the knowledge this research is
seeking lies in the minds and stories of the participants and is subjective. Thus, this research fits best in the interpretive paradigm because interpretivism is about making meaning through studying peoples’ interactions (Bryman, 2012). An interpretative approach to this research entails the application of a qualitative methodology because it enables the appraisal process for principals to be investigated from the perspectives of principals and superintendents based on their descriptions of experiences. Qualitative methodology produces descriptive data which consists of people’s spoken words, transcribed conversations and observable behaviour, and it usually attempts to provide rich descriptive data to gain an understanding of certain phenomena (Villiers & Fouche, 2015; Merriam, 2009). According to Scotland (2012) and Merriam (2009), qualitative methodology is aimed at understanding phenomena from an individual’s perspective through investigating interactions among individuals as well as the historical context which people inhabit.

**Participant selection**

This research study tried to understand the nature of principal performance appraisal in an Indonesian context from the perspectives of both principals and superintendents. Thus, the information sought came from principals and superintendents. The participants of the study were principals and superintendents in the Landak regency (region), West Borneo, Indonesia. Four principals were selected from four public secondary schools, consisting of two schools from rural areas and two schools from urban areas and four school superintendents from the Landak Education Authority (LEA). All the interviews were conducted in the Indonesian language and were transcribed into English.

The choice of public schools in this study was done purposely to get a thorough understanding of performance appraisal in public schools. Public school principals are required to comply with the laws and regulations of principal appraisal. Purposive sampling was chosen in order to select participants who had relevant information regarding the questions being investigated in the study (Bryman, 2012). Lichtman (2013) asserts that there is no consensus about the exact numbers
of participants to be enough in qualitative research because qualitative research is about making meaning and getting deeper information from the eyes of others. The four school principals and four superintendents have provided a good representation of participants in the research study and yielded sufficient data to establish some common themes. The choice of schools was based on distance which allowed the researcher to easily reach the school locations.

**Method 1: Semi-structured interview**

Interviews are a primary way and prevalent method for researchers in qualitative research to gather data and are used worldwide (Lichtman, 2013). Lichtman (2013) defines interview as a form of interaction jointly constructed by the interviewer and the person being interviewed. Wellington (2015) argues that interviews are a tool of data collection that allow the researcher to delve deeper into things that we cannot observe. Wellington (2015) believes that interviews are a conversation with a purpose to probe interviewees’ perspectives, views, feelings and perceptions. Lichtman (2013) asserts interview is used to gather information from participants about a topic under study by revealing feelings, intentions, meanings and thoughts on a certain topic. Interviews can be categorised into three types regarding the question format and process of the interview: structured, semi-structured and unstructured. Lichtman (2013) and Wellington (2015) asserts that the structured interviews are an interview which allows no deviation to be made on the wording or the order of the questions. It acts more like a questionnaire where no flexibility or emergent themes are allowed for further exploration. Travers (2013) defines the structured interview as an interview which mostly asks closed questions which allow no improvisation or deviation.

An unstructured interview has no fixed questions and flexibility is unlimited where free questions can come up along the interview and there is no set of questions or order of questions be asked. Travers (2013) calls the unstructured interview an interview which mostly asks open questions and allows greater flexibility. Lichtman (2013) calls this an in-depth interview which does not have a specific set of questions.
The semi-structured interview allows for probing and clarifying answers and gives the interviewer opportunity to investigate other issues which might emerge during the interview within a set of structured questions (Villiers & Fouche, 2015). Villiers and Fouche (2015) further argue that the semi-structured interview is particularly appropriate in a situation where the phenomena or issues are personal to the participants. The semi-structured interview involves researchers developing a general set of questions and a format where all the participants and researchers can vary the questions as the situation demands (Lichtman, 2013). It allows flexibility for the researcher to explore deeper on questions since they can expand more questions into specific topics (Bryman, 2012). Lichtman (2013) further argues that semi-structured is appropriate for new interviewers because it provides something to use as a guide. To conduct an appropriate interview, researchers need to consider some issues which can help to produce a quality interview which meets the purpose such as preparation of questions and schedule, identification of participants, number of participants, rapport with participants, setting of the interview and the quality of the interview itself (Wellington, 2015; Lichtman, 2013).

This study sought perceptions of principals and superintendents regarding the purposes, practices and perceptions of performance appraisal to understand the nature of appraisal in the Landak region; thus, the knowledge this study aims to find, lies in the minds of the participants. To delve deeper into their understanding, the semi-structured interview was used to explore the nature of performance appraisal because it provided flexibility in terms of questions where a combination of closed and open questions was able to be used. The semi-structured interview was used because it also provided guidance for a new researcher so they felt comfortable with the interview process. The interviews were conducted in the Indonesian language and recorded, transcribed, then translated to English verbatim. The translation was verified by an approved reader by the Unitec Research Ethics Committee to ensure accuracy. The Interview Schedule used in this study is appended (see Appendix A).
Method 2: Documentary analysis

Documents can be valuable information resources when researchers are studying organisations or regulations when conducting certain procedures. Wellington (2015) believes that through studying documents, researchers can understand the way an organisation portrays itself in print. Bryman (2012) argues that “documents are windows onto social and organisational realities” (p. 554) because a document can reveal the underlying social reality of an organisation such as culture and ethos. However, Atkinson and Coffey (as cited in Bryman, 2012) remind us that documents should be viewed as a distinct level of reality because they have a distinctive ontological status and thus should be not treated as transparent representations. Wellington (2015) and Bryman (2012) further argue that documentary research is done in conjunction with other research methods as a complementary strategy to enrich the data. To study the purposes of principal appraisal in an Indonesian context, the researcher needed to read and analyse the purposes of appraisal in his context and that was done by studying legal documents on the appraisal of principals in Indonesia. Flick (2014) believes that documents within particular institutions can reveal contextualised interpretation and political context. Bryman (2012) argues that through studying documents, researchers can find out the purposes and underlying themes of the documents or philosophical underpinning of the documents. Wellington (2015) argues that there are several aspects which need to be explored when analysing documents: context, authorship, intended audiences, intentions and purposes, genre, style and tone and presentation and appearance. These aspects of documents can uncover the underlying themes or assumptions of documents.

For the purpose of this study, three documents were analysed to find the purposes, guidelines and “ideal practice” of how performance appraisal for principals should be applied. The three documents were Ministerial Decree No. 13 year 2007 on national standards for Indonesian secondary schools, Ministerial Decree No. 28 Year 2010 on the appointment of principals and their additional responsibility, and Guideline Book for Appraising Principals from the Ministry of Education of Indonesia (2012). These three documents were selected purposely because they reveal the roles and responsibilities of principals in Indonesia and reveal the
purposes and intended practices of performance appraisal in an Indonesian context, particularly in the Landak region.

**Data Analysis**

Willis (2013) argues that the task of data analysis in qualitative research is “meaning-making”. Bryman (2012) asserts that the nature of qualitative data is large and cumbersome data from interviews, documents or questionnaires. Bryman (2012) suggests that qualitative data has “attractive nuances” due to its attractiveness of richness and difficulty in finding analytic paths through the data. Loftland, Snow, Anderson, & Loftland (2006) assert that data analysis is a transformative process which turns raw data into “findings or results”. A meaning-making process requires the researchers to be engaged fully in a process called reflexivity. Reflexivity is “a researcher’s self-conscious awareness of their position in the research” (p. 317) as a result of the methods which the researchers use in the research process of meaning-making which stresses the need to reflect on and be aware of the researcher’s position in the study. There are two common ways of analysing data in qualitative research: thematic analysis and narrative analysis (Willis, 2013). This study applied thematic analysis to interpret data. As its name suggests, thematic analysis is a way of analysing qualitative data through exploring the presence of themes that emerge from the data and finding common or different themes that arise in the reading of the data (Willis, 2013; Bryman, 2012). Thematic analysis is common across qualitative approaches to data analysis and is not attached to specific theories such as grounded, critical race theories or narrative analysis.

Two common approaches used in qualitative analysis through thematic analysis are coding and memoing. These two approaches are complementary in analysing the data. Bryman (2012) argues that the process of data analysis in qualitative research is dynamic and iterative. Data analysis can start even in the process of the interview when the researcher starts noticing that there are a few common themes which can be grouped upon hearing the interview record. In a sense, reflexivity is at work in transcribing and reading the data.
This study applied coding and memoing in data analysis. Coding is a process of organising data for analysis into segments by using symbols, descriptive words or category names (Willis, 2013). Flick (2014) and Urquhart (2013) define coding as a process of labelling and categorizing data into meaningful themes or concepts. In a sense, coding is a process of finding themes from the data and grouping those data into similar themes to talk about in the analysis of the results.

Coding can be done in two ways: initial coding and focused coding. Initial coding is a process of breaking down the transcription into lines of meaningful units by categorising them into codes by using general open-ended questions. Focused coding is a process of finding a larger theme from initial codes by knitting together all the codes into a general theme. Urquhart (2013) uses the terms “open coding and selective coding” to refer to initial and focused coding. In a sense, focused coding is weaving codes into a large theme which carries interpretation of the data.

To start the coding process, I read the transcripts several times carefully to fully grasp the content and then divided the transcription into meaningful lines of sentence units. Afterward, I grouped those sentences into several themes which emerged from the data and then related the themes to the relevant literature. Loftland, Snow, Anderson & Loftland (2006) define coding as the process of sorting data into various categories to create meaningful frameworks to understand the phenomena. Interview transcripts from the principals and superintendents were read intensively and coded into several chunks to find codes and then those codes were understood further by coding them into several themes.

During the process of coding, memoing was also applied where notes were taken to analyse any ideas or themes or categories which might give understanding of the data. Memoing is the second strategy to analyse the data: a process of note-taking and jotting down themes or ideas while in the process of coding or transcribing (Loftland, Snow, Anderson & Loftland, 2006). Ideas and notes from the process of coding and transcribing are called memos. Charmaz (as cited in Loftland, Snow, Anderson & Loftland, 2006) argues that memoing is “the intermediate step between coding and the first draft of completed analysis” (p. 209) and memoing is fundamental to the process of making sense of data. In this
study, I did memoing when reading the transcripts in which I wrote down findings which were relevant to the study.

This study applied coding and memoing in the process of analysing data in which data was read carefully and then coded line per line or sentence per sentence. Afterward, any emergent themes from the codes were written and categorised to certain concepts or themes. Concepts which had been discussed regarding appraisal in this study were related to roles and responsibilities of principals, and also the purposes, practices and challenges in performing appraisals. I tried to find themes and concepts to build up my analysis and relate the themes to the concepts in the literature.

**Validity**

Research quality is dependent upon the ability of the researcher to demonstrate its rigour. The rigour of a research can be valued in terms of its validity and reliability. Kumar (2014) argues that the application of concepts of validity and reliability has been hotly debated. He argues that the concept validity broadly refers to “the ability of research instrument to demonstrate that it is finding out what you designed it to and reliability refers to consistency of its findings when used repeatedly” (p. 218). Since qualitative research is finding out perceptions through various methods, thus the standardisation of methods and process of research become difficult since qualitative research methods and procedures are flexible and evolving. Creswell (2007) argues that validity and reliability of qualitative research have been criticized from the perspective of quantitative research for failing in “adhering to the canons of reliability and validity in traditional sense” (p. 202). However, he asserts that many authors suggest strengthening validity in qualitative research by using other strategies such as prolonged engagement and persistent observation in the field, triangulation, peer review, negative case analysis, member checking and external audit.

Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2011) argue that both validity and reliability are important in effective research. Bryman (2012) argues that reliability is “concerned with the question of whether the result of a study is repeatable” (p. 46)
and is a particular issue for quantitative research. Thus, the idea of replication in a study is emphasized in quantitative research so that the research result will be consistent when done with the same measures and conditions. In a qualitative study, reliability in this sense is not so much a concern because qualitative research is about making meaning from the perspectives of people and admits the importance of individual meaning and context (Bryman, 2012).

Validity is “concerned with the integrity of the conclusions that are generated from a piece of research” (Bryman, 2012, p. 47). Winter (as cited in Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011) defines validity as “research instruments in fact measures what it purports to measure, or that an account accurately represents those features that is intended to describe, explain or theorise” (p.179). Reliability is not so much a concern for qualitative research since qualitative research is not trying to make generalisations based on the research results because qualitative research acknowledges the individuality and context of the research (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011). Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) argue that reliability in qualitative research can be achieved through the accurate replication of questions. This was used in the interviews of principals and superintendents in acquiring their perceptions of performance appraisal.

Guba and Lincoln (2005) argue that there is a need to have an alternative view in maintaining reliability and validity standards in qualitative research because the use of reliability and validity terms in qualitative research assumes that a single absolute of social reality is achievable. To strengthen the validity of qualitative research, Bryman (2012) argues that triangulation can be applied to achieve credibility. Triangulation is the use of more data collection methods to get wider perspectives on the topic (Bryman, 2012; Flick, 2014). This study used triangulation in which more than one data collection method was used; semi-structured interviews and documentary analysis. Multi-level triangulation was also used in which the perceptions and practices of principals were seen from both principals and superintendents’ points of view. This provided a variety of perspectives on the topic.
Validity in qualitative research means that the research measures what it intends to measure using correct and ethical procedures to tell the truth (Bryman, 2012). To ensure that the research process was open and transparent in order to tell the truth, participants were provided with the transcripts to validate whether their interview was transcribed properly for the purpose of ethical and valid research.

**Ethical issues**

Every research study needs to be conducted ethically. Habibis (2013) argues that ethics is “concerned with the establishment of moral standards that govern behaviours in particular setting or particular group” (p. 73). Ethics of research are needed to ensure that ethical principles and values are applied in conducting research, particularly when research involves humans (Habibis, 2013). Flick (2014) argues that ethics is important in research to regulate the relationship between researchers and the people and the field they intend to study so the researchers avoid harming the participants and respect them and take into account their needs and interests. Therefore, codes of ethics for research are developed. Some authors argue that there is a need to have ethical considerations in qualitative research which concerns three major areas in the research, the participant, the research itself and the researchers because the line and relationship between researchers and participants is blurry due to patterns of interactions (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). Bryman (2013) argues that there are some issues which usually need to be paid close attention when conducting ethical research. These are whether there is harm to the participant, lack of informed consent, invasion of privacy and deception in the process of the research. There are some principles that govern the process of research which involve humans: protecting participants, seeking and giving consent, anonymity of participants, autonomy and confidentiality (Bryman, 2012; Habibis, 2013; Wilkinson, 2001; Flick, 2014).

Habibis (2013) and Bryman (2012) assert that researchers need to make sure that the research process will not harm participants, will respect human beings and will protect participants from any possible harm. Researchers also need to get
informed consent from the participants in which participants are given an explanation of the research purpose and the benefits of the research. Anonymity and confidentiality of participants will also be an ethical consideration in the research process in that participants’ identification will remain undisclosed in the research report and specific participant contributions to the research cannot be identified. Participants’ autonomy also needs to be ensured in the research so participants know that they can withdraw from the research process at any time without affecting their well-being and their data can be redrawn from the study if the participants wish it. Corbin and Strauss (2015) also argue that ethical research needs to have integrity of methods. This means the research admits that there is flexibility in methods in qualitative research, but it does not mean the researchers can alter the methods just to suit their convenience, and the researchers need to respect the time invested by participants in the study as well as not taking short cuts or sloppy analysis to get the research done. Furthermore, they argue that the research findings need to contribute to the field they are researching.

The following ethical considerations were taken to ensure that this study was ethically conducted. First, the research proposal was submitted to the Unitec Research Committee and Unitec Research Ethics Committee (UREC) to gain approval to conduct the research. Second, I had gained formal consent from the Head of the Landak Education Authority (HLEA) in the form of a letter which allowed me to approach the principals and superintendents under their leadership to join the study. Individual consents were also sought from each participant as I had approached some of them informally. Before collecting the data, I asked participants to fill in a form and explained the research to them. Each participant was given an Information Sheet (see Appendix B) and explanation of the research to ask for their voluntary participation in the study. I had received a formal letter which allowed me to approach these superintendents and principals personally to ask their individual consent to join the study. I met all the participants a week before the interview to provide information about the study, provide them with the interview questions and to come up with an interview schedule as well as to ask for them to sign a Consent Form (see Appendix C) to get their permission to
record the interview. The participants were all my seniors in the region, but I have built a good rapport with them in terms of relationships and communication so I was confident that they would be willing to voluntarily join the study as the participants.

Third, participant identification remained confidential and anonymous in the study and verbatim data codes were used so that the participants could not be identified in the research report. Fourth, no harm was done to participants since this research only involved interviews and I made sure that the questions did not ask for personal details which could invade privacy. Questions asked were those related to the research questions posed in the study. Fifth, the interview transcript was given to participants for validation of the content and any changes they thought necessary were made so that the data was authentic. Finally, all the superintendents and school principals I interviewed were not related to my workplace, so no conflict of interest exists in the study.

**Summary**

This chapter outlines the research epistemology and methodology concerning the application of an interpretative approach and qualitative methodology in this study. The chapter also discusses the choice of two data collection methods, semi-structured interview and documentary and data analysis tools, which were employed to analyse findings in the study. Finally, issues of validity and ethical research were also discussed.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS

Introduction
This chapter presents the findings of the study from the semi-structured interviews and documentary analysis. Firstly, findings from the documentary analysis of Ministry of Education in Indonesia documents are presented to show what is espoused as effective practice and what the expectations are. Secondly, findings from the interviews and pertinent documents are presented in relation to the aims of the study which are to examine the principal’s role and to investigate the purposes, practices and challenges of conducting secondary school principal appraisal in an Indonesian context. The themes that emerged from the interview data are presented based on the headings of purposes, practices and challenges of the principal appraisal in two sections. Section I presents the findings from the perspectives of the principals about their role and their appraisal. Section II presents the findings from the perspectives of school superintendents.

The Participants
The participants in this study are four principals and four school superintendents from the Landak region, West Borneo, Indonesia. The four principals come from four public secondary schools. Two of these four schools are located in the rural areas of Jelimpo and Kuala Behe in the Landak region and the two other schools are urban schools located in the heart of the district town called Ngabang town. The four superintendents are from the Landak Local Education Authority (LLEA). Three of the four principals are senior principals with more than eight years in the post and three of the four school superintendents are senior superintendents with more than eight years in the role. In this thesis, data from the principals and the superintendents are coded as shown in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1: Data identification codes for interview participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Coding used</th>
<th>Coding used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Principal</td>
<td>Sp1</td>
<td>School Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School principal 1</td>
<td>SP1</td>
<td>School superintendent 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School principal 2</td>
<td>SP2</td>
<td>School superintendent 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School principal 3</td>
<td>SP3</td>
<td>School superintendent 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School principal 4</td>
<td>SP4</td>
<td>School superintendent 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Principal Appraisal Documents

To understand the espoused purposes, practices and expectations of the principal appraisal in an Indonesian context, it is necessary to analyse the policy contained in the *Guideline Book for Appraising School Principals* (2012) published by the Ministry of Education of Indonesia. According to the *Guideline book*, the purpose of principal appraisal is twofold: accountability and development. It is clearly stated in the *Guideline Book* (p. 13) that the purposes of principal appraisal in Indonesia are;

- To collect information as a form of consideration for decision making in measuring the effectiveness of the principal performance.
- To improve efficiency and effectiveness of the school principals.
- To collect information as the basis for professional development for principals.
- To ensure accountability and objectivity in the process of developing principals to map the overall performance of principals.

To ensure the process is done well, the principles to be applied in appraising principals are also stated specifying that principal appraisal must be conducted in an authentic, objective, fair, open, integrated, systematic, continuous, indicator based and accountable process (p.15).
It is also stated that principal appraisal consists of three appraisal phases (early in the year appraisal, mid-year process and end of the year phase) involving three procedures of preparation, process of appraisal and final reporting. The superintendents are expected to use a 360-degree approach in appraising principals where they collect both tangible and intangible data during the year in a continuous and ongoing process. Superintendents are also required to work together with the communities around the schools and the heads of parent representative committees in discussing appraisal as stated:

*The process of principal appraisal is done by a superintendent appointed by the Head of Local Education Authority with its given authority to appraise principals using the 360 approach to observe the performance of principals from many dimensions such as parents, teachers and students as well. Superintendents appraise principals through the instruments by giving scores to each item based on the evidence and the relevance of evidence that can be identified in an ongoing process of observation or interview (p.32).*

This indicates superintendents need to visit schools as often as possible, at the very least early in the semester and at the end of semester. It is also mentioned that it is hoped that the appraisal outcome can be used as a basis to improve the performance of principals through professional development as stated in the benefits section as follows:

*The Local Education Authority can use the appraisal outcome to collect information to be used to design a professional development programme which meets the needs of the principals to improve the competences in the region (p.14).*

The final outcome of the appraisal must be reported to the Local Education Authority through its Head of Secondary Education Division (HSED) who then submits the final report to the Head of the LEA to be approved and used as a part of their consideration for career development, accountability and professional development programmes for principals.
It is clear that the Ministry of Education of Indonesia’s policy on principal appraisal espoused that the purposes of principal appraisal are to improve the performance of principals and to hold principals accountable for the duties that are entrusted to them. Principal appraisal is intended to be conducted by appointed superintendents annually in an authentic, objective, fair, open, integrated, systematic, continuous, indicator-based and accountable process (p.15) involving the three phases of preparation, process and final reporting. Superintendents are responsible for ensuring that the principal appraisal is done effectively and in line with the regulations. Principal appraisal outcome is clearly linked to professional development of principals because it serves as the basis of a needs analysis of principals’ professional development.

Section I: Principal’s Perspectives

**Principals’ understanding of their role.**

Understanding the role of principals in the principal appraisal is important because the roles of principals depict the duties the principals are expected to perform in order to play the role of principalship in Indonesia. According to the *Indonesian Education Ministerial Decree No. 13 Year 2007*, the roles of principals cover the five areas of personality, managerial, entrepreneurship, academic supervision and social. Principals are expected to play many different roles in these areas such as a motivator, manager, entrepreneur, supervisor, leader and innovator.

All of the principals in the interviews agreed that the role of principal is complex and demanding. They argued that principals play many different roles in schools such as educator, leader, manager, motivator and entrepreneur as well. For instance, all the four principals said that they played many roles when asked about their roles and, for instance, one principal said

*My roles as a principal are LEMAS which stands for leader, administrator and manager. As a manager, I have a lot of duties either as a teacher, a guide*
and leader. My overall role aim is to improve the quality of education in the school (SP2).

When asked about which roles are more important according to their perspectives, if they had to put priorities to their role, interestingly two principals argued that all of those roles are important and that they have to play several roles such as manager of curriculum, teachers, students, facilities and other resources simultaneously. Two participants, for instance, did not see that some areas were more important than others because all areas were interrelated as one of two principals said

_There are many duties of principals and all of them are important and interrelated. Leadership, curriculum, managerialism are all important (SP3)._ 

One principal however stressed the importance of daily routine duties. He uttered that his important duties were to make sure that teachers are present in the classrooms and to monitor students’ progress without emphasizing which areas of his duty that he thought were important. This principal said that his main role as a principal is to check teachers’ presence and supervise their daily tasks in monitoring students’ progress and attendance rate. This principal also put emphasis on the need for getting the school to run normally without too many problems and the fact that his school is not the favourite school. He admitted he had had no difficulties in leading the school for 10 years. He said:

_During my ten years of principalship, everything went well and I had no real concerns with the school. Fortunately, I could handle the job well (SP1)._ 

Another principal believed that curriculum is an area of importance for him and he paid close attention to it. However, since the curriculum quite often changes when the government changes, he complained that this made the role of principals confusing.

_If we do it wholeheartedly, I think there is no difficulty and all are important areas. However, the problem is our curriculum always changes when the new_
government is formed. So, it is kind of confusing. This one is not yet done, another change is coming (SP2).

When asked which areas of the principal’s duty are difficult and challenging, two principals agreed that curriculum-related matters and financial reporting matters made they feel worried and intimidated.

The most difficult area of my job is curriculum because it keeps changing now. Before we can grasp the current curriculum, the government has already introduced a new curriculum and I have a problem with it (SP2).

Two other principals did not feel any difficulties in performing their duties as principals. One principal who is a principal in a big public school in the heart of a district town argued that so far, he has done his best to do the tasks and so far his appraisal is always good and he believes that if people are committed to the tasks, there will be no difficulties. He also argued that the Local Education Authority is ready to help them out as long as they are active in seeking help. He said

Basically, I don’t have really difficult problems in performing my job. If I don’t know how to do something or I find it difficult, I seek advice and help from teachers, superintendent or if needed from the Head of Local Education Authority (LEA) concerning the problems. Sometimes, I do self-reflection in doing my job or ask fellow teachers for advice (SP4).

Another principal offered a different perspective when asked what areas of duty he thinks are difficult for him. According to him, as long as the school runs normally where teachers come to school to teach and students are attending classes to learn, he has no difficulties. His school is located in a rural area with minimum facilities and resources and thus he thinks that Local Education Authority will not demand much from him. As long as the school runs fairly well, he believes that there are no difficulties. He said:

So far, the school runs fairly normal (as usual). I was appointed to this school some years ago when nobody wanted to be assigned here. As long as
the teaching and learning take place and teachers come to teach and students attend classes, I think it is quite good (SP3).

It is clear that the principals in the four schools in the Landak region understand that their roles and duties are complex and demanding covering many areas of duties such as leadership, administration, management and supervision, personality and entrepreneurship. Two principals however, seem to simplify their duties by considering that their main roles are just attending to teaching and learning at schools and running school operational tasks daily.

**Principal’s Perspectives of Appraisal**

**Purpose of the appraisal: development or accountability**

Interestingly, all four principals in the interviews stated that their appraisal is to serve the purpose of development. They believed that the sole purpose of their appraisal is to find out areas of weakness and strength, where their performance can be improved and to see how well they perform the roles so that they can be promoted to a higher level if they perform well.

*The purpose of appraisal is very good actually to evaluate the performance of principals that they know their weaknesses and strengths. Appraisal also measures which principals perform well and which ones that do not perform well that they can be considered for career rotation or remain in the same school (SP2).*

*Appraisal also depends on the superintendents and each superintendent has different approach and style and if he/she wants to improve our performance and guide us along the way and show us how to do it, it is not difficult. If he just complained and not giving examples, then this one is difficult. Appraisal does give me assistance with the job I am doing (SP3).*

All the principals in this study interpreted the developmental purpose of appraisal in a limited way that development means assistance provided by the
superintendents to help them cope with their role. Only one principal touched on the *accountability* purpose of his appraisal when asked about why he thought appraisal was important. He said

*Of course, appraisal is important that we are accountable for the responsibility we are entrusted to. If we are not appraised, how do we know that we have done our job well or not. How do we know what to improve and what has been good (SP3).*

When asked about the importance of having an appraisal for their role, all the four principals agreed that appraisal is important for them by arguing that appraisal is important either to measure how well they perform their role or to improve their future performance and to see what has been done well and has not been done well as one of them commented.

*Of course, appraisal is important. I say it is very important to evaluate our performance to see how well we have done our duties and roles (SP4).*

All four principals agreed that their appraisal’s purpose is to serve the development purpose of appraisal so that they can identify areas of improvement of their role of principalship. Only one principal considered that the appraisal is a part of evaluation of their responsibility of being principals.

**Practices of Principal Appraisal: Process of Appraisal**

According to the *Guideline for Appraising Principals in Indonesia* (Ministry of Education of Indonesia, 2012), there are three phases of principal appraisal in Indonesia: early phase including preparation and self-evaluation, middle phase which includes evidence collection and confirmation, and final phase at the end of the year which includes appraisal rating and reporting.

When asked about how their appraisal was conducted, two of the principals said that their appraisal was done in several phases. However, when they were asked to provide details of the process, they just said that they were given instruments
by the superintendents to be filled in and then the instruments would be returned to the superintendents for correction and approval. Thus, their appraisal was a mere tick-box activity. For instance, one of the principals said

*The superintendent comes to school and gives us some instruments for self-evaluation and they will check the administrative matters and leave. Sometimes, I ask my deputy principals to fill in the instruments based on the data in the school such as curriculum, infrastructure etc. Afterward, the superintendent comes again to verify and check and they would give me my final score. This happens once a year and it used to be early in the semester every year (SP3).*

One principal admitted that he had never had any real appraisal since becoming a principal six years ago. He said that he did his own appraisal and went to the Local Education Authority to ask for approval of superintendents and Head of Secondary Education Division (HSED) who is his direct employer in the process of appraisal. He said

*In theory, it should have been the superintendent who appraised me and then asked the Head of Secondary Education Division to approve it by signing it. However, I did my own appraisal and even when I did my own, I still found difficulties to get their signature and approval for my appraisal documents (SP2).*

This principal admitted that he had never had any real appraisal and he did not mind the fact that he had never been appraised. He said

*Honestly, I never had a real appraisal. I made my own appraisal and I found it difficult to get their approval and signature. I am not afraid because it is the reality. If they get angry to me because I said this. It is okay with me (SP2).*

Only one principal admitted that he had a year-long process of appraisal where superintendents often came to do appraisal and required him to show some information or documents to meet the appraisal process. The school is located in
the heart of the district so he admitted that his school became the focus of attention from the Landak Local Education Authority. The principal explained his process as follows

*There are phases of my appraisal which are early phase, process phase and end of the year phase. The superintendent comes to school and asks me for information about programmes including semester and yearly programme in the early year and then they also ask for our performance target of the year. Along the year, they come to check and see whether we implemented our programme or not. Finally, they determine the final score (SP4).*

When this urban principal was further asked from which sources of data his appraisal was based on, he commented that the superintendent came during the year to his school anytime to get information from different sources such as teachers, students and the surrounding areas. This principal said that the superintendent also asked teachers, students and school committees and people around the school when appraising him.

From the four principals in the study, two principals admitted that their appraisal was a mere process of formality in which it was a tick-box activity where superintendents came early in the year and gave them instruments of the appraisal, and at the end of the year the superintendents come to check and collect the instruments to determine the final score of the appraisal. Interestingly, one principal admitted that he had never had any appraisal within his six years of principalship in the current school because he did his own appraisal and asked the superintendent and Head of Secondary Education Division (HSED) to approve the appraisal score. Finally, only one principal admitted that his appraisal was conducted holistically based on the procedures.

It can be argued that the appraisal process for principals in the Landak region is still a tick-box activity for the purpose of serving the requirements of bureaucracy. In rural schools (small district or *Kecamatan* in Indonesia), principal appraisal is a mere formality and has not been carried out holistically in accordance with the regulations.
Challenges related to the Principal Appraisal Process

When the four principals were asked about the challenges or the concerns they found in the process of their appraisal, all four principals had their own concerns about the process of appraisal. One principal for instance, found that the scoring system in the instrument was subjective and created a dilemma for self-evaluation because the range of the score is 1 to 4. 1 is poor, 2 is fair, 3 is good and four is very good. He admitted that he tended to give 2 or 3 to his instruments. He said

*There are some difficulties. For instance, the instrument. The range of score is 1 to 4. If I mark myself 1 is too low, 2 is minimum mark for credit target, 3 is sometimes is a good one and 4 is too high. It is quite subjective in marking it (SP1).*

Then, this principal went on to argue the need for better communication and socialisation of the process before the appraisal takes place and said that

*There is a need for better communication through socialisation of the process prior to the appraisal when superintendents come to conduct the appraisal. Sometimes, the superintendents did let us know that they would come. The point is better communication (SP1).*

On the other hand, another principal complained the new software for appraisal was complicated and the current appraisal system for principals is more complex than ever before. He commented that he was having a hard time with the current instruments where there was software being used to calculate the score saying that

*I find it difficult to do my appraisal system by using the current software prepared by the Ministry of Education since we have limited skills in computers and we do not have clerical and computer staff that understand the software of SKP (Employee Performance Target Indicators (SP2))*

This principal further argued the need for frequent superintendent visits to school to improve the process of appraisal. He felt that a school located in a remote area
like his school needs more attention from the Local Education Authority particularly concerning the facilities of the school and the availability of teachers and to improve the appraisal and quality of instruction in school in general. This principal also stressed that the superintendent needs to visit his school more often.

Another principal who is also a principal in a small district complained about the increasing scrutiny of financial reporting of school budgets from the central government which is part of the appraisal. He argued that the use of online reporting of finance and approval from the Local Education Authority is a problem or a concern for him stating that

My concern is the regulation on money, particularly the financial reporting of school funding. I think the regulation is rigid and does not meet the contextual demands. The regulation clearly states what you can buy and what you cannot buy. This make school hard to allocate money on the things they really need. We need to be able to cheat on reporting to comply with the regulations (SP3).

This principal then provided an example of how he found a way to cheat on the financial reporting of school funding. For instance, he said, money allocated to the school cannot be spent on paying contract teachers because it is not allowed by the regulations. However, his school still has some contract teachers because the government has not provided enough civil servant teachers for his school. It is his responsibility to find a way that the money is reported on other things in the report.

Another principal had a concern touching upon the areas of commitment, competence and ambiguity in interpreting the items in the appraisal instruments. He stated some of his concerns were;

My concern of appraisal is that there is a different interpretation in the instruments and what evidence to prove the items. There is a need for a space of coordination and consultation with the superintendents before the
appraisal that we may come to the same opinions on items. Sometimes, we don’t share the same understanding of the items (SP4).

This urban principal furthermore suggested that there is a need for commitment from both principals and superintendents to make appraisal more effective and impactful for principals by emphasising that both principals and superintendents need to consider appraisal as important to the success of schools in general. He then continued to explain that competent superintendents are needed to have effective appraisals. He argued that even though all superintendents are holders of a Bachelor of Education, not all of them can perform the duties of superintendents.

I think what we need to focus more on to make appraisal effective is the need to have more competent superintendents. We know all superintendents are Bachelor of Education but not all of them are good enough to be superintendents (SP4).

All the four principals had different concerns in the process of their appraisal. Those concerns are about subjectivity in the score range, communication and socialisation of the appraisal, a complex system of finance reporting and regulation, the introduction of new software for appraisal, commitment and competence of both parties, and interpretation of items in the instruments.

**Principal Appraisal Impact**

Ideally, an effective principal appraisal should improve the performance of the principals. Thus, it can be said that principal appraisal has an impact to serve its purpose of development. Three of the four principals espoused that their appraisal should have an impact on their performance. However, what they emphasize is not actually appraisal affecting their overall performance in the role that they play, but it is more the impact of the appraisal’s final score to their career. One principal for instance said that the appraisal outcome affected them in terms of promotion. Two principals contended that appraisal should have an impact on
performance. However, they then admitted that political relationships are more important in determining a career than performance by saying that the appraisal outcome is used depending on who is the number one person in the district. One principal stated that

Appraisal should have an impact on the principal’s performance. But nowadays, I noticed that it depends on the current political power. It then depends on who is the number one person in the local district. Formally, principals are not supposed to be involved in political activities of supporting this candidate or that candidate. In reality, since senior high school students are young voters, principals then play a role in local politics (SP2).

An urban principal also espoused the same political issue. However, he used the term “user” to indicate whether or not the appraisal outcome had an impact on performance and career depends on the local leaders. He stated that

I think appraisal should have an impact to improve our performance. As principals, of course we always want to be better in our job. However, it also depends on the users themselves or the Local Education Authority (LEA) whether they want to use it or consider it important or not (SP4).

Another principal, however, is not really clear whether or not his appraisal is having an impact on his overall performance. On one hand, he espoused that appraisal should have an impact to overall performance but indicated that in practice it does not affect him, while he continues saying that appraisal does help him in doing his job, saying

I think appraisal does affect my performance. Appraisal also depends on the superintendents and each superintendent has different ways of appraising and scoring. Appraisal does help me with the job I am doing (SP3).

This principal further explored what kind of appraisal process from superintendents could have an impact on him. He said that he preferred superintendents who guided him along the process of appraisal and gave examples
of what he should do, not just asking and verifying things without explanation or examples.

It can be stated that even though all four principals considered their appraisal was important to evaluate their performance, principal appraisal does not have an overall impact on the performance of the principals. Only one principal thought his appraisal process did affect his performance while still espousing his idealistic value on appraisal.

**Appraisal Linkage to Principal Development**

When the four principals were asked whether they have been given any professional development programmes as the outcome of the appraisal final score, the four principals were divided. Two principals stated that the appraisal final score affected the professional development they received. However, one of the two then referred to career development rather than professional development stating that

> Yes, it affects the professional development. For instance, I cannot get a promotion to a higher career (SP1)

Though this principal admitted that he once was given a 72-hour training course on being a principal when he was appointed to become a principal, the training was not given based on the appraisal but because it was more of a formal requirement of the principal post. When asked how many times he had been given training due to his appraisal score, another principal then said

> Not really many, very few and just once in a while we receive training from appraisal feedback (SP3).

This principal thought that his appraisal was linked to the professional development programme he received. When asked about what programme he has participated into due to his appraisal, he said
Yes, it affects the professional development programmes. Once I was given a week workshop at the Hotel of Orchard in Pontianak region to learn how to manage schools well. From the Landak region, there were four principals that week. That workshop enriched our understanding the job we do (SP3).

The other two principals admitted that their appraisal outcome had no impact to the professional development they received. One principal for instance felt that he was the stupidest principal in the region because he was never given a lot of training during his principalship and said

_I have never received training due to my performance appraisal. During the local autonomy, maybe just once in a while. Honestly speaking, I feel that I am the stupidest principal of all. Why the stupidest one? Because I have never been given training in Jakarta. I don’t know why it is like that. Those who are appointed to attend training in Jakarta are always the same principals. Just those few principals (SP2)._*

Another principal also asserted the same thing related to professional development and career development as the impact of appraisal outcomes. He stated that until the current time, the appraisal outcome was not clearly linked to professional development. He believed that the consideration being used by the Landak Education Authority is still based on general consideration of the LEA. He stated that

_For the time being, I don’t think it has reached that level yet where appraisal affects the professional development given to us. It is more on general consideration from LEA who can be sent to attend a training to improve their performance. Though, once I was sent to attend training, but I did not think it was based on appraisal outcome (SP4)._*

It is clear that principal appraisal in the Landak region is not yet linked to professional development programmes given to principals, though two principals thought that it did have some linkage to the professional development they received. However, they misinterpreted the linkage to the career development.
Only one principal admitted he had been given training related to his performance appraisal. Professional development was given based on the Local Education Authority’s consideration.

**Key Findings from Principals’ Perspectives**

The following are some key findings from the perspectives of the four principals in the Landak region concerning their appraisal process.

Firstly, principal appraisal in the Landak region was geared more toward developmental purposes where all four principals believed that the purpose of the appraisal was to improve their performance. Only one principal believed that his appraisal was to serve the purpose of accountability. However, the principals in this study interpreted development as getting practical assistance from their appraisal superintendents and thus it could be considered that they understood the meaning of development in a limited way because they viewed it as assistance.

Secondly, three of four principals in the study argued the process of their appraisal was more of a tick-box activity where they filled in instruments given by superintendents and then they got the final score of the appraisal. One principal especially commented that he did his own appraisal and he even had a difficulty to get his appraisal documents approved. Only one principal stated that he had a holistic appraisal process along the year and he believed his appraisal had been done in line with the regulations.

Thirdly, there are some concerns and challenges regarding the process of appraisal articulated by the four principals such as subjectivity of the instruments, better communication and socialisation of the appraisal system, complex system of finance reporting, new complex software for the appraisal, commitment, ambiguity in interpreting the items and finally competence of the superintendents.
Fourthly, three principals believed that their appraisal had no impact on their overall performance. Three of them believed that their appraisal had not affected their performance in the schools. Only one principal felt that his appraisal did help him with the role he was doing but did not clearly state whether it improved his performance or not.

Fifthly, three principals believed that there was no clear linkage between their appraisal outcome with the professional development given to them. Two principals admitted that they got a professional development programme but it was not because of the appraisal. It was more a training for them randomly assigned by the Local Education Authority.

SECTION II: The Superintendents’ Perspectives

The Superintendents’ Understanding of the Role

To get a better understanding of the superintendents’ role in the appraisal of the principals, it is necessary to explore the superintendents’ understanding of the role in the appraisal. In an Indonesian context, superintendents are located within the Local Education Authority as a sub-functional unit under the Secondary Education Division led by a head of division.

When the superintendents were asked about the role and duties, all four superintendents understood that their role was to supervise principals and teachers. They all referred to the Ministerial Decree No 28 Year 2010, the appointment of teachers as principals, which in article 12 mentioned that principals are appraised by superintendents against the standards of Indonesian National Education Goals.

One superintendent mentioned the wide areas of duty for superintendents in which she also needed to supervise teachers as well by saying that

*There is a wide range of superintendent’s duties and the main duty is to appraise principals through school appraisal to evaluate the competencies of*
principals covering personality, social, leadership, human resource, entrepreneurship and school management overall (SS1).

She then went ahead to inform the exact regulation on which her roles were clearly described. Another superintendent also mentioned that his duty was to supervise principals against the eight Standards of Education in Indonesia stipulated in another Ministerial Decree No.35 Year 2010 and report the outcome of the appraisal to the Local Education Authority.

Based on the Ministerial Decree No. 35 Year 2010, our job as a superintendent is to evaluate or appraise the performance of principals against the standards and report it to the Local Education Office (SS2).

One superintendent also argued that his role as a superintendent was more acting as a motivator and guide for principals so that principals could then motivate their own teachers to smooth the process of learning and teaching.

Our duty as a superintendent is clearly stated in the regulation and our main job is to guide and motivate principals so that principals can also motivate their teachers. We guide principals in many matters such as curriculum and syllabus (SS3)

A junior superintendent who had been a superintendent for about six years seemed as if he wanted to look more capable by showing the researcher the guide book of superintendents during the interview when asked about his role and said

The role of a superintendent is to appraise or supervise both schools, principals and teachers on whether or not they have done their duties well. According to the Guideline for Superintendents, a superintendent can only supervise seven schools at the maximum and the process of appraisal must be in accordance with the process listed in the book (SS4).

When the superintendents were interviewed about which areas of duties in the appraisal of principals were easy to appraise in the appraisal, one superintendent commented that she felt it was easy for her to appraise the younger generation of principals because she felt those young principals could accept criticism and
suggestions but senior principals thought they had had enough experience already.

*For me, it is easy to appraise young principals because they can accept criticism and are willing to follow up our recommendations faster than senior ones because they think they are already good enough and know better since they are senior principals (SS1).*

Another superintendent, however, admitted that the appraisals he had done so far were never difficult because he said that during his long-time career as a superintendent, he had never carried out a principal appraisal which was in line with the regulation. His appraisal was a sporadic and incidental one when saying

*Once again, I say that real appraisal based on the regulation has never been carried out. So, we found no difficulties. We appraise principals when there are problems or a feeling of dislike from the Local Education Authority as a basis to dismiss the principals from the post or move them to other schools (SS2).*

One of the most senior superintendents said the easiest competence to appraise in the appraisal of principals was the personality and religious values because according to him, as long as the principals did not do crime or amoral things and the principals attended the church or mosque regularly, it was considered that the personality was good. He said

*The easiest competence to appraise is personality and social values because we can just ask the society members whether he prays regularly on Sunday or goes to the church. So, it is easy to appraise (SS3).*

The youngest superintendent among the four argued that he had no difficulties in the areas of competence in the appraisal for principals. He did not see any separation of category between easy or difficult ones in the competencies of principals. He said that all of those were related and principals already understood the benefits of their appraisal.
When the interviewees were further asked which of the areas of appraisal of principals that they would put more priority on and asked the reasons why. Three superintendents clearly mentioned that in their appraisal of principals, they put more priority on the areas of supervision of academic learning and managerial supervision because they thought these two areas were vital for the success of learning in the school. One superintendent said

*Supervision of learning is important for me because the supervision of teaching and learning is about educating kids. In educating kids, teachers’ teaching and students’ learning are the main things. Checking teachers’ presence and syllabuses and the materials they use in teaching (SS4).*

This superintendent then expressed the same thing when he was asked which areas of principal duties he would give more attention to in the appraisal of principals, he commented that

*The area which become my focus of attention in appraising principals is his instructional leadership, the second competence in the regulation. That competence becomes my focus because it deals with the core vision and mission of schools related to curriculum development and to measure the quality of instruction in that school (SS4).*

Another superintendent also stressed the importance of academic supervision and the managerial aspect of principals in his appraisal process, saying that it was important for principals to be supervised so that the principals could supervise their teachers academically because school business is all about learning and teaching.

One superintendent contended that the five areas of competency were all important areas. According to her, she could not say that a certain area was more important than others because all the five competencies of principals are interrelated. She said that all the five areas need to be in balance and the duty of the superintendent is to guide and help principals along the way. She said

*For me, there is no a term of more important areas or not so important areas. All these five areas need to improve together. I cannot only appraise*
personality, no I cannot. All these five competences are appraised together in the process. All are equally important (SS1).

All the four superintendents understood their role in the appraisal of principals which was to appraise principals against the standards stipulated in the Ministerial Decree of Indonesia. They understood the areas of competency in appraising principals. Three superintendents agreed that academic supervision and managerial aspects were more important aspects in the appraisal of principals.

The Purposes of Principal Appraisal: development or accountability

For the effectiveness of principal appraisal, appraisal should serve the dual purposes of accountability and development. Indonesian principal appraisal is aimed at improving principals’ performance and holding them accountable to the role they are entrusted with so that it can be used a measure of effectiveness and consideration for decision making as stated in the Guideline for Appraising School Principals of Indonesia (2012).

The research study then asked the four superintendents about their perspectives on purposes and the importance of having a principal appraisal. From the interview data, all four superintendents agreed that the purpose of principal appraisal is both for accountability and development. For instance, a superintendent touched on both purposes saying that

In my understanding, the purpose of principal appraisal is to improve the performance of principals. Secondly, it also improves the overall quality of the school in terms of instruction and graduates and then acts as a supervision of principals’ duties (SS1).

Another superintendent also thought the same by emphasizing that the appraisal purpose is to measure the quality of principals and the professionalism of principals in carrying out their duties and stated that appraisal also aimed at improving the performance of the school through the principal. One superintendent argued that the purpose of appraisal is to make principals able to
lead effectively so that they can lead and influence and motivate teachers to provide the best learning and teaching service to students. He argued that if principals were not appraised, they might not be able to appraise the teachers and this affected students’ learning. He commented that

*The purpose of appraisal is to make principals able to lead the school effectively and make them also capable of appraising their teachers so they do not appraise teachers carelessly. Thus, they know how to appraise and understand the process (SS3).*

And then this superintendent went on arguing that appraisal is important for principals to find areas of weaknesses that can be improved. He argued that without appraisal, principals cannot be helped when encountering problems and difficulties and said that

*Appraisal is important to improve the performance of principals. Without appraisal, they do things as usual with no improvement. Through appraisal, if they encounter problems, they can ask us and we will help them to solve them My duty is to ease the job of principals and help them (SS3).*

Another superintendent who seemed to keep adhering to the regulation answered that the purpose of principal appraisal is to improve principals and to act as a form of evaluation for decision making for career development when he said the outcome of the appraisal can measure the overall quality of the school. This superintendent went on stating that the appraisal outcome is reported to the Local Education Authority as part of their accountability to the Local Education Authority stating that

*The outcome of the appraisal will be reported to the Local Education Authority in a written report. If there is something serious or urgent, we may be asked to do a more detailed observation and write a more detailed report (SS4).*

All four superintendents espoused that the purposes of principal appraisal in Landak region both served as accountability and development. The four superintendents were aware of the importance of having appraisals for principals
to improve principals’ competence and professionalism and hold principals accountable to the role.

**Practices of the Principal Appraisal: Process of the Principal Appraisal**

All four superintendents understood that the practices of doing appraisal at least involved two phases which are early in the year appraisal and end of the year appraisal with a process of visitation and collecting evidence during the mid-year of the appraisal. All four superintendents admitted that they came to schools early in the year and at the end of the year. However, all four superintendents asserted that they rarely did the mid-year process which is data collection and evidence finding because they have many schools under their supervision. One superintendent indicated this practice when she asked how she did appraisal

> I think the process is quite clear based on the procedures. We appraise principals in two phases: early and end of year phases. Early year phase we do observation of annual plans, school teaching plans, overall infrastructure etc. We observe first and then advise them to improve areas that can be done soon based on the eight standards of education in Indonesia. We do this early in the academic year around June or July. After a semester, we come again to check what changes and improvements have been made. At the end of the year, we come again to do final appraisal and confirmation to determine the final score (SS1)

From the four superintendents, one superintendent dared to admit that he had never done principal appraisal according to the regulation. He admitted that principal appraisal was carried out to meet the formality of bureaucracy and it was done incidentally and sporadically when there were problems with a principal or cases involving principals by saying

> In doing the appraisal of principals, we have not been able to do it holistically according to the regulation. However, we did do some appraisal but it was unstructured and sporadically (SS2).
This superintendent espoused that in theory principal appraisal should be done in two major phases which are early in the year and end of the year with the process of collecting information and evidence along the year. He stated that

_Theoretically speaking, the appraisal of principal has to be done twice a year which is early in the year and end of the year with a process along the year. Early in the year we do formative appraisal involving principal self-evaluation and then we suggest areas of improvement during early first and second semester. At the end of the year, we do a final appraisal which is a summative appraisal to determine the final score appraisal which is then reported to the Local Education Authority (SS2)._ 

This superintendent bluntly admitted that political relations with local leaders determined the attention and commitment of the principal in the process. He explained that once when he was appraising a principal and he asked the principal for some data and evidence for the appraisal and the principal answered that some data that he asked for were not important and no use as he stated

_Many principals consider appraisal as a trivial thing which can be ignored and I personally told them that it is important for principals to be appraised in a meeting with school principals. Then, a principal interrupted saying that is not important and a mere administrative process. I know that this principal was close to someone in the power circle and this made recruitment of principals full of collision, corruption and nepotism (SS2)._ 

Another superintendent stated that his process of conducting appraisal of principals consisted of two phases that are early in the year and end of the year. This superintendent was the coordinator of superintendents and stated that his process of principal appraisal was

_The appraisal I did consisted of two phases namely early in the year and end of the year. Appraisal should be conducted once a year and we must visit school once a month where we stay there for at least three hours. By the end of the year, we come again to do the final appraisal to determine the final score of the appraisal (SS3)._
When he was further asked to elaborate the detailed process of conducting principal appraisal in the school, he said that he wrote down everything he observed in the field and asked many parties such as teachers, students and community members around the school and he observed everything in the school. One superintendent expressed the same practice of appraising principals when he was asked to describe the stages he had conducted. He said

_We used to do appraisal once a year in two phases. It started in odd semester early in the academic year around May or June. In the first phase, we supervise principals by observing schools and asking principals to do self-evaluation and school profiling about teachers, students and facilities. Afterward, we collect information from different sources such as members of the schools_ (teachers and students might be what he meant here) _and other community members (SS4)._ 

and this superintendent further admitted that he did at least two visitations to the school every month to collect data for appraisal.

It can be stated that all four superintendents admitted that they had done their best to conduct principal appraisals. Two superintendents believed that they had followed the procedures based on the regulations by stating that they did appraisals in two phases in a year. When asked how they conducted them, these two superintendents admitted that they had not done the whole process. They tended to do it sporadically with a little follow-up process to gather the data during the year. One superintendent admitted that the appraisals he conducted were incidental and unstructured and admitted his appraisal was not done holistically. This superintendent also saw the principal appraisal as a mere formality to meet the demands of bureaucracy.

**Impact of the Principal Appraisal**

During the interviews, the superintendents were asked whether the appraisal they conducted for principals had an impact on the performance of principals, three superintendents argued that the principal appraisals that they conducted
had an impact and had made the principals improve their performance. One of them, however referred to the impact that affected the principals' careers because he said the final appraisal report will be reported to the Local Education Authority, who determined whether the principals can be retained or not as principals. He said

> Of course, it affected the performance of principals because the outcome of the appraisal will be reported to the Local Education Authority and the Head of the Local Education Authority would consider the future of the principals and whether they can be retained as the principals. The basis for the LEA consideration is the outcome of our appraisal (SS4).

One superintendent was firm that her appraisals had an impact and argued that maybe 75% of principals followed the recommendations of the appraisal outcome. When this superintendent was further asked to explore how she was sure that the principals changed and improved their principal performance, she said that she monitored the principals by saying

> For instance, after the appraisal process or visitations, I tell the principals “Sir, please fix this within the next two weeks”. And then I will be back to check to make sure they made the improvement (SS1).

She also said that their recommendations sometimes were not heard by the Local Education Authority officer, stating that the LEA Head of Division just delegated the duty of appraising principals without getting involved in the process while the final score needed to be approved by them. She felt that LEA just delegated the duty of appraisal of principals without much care of the process.

Another superintendent commented that the principal appraisals that he conducted had an impact on the principals. However, he stressed that it depended solely on the principals themselves whether they wanted to follow up the recommendations and make the improvements as he said

> We hope that the principal appraisal process affects the principal’s performance. In reality, not all the principals are affected by the process. I would say maybe 60 percent of them do make changes based on the
appraisal review. The rest does not want to change and improve their practice and it is up to them to stay worse like before without improvement (SS3).

And then he further explained that his recommendation in the appraisal outcome could be used as part of consideration for the Local Education Authority, and principals with good appraisal outcomes can be nominated to lead bigger schools or promoted to be candidates for superintendents in the future as he said

*Appraisal does have an influence. For instance, if the appraisal outcome is good, we recommend the principals to be nominated to other better or bigger schools or recommend the principals to be superintendents. Superintendent is the highest career of a teacher* (SS3).

The most senior superintendent admitted that appraisals he conducted had no impact on the principals as he told the story of one particular principal that he appraised. He said

*One of the principals I appraised was doing an amoral thing (did not say what it was), a gambler and his leadership was worse. I reported to the Local Education Authority and also brought the case to the coordinator of superintendent to take care and possibly to remove him from the post. Nothing has been done to take care of the problem or remove him from his post. My conclusion is appraisal of principals is no use in our region of Landak* (SS2).

This superintendent even said that appraisals of the principals in Landak was no use and full of political interests. For instance, he appraised one of the principals in B region and the outcome of that particular principal was worse, but the Local Education Authority would not dare to remove him from the post because that principal was a close friend of the current district leader and he stated that as long as the current leader is still in power, nobody could touch the position of that principal.

Three of the four superintendents argued that the principal appraisals they conducted had affected the performance of the principals even though not all of
them made changes or improvements based on the appraisal outcome review. One superintendent thought that appraisal practice did not affect or improve the performance of principals because there was no sanction for not following up recommendations and it was political in nature. Thus, he thought overall the principal appraisal was not impactful and was useless.

**Challenges of the Principal Appraisal**

There are some challenges or concerns in conducting appraisals for principals. Only one superintendent felt that there were no concerns with his process of appraisal because everything went smoothly as expected because he understood his responsibility and the principals themselves understood the benefits and duties of their jobs as he said

*So, in doing the appraisal of principals, I find no problems and I can say that the appraisals that I conducted went well and I appraised them thoroughly with the five competences of principals (SS4).*

And then he went on arguing that during his six years of superintendence, he had no problems at all. When the researcher pushed him to explore more that appraisal was difficult and always has some problems, this junior superintendent was firm that he had no difficulties during the appraisal process. He kept referring to the *Guideline Book*.

The other three superintendents admitted there were concerns they faced when appraising principals that hindered them from having better principal appraisals. Those concerns and challenges covered some issues such as infrastructure gaps between urban and rural schools, geographic location of schools, openness, political nature, cooperation and commitment, complexity of the appraisal instruments, trust and fear of appraisal.

Two superintendents for instance explained that the distance of the geographic location of the remote schools from the city made it hard to visit the schools regularly and thus the appraisals were not done fully. They also felt pity for the remote schools because there was a wide gap of infrastructure between rural
schools and urban schools which made it hard for them to appraise the schools with the same instruments in the appraisal. They stated that

*Geographic location of the school is also a concern. Some schools are far away that are hard to reach and thus hard for us to visit them to appraise the principals. There is a concern that I have in the appraisal of principals. For instance, the wide gap of infrastructure and human resources between the schools in the city and rural schools. (SS1).*

One superintendent who often visited rural schools also conveyed the same concern of location as he said that rural schools are hard to reach and that made it difficult to appraise the principals timely in line with the regulation and thus it became more of a formality. This superintendent also asserted that some principals felt uneasy and afraid of being appraised and thus they felt reluctant and unwilling during the process of appraisal as he stated

*Sometimes, the principals are afraid of being appraised. They feel reluctant and mixed with fear to be appraised (SS3).*

Two other superintendents on a different note said that there was a need for synergy and cooperation between the Local Education Authority and superintendents to improve the process of appraisal because the incentive (money) from the LEA is too small to cover the cost of travelling to far away schools. They said lack of cost and transport to the school hindered the appraisal process.

*There should be a mutual synergy among the principals, superintendents and the Local Authority staff that principal appraisal can be done effectively. We are asked to appraise principals whose schools are far away but were not given any decent transport fee and were only provided 300.000 Rupiah (32 NZD) a month for transport. Thus, we can only do what we can with limited resources (SS2).*

The only female superintendent argued that there was a need for openness or transparency in the process of appraisal. Sometimes she felt the principals were not open with her about data that she requested. She said
There is a need for transparency in the process that we feel fine when we talk face-to-face with the principals on what are needed to be improved and in the process of monitoring his/her progress (SS1).

She then argued that principals needed to be open in the process of appraisal and she also stressed the need to be able to communicate in a convenient way so the principals did not feel intimidated and offended as she said

Sometimes, there is a lack of openness from the principals in the appraisal. For instance, when we appraise them, we do not only use the instruments to measure. Sometimes we interview principals to prove whether they have the annual programme and all the documents, evidence etc. Principals used to avoid this by saying they have all those matters and but saying that all those documents are still in the laptop and not yet printed when the appraisal takes place (SS1).

Two other superintendents asserted that their concern about principal appraisal was that many principals complained about the complexity of the appraisal instruments where there were too many items to be appraised and that became a burden for the principals as he said

Nowadays, many principals complained that the items in the instruments are too many and they said it was a heavy burden for them. As human beings, they said that they want things easier and simple to do. But we cannot do much because it is the government who introduced the change for the sake of principal’s performance that can get better and better (SS3).

Another senior superintendent worried that the political nature of principalship has faded the true purpose of appraisal so that principals tended to ignore the process of appraisal. He argued that many principals now considered that principal’s appraisal is a trivial thing and a mere formality that they did not take it seriously. He said one of the principals he appraised ignored him and even said that some of the documents and the data he asked were not important. He then argued that because politics had entered the management of education, the
outcome of the principal was never considered and principals with political relationships could just ignore the outcome saying

One of the principals I appraised was doing an amoral thing (did not say what it is), a gambler and his leadership was worse. I reported to the Local Education Authority and brought the case to the coordinator of superintendent to take care and possible to remove him from the post. Nothing has been done to take care of the problem or remove him from his post. My conclusion is appraisal of principal is no use in our region, Landak here (SS2).

This superintendent felt that the superintendent’s position is more a waste place for unwanted former principals and critical teachers. He felt that his position is more like a garbage bin where his opinion and advice was not heard or considered by the Local Education Authority. Another superintendent who was the newest person in the post of superintendents argued that he had no concerns or any difficulties because he had followed the Guideline book for Superintendents. According to him, as long as he followed the regulations, his appraisals were good. He went on arguing that the secret of successful appraisal of principals is trust between superintendents and all members of the schools and he said

And it is important for the superintendents and the schools to have trust and principals and teachers as well as superintendents can grow together to be better (SS4).

There are some concerns or challenges faced by superintendents in the Landak region in conducting the appraisal of principals such as the infrastructure gap between urban and rural schools, geographic location of the schools, openness, political nature of local district, cooperation and commitment of principals and superintendents, complexity of the appraisal instruments, trust and fear of appraisal.
Support for the Superintendents

The superintendents in the study asserted that they were given some form of support from the Local Education Authority in conducting the appraisal of principals in the Landak region. One superintendent for instance commenting

*I have participated in some training quite often either at the local district level or provincial level. In a year, at least we had one training session to refresh our understanding of the role of superintendent. I could say that training is quite often given to us (SS1).*

All four superintendents believed and argued that they were given enough training and professional development programmes to support them in conducting principal appraisals which is their main duty as superintendents.

Key Findings from the Superintendents’ Perspectives

Here are some key findings from the perspectives of superintendents regarding the principal appraisal conducted in the Landak region:

Firstly, all four superintendents understood their role in the appraisal of principals as stipulated in the Ministerial Decree of Education of Indonesia where there are five areas of competence of principals and there are eight standards of Indonesian National Education goals. All superintendents agreed that managerial and instructional leadership of principals are the two difficult areas to appraise.

Secondly, all four superintendents perceived that the purpose of principal appraisal is to serve both the accountability and developmental purposes of principals to improve the principals’ capacity and hold them accountable to the role that principals can be more competent and professional.

Thirdly, three of the superintendents admitted that they had done their utmost to appraise principals by following the regulations. However, in practice, they admitted that they could not follow up the whole procedures holistically. They admitted that the middle year process was not done thoroughly with more visitations because of several problems. Only one particularly admitted that he
had never conducted a holistic and structured principal appraisal. His principal appraisal was more incidental and sporadic.

Fourthly, three superintendents argued that that the principal appraisals had affected the performance of principals though not all principals were responsive and followed their recommendations. However, they said more than 65% the principals made improvements because of the principal appraisal process. Only one superintendent argued that the principal appraisals did not affect the performance of principals because principals could ignore the recommendations and change the appraisal outcomes through political relationships with someone in the Local Education Authority. Finally, there are some challenges or concerns faced by superintendents in principal appraisals in the Landak region such as the infrastructure gap between urban and rural schools, geographic location of the schools, openness in the process of appraisal, political nature of the local district, synergy, cooperation and communication, lack of commitment and trust of superintendents and principals, fear of appraisal and complexity of the appraisal instruments.

**Overall Consolidated Findings**

The findings of the study revealed that according to the principals, their appraisal was geared more toward developmental purposes than accountability. The superintendents stated otherwise, that principal appraisals that they conducted covered both accountability and development and assistance purposes. Principals also felt that the process of their appraisal was more a tick-box activity where they filled in instruments. Three superintendents argued that they had done their best and but had not followed all the regulations. Only one superintendent admitted he had done principal appraisals sporadically and in an unstructured way. The principals perceived that their appraisals had little impact on performance while superintendents felt that the appraisal of principals had affected the working performance of the principals. The principals felt there was no linkage between appraisal and professional development. There were some concerns and challenges that hindered the process of appraisal according to the principals and
superintendents such as subjectivity, lack of competence and communication, political nature of local districts, geographic locations, complexity of appraisal instruments, lack of openness, trust and commitment.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction
This chapter presents a discussion of the findings by integrating the findings with the literature to understand the nature of principal appraisal in an Indonesia context in relation to the purposes, practices and challenges. The discussion of the findings is presented under the following headings: the role of principals and superintendents in Indonesia, purposes of principal appraisal, appraising principals in Landak region and challenges in appraising principals. After a discussion of the findings, conclusions are drawn and recommendations are provided at the end of the chapter.

The Role of Principals and Superintendents in Indonesia

Principals’ understanding of the role
All four principals in this study agreed that the role of principal is complex and demanding. All these principals stated they had to play many different roles to perform their role successfully. Two of the principals particularly asserted the complex nature of principalship in Indonesia by stating that the principal’s role and duties are all-encompassing by commenting that principal’s duties are many and complex, covering many areas such as managerial, leadership, social and administrative matters. These two principals for instance said that their role is complex by referring to the Professional Standards for Principals in Indonesia as stipulated in the Ministerial Decree No. 13 (Ministry of Education of Indonesia, 2007) which mentions that the areas of duties of principals have managerial, leadership, supervision, social, religious and entrepreneurial aspects. This finding correlates with the literature by Cardno (2012), Goodwin, Cunningham, and Childress, (2003), Catano and Stronge, (2007) and Ginsberg, (2008) who argue that principalship in today’s era is complex and demanding where principals have to play many different roles simultaneously and where it is impossible to carry the
workload on their own. The idea of the complex role of principals today is also expressed by Green (2000), Kowalski (2010) and Dean (2002) where they argue that the landscape of the principals’ role has changed rapidly and has become a more complex role due to the demands from many stakeholders.

Two other principals in this study, though they stated the complexity of the role, seemed to simplify the roles in practice by arguing that the main duties of principals are to pay attention to teachers’ presence and daily routines when they were asked to describe what areas of duties were deemed important to them. One of the two principals argued that as long as teachers come to teach and students attend school regularly, the school runs normally and everything was good. One of these principals kept sticking to his notes when asked about his role and duties which might indicate his lack of understanding of his role as a principal during the interview. Another principal, in a rural school, answered with a short response that his main duties are to guide teachers and make sure they teach students well without further elaboration of his duties. This finding matches the findings of the Indonesian Ministry of Education study (2013) where they found that the majority of Indonesian principals were only good at the personality and social skill aspects of principalship. These two latter principals’ findings are in contrast with the current literature which depicts the complexity of the principal’s role (see for example, Cardno, 2012; Catano & Stronge, 2007).

The increased emphasis on instructional leadership (Raihani, 2008; Sofo, Fitzgerald & Jawas, 2012) in the role of Indonesian principalship is also evident in this study from the principals’ responses when they were asked which areas of their duties were difficult and important in performing the role. All the principals agreed that all areas of their duties were important and interrelated. However, two of these principals believed that curriculum-related matters were more important and difficult since the curriculum in Indonesia kept changing when the government changed, which made them confused. These two principals argued that the most challenging areas of their duties were curriculum and managerial matters such as financial reporting that made them feel worried and intimidated. This finding is also reflected in an international context where principals are
urged to improve students’ learning outcomes as argued by Hallinger (2009) and Horng & Loeb, (2010) which makes the principal’s role more demanding and complex. Leithwood, Harris and Hopkins (2008) and Cardno (2012) also noted that the demands to improve students’ learning outcomes have made instructional leadership the focus of principalship today. Altrichter and Kemethofer (2015), in the case of accountability in education, argued that more accountability was put on principals with regard to the achievement of students in international tests. In the context of Indonesia, Sumintomo et al. (2015) and Sofo et al. (2012) found that in Indonesia there was a shift in the principalship role where more freedom and responsibility was given to principals, making the role of principals more accountable because the government allocated more funding to schools and national standardised tests were introduced in 2006.

Superintendents’ understanding of the role

All four superintendents in this study theoretically understood the role and duties as depicted in the regulations where they all referred to the Ministerial Decree No. 28 (Ministry of Education of Indonesia, 2010) which mentioned that the role and duties of superintendents in the context of Indonesia is to appraise and guide principals and teachers and then report the outcome to the Local Education Authority that is responsible for the development and promotion of principals. One superintendent in the study specifically mentioned article 12 in the regulation which says that principal appraisal is the responsibility of superintendents and principals are appraised against the Professional Standards and the Eight Standards of Indonesian Education Goals. All the superintendents in this study understood that their role was crucial for the success of school principals. This study finding is contrary to the findings of the Indonesian Ministry of Education (2013) that found that the majority of superintendents did not have competency and did not understand their role and duties in appraising principals. However, since this study was conducted with a small sample of senior superintendents, the findings cannot be generalised. This finding challenges the findings of Viramontez’s (2011) in her study of principal appraisal in the USA where she
found superintendents lacked competence and received no training. The four superintendents understood their role and duties because all admitted that they received some form of training and workshops before becoming superintendents and all these superintendents were former long-time principals. This finding is in line with Piggot-Irvine (2005) and Lawler, Benson, McDermott, and Sitzman (2012) who emphasised the need for training for both principals and superintendents to improve competency so that an effective appraisal can take place.

The emphasis on instructional leadership of principals (Sofo et al. 2012; Sumintomo et al. 2015) in Indonesia was also evident in this study when the four superintendents were asked which areas of the principal’s role for them were more important. Three of the superintendents particularly stated that academic supervision and managerial skills associated with academic supervision were the most important aspects for them when appraising principals because they believed that the core activity of schools is teaching and learning. However, one superintendent asserted that all the areas of competency were important and related. This finding is in line with the study done by Sofo, Fitzgerald and Jawas (2012) who argued that there was a shift in the role of principals in Indonesia where principals were given more freedom since the introduction of School-based Management to improve the quality of teaching. In addition, Kolu (2015) also noted that instructional leadership was given more emphasis in school leadership in Indonesia these days where she found instructional leadership was successful in schools with a high collaboration among principals, teachers and students. The emphasis on instructional leadership associated with managerial skills can also be seen in the Professional Standards for Principals (Ministry of Education of Indonesia, 2007) where more instructional duties are listed on managerial and academic supervision components in the standards. DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2003) and Cardno (2012) also argue that today’s principals are encouraged to become instructional leaders and effective managers at the same time.

It is clear from both principal and superintendent’s perspectives that the Indonesian principal’s role has also embraced the multifaceted and complex role
of principalship as depicted in an international context. This can be seen from Indonesian principals’ wide range of duties and roles depicted in the *Professional Standards*. The superintendents also understand their role in the appraisal of principals against the professional standards. However, there is a paradoxical message in the regulation of Indonesian principals where on one hand, it is mentioned that the role of the principal is complex with many areas of duties and competences. On other hand, the regulation defines principals as teachers with an additional responsibility of leading a school which seems to simplify the role.

**Purposes of principal appraisal in Indonesia**

**Policy**

The policy on principal appraisal in Indonesia clearly describes that the purpose of principal appraisal is twofold, for accountability and development which can be seen in the purpose part in the *Guideline Book for Appraising Principals* (Ministry of Education of Indonesia, 2012, p. 13) which says that principal appraisal is conducted to find out areas of improvement for principals and to assess their performance against the professional standards: that the outcome of appraisal can serve as an objective consideration for promotion and professional development. This is in line with what Cardno (2012) and Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) believe: that effective appraisal should serve the dual purposes of development and accountability. The definition of principal appraisal in Indonesia also depicts the aspects of accountability and development where it mentions that appraisal is to measure effectiveness of principals against standards and be used as a consideration for development (Ministry of Education of Indonesia, 2012).

All the participants in the study agreed that the purposes of principal appraisal are twofold: development and accountability. However, from the principals’ perspectives, they stated that their appraisal was geared more toward development than accountability. All the principals highlighted the issue of development when asked about the purpose of their appraisal. These three principals mostly said that their appraisal was to find areas of weakness that can
be improved to enhance their overall performance. Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) argue that ideally, appraisal needs to serve the dual purposes to be effective. This finding emphasising developmental purposes matches the studies conducted by Chapman (2008), Viramontez (2011) and Gaziel (2008), where they found that principals’ felt that their appraisal was geared more toward the developmental aspect than accountability. A study by the Education Review Office (2014) in New Zealand also described that principals felt that their appraisal was geared more toward principal development. This finding supports Wilson (2002) and Jennings and Lomas’ (2003) argument that it is very unlikely for an appraisal to serve the two purposes since it is difficult to act as a judge while being a counsellor at the same time. Bush and Middlewood (2005) also noted that an imposed appraisal is very unlikely to serve the dual purposes. Because the appraisal outcome is used as a payment rise consideration in Indonesia, it is strongly geared towards accountabilities.

The principals in this study interpreted development as getting practical assistance from their appraisal superintendents and thus it could be considered that they understood the meaning of development in a limited way because they viewed it as assistance. Unlike the four principals who mostly asserted that their principal appraisal was geared more toward development and assistance, the four superintendents in the study stated that their appraisals of principals was aimed at both improving principals’ performance and holding them accountable to the role. All the superintendents agreed that principal appraisal should serve both development and accountability purposes. Two superintendents for instance argued that principal appraisal was important to measure how well principals performed their roles and that they were accountable to the role they were entrusted to determine career development. The four superintendents also believed that their principal appraisal outcome could improve the performance of principals and be used as a tool for the Local Education Authority to make decisions.
**Appraising principals in the Landak region**

As espoused in the policy of principal appraisal (Ministry of Education of Indonesia, 2012), principal appraisal in Indonesia should be done in three phases within a year which consist of an early phase including preparation and self-evaluation, a middle phase which includes evidence collection and confirmation and a final phase at the end of the year which includes appraisal rating and reporting. In this sense, the appraisal process is a cyclical process during the year.

Two principals admitted that they had appraisal in several phases during the year. However, when these two principals were asked to describe further details of the process, they admitted that mainly they only had the early phase and end of the year phase with very little mid-year follow up without an ongoing data collection done by the superintendents. These two principals admitted that their appraisal was a tick-box activity where superintendents came early in the year and asked them to fill in some appraisal instruments and prepared the evidence for the appraisal. By the end of the year, the superintendents came again to do the final rating for the appraisal. One rural principal admitted that he had never had an appraisal, which is in line with the regulations because he mainly did his own appraisal by himself. Two principals in the rural areas admitted that their superintendents rarely visited their school to do appraisals because their school was quite far from the centre of the district so they felt the appraisal was more of a formality. This finding is common in the appraisal study where appraisals are a mere tick-box activity, particularly when appraisal is used as a tool of control or to serve as an accountability tool. Forrester (2011) warns that appraisal could become a tick-box activity where it is used a tool of control for payment or career. In addition, Piggot-Irvine (2000), Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) and Cardno (2012) also noted that appraisal can be a tool for bureaucratic control rather than a tool to assess performance to improve practice. Furthermore, Goldring et al. (2009) also asserted in their study that there was a lack of justification and documentation in the process of appraisal in the USA where it was also more of a tick-box activity.
Two superintendents admitted they had conducted the principal appraisal according to the regulations by stating that they followed the procedures and visited schools regularly. Two other superintendents admitted they conducted principal appraisal sporadically when principals had problems or when they were asked by the Local Education Authority to appraise the principals. These two superintendents admitted that there are too many schools under their supervision which made it hard for them to regularly visit all the schools and to do the appraisal holistically. The two superintendents believed their appraisal process of principals was a formality process with very little follow-up actions in the mid-year phase. These two superintendents argued it was hard to follow all the procedures because when the central regulations were applied in local districts, the interpretation and the implementation could vary across districts and depended on the local nature. This finding matches the finding of Fuller et al. (2015) where they found that in the USA, principal appraisal was superficial and simplistic and provided little useful feedback on how to improve practice and was administered inconsistently. Goldring et al. (2009) also asserted that there was a lack of justification and documentation in the process of appraisal or evaluation in terms of using psychometric assessment. This view of principal appraisal as a mere tick-box activity is also expressed by Yavuz (2010), who found that principal appraisal activity in Turkey was a document-checking activity. Furthermore, Gaziel (2008) found that principal appraisal in Israel was inconsistent and Murphy, Goldring and Porter (2014) also noted principal appraisal in the USA was perfunctory and a mere formality process.

It could be argued that principals in the Landak region felt their appraisal was still a mere tick-box activity with few mid-year processes to collect data and evidence for the superintendents. This study found that principal appraisal in Landak is a formality to meet the demands of bureaucracy. Only half of the superintendents admitted that they conducted principal appraisals in accordance with the regulations.
**Appraisal impact**

Three principals felt that their appraisal did not affect their overall performance. Although these principals espoused that appraisal should have an impact on their performance, in practice they admitted that their appraisal was more of a process to get to the next level for payment rise and career promotion which is more an accountability matter that an appraisal to help them to improve their performance.

In contrast, three superintendents believed that principal appraisal had an impact on the working performance of principals. Two of them argued that at least 60% of principals under their supervision made some improvement after being appraised. However, these two superintendents stressed that the follow-up actions solely depended on the willingness and the goodwill of the principals. If the principals did not want to follow the recommendations, there was no sanction for them. Another superintendent argued that his appraisal outcome could be used as a basis for the Local Education Authority to make decisions on further appointments. This finding matches the study by the Education Review Office (2014) where they found that appraisal was impactful to the performance of principals. Mendel (2017) also noted that 85% of the principals in the study said that their appraisal was beneficial and worthwhile and reflected the breadth of their roles. In addition, Piggot-Irvine (2000) also described that the introduction of appraisal in New Zealand schools was positive for the profession. Furthermore, Goldring et al. (2009) found that many principals felt that their appraisals were positive, accurate and consistent with job expectations.

However, one superintendent, the most senior one, strongly disagreed with the other superintendents by stating that his appraisal had no impact and could be regarded as useless since appraisal was political and principals did not get sanctions from the Local Education Authority if they did not follow up the recommendations from the superintendents. According to him, this makes principal appraisal useless. This view of principal appraisal was also expressed by Brady (2012) where he found that principals in Southern California felt their appraisal did not affect their performance and lacked meaningfulness. In addition,
some authors such Harper (2016), Condon (2009) and Gaziel (2008) discovered in their studies that principals felt their appraisals were not meaningful and were a waste of time with very little formative feedback and too much emphasis on documentary evidence.

It can be stated that principal appraisal in this small study in the Landak region has not affected principal performance in general but served more as a tool of control by the bureaucracy.

**Appraisal linkage to professional development**

Two principals perceived that their appraisal affected the professional development given to them. However, one of these two principals actually referred to career development and assistance provided by superintendents and Local Education Authority rather than professional development in which he said that he could not get a pay rise if his appraisal outcome was too low to get him to another level. One of the two principals said that he received training after he was appointed a principal and that could be the result of his appraisal outcome. The view that performance appraisal should inform professional development is clearly expressed by Cardno (2012) where she argued that professional development should stem from the performance appraisal outcome to find out areas of improvement. This idea is also supported by Clifford and Ross (2012) who believe that appraisal should inform professional development to improve learning and performance. They argue that appraisal results can spark learning and reflection that affects principals’ leadership performance. Finally, Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) and Cardno (2012) also noted that performance appraisal outcomes should be a basis for policymakers to design relevant professional programmes because through the appraisal process can find what areas need attention to improve performance and effectiveness.

Two other principals did not feel that their appraisal outcome influenced the professional development given to them. These two principals argued that the appraisal outcome currently was used only as a consideration for the Local Education Authority to make decisions related to career and payment. They
commented that the appraisal outcome had not reached a level where it affects professional development for principals yet. They then further believed that a professional development programme for principals is given solely on the Local Education Authority consideration. Moreover, in the context of Indonesia, professional development programmes for principals are formally provided by another institution called Education Quality Assurance Institute which trains and prepares principals and it is not under the Local Education Authority. Thus, there is a separation of function in the principal development in Indonesia where appraisal of principal is conducted by the Local Education Authority and the professional development is conducted by the Education Quality Assurance Institute. This study finding confirms the study conducted by Fuller, Hollingworth and Liu, (2015) where they found that 77% of principal appraisal outcomes were used to make high-stake decisions such as terminations and sanctions rather than as a prime consideration in designing professional development programmes for principals. Furthermore, Clifford and Ross (2012) also found that principal appraisals in the USA provided limited feedback value for professional development.

Overall, principals in the Landak region felt that their appraisals were not directly linked to their professional development because professional development programmes were given sporadically based on the consideration of the Local Education Authority and are formally provided by another institution under the Ministry of Education.

**Challenges in appraising principals**

Conducting and having an appraisal is both difficult and challenging whether for the principal or the superintendent because appraisal activity is inherently complex and difficult and thus presents challenges (Cardno, 2012). In this study, some challenges were identified related to the process of principal appraisal in the Landak region, Indonesia.

The first challenge is subjectivity. Two principals shared that they faced a challenge in the process of appraisal where these two participants argued that
subjectivity in the scoring system and different interpretations on the items in the appraisal documents made the scoring subjective and mainly depended on the power of the superintendents. This challenge is not uncommon in appraisal processes in general. Some authors (Yavuz, 2010; Murphy, Goldring & Porter, 2014; Ahmad & Bujang, 2013) argue that appraisal processes’ lack of objectivity was caused by unclear criteria and the processes that made the scoring were subjective. In addition, Middlewood and Cardno (2001) also assert the need to have clear role clarification and expectations of principals so that appraisal can be done effectively and objectively. Murphy et al. (2014) found that a common pitfall in the USA was unclear rubric with a mere set of checklist rubric with little linkage between evidence and judgment that can cause subjectivity.

The second challenge is competence and communication. Two superintendents and two principals argued that there was a lack of communication and competence on both sides. These participants argued that they needed to communicate in a convenient and honest way, that both parties regarded appraisal as important and relevant for both parties. This finding correlates with superintendents in Viramontez’s research (2011) that received no training to conduct appraisal for principals. In Indonesia, the baseline survey conducted by the Ministry of Education (2013) also found that in general school superintendents in Indonesia lack competence and training. Cardno (2012) also argues that for the appraisal process to be effective, both appraisers and appraisees need to create productive dialogues in which both parties need to be open, honest and trustworthy. In addition, Piggot-Irvine’s study (2003b) found that training of appraisers affected the process of principal appraisal in 25 schools in Northland, New Zealand where appraisers felt they had more courage and openness to discuss problems rather than avoid them.

The third challenge is the political nature of the local district. Two principals and two superintendents argued that their appraisal was influenced by the political nature of the local district. One superintendent for instance stated that his appraisal of principals was useless since political influence was in place. Principals or superintendents that have close political relations with local leaders can put
pressure on others or ignore the appraisal because the outcome of the appraisal can be influenced by the politics. This finding is common across organisations. Gaziel (2008) noted that his study of principal appraisal in Israel found that parents and political figures can influence the outcome of the appraisal. Sweinstani (2016) and Rosser et al. (2011), in their study of the political nature of public services in decentralised Indonesia contend that political interests play a role in the education sector and the local district budget on public services in Indonesia. Furthermore, Carron and De Grauwe (1997) found that supervision is influenced by the political nature of the environment. They noted that in some countries such as Thailand, Ghana and Greece, school supervision has been politicised in which school inspectors or superintendents played a political role.

The fourth challenge is the geographic locations of the schools. Rural school principals and two superintendents explicitly admitted that when the rural school location was far away and hard to reach this made the appraisal process ineffective. They argued that with lack of transport and cost support, the appraisal of these rural principals was minimal and neglected. Superintendents admitted that they did not visit the schools regularly during the appraisal because of the location. This finding is in line with Triwiyanto’s (2015) study of appraisal in East Malang, Indonesia which found of that geographic locations of the schools influenced the process of appraisal. Triwiyanto (2015) asserted that differences in terms of school resources (teachers, facilities and location of schools) have also affected the fairness of principal appraisal. Moreover, Carron and De Grauwe (1997) and Stokes, Stafford and Holdsworth (1999), in their survey on rural and remote education found that schools in remote areas faced lack of provision and supervision and access due to the locations. Furthermore, the Asia Foundation in their report (n.d.) on Indonesian basic education suggests the need for government to provide better transport for rural areas so that they can increase school participation in rural areas or villages and provide better school supervision from the local government.

The fifth challenge is the complexity of the appraisal instruments. Two superintendents and two principals argued that the instruments used in the
appraisal were complex with too many items to address that made it hard to do self-evaluation and evidence collection. One principal for instance asserted that the new appraisal software issued by the Ministry of Education of Indonesia was complex and required computer skills while his school, and he himself, was not good at the computer and this made it hard for him. This complexity of instruments of appraisal is also described in Hamilton, Engberg, Steiner, Nelson and Yuan (2012) where they found that principals in Pittsburgh felt that collecting rubric documentation requires an excessive amount of paperwork and the performance standard rubric contains so many items and components that they cannot possible address them all. In addition, Collins (1999) found out that in two secondary schools in New Zealand, the principals felt that appraisal judgement was complex requiring multiple elements considered in their works as teaching principals.

The last challenge of principal appraisal in Landak region is a lack of openness, commitment and trust. Two superintendents and two principals assert that there was a lack of openness, commitment and trust from both superintendents and principals. For instance, some superintendents complained that some principals were not open about financial matters and not committed to the process of appraisal, ignoring the outcome and processes. Principals, on the other hand, they felt that superintendents did not do enough socialisation and thus they were hard to trust in the process. One principal argued that sometimes superintendents appraise based on their ego. This finding matches the study of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (2014) that argues that superintendents (appraisers) and principals need to be committed to appraisal by regarding appraisal as important and committing to spend more time to the processes. National College for Teaching and Leadership (2014) and Tran and Bon (2015) in the study of principal appraisal in the USA found out that there was a lack of openness and trust between the superintendents and principals so principals perceived that superintendents could be biased in scoring. In addition, Walker. Kutsyuruba and Noonan (2011) assert that trust and respect is fragile in an environment with increased accountability.
Conclusions
I have drawn conclusions from my study that relate to a) the principal’s role; b) purposes of principal appraisal in Landak region; c) practices of principal appraisal in the Landak region.

a) The principal’s role in Indonesia

In terms of the principal’s role in the Landak region, it is clear that the Indonesian principal’s role has also embraced the multifaceted and complex role of principalship as depicted in an international context. This can be seen from Indonesian principals’ wide range of duties and roles as depicted in the Professional Standards which gives more emphasis to instructional leadership of principals. However, there is a paradoxical message in the regulation of Indonesian principals where on one hand it is mentioned that the role of the principal is complex with many areas of duties and competences. On other hand, the regulation defines principals as teachers with “an additional responsibility” of leading a school which seems to simplify the role itself.

This paradoxical message of Indonesian principalship has resulted in the confusion of principals in performing their role because in one hand they are faced with many demands and regulations from the central government through complex appraisal instruments, on the other hand they are not provided with enough support and development because principalship is still not fully considered as an important and strategic position in the policy context of principalship in Indonesia. The confusion about their role, experienced by principals, has implications for the effectiveness of the appraisal of principals. This is because the role defines the performance areas to be appraised.

b) Purposes of principal appraisal in the Landak region

Regarding the purposes of principal appraisal, all the four principals in this study expressed that the principal appraisal process in the Landak region is geared more
toward a developmental and assistance purpose rather than an accountability purpose where principals interpreted development in a limited way as getting practical assistance to cope with the role. However, the superintendents in the study argued that the principal appraisals they conducted served the dual purposes of appraisal. Thus, there is a difference in the perceptions of the participants regarding the purposes of principal appraisal in the Landak region. This difference in the perceptions of principal appraisal has caused principals to take their appraisal trivially because they thought their appraisal outcome would not affect their career and promotion. Because of the principal’s perceptions of appraisal was only for developmental purposes, this could also make them ignore the appraisal process so that there was lack of openness and commitment in the appraisal. This makes appraisal of principal a mere document-checking activity.

c) Practices of principal appraisal in the Landak region

This study argues that most of the principals in the Landak region feel their appraisal process is still a mere tick-box activity with few mid-year processes to collect data and evidence from the principals. This study also found that principal appraisal in Landak is a formality to meet the demands of bureaucracy. In addition, it can be argued that principal appraisal in the Landak region may not have affected principal performance because the appraisal was perceived to serve more as a tool of control and bureaucracy. This makes principal appraisal is a compliance-driven process where principals are required to fill in appraisal instruments to comply with the regulations and this could make the appraisal of principal ineffective because of the absence of openness, commitment and trust in practice. Further, principals in the Landak region felt that their appraisal is not directly linked to their professional development because professional development programmes are given sporadically based on the consideration of the Local Education Authority by another institution called The Education Quality Assurance Institute which is directly under the Ministry of Education. This separation of functions of appraisal purposes where accountability lies in the Local Education Authority and developmental purpose lies in the Education Quality
Assurance Institute has caused a mismatch in the training and development of principals and superintendents which do not meet their needs to improve performance. This separation of function creates confusion in the efforts of principalship development in Indonesia because there is no evidence that their principal appraisal outcome by Local Education Authority is used as the basis of the principal development programme provided by the Education Quality Assurance Institute.

**Recommendations**

These study findings have prompted me to provide recommendations to the concerned parties in the principal appraisal in Indonesia, namely the Local Education Authority, the superintendents and the principals, in order for all to be more effective.

**Recommendation to the Local Education Authority**

The formal description of the principal’s role should make it clear that this is an instructional leadership and strategic role rather than just an additional duty for a teacher to lead schools. The Local Education Authority needs to monitor the process of principal appraisal by paying more attention to the process of appraisal through discussion, guidance and training for the superintendents to improve their competence and effectiveness in appraising principals through the Head of Secondary Education Division.

**Recommendation to the superintendents**

There is a need for superintendents to be open and trustworthy in the process of principal appraisal by regularly visiting the schools and having a productive dialogue with principals so that the appraisal process is not a mere document checking activity. The superintendents need to be more active and clear in communicating the process of appraisal to the principals so that both principals
and superintendents have the same understanding and commitment to the process of appraisal.

**Recommendation to the principals and superintendents**

Principals and superintendents need to place important on values of commitment, openness and trust in the process of appraisal so that appraisal is not seen as a mere formality and can in reality become a developmental activity. The principals are recommended to work together regularly with the superintendents through productive dialogues in the process of appraisal so that it can result in an improved performance.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Since this study was conducted with a small number of participants, it could only portray some perspectives of principal appraisal in the region. However, I have a hunch that some other local districts might face the same issues in conducting principal appraisal. There is a need to conduct further research with larger numbers of participants from each separate perspective or on different topics as follows:

- A large-scale study involving many principals at the provincial level to uncover their principal appraisal issues related to purposes, practices and challenges of principal appraisal so that a wider perspective can be taken from the findings.

- A large-scale research involving all the superintendents at the provincial level and the Education Quality Assurance Institute staff members who train superintendents and principals in relation to the principal appraisal issues related to purposes, practices and challenges of principal appraisal.

- A research study which investigates the instruments of principal appraisal in detail in terms of what skills are more emphasised and how those areas are assessed in the instruments.
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Appendix A – Interview Schedule

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PRINCIPALS

The Nature of Performance Appraisal for Principals in Landak region of Indonesia

DATE: _________________________________

INTERVIEWEE: _________________________________

POSITION: _________________________________

INTERVIEWER: _________________________________

Role and Responsibilities

1. Where is your role and main responsibilities as a principal described?

   The role of principal is first to become an educator. The second is manager and third is administrator and fourth is supervisor and finally is a motivator. Principals' duty is to manage everything to achieve the goals of education stated in ministerial decree No 20 Year 2014

2. As a principal, who are the people interested in the way you perform your role and responsibilities?

3. Officially, to whom do you believe you are accountable?
4. Where do you look for support and development to perform your role?

5. What kind of support and development are provided and is that linked to your appraisal?

6. Which areas in your role is important? Can you list five main areas of your roles?

**Appraisal experiences**

7. In your opinion, what is the purpose of your appraisal?

8. How do you get appraised by superintendents?
   a. How often are you appraised?
   b. How is it organised?
   c. Why is it useful?
   d. What do you find difficult in appraisal?

9. Has appraisal review had an impact on your job and performance?

10. How has your performance appraisal informed professional development needs?

11. What can you suggest to improve the effectiveness of your performance appraisal?

12. Is there any issue you want to add regarding your process of appraisal that matters to you?

Thank you very much for your valuable time to contribute informative information, answers, and comments to this interview.
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SUPERINTENDENTS

The Nature of Performance Appraisal for Principals in Landak region of Indonesia

DATE: ______________________________________________
INTERVIEWEE: _________________________________________
POSITION ______________________________________________
INTERVIEWER: __________________________________________

Role and responsibilities

1. What are your role and main responsibilities as a superintendent in relation to the appraisal of principals and where is it described?

   There is a wide range of superintendent’s duties and one of them is to appraise principals through school supervision to appraise the competences of principal covering personality, social, leadership, academic and entrepreneurship areas

2. As a superintendent, who are the people interested in the way you perform your role in appraising principals?

3. Which areas of your role and responsibilities do you feel successful in appraising principals?

4. Which part of your appraisal role and responsibilities are difficult for you?

5. Officially, to whom do you believe you are accountable to?
6. Where do you look for support and development in appraising principals?

7. Which areas in your appraisal roles are important? Can you rank them into priorities?

**Appraisers’ experiences**

8. In your opinion, what is the purpose of conducting appraisal for principals?

9. How do you appraise school principals?
   
   a. How often are principals appraised?
   
   b. How is it organised?
   
   c. Why is it useful?
   
   d. What do you find difficult in appraisal?
   
   e. What aspects do you look for when appraising principals?

10. Has your appraisal review had an impact on principals’ job and performance?

11. What can you suggest to improve the effectiveness of principals’ performance appraisal?

12. Is there any issue you want to add regarding principals’ appraisal that matters to you?

Thank you very much for your valuable time to contribute informative information, answers, and comments to this interview.
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Consent Form – Adult Participants

Research Event: Individual Interview

Researcher: Kristian

Programme: Master of Educational Leadership and Management

Thesis Title: The Nature of Performance Appraisal for Principals in Landak region of Indonesia.

Participant’s consent

I have been given and have understood an explanation of this research and I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered. I understand that neither my name nor the name of my organisation will be used in any public reports.

I also understand that I will be provided with a transcript of the interview for verification and that I may withdraw myself or any information that has been provided for this project up to two weeks after the return/confirmation of my verified transcript.

I agree to take part in this project.
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