

Adult Basic Education Teachers' Experiences about the Cascade Model of Training: An Appreciative Inquiry

Mpho M. Dichaba

*College of Education, University of South Africa (Unisa), P. O. Box 392,
Pretoria, 0003, South Africa
E-mail: dichamm@unisa.ac.za*

KEYWORDS Cascade Model. Department of Education. Appreciative Inquiry. Transmissive Mode of Training. Misinterpretation of Information

ABSTRACT This article discusses the effectiveness of Appreciative Inquiry as a model to improve employee performance. The article describes Appreciative Inquiry and then looks at its use in the in-service training of Adult Basic Education teachers using the cascade model. Rather than focusing on the shortcomings of the cascade model, Appreciative Inquiry was used as a tool to focus on the positives that exist in it. A qualitative research design was used to ascertain the experiences of teachers regarding the effectiveness of the cascade model. Interviews were conducted with purposively selected four Adult Basic Education teachers. Therefore, this study adopted two phases of Appreciative Inquiry to research the hopes and dreams of Adult Basic Education teachers about their in-service training using the cascade model of training. From the success stories of Adult Basic Education teachers, the article recommends strategies to accelerate the effectiveness of the cascade model.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Recent research studies have shown a growing interest in use of the Cascade Model of Training as the most likely tool to address the training needs of teachers. The South African Department of Education is no exception. The cascade model of training seems to be preferred by the Department of Education because of its cost effectiveness and it also uses existing staff as co-trainers (McDevitt 1998). This means that the cascade model of training is economical in the sense that a package of material is prepared and delivered to the first level of recipients, who in turn are trained to deliver the same package to the next level (More 2004). Although this tool is regarded as the most suitable to develop a large number of teachers in a short period of time, thereby saving the government funds, it is not immune to criticism. The period between the cascades, the quality of presentations and the messages delivered may contribute to the deteriorating quality of the model. For example, Jansen (2003), drawing on the case studies of curriculum change in South Africa, observes that although curriculum policy is developed and promulgated by central government, it is subject to various interpretations as it moves through the system to the classroom. This interpretive drift impedes the flexibility of the cascades.

Notwithstanding these limitations, the cascade model is still used predominantly (Frame

2003; Graham-Jolly 2003; Jansen and Middlewood 2003) As South Africa continues to be plagued by curriculum changes, the skills of a large number of teachers in the North West province of South Africa need to be developed through in-service training. In addition, serious measures need to be employed in order to find effective strategies to provide efficient in-service training. It could be that the cascade model of training, despite its shortcomings, may be the most effective solution.

Objectives of the Study

This study adopts two phases of Appreciative Inquiry theory to find out about the hopes and dreams of Adult Basic Education teachers about their in-service training using the cascade model of training. The Appreciative Inquiry theoretical research perspective emphasises a search for what is good and sought to identify experiences when people or organisations are at their best (Cooperrider et al. 2003). Rather than focusing on the flaws of the cascade model, the study focused on two questions. Firstly, what are the positive experiences of teachers regarding the cascade model of their in-service training discovery phase, and secondly, what strategies may be introduced to accelerate the effectiveness of the cascade model – the dreaming phase?

This is achieved by providing a summary of the cascade model of training based on the lit-

erature review, followed by a discussion of the theoretical framework of this study, namely, appreciative inquiry. The research design is presented, followed by the findings of the positive views and experiences of Adult Basic Education teachers regarding their in-service training using the cascade model. This article concludes with a proposed framework for effective in-service training, and guidelines based on intervention mechanisms for providing effective in-service training for teachers.

Cascade Model of Training

The major concept underlying cascade training is that of critical information flowing from one group to another until it reaches its final destination (Jacobs and Russ-Eft 2001: 496). It has been particularly influential in industry, space exploration, military applications and agriculture. For instance, the first reported use of the cascade model was to implement the Job Instruction Training (JIT) programmes as part of the Training Within Industry (TWI) effort during the Second World War (Jacobs et al. 2001: 180). According to Dooley in Jacobs et al. (2001: 180), plant managers were trained by TWI staff on the need for effective technical training in their organisation. In turn, these individuals were expected to train their line managers on the issue, and they in turn helped their supervisors become On-the Job (OTJ) trainers. In the end, supervisors were expected to deliver the technical training through OTJ to production employees (Jacobs et al. 2001: 180). In this article, the cascade model of training means that the National Department of Education trains the provincial personnel; they then arrange two- to three-day workshops to train the district officials, who are charged with the responsibility of training selected educators; and they in turn are expected to train their colleagues at Adult Basic Education centres to be able to implement the changes required within the system. This is what McDevitt (1998: 425) refers to as a system of dissemination that ensures that what is produced at the top filters down effectively to the base.

The cascade model is widely used to maximise throughput of trainee educators in a cost-effective manner (Hayes 2000: 137–138; Bax 2002: 165). In essence, the cascade model of training means that training messages flow

down from experts and specialists, through several tiers of personnel and eventually to the educators (Masheshwari and Raina 1998: 92). Cascade training offers a logical approach to disseminating this information through the ranks of employees in a relatively short period of time (Jacobs and Russ-Eft 2001: 498).

Although this model of training has come to be accepted as the way of disseminating information in most in-service training programmes, it appears to have failed significantly to improve the performance of teachers. For instance, Chisholm (2000: 4) and Janse van Rensburg and Mhoney (2000: 45) posit that cascading of information results in dilution and misinterpretation of crucial information. This occurs because less and less is understood as one goes down the cascade. Concentration of expertise is at the top level of the cascade where the knowledgeable people of the cascade tend to use a purely transmissive mode of training at all levels.

The model has been widely criticised as inadequate for delivering effective in-service training. Teacher development within the sort of technical paradigm evident in the official cascade model for Curriculum 2005 has been rejected by a number of theorists, including Fullan (1993), Hoyle and John (1995), Kemmis and McTaggard (2000), Southwood (2000) and Hargreaves (2004). The main weakness of this strategy is the dilution that invariably takes place when the training design is passed down the various levels of personnel. The prime cause of failure of the cascade model of training is the concentration of expertise at the topmost level of the model, allied to a purely transmissive mode of training. Once the cascade model of training has been set in motion, it is difficult to view it as anything but a one-way transmission (McDevitt 1998). Its tendency of using trainers drawn from successive tiers of the cascade also has potential disadvantages, the foremost being dilution of the training; that is, less and less is understood the further one goes down the cascade (Hayes 2000).

Some disastrous consequences of the application of the cascade model are evident in the abortive attempts at implementing Curriculum 2005 in South Africa (More 2004). The Governmental Report of the Review Committee that was presented to the Minister of Education in May 2000 was highly critical of the cascade model (Bax 2002). The review noted that it

failed to prepare either officials or school-based teachers for the complexity of Curriculum 2005 implementation. In the first instance, the cascade of information resulted in the watering down and/or misinterpretation of crucial information (Chisholm 2000; Janse van Rensburg and Mhoney 2000). Secondly, trainers lacked confidence, knowledge and understanding to manage the training process (Taylor and Vinjevold 1999; Chisholm 2000).

In the context of "The Learning for the Sustainability Project in South Africa", curriculum developers did not seem to have confidence to conduct workshops with teachers except when they were fulfilling a dissemination of information function by informing teachers of the technical requirements for curriculum implementation (Lotz-Sisitka and Janse van Rensburg 2000). In the same vein, the Review Commission on Curriculum 2005 emphasised that the District trainers did not understand Curriculum 2005, with the result that they did not use its principles in their own methodology of training (DoE 2000). Notably, one of the biggest problems of the cascade model seems to be the lack of transfer of learning. In this case many trainees, even if they have effectively learnt the competencies, they, however, refrain from using them on the job (Harris 2000). For instance, teachers may be ready to train their colleagues at the centre level but the circumstances and fear of not being able to answer all sorts of questions from them may make the trainee reluctant to transfer information from the training to their colleagues.

Theoretical Framework: Appreciative Inquiry

Proponents of Appreciative Inquiry focus on "positive aspects of human nature and development as the catalysts for organizational change" (Lehner and Hight 2006: 142). In their seminal work, Cooperrider and Srivasta (1987) developed the Appreciative Inquiry technique which positively focuses on what works well in organisations or situations (Lewis and Van Tiem 2004: 440). Appreciative Inquiry builds on the "positive psychology of Seligman in the late 1990s" (Billings and Kowalski 2008: 104) which "is a research perspective, research method and world view" (Calbrese et al. 2007: 278).

The Appreciative Inquiry model consists of a "Four Ds" cycle. *Discovery* is the first phase

and entails an appreciation of what currently exists, "the best of what has been and what is" (Dunlap 2008: 26; Lehner and Hight 2006: 143; Schutt 2007: 23). In this phase, the aim is to "build on the positive core" (Schutt 2007: 27) by expecting participants to explain their personal perception of a particular phenomenon in their situation or organisation (Elleven 2007: 451), in this case the current school climate. The second phase, called the *Dreaming phase*, entails imagining what could be and attempting to envision the results after new strategies have been implemented (Dunlap 2008: 26; Elleven 2007: 451; Schutt 2007: 23). In short, this phase involves the creation of a new vision for the future (Lehner and Hight 2006: 145). The other two phases, namely the *design* (what should be) (Schutt 2007; Dunlap 2008) and the *destiny* (creating what will be) (Bushe and Kassam 2005; Schutt 2007), could be the focus of further studies once participants have intentionally implemented certain aspects of the Appreciative Inquiry model in their practice.

Appreciative Inquiry therefore involves transferring learning to build a bridge between "the best of what is and the best of what might be" (Trosten-Bloom and Whitney 2003: 205). And elsewhere Boyd and Bright (2007) note that Appreciative Inquiry differs from usual methods of organisational change by focusing on the positive rather than seeking solutions to problems. Walker and Carr-Stewart (2004: 73) succinctly provide the eight assumptions of Appreciative Inquiry. The assumptions are:

- In every society, organisation or group, something works;
- What we focus on becomes our reality;
- Reality is created in the moment, and there are multiple realities;
- The act of asking questions of an organisation or group influences the group in some way;
- People have more confidence and comfort to journey to the future (the unknown) when they carry forward parts of the past (the known); and
- If we carry parts of the past forward, they should be the best about the past. It is important to value differences. The language we use creates our reality.

Therefore, the Appreciative Inquiry is effective in shifting an organisation's perceived work environment because it builds relationships be-

tween participants and creates an opportunity for everyone to express their organisational vision and be heard (Trosten-Bloom and Whitney 2003).

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This study is qualitative in nature. Recent research studies have provided evidence of a growing interest in using the narrative approach as a research design (Goodson 2009; Heikkinen et al. 2002). This study employed narrative inquiry-based research approach to gain a richer and deeper understanding of views through narratives (Bathmaker and Harnett 2010). Appreciative Inquiry, as its name implies, opens up a dialogue by inquiring (Adams et al. 2004). It is a narrative-based process of positive change (Cooperider and Whitney 2005: 15). This study therefore used narratives because they helped to have a deeper understanding of the experiences of the five purposively selected Adult Basic Education teachers in respect of the cascade model of training, that is, what was working, what they liked about the training and what would they do differently to accelerate the effectiveness of the cascade model.

Appreciative semi-structured interviews were conducted with four Adult Basic Education teachers. Appreciative interview questions create a provocative connection between diverse groups of people and agendas to realise one shared vision (Whitney and Trosten-Bloom 2003). Participants were informed how the Appreciative Inquiry framework works. Each participant was asked to reflect about the processes of their in-service training. The interviews were conducted at their workplaces. The interview covered the discovery phase, that is, the best of what exists in the cascade model and the dreaming phase, which involves creating a new future. These narratives were then organised thematically before they were analysed in a two-phase process, the discovery phase and the dreaming phase. These themes were subsequently used by the researcher to provide guidelines for possible mechanisms to achieve positive results in the use of the cascade model of training. Fictitious names were used in this study to protect the confidentiality of these teachers.

The teachers were promised that the information they provided would be kept confiden-

tial and that anonymity would be maintained by using fictitious names instead of their real names. The subsequent discussion looks into the findings with special reference to the positive views and experiences of Adult Basic Education teachers regarding their in-service training using the cascade model and the framework for effective in-service training.

FINDINGS

The findings were extrapolated from transcripts of Adult Basic Education teachers' interviews. Each theme was discussed according to the summary of findings and interpretation of literature. The discovery phase discovered the best of what exists in the cascade model and the dreaming phase involved creating a new future.

The Discovery Phase

The following categories were identified in the discovery phase: collaborative competence and context-sensitive training strategies.

Collaborative Competence

Collaborative competence was a critical theme identified in the analysis. The Appreciative Inquiry discovery phase brings people together and is an important step toward tapping the positive core of the organisation (Sekerka et al. 2001). The Adult Basic Education teachers were asked to tell a story of when they experienced the cascade model at its best (what they did, how they felt). This is how they responded:

Caly: The in-service trainers had the necessary skills to present materials that encourage learning. I never thought I had it in me to be a trainer; thanks to the trainer who used the cascade model and encouraged us to train our colleagues wearing a "trainer cap", now I see myself as a trainer and since then I have gained confidence not only as a content specialist but as a trainer as well.

The above assertion resonates with Carr-Stewart's (2004) assumption about the Appreciative Inquiry that people have more confidence in journeying to the future (the unknown) when they carry forward parts of the past (the known). The emerging trend here is that the possession of appropriate and relevant knowledge and skills on the part of the trainers involved can promote

effective training and transfer of learning. Training is only successful when participants have learnt, and learning happens when participants can recall the skills and abilities that were taught and put them to work on the job.

Context-sensitive Training Strategies

For the cascade model to be effective, the in-service training itself must be appropriate for the person and the situation. In order to provide the most appropriate training at all levels of the cascade, in-service training strategies are informed by continuing examination of the training and learning context and are sensitive to emerging contextual features. A more context-sensitive training strategy is trainee centred.

Thabo: *The training gave me opportunity to meet with other colleagues from different areas and we were able to share ideas on our challenges in the Adult Basic Education and Training centres and how to combat those challenges. The fact that we were bringing our different experiences to training session enhanced my subject knowledge and sharing with other colleagues boosted my self-esteem. We learnt so much from each other. When I conducted training at my centre, I was able to come up with initiatives and I had all the answers to the questions my colleagues asked, thanks to the expert information I learnt from my colleagues in other centres.*

The power of Appreciative Inquiry as a large-scale positive change intervention is demonstrated in the above assertion. This shows team spirit where teachers collaborate with team members, share their experiences and support each other in the process of continuous development. This resonates with Walker and Carr-Stewart's (2004) assumptions of Appreciative Inquiry that people journey to the future (the unknown) with more confidence and comfort when they carry forward parts of the past (the known).

Neo: *I had a chance to meet colleagues from different centres, something that is rare because our centres are widely scattered and we always find ourselves isolated in our little corners not knowing what to do. I have learnt how to use my creativity to teach adults with the limited resources we have.*

Tony: *We were equipped with more knowledge and imparting that information to our fel-*

low colleagues trained us and made us more confident to practise it in our classrooms.

From the assertions, it emerges that the discovery phase allowed teachers to have a more positive impact in their respective centres. The process of asking people to think about and share the "best of" their organisational experiences with a fellow organisation member appears to energise participants (Sekerka and Cooperrider 2001). Training is only successful when participants have learnt, and learning happens when participants can recall the skills and abilities that were taught and put them to work on the job.

The Dreaming Phase

This is the phase where Adult Basic Education teachers envision the future of the cascade model of in-service training based on what they learned in the discovery phase. According to Whitney and Trosten-Bloom (2003), stakeholders use these dreams to inform a design through the development of a set of "provocative propositions", which are statements about "what should be". Furthermore, the in-service trainers need to receive constant feedback from the teachers, so that both the trainers and the trainees could reflect on the outcomes of the training, thereby addressing the question of whether the training achieved the set goals and objectives.

In the dreaming phase, the following themes were identified: using work-related situations when training, training needs analysis, involvement in the planning, adequate support systems, clearly formulated objectives and gaps between trainings.

Using Work-related Situations When Training Adult Basic Education Teachers

Trainers of adults need to update and improve their existing skills and attitudes and acquire new ones that will enhance their ability to deal with different challenges that accompany adult training (Moore 2000: 127). In order to provide clear in-service objectives that relate to work practices, it is important for in-service trainers to understand the day-to-day operations of the Adult Basic Education sector. This requires knowledge of the teaching and learning processes within the Adult Basic Education cen-

tres and an understanding of the procedures most requiring change. If the objective of in-service training is the transfer of knowledge and skills to the trainees' workplace, the trainer must be familiar with Adult Basic Education Training operational procedure.

Caly: *We need to refocus training on what is appropriate, to use better educational methods and support training with coordinated work. I learn best when I am motivated, when my daily experience is taken into consideration and when I am encouraged to participate actively in the discussions during training. Strategies that emphasise learning by doing and problem solving are key in building competencies I need.*

From this assertion, we see that the Adult Basic Education teachers felt that there was a need to move towards positive change. In telling their stories, the Adult Basic Education teachers see themselves as being able to make a difference in their in-service training using the cascade model. It is important to note that adult learning theories often talk of the importance of motivation in learning. Literature suggests that for the cascade model of training to function effectively, the training must be experiential in nature with maximum participation by trainees. For effective in-service training for Adult Basic Education teachers, Hargreaves (2004: 2) suggests that the support systems that educators most require are: support systems for training, mentoring, time and dialogue, and that these are essential to successful change management. Giving relevant examples of how new learning can be applied to trainees' jobs and incorporating a variety of classroom activities and assessment methods that support transfer of learning in training are techniques which can be used by in-service trainers.

Training Needs Analysis

Training needs analysis implies that before engaging in training, it is important to consider what the in-service training is expected to achieve, what kinds of people will be the most effective trainers and whether the training needs of the Adult Basic Education teachers (who are uninformed and unskilled) are considered a threat to the optimal performance of the in-service training programme.

Thabo: *Training often fails when it targets the wrong people, or teaches the wrong con-*

tent. Training needs analysis must be conducted to find out who needs training and on what. The content and examples given in training must be relevant to our daily work. Trainers must give us relevant examples of how new training can be applied to my job. The quality of the training material has to be high. It must incorporate classroom activities and assessment techniques that can be used. For effective cascading of knowledge and skills, each in-service training session must be designed afresh, based on past experience as well as the training needs of teachers, our situations and our backgrounds.

Tony: *The training needs analysis should precede any attempt at making use of the training model. It should be properly taken care of in good time before the actual training commences. It is important to consider what the in-service training is expected to achieve.*

From the responses, it seems that Adult Basic Education teachers felt that in order to provide clear in-service objectives that relate to work practices, it is important for in-service trainers to understand the day-to-day operations of the Adult Basic Education sector. This requires knowledge of the teaching and learning processes within the Adult Basic Education centres and an understanding of the procedures most requiring change. If the objective of in-service training is the transfer of knowledge and skills to the trainees' workplace, the trainer must be familiar with Adult Basic Education operational procedure. If the in-service trainer ignores these needs, it is unlikely that the trainees will learn anything, which consequently means that knowledge of trainees' needs is a prerequisite for adult learning and training.

Involvement in the Planning of the Training Programme

Both adult learning and constructivism guidelines suggest that Adult Basic Education teachers should be given responsibility for shaping their own programmes, because if they believe that they have control over the learning situation, they will be more willing to take risks in learning new knowledge and skills. The adult learner is described as having a clear sense of purpose and the ability to be more involved in the in-service training (Knowles et al. 2005).

Neo: *for the cascade model to be effective, we need to be involved in the planning of our training. Needs assessment (what we really*

need to be trained on) need to be conducted by the Department. And for effective cascading of skills, competent trainers need to be carefully selected for their understanding of the particular knowledge and skills which are to be transferred. Trainers need to be experienced in both theory and practice of what is to be imparted to trainees.

From the statement above, it can be concluded that the involvement of Adult Basic Education teachers in the planning of their training will promote a common vision of in-service training and that the possession of appropriate and relevant knowledge and skills on the part of the trainers can promote effective training and transfer of learning. The response endorses the use of the cascade model and the contention that adults bring numerous life and work experiences, needs and learning styles to their learning, which is shaped by their perspectives on learning, education and professional development.

Adequate Support Systems

Many attempts at training fail because the in-service trainers underestimate the importance of ongoing support after training. It is necessary for in-service trainers to visit their trainees at their respective centres after training in order to identify factors that accelerate and those that inhibit the effectiveness of the cascade model of training.

Tony: *Each trainer must be given enough time to be well prepared before transferring knowledge to the next level. At least five days instead of two days must be set aside for training to give trainees time to understand and absorb the knowledge and skills imparted during training and to be able to ask questions. Monitoring and evaluation by expert trainers in each level of the cascade must be established to ensure that the intended procedures and information reach the intended beneficiaries. Regular supervision should be maintained by trainers in different trainee centres to ensure the flow of training information and accountability when trainees impart what they have learnt in training to their fellow colleagues.*

Caly: *The in-service trainers should do class visits in order to be able to identify challenges that ABE teachers experience when implementing the changes that the in-service trainers have taken them through.*

From the voice of the teachers it is clear that effective monitoring and review processes are highly effective in helping trainees develop their skills for training their colleagues at the centres. The best practice of post-training monitoring is for in-service trainers to review how the trainees progress, that is, whether trainees have cascaded what they were expected to cascade to their fellow colleagues.

Clearly Formulated Objectives and Gaps Between Trainings

Once the training needs have been identified, measurable objectives must be set and the design must be mapped out. The objectives define in detail what type of training is required to improve job performance. To develop the design plan, objectives should be used to guide the trainer through the process of choosing an approach to meet the objectives. On this aspect, the Adult Basic Education teachers explained:

Thabo: *When teachers train their fellow colleagues, they need to show a high level of commitment and the quality of training at the centres must be maintained. To accelerate the effectiveness of the cascade model, clear and unambiguous training objectives need to be spelt out in order to avoid misinterpretations of information in different levels of the cascade.*

Neo: *If the gaps between the trainings of different levels are minimised and the smooth stream of the cascade is assured, the quality of its function will be improved and its efficiency can be increased. This hope needs to be continually nurtured by moving forward with use of the tool.*

The above assertions indicate that well-designed programmes often fail because lessons learnt are not used and are soon forgotten, and that there is training loss due to the time gaps between the training of the various levels. Therefore, the in-service training objectives should give opportunities for practice and self-learning, and the theory that is presented in the in-service training should give rise to practise and the relationship between these two should always be clear.

DISCUSSION

This article recognises the transfer problems regarding the cascade model of training, includ-

ing the identification of factors that facilitate or impede the effectiveness of transfer of learning in most in-service training programmes. The results of this study suggest that individuals engaged in Appreciative Inquiry focusing appreciatively on their organisation – became less negative, more relaxed and less stressed (Sekerka 2002). This statement is in harmony with Hayes (2000: 138) when he indicated that it is not the cascade model per se that is the problem, but the manner in which it is often implemented (Hayes 2000: 138). From the stories of the Adult Basic Education teachers, it can be argued that the success of the cascade model depends on the positive reaction of trainees (teachers) towards in-service training. This concurs with current trends that call for teacher professional development to occur through reflection on and learning from practice rather than coercive interventions (Knight et al. 2006). As a result of these findings, it emerged that there was a need for more structured in-service training of teachers with the element of Appreciative Inquiry if the cascade model of training was to be effective. The Appreciative Inquiry process allowed the Adult Basic Education teachers to identify their needs. For instance, the inquiry made the Adult Basic Education teachers see the importance of collaborating with each other. It also identified the importance of sharing and recalling success stories about the in-service training they attended. The findings suggest that the Appreciative Inquiry has the potential to improve the flaws of the cascade model of training.

CONCLUSION

This article looked at the success stories of the cascade model of training in the in-service training of Adult Basic Education teachers using the Appreciative Inquiry. Using the Appreciative Inquiry approach helped improve the attitudes and morale of Adult Basic Education teachers, allowing them to grapple with issues and face challenges of the cascade model of training from a positive perspective. Since the findings of this study was largely confined to Adult Basic Education teachers in the North West province of South Africa who were involved in in-service training and who were expected to cascade what they learnt in training to their colleagues at their centres, the findings

may not be generalisable to the South African education sector. As anticipated, the Adult Basic Education teachers focused only on the positives of the cascade model; this garnered useful findings.

Before Adult Basic Education teachers could appreciate the cascade model, they started raising negative issues about the model, that is, what is not working about the model, but I encouraged them to capture the moment when things were working at their best during the training. The findings in this article have the potential to contribute to the areas of study that focus on the in-service training of teachers. There are many success stories as indicated by the Adult Basic Education teachers; among others, the peer support system increased the possibility of adequate transfer of knowledge from the training environment to the workplace. In this case, the quality of the cascade function will be improved and its efficiency can be increased. The Appreciative Inquiry reported in this article provided a platform to facilitate Adult Basic Education teachers to share their success stories in their in-service training. Using Appreciative Inquiry can provide the empowering environment for application of the cascade model in Adult Basic Education teacher training.

RECOMMENDATIONS: THE DREAMING PHASE

The Adult Basic teachers' stories demonstrated that by using Appreciative Inquiry, the effectiveness of the cascade model can be ensured through its empowerment of staff. A well-constructed, practical, participatory workshop can be an empowering means of introducing new ideas in the in-service training using the cascade model. The success stories of Adult Basic teachers showed that delving into their already existing experience in the in-service training using the cascade model of training has a better possibility of encouraging them to envision the future.

Thus training designers must carefully develop training materials that target the specific contents consistently and coherently while indicating the clear ideal models and goals based on the needs of real classrooms. In order to create the smooth flow of the cascade, the path between layers must be cleared without any gaps between the training providers and training en-

vironment. The targeted trainees must also be selected carefully, instead of including every teacher, including those who may not need the training. If the training achieves these conditions, the cascading path will be cleared without any obstacles to prevent messages from smoothly flowing down. Furthermore, it is clear from the narratives of the teachers that when adequate monitoring is in place, there is a greater chance of ensuring the smooth stream of the cascade. Then the cascade model using the Appreciative Inquiry can be a great potential tool to make classroom practice change.

REFERENCES

- Adams MG, Schiller M, Cooperrider DL 2004. With our questions we make the world. In: A Bathmaker, P Harnett 2010. *Exploring Learning, Identity, and Power Through Life History and Narrative Research*. United Kingdom: Taylor and Francis Ltd.
- Bax S 2002. The social and cultural dimensions of trainer training. *Journal of Education and Teaching*, 28: 165-178.
- Billings DM, Kowalski K 2008. Appreciative inquiry. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*, 39(3): 104.
- Boyd NM, Bright DS 2007. Appreciative inquiry as a mode of action research for community psychology. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 25: 1019-1036.
- Bushe GR, Kassam AF 2005. When is appreciative inquiry transformational? A meta-case analysis. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Sciences*, 41(2): 161-181.
- Calbrese RL, Hummel C, Martin TS 2007. Learning to appreciate at-risk students: Challenging the beliefs and attitudes of teachers and administrators. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 21(4): 275-291.
- Chisholm L 2000. *Report of the Review Committee on Curriculum 2005: South African Curriculum for the Twenty First Century*. Pretoria: Ministry of Education.
- Cooperrider DL, Srivasta S 1987. Appreciative inquiry in an organizational life. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 1: 129-169.
- Cooperrider DL, Whitney D 2005. *Appreciative Inquiry: A Positive Revolution in Change*. San Francisco, California: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Cooperrider DL, Whitney D, Stavros JM 2003. *Appreciative Inquiry Handbook*. Bedford Heights, OH: Lakeshore Publishers.
- Department of Education 2000. *A South African Curriculum for the 21st Century. Report of the Review Committee on Curriculum 2005*. Pretoria: Department of Education.
- Dunlap CA 2008. Effective evaluation through appreciative inquiry. *Performance Improvement*, 47(2): 23-29.
- Elleven KR 2007. Appreciative inquiry: A model for organizational development and performance improvement in student affairs. *Education*, 127(4): 451-465.
- Frame J 2003. Theorising curriculum. In: M Coleman, M Graham-Jolly, D Middlewood (Eds.): *Managing the Curriculum in South African Schools*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat, pp.17-35.
- Fullan M 1993. *Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reform*. London: Falmer.
- Graham-Jolly M 2003. The nature of curriculum. In: M Coleman, M Graham-Jolly, D Middlewood (Eds.): *Managing the Curriculum in South African Schools*. London: The Commonwealth Secretariat, pp.3-17.
- Goodson IF 2000. Social histories of educational change. *Journal of Educational Change*, 2 (1): 4-63.
- Harris H 2000. *Defining the Future or Relieving the Past? Unions, Employers, and the Challenge of Workplace Learning: Information Series No 380*. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, US Department of Education, Washington D.C.
- Hayes D 2000. Cascade and training teacher's professional development. *English Language Journal*, 54(2): 135-145.
- Hoyle E, John P 1995. *Professional Knowledge and Professional Practice*. London: Cassell.
- Heikkinen H, Huttunen R, Syrjala L (Eds.) 2002. *Biographical Research and Narrativity: Stories of Teachers and Philosophers*. Jyväskylä, Finland: SoPhi Press.
- Jacobs RL, Russ-Eft D, Zidan S 2001. Cascade Training and Institutionalizing Organizational Change through Cascade Training: Implications for HRD Research. In: O Aliaga (Ed.): *Proceedings of the 2001 Annual Conference of the Academy of Human Resource Development*. Baton Rouge, LA: Academy of Human Resource Development, pp. 435-439.
- Jansen JD 2003. On the politics of policy: State and curriculum after apartheid. In: CJ Craig 2006. Why is dissemination so difficult? The nature of teacher knowledge and the spread of curriculum reform. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(2): 257-293.
- Jansen JD, Middlewood D 2003. From policy to action: Issues of curriculum management at school level. In: M Coleman, M Graham-Jolly, D Middlewood (Eds.): *Managing the Curriculum in South African School*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat, pp. 49-65.
- Janse van Rensburg E, Mhoney K 2000. The spiral model of learning for sustainability. In: E Janse van Rensburg, H Lotz Sisitka (Eds.): *Learning for Sustainability: An Environmental Education Professional Development Case Study Informing Policy and Practice*. Johannesburg: Learning for Sustainability Project, pp. 41-69.
- Kemmis S, McTaggart R 2000. Participatory action research. In: NK Denzin, YS Lincoln (Eds.): *Handbook for Qualitative Research*. 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp. 567-607.
- Knight P, Tait J, Yorke M 2006. The professional learning of teachers in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31 (3): 319-339.
- Knowles M, Holton EF, Swanson RA 2005. *The Adult Learner: The Definitive Classic in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*. San Diego: Elsevier Inc.
- Lehner R, Hight DL 2006. Appreciative inquiry and student affairs: A positive approach to change. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 25(2): 141-151
- Lewis J, Van Tiem D 2004. Appreciative inquiry: A view of a glass half full. *Performance Improvement*, 43(8): 19-15.
- Lotz-Sisitka H, Janse van Rensburg E 2000. *Learning for Sustainability - Contextual Profile*. Johannesburg: Interfund.

- Maheshwari A, Raina V 1998. Interactive video technology: An Indian experience. *International Review of Education*, 44(1): 87-101.
- McDevitt D 1998. How effective is the cascade as a method of disseminating ideas? A study in Botswana. *International Journal Development*, 18 (5): 425-428.
- More DD 2004. *The Impact of Large Scale Training Programmes on Educational Management Development in South Africa*. PhD Thesis, Published. University of Pretoria, South Africa.
- Moore A 2000. *Recognition of Prior Learning in a Contemporary South African Context: A Non Formal Educational Approach*. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Schutt DA 2007. *A Strength-based Approach to Career Development Using Appreciative Inquiry*. Broken Arrow, OK: National Career Development Association
- Sekerka LE 2002. *Exploring Appreciative Inquiry: A Comparison of Positive and Problem Based Organizational Change and Development Approaches in the Workplace*. Doctoral Dissertation, Unpublished. Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
- Sekerka LE, Cooperrider DL 2001. The Appreciative Inquiry Conversation and its Impact on Affect, View of Self, and Creativity. *Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting*, August, Washington, D.C
- Sekerka LE, Cooperrider DL, Wilken J 2001. An Appreciative Organizational Development Intervention: Positive Emotions Set the Stage for Change. *Poster Session presented at the Positive Psychology Summit*, October, Washington, D.C.
- Southwood SL 2000. *Towards a Collaborative Approach to Teacher Professional Development: A Journey of Negotiation*. Doctoral Dissertation, Unpublished. Rhodes University, Grahamstown.
- Taylor N, Vinjevold P (Eds.) 1999. *Getting Learning Right. Report on the President's Education Initiative Research Project*. Johannesburg: Joint Education Trust.
- Walker K, Carr-Stewart S 2004. Learning leadership through appreciative inquiry. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 32: 72-85.
- Uys T, Puttergill C 2003. Sampling. In: D Rossouw (Ed.): *Intellectual Tools, Skills for the Human Sciences*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Whitney D, Trosten-Bloom A 2003. *The Power of Appreciative Inquiry: A Practical Guide to Positive Change*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.