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SYNOPSIS

The purpose of this research was to investigate the challenges facing the Development Support Grouping (DSG) in the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS). Based on this, the researcher sought to present guidelines to improve the process of educator evaluation.

The Integrated Quality Management System is a national policy aimed at increasing productivity among educators. IQMS comprises three programmes namely: Development Appraisal (DA), Performance Measurement (PM) and Whole school Evaluation (WSE). The three programmes ought to complement each other and run concurrently. The role of the Development Support Groups (DSG) is of cardinal importance in the implementation of IQMS. Because of the tremendous challenges inherent in IQMS and the fact that the DSG are responsible for baseline and summative evaluation, it is necessary to ascertain the challenges that the DSG are likely to encounter whilst exercising their roles and responsibilities during the implementation of IQMS.

The research concentrated on schools in the Vryheid District of KwaZulu- Natal. The quantitative research methodology was employed to elicit the perception of educators with regard to the implementation of IQMS in schools as well as the challenges facing the DSGS.

The findings of the research were clustered according to the four sections of the questionnaire. Some of these findings were:

- A large majority of educators in Vryheid District seem not to understand the purpose of IQMS.
- A higher percentage of respondents do not believe that the training they receive had prepared them for implementing IQMS.
- Most respondents do not strongly agree that WSE evaluates the effectiveness of school in terms of national goals.
- A smaller percentage of respondents agreed that WSE provides feedback as a means of achieving continuous improvement.
- Most educators believe that lesson observation is necessary for educator development.
- The contribution of the DSG towards educator development is of a limited extent.
- Educators do not have sufficient time to serve on DSG.
As a result of the findings of the research, the following recommendations were made:

- Educators need to be capacitated so that they can clearly understand the purpose of IQMS.
- Thorough training is essential in order to ensure effective implementation of IQMS.
- Educators need to understand that WSE is one of the programmes of IQMS and is aimed at ensuring quality education for all.
- The importance of feedback needs to be overemphasized since it enables individuals and schools to know how to improve performance.
- The DSG role to be clarified so that they can contribute effectively to educator development.
- Educators’ workload to be reviewed to enable educators plenty of time to serve on DSG.
CHAPTER 1

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (IQMS) CHALLENGES FACING THE DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT GROUPING (DSG) IN THE VRYHEID DISTRICT OF KWAZULU-NATAL

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Public organizations in our country are at pains to increase productivity among employees. One of the biggest challenges facing South Africa since its re-entry into the international community is its labour productivity (Grobler, Warnich, Carrell, Elbert & Hartfield, and 2002:18). The above view is supported by Nel and Haasbroek (1998:432), who state that South Africa is faced with the enormous challenge of increasing productivity among workers. Schools are no exception to this. There is a growing concern in the Department of Education over the quality of education and solutions that are being sought to improve teaching practices. The Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) is the proposed solution to this challenge.

The IQMS is informed by Schedule 1 of the Employment of Educators Act No. 76 of 1998, whereby the Minister is required to determine the performance standard of educators. Each individual educator’s performance must be measured against the stipulated performance standards of the IQMS document. A four-point rating scale is employed to determine the level of performance for each educator. The ratings provided by the Development Support Grouping (DSG) clearly indicate areas in need of development as well as the strengths of individual educators that need to be enhanced.

The IQMS is a national policy aimed at increasing productivity among educators. According to ELRC (2003:1) IQMS is intended to integrate the existing programmes on quality management in education. The existing programmes were the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS), Performance Measurement (PM) and Whole School Evaluation WSE).

Nel and Haasbroek (1998:432) hold that effective training and development by the organization is necessary to ensure that employees achieve the required level of competence. According to Steyn (1996:37), individuals develop by taking responsibility for their own
growth. It is through the continuous improvement and development of each individual educator that quality education will surface.

The IQMS is designed to ensure that the individual is involved in the process. IQMS ensures the democratic participation of the individual. The establishment of the Development Support Grouping (DSG) is intended to achieve this. The DSG is one of the structures needed in the implementation of IQMS. The DSG is responsible for the baseline evaluation of educators (for developmental purposes) as well as for the summative evaluation that takes place at the end of the year for Performance Measurement (ELRC 2003:5). The focus of this research study falls on perceptions of the Development Support Grouping in the Vryheid District with regard to their roles and responsibilities in the implementation of IQMS. Consequently, the purpose of this research is to investigate the challenges facing the DSG in the implementation of IQMS.

1.2 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Mestry (1999: 141-142) found that in historically disadvantaged schools educators were dissatisfied with the previous system of appraisal which had the following pitfalls:

- it was judgemental,
- it led to an abuse of merit awards,
- too much secrecy surrounded the appraisal,
- it was characterised by favouritism, nepotism and victimization,
- it identified itself with the incompetence of inspectors,
- it was sometimes guilty of sexual harassment and discrimination against women,
- It was used as a system for the promotion of candidates.

Between 1985 and 1990 it became impossible for the inspectors and subject advisors to physically visit historically disadvantaged schools due to the dangers posed by the sometimes riotous behaviour that was common in schools at that time. There was a need for the development of an appraisal instrument which would be acceptable to all stakeholders and which would enhance the development of competency of educators and the quality of public education in South Africa (Department of Education, 1999:5).
According to the Department of Education (2001:1) for many years, there has been no national system of evaluating the performance of schools, and there is no comprehensive data on the quality of teaching and learning, or on the educational standards achieved in the system. As a result in 1998, a Development Appraisal System was introduced in order to help educators with their professional development, career planning and in-service training consistent with the needs of individual educators at schools (Montgomery & Hatfield, 1989: 9-10). In the year 2000, the Whole School Evaluation was introduced, the aim being to improve the overall quality of education in South African schools (Department of Education, 2001:1). The Education Labour Relations Council, in accordance with Collective Agreement (No.7, 2003), then brought about the introduction of the system of Performance Appraisal (PA).

However, before such Performance Appraisal could be implemented, an agreement was reached in the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC), to integrate the existing programmes on quality management in education (ELRC, 2003:1).

The Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) consists of three programmes, namely Developmental Appraisal, Performance Measurement and Whole School Evaluation. It is aimed at enhancing and monitoring performance of the education system. The main objective of IQMS is to ensure quality public education for all (ELRC, 2003:3).

It is proposed that the programmes be implemented in an INTEGRATED way so as to ensure optimal effectiveness and co-ordination of the various programmes (ELRC, 2003:1), yet the purpose of each programme should remain intact. The purpose of developmental appraisal is to appraise individual educators in a transparent manner with a view of determining areas of strengths and weaknesses and to draw up programmes for individual development (ELRC, 2003:1). The purpose of performance measurement is to evaluate individual teachers for salary progression, grade progression, and affirmation of appointments, rewards and incentives. The purpose of whole school evaluation is to evaluate the overall effectiveness of a school as well as the quality of its teaching and learning (ELRC, 2003:1).

The implementation of IQMS depends on the existence of the following structures: the School Management Team (SMT), Staff Development Team (SDT) and the Development Support Grouping (DSG). The SMT is comprised of the principal, deputy principal and heads of
department. The SMT has to inform educators of in-service training programmes to be offered. The SMT has to assist with broad planning and implementation of IQMS (ELRC, 2003:12).

The staff development team (SDT) consists of the principal, the whole school evaluation coordinator and democratically elected post level one educators. The SDT is responsible for the management of the process (ELRC, 2003:1).

A Development Support Grouping (DSG) consists of an educator’s immediate senior and one other educator, called the peer (ELRC, 2003). The DSG is responsible for baseline evaluation of educators (for developmental purposes) as well as summative evaluation at the end of the year (for Performance Measurement) (ELRC, 2003:5). The main purpose of the DSG is to provide mentoring and support.

The principal has a vital role to play in the implementation of IQMS. The principal is expected to work hand in hand with the DSG to ensure fairness and consistency in the evaluation process. The principal also has the overall responsibility of ensuring that IQMS is implemented uniformly and effectively at the school and is furthermore responsible for advocacy and training. According to Sallis (1996:76), the main reason for the failure of quality initiatives in our institutions is the lack of senior management backing and commitment. He goes on to say that without leadership at all levels of the institution; the improvement process cannot be sustained. It is therefore imperative for the principal and the DSG to work hand in hand to ensure that the evaluation process takes place in the manner expected.

1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
In the implementation of IQMS, the Development Support Grouping (DSG) forms part of the evaluation process in education. Its importance is to monitor and enhance performance in schools. The DSG is responsible for baseline and summative evaluation of educators. It is in the execution of their (the DSG) duties that they are most likely to encounter challenges.

According to Murgatroyd and Morgan (1993:190), some of these challenges include lack of appropriate skills, poor planning, lack of viable commitment by leaders, lack of information and purpose, and paucity.
Swanepoel (1998: 412) asserts that raters who feel uncomfortable about any confrontation with subordinates may, for instance, be inclined to assign average ratings where poor ratings would have been appropriate; ratees facing even the most accurate and objective criticism may tend to resist and revitalise findings if they perceive assessment as a blow to their self-esteem.

The problem that this research aims to address could be stated as: what are the challenges facing DSG in the Vryheid District of KwaZulu-Natal in the implementation of IQMS?

In view of the above, the research study is aimed at determining the following:

- What are the perceptions of educators with regard to the roles and responsibilities of the DSG?
- What are the challenges faced by the DSG in implementing IQMS in schools?
- What guidelines could be presented to the DSG to improve the IQMS process?

1.4 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The general aim of this research project is to investigate the challenges facing the DSG in the implementation of IQMS in schools.

The objectives are:

- to probe the perceptions of educators with regard to the roles and responsibilities of DSG in the implementation of IQMS,
- to determine the challenges faced by the DSG in the implementation of IQMS,
- To present guidelines to improve the process of the educator evaluation.

1.5 METHOD OF RESEARCH

According to Verma and Mallick (1999:1), research is often defined in terms of “systematic enquiry” while Brown and Dowling (1998:7) go further by saying that the term “research” means an enquiry which seeks to make known something about a field of practice or activity which is currently unknown to the researcher. Mcmillan and Schumacher (1993:8) define research as a systematic process of collecting and logically analysing data for some purpose.
Research is also conducted to explore a topic and to provide a beginning familiarity with that topic (Babbie, 1994:84).

Research is done for the sake of the expansion of knowledge. Educational researchers search for new knowledge about education, teaching, learning and educational administration. In most cases this knowledge has the possibility of practical application and therefore it is maintained so that it may give rise to more effective educational practice (Booyse, 1993:4). Research in education has an effect on the educational process and in that way it definitely influences the decisions made by policy-makers.

This research study is aimed at addressing the challenges encountered by the DSG while exercising their roles and responsibilities in the implementation of IQMS. It furthermore probes the perceptions of educators with regard to the roles and responsibilities of DSG in the implementation of IQMS. A survey is part of the research design of this study and it is used to probe the perceptions of educators with regard to the roles and responsibilities of DSG in the implementation of IQMS.

1.5.1 Research Design
A research design refers to one’s overall research approach and justification of the use of such an approach with regards to the problem under investigation (Imenda & Muyangwa, 2000:13). Mouton (2003:55) further defines a research design as a plan or blueprint of how you intend conducting the research. Surveys are often part of research designs (usually in the form of a questionnaire) and in this study a survey is used to probe educators’ perceptions with regard to the roles and responsibilities of the DSG in the implementation of IQMS. One may then generalise findings to the wider population using data obtained by means of a survey of a representative sample of a certain population. The purpose of a survey is to find out what the members of a certain population believe (and what practices they follow) and it is administered in the form of a questionnaire to a representative sample of such a population so that the researcher can describe what is going on in that population. The population of educators in the Vryheid district were used in this research. A questionnaire represents one aspect of the design of a survey. Having obtained the relevant facts about the questions under research, the researcher can then state those facts quantitatively.
1.5.2 Literature Review

In this study, a literature survey consisting of primary sources (including educational journals and newspapers) and secondary sources (including textbooks, theses, dissertations and presentation papers) is used to elucidate the roles and responsibilities of the DSG in the implementation of IQMS. The findings from both the literature and empirical investigations are then used to make recommendations that will hopefully assist the DSG in the implementation of IQMS.

1.5.3 The Questionnaire

A questionnaire represents one aspect in the design of a survey. A structured questionnaire consisting of direct questions based on a five-point scale, as generally suggested in research literature, was developed as part of the research design in order to achieve the goals of this study.

The questionnaire was therefore chiefly instrumental in obtaining teacher opinion with regard to the roles and responsibilities of DSG in the implementation of IQMS in Vryheid district.

1.5.4 Research Methodology (Quantitative)

A quantitative research paradigm was used to probe the perceptions of educators with regard to the roles and responsibilities of the DSG in the implementation of IQMS in this study. Quantitative research is usually based on a form of “logical positivism,” which assumes that there are stable social facts within a single reality, separated from the feelings and beliefs of individuals (Mcmillan and Schumacher, 2001:15). It is for this reason that quantitative research seeks to establish a single objective reality by being detached from the situation being studied so as to avoid bias and the intimidation of the subjects of the study. It is believed that this single objective reality will indicate whether there are challenges facing the DSG while exercising their roles and responsibilities in the implementation of IQMS.

According to Higgs and Smith (2000:5), logical empiricism claims that this is the only form of real truth that there is because this form of truth can be tested and checked. The above view is supported by Creswell, (1994:20) who states that a quantitative study is an inquiry into a social or human problem, based on testing a theory composed of variables, measured with numbers, and analysed with statistical procedures, in order to determine whether predictive generalisation of the theory holds true. This means that statistical procedures will be
employed to ascertain whether it is true that there are challenges facing the DSG in the implementation of IQMS or not.

1.5.5 Data Collection (Population and Sample)
A research sample is a small group of subjects that possesses the main characteristics of the accessible population (Imenda & Muyangwa 2000:118). A stratified sample was selected in that a similar proportion of groupings were selected to reflect the target population. In selecting the sample, the researcher wrote down the names of all the schools in the Vryheid District and then classified the schools into two groups, namely the primary and secondary schools. A representative sample was then drawn from each group of schools.

1.5.6 Data Analysis
Data will be analysed according to the SPSS 14 software package. Data will be analysed by means of a descriptive inferential statistical technique (Booyse, 1993:14).

1.5.7 Validity and Reliability
Reliability refers to consistency of measure, that is the extent to which a given instrument or procedure yields the same observation for all research subjects who possess the amount (in quantity and quality) of a given attribute (Imenda & Muyangwa, 2000:140). Suppose a questionnaire is used to probe the perception of educators with regard to the roles and responsibilities of DSG in the implementation of IQMS, if the same results are obtained every time the questionnaire is analysed using SPSS14 software, we can then conclude that the measure is reliable.

Validity refers to the extent to which an empirical measure adequately reflects the real meaning of the concept under consideration (Babbie, 1994:12). If the analysis reveals that roles and responsibilities of the DSG are a challenge in the implementation of IQMS, internal validity will be established. The researcher will attempt to establish external validity by looking for generalizations emerging from the data analysis (Hariparsad, 2005:20).
1.6 ETHICAL ASPECTS
Ethical aspects represent a pattern of knowing that focuses on matters of obligation or on what ought to be done. Since most educational research deals with human beings, it is necessary to understand the ethical and legal responsibilities of conducting research (Mcmillan & Schumacher, 2001:195).

1.6.1 The Participant as a Person
A researcher needs to respect the independence of the participants. Participants must receive equal treatment and their uniqueness must be taken into consideration (Mcmillan & Schumacher, 2001: 198).

1.6.2 The Ethic of Justice, Fairness and Objectivity
According to Mcmillan and Schumacher (2001:422), a sense of caring and fairness has to enter into the researcher’s negotiations and this usually promotes fairness. Equal treatment of the subjects is a prime concern.

1.6.3 Competence
The researcher must adhere to the highest possible standards of research. This will be achieved if the researcher has undergone training in research methodology and interpersonal skills. The researcher must be personally and professionally qualified (Babbie, 1994:198). Researchers must be accountable and act in a responsible manner.

1.6.4 Integrity
Mcmillan and Schumacher (2001: 196) are of the opinion that the researcher needs to be honest and fair about his/her limitations, competence, belief system, values and needs.

1.6.5 Communication
Clear and understandable communication is required. This usually involves a full disclosure of the purpose of the research, but there are circumstances in which either withholding information about the research or deceiving the subject may be justified (Mcmillan & Schumacher, 2001:196).
1.6.6 Voluntary Participation
Participants must not be forced to participate in any study. Babbie (1994:449) stresses that no one should be forced to participate. This view is supported by Mcmillan and Schumacher (2001:197), who emphasise the point that informed consent implies that the subjects have a choice about whether to participate or not. According to Mcmillan and Schumacher (2001:196), the investigator should inform the subjects of all aspects of the research that might influence willingness to participate and answer all queries of subjects on features that may have adverse effects or consequences.

1.7 DEMARCATION OF THE INVESTIGATION
This particular study was conducted in schools in the Vryheid District of KwaZulu-Natal. The target group was educators in both primary and secondary schools.

1.8 CLARIFICATION OF CONCEPTS
1.8.1 Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS)
According to ELRC (2003:2), the IQMS is an integrated quality management system that consists of programmes that are aimed at enhancing and monitoring performance of the education system. These are Development Appraisal, Performance Measurement and Whole School Evaluation.

1.8.2 Development Support Grouping (DSG)
The Development Support Group is one of the structures in the implementation of IQMS. It consists of the educators’ immediate senior and one other educator (peer) selected by the educator on the basis of appropriate phase/learning area and subject expertise, and not on the basis of friendship (ELRC, 2003:4).

1.8.3 Challenges
The word “challenge” refers to a demanding task or situation. It implies a call to prove or justify something (The Concise Oxford Dictionary, 2002:233). A “challenge,” in simple terms, means “a difficult task,” or something that stands in the way of success. It is a problem that equals one’s capacity to tackle it and overcome it.

1.8.4 Evaluation
1.8.5 Appraisal

Appraisal is a systematic process intended to help educators with their professional development, career planning and in-service training consistent with the needs of individual educators at schools (Montgomery & Hatfield, 1989:9-10).

For the purpose of this investigation, the terms “evaluate” or “appraise” shall be used as one and the same meaning, namely meaning to assess, appraise or value. Similarly, the terms “teacher” or “educator” will mean the same, namely a person who systematically trains and teaches someone (Alswag & Van Rensberg 1991:167).

1. 9 PLAN OF STUDY

Chapter one is the introductory chapter, in which the background of the research study on Integrated Quality Management is sketched. The problem statement, aims, research methodology, demarcation of the study, ethical aspects, clarification of concepts as well as an outline of the whole research study is presented in this chapter.

Chapter two deals with the literature review and contain theories relevant to the topic as well as reviews of previous researchers and relevant literature on the nature of the Development Support Grouping.

In chapter three the methodology is discussed and questions are formulated in respect to the implementation of IQMS.

Chapter four focuses on issues of reliability and validity with regard to the research study. Empirical data is analysed and interpreted in this chapter.

Chapter five provides the summary of the entire research study. Findings and recommendations are also put forward in this chapter.

1.10 CONCLUSION

This chapter provided the background as well as a brief overview of the study. The next chapter deals with the relevant literature, which is also reviewed therein. The aim is to probe the research questions which serve as the basis for the formulation of the questionnaire, which is used to procure the opinions of the respondents regarding the implementation of IQMS as
well as challenges facing the DSG while carrying out their roles and responsibilities. The literature review is also relevant to the implementation of IQMS as well as to challenges that face the DSG. A comparison is made with other related research findings and recommendations that flow from this study are also provided in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH LITERATURE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IQMS: CHALLENGES FACING THE DSG IN THE VRYHEID DISTRICT OF KWAZULU-NATAL

2.1. INTRODUCTION

Chapter one of this research study provided the background and the overview of what the research project entails. In the light of what has been said in the preceding chapter, Chapter two will concentrate on developing a literature review which underpins the theoretical perspective of this research project and will also elicit the implications and recommendations that emerge in the Chapter five.

For the purpose of this research study, it is premised that the DSG in the Vryheid District of KwaZulu-Natal are destined to encounter many challenges whilst in the process of IQMS implementation.

Having introduced this section of the research, it is necessary to review the relevant research and opinions about the implementation of IQMS as well as challenges facing the DSG in the Vryheid District of KwaZulu-Natal.

2.2. INTEGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS (IQMS)

According to the IQMS training manual (2003:1) the IQMS is an integrated quality management system consisting of three programmes that are aimed at enhancing and monitoring the performance programmes of the education system. The three aspects consist of:

- The Developmental Appraisal
- The Performance Measurement, and
- The Whole School Evaluation

Even though Educational researchers define these three programmes in a variety of ways, it is easy for practitioners to grasp the essential and practical meaning of the concept.
2.2.1. Developmental appraisal

Evans and Thomlison (1989:54) define developmental appraisal as the process of measuring an employee’s past or present performance quantitatively and qualitatively against the background of his or her expected role performance. It is a process of appraising performance in a formative and supportive way in order to facilitate further professional and personal development and growth (Department of Education 1999:12). Poster and Poster (1993:1) agree with the previous researchers in stating that developmental appraisal concentrates on improving the ability of the employees to perform in their present or future roles by identifying individual developmental needs through subsequent training or self-development.

Fletcher (1996:77) states that developmental appraisal is necessary in order to assist teachers in developing by helping them to see their shortcomings and to commit themselves to improvement.

According to ELRC, (2003:1) the purpose of Developmental Appraisal is to appraise individual educators in a transparent manner with a view to determining areas of strength and weaknesses, and to draw up programmes for individual development.

This appraisal is concerned with the teachers’ professional developmental needs and training opportunities in order to improve their performance in present and future roles.

2.2.2. Whole school evaluation

The Gauteng Department of Education, OFSTED, Concept Document (Department of Education, 2001:16-19), defines whole school evaluation as a process of evaluating schools in order to collect relevant and appropriate data to support decision-making, planning and policy development at all levels of the education system and to measure the contributions of educators and learners against set criteria (standards) as well as the support system to the school and their performance, by using nine focus areas which include, inter alia:

- Leadership management communication
- Basic function of the school
- The quality of teachers and learning and educator development
- Curriculum provision and resources
- Learner achievement
This concept, as defined by the National Education Department of South Africa, was earlier used with special reference to “a way of judging the performance of a school as a whole in which the corporate contribution to improving performance is measured rather than simply the performance of individual members of staff” (Department of Education, 2000:25). Later, it was redefined as “a collaborative, transparent process of making judgments on the holistic performance of the school that is measured against agreed national criteria” (Department of Education, 2001:24).

The Whole School Evaluation Policy is rooted in quality assurance, quality management and total quality management principles; hence it is a policy that is ideally the most suitable and important tool for measuring the performance of schools (Department of Education, 2001:24).

According to ELRC (2003:1), the main purpose of the WSE policy is to facilitate school improvement through approaches characterized by partnership, collaboration, mentoring and guidance.

The Gauteng province has established the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED), which is tasked with “monitoring and evaluation of educational standards across the province, including benchmarking organisational performance levels of learner achievement” (Gauteng Department of Education, 2001:16).

The KwaZulu-Natal province has also established such an office, which is known as Quality Assurance. Quality Assurance (QA) is a system of ensuring quality in schools and in the Education Department as a whole through monitoring and evaluating performance (Department of Education, 2002:7) In the KwaZulu-Natal Department of Education there are two main thrusts:

- Whole-school evaluation (WSE)
- Systemic evaluation (SE)
These two thrusts are independent of each other but they complement each other as they strive to ensure quality. Further, the two align with and are complementary to the developmental appraisal system (DAS).

It is therefore clear that Quality Assurance is the fundamental task of every school management team (SMT). Good schools are constantly aware of the need to evaluate standards, and they now have the means to do so effectively through the whole school evaluation process (WSE). WSE provides the mechanisms to assist SMT in monitoring and improving their schools performance (Department of Education, 2002:7).

2.2.3 Performance measurement
According to ELRC (2003:1), the purpose of performance measurement is to evaluate individual teachers for salary progression, grade progression, affirmation of appointments and rewards and incentives. Performance appraisal is a process of evaluating and documentation of personnel performance in order to make judgments that lead to decisions regarding promotions, rewards, probationary tenure and dismissal. According to Dunham (1995:94), performance appraisal is concerned with the setting of achievable goals as well as feedback to staff on their performance. This, in turn, identifies their training needs and encourages better performance in order to achieve the aim of the organisation.

It is important that the performance appraisal system should measure the performance climate and that the remuneration system should reward this performance reasonably and fairly (Gerber, Nel &Van Dyk, 1998:170). It may thus be said that performance appraisal and remuneration have a direct influence on the motivation of employees to achieve organisational goals.

Swanepoel, (1998:402-403) agrees with the above author with regard to the purpose of performance appraisal, which is concerned with reward decisions, including salary and wage increases (or the withholding thereof), merit bonuses, etcetera.

Ivancevich and Matteson (2002:186) concur with the above author with regard to the use of performance appraisal, which is to provide a basis for reward allocation, including raises, promotions, transfers and layoffs. From the above, it becomes evident that if the Department of Education is concerned about high-quality education, it then needs to see to it that PMS is
well implemented in schools. Teachers are easily motivated by rewards, incentives, remuneration and promotions, and given these, they will work very hard to ensure quality education in their respective schools (Steyn, 2001: 56).

2.3. PURPOSE OF IQMS

2.3.1 Identification of specific needs of educators, schools and district offices.
It is imperative in a school situation to involve educators in doing needs identification and analysis. Involving teachers in helping to determine their individual development or training needs can enhance the success and effectiveness of the professional development programmes (Steyn, 2001:51). Professional development programmes require an intensive systematic analysis of needs so that areas for professional development can be selected and planned for. In this way the development (training) gap between actual staff performance and desired staff performance can be identified (Cushway, 1994:99).

A thorough needs analysis is required before planning begins (Dunlap, 1995:156). Needs have to be determined at three levels, namely at individual level, group level and school level (Castetter, 1996:236). Some needs will be specific to an individual, although two or more individuals may have the same needs; others will concern groups of people or even the entire school or organisation.

Once needs are identified, it becomes possible to decide how best to respond to them. Response can include observation, a feedback mechanism and the setting of specific objectives and plans of action to satisfy the needs. Active interaction and meetings between the appraiser and appraisee generally achieve this goal, which culminates in a conference to discuss the implications of the results and to plan further action. In a school situation, it is the DSG that need to take action in order to meet the needs of each and every educator.

2.3.2 Provision of support for continued growth
According to ELRC (2003:5), the main purpose of the DSGs is to provide mentoring and support. DSG need to take their roles seriously, so that the school gains maximum benefit from the appraisal process. The DSG needs to contribute positively to the personal and professional development of the appraisees.
In the appraisal process, appraisees will require ongoing support in order to gain maximum benefit from the process (Jones 1993:30). Such support might come from one of the senior management team members, a member of the DSG or a mentor. Appraisers should also create a non-threatening atmosphere in which teachers are encouraged to experiment (Gainey 1990:17).

Support is rendered in a variety of ways, for example by coaching, motivation and demonstration.

2.3.2.1 Coaching (mentoring)
Blasé and Blasé’s study (1998:71) found substantial evidence that good principals advocate coaching among teachers for the sake of teacher development. In their study, examples are given of teachers acting as models for other teachers to improve their teaching. Coaching also serves to motivate and to recognise exemplary teachers. Educators are exposed to new options and ideas and are thus able to learn from others. Steyn (2001:59) believes that coaching is more a way of managing staff than a direct way of passing on detailed instructions. The staff member is given support and guidance but the focus is more on helping the staff member teach him or herself and of ensuring that he or she acquires the necessary knowledge and skills.

2.3.2.2 Motivation
Recognising the importance of and promoting staff motivation can therefore greatly contribute to the effectiveness of an education system (Department of Education, 2003:79). Educational managers should also reflect on their own motivation, commitment, energy levels and passion, so that they can model positive behaviour to other staff members.

According to Gerber, Nel and Van Dyk (1998:256), motivation is regarded as a very important human resources variable in pursuing organisational success. It is seen as a resource to be taken seriously with regard to an organisation’s culture and identity, but should also be taken into account for managing effectiveness and quality. Swanepoel (1998:340) states that a central attribute of good management is the ability to create an environment in which people are motivated to act in a goal-directed way.
Motivated members of staff make schools more effective because they always look for better ways of doing their jobs and are usually concerned about quality (and the school then benefits accordingly) and are more productive than apathetic, de-motivated members of staff (Department of Education 2003:78).

The DGS need to understand that motivation is made up of complex forces that include incentives, needs and tensions (Department of Education, 2003:78) needs arise as a result of tension that is created when a shortage or a lack is experienced. If a need is not satisfied, provided that it is important enough and there are no equally important opposing needs, people take action in an attempt to satisfy the need. This urge for satisfaction leads to specific action until the need has been satisfied (Steyn, 1996: 189).

2.3.2.3 Demonstration
Demonstration is one of the most common forms of development. In demonstration the staff member is shown how to perform a task by an experienced staff member and then left to get on with it. Unfortunately negative attitudes towards the school or unauthorized short cuts in working methods are also likely to be acquired. However, demonstration is perhaps the simplest, quickest and most cost-effective way of enabling a staff member to learn the work, provided it is properly controlled (Steyn, 2001:59). Demonstration lessons may be organized in a school whereby educators who did very well during the evaluation process may be requested to present their lessons in front of other staff members.

2.3.3 Promotion of accountability
Accountability of individuals and structures involved in the process of IQMS implementation is a cardinal issue. In a participative/democratic management style all role players are seen to be important in the school development process, and all concerned need to account for their involvement in the process (Van Niekerk, 2001:152). If educators and schools are serious about their function and calling in society, they will indeed take the issue of accountability very seriously (Van Niekerk 2001:166). This implies that all the structures and individuals involved in the implementation of IQMS will be held accountable for whatever happens during the evaluation process. In order for the DSG to be fully accountable for the evaluation process, they need to have a clear and thorough understanding of their roles and responsibilities.
In education, accountability thus amounts to being required to give an account of events or behaviour in a school to those who may have a legitimate right to know (Bush & West-Burnham 1994:310). Accountability occurs by means of some form of reporting system, which can consist of such things as minutes of meetings, written reports at stipulated times and evaluation reports (Van Niekerk, 2001:160). The DSG need to keep record of the proceedings at meetings held about pre and post evaluation discussions.

For DSG to be truly accountable, it is necessary for them to take ownership of their role and the tasks that it implies (Van niekerk, 2001:159). When this happens, accountability becomes a personalized issue, which contributes to the successful fulfilment of the person’s role and task in an organisation such as the school. People who accept ownership of their roles are motivated to reach outcomes that they have set for themselves, and more.

2.3.4 Monitoring the institution’s overall effectiveness

According to Davis, Ellison, Osborne and West-Burnham (1993:73), an effective school will have a vision derived from the school community. The vision will drive the school and its programmes towards that which the school wants to achieve. The instructions, learning and classroom approaches will concentrate upon what the school wants to achieve.

Leithwood, (1996:808) and Davis, et.al (1993:82) agree that an effective school should employ strategies such as the following in order to accomplish intellectual stimulation among educators that will assist them to perform their work better. These strategies are:

(i) Changing the norms that might constrain the thinking of staff through:
   - Removing penalties from making mistakes
   - Embracing conflict as a way of clarifying alternative courses of action
   - Requiring colleagues to support opinions with good reasons; and
   - Insisting on careful thought before action.

(ii) Challenging the educator’s performance status quo through:
   - Directly challenging educators’ assumptions about their work and unsubstantiated beliefs and practices
• Encouraging educators to evaluate their practices and refine them as needed; and
• Stimulating educators to think more deeply about what they are doing.

(iii) Encouraging new initiatives by:
• Encouraging educators to try new practices without using pressure
• Encouraging educators to pursue their own goals for professional learning
• Helping educators to make personal meaning of transformation, and
• Promoting the necessary resources to support educators’ participation in transformation initiatives.

(iv) Bringing educators into contact with new ideas through:
• Stimulating the search for information relevant to the school goals and promoting discussion of new ideas;
• Seeking out new ideas by visiting other schools, attending conferences and passing on new ideas to other educators;
• Inviting educators to share their expertise with their colleagues; and
• Providing information helpful to educators in thinking about ways to implement new practices.

IQMS is aimed at monitoring an institution’s overall effectiveness through the use of the Whole School Evaluation programme. According to ELRC (2003:1), WSE is aimed at evaluating the overall effectiveness of a school as well as the quality of teaching. The main purpose of WSE is to facilitate school improvement through approaches characterised by partnership, collaboration, mentoring and guidance (Department of Education 2002:1).

The policy also contains a built-in mechanism for reporting findings on the level of performance achieved by schools and for providing feedback to the school and to various stakeholders, to the national and provincial education department, and to parents and society in general.

The principle aims of Whole School Evaluation are also integral to the supporting documents and to the guidelines and criteria (Department of Education, 2002:3). The aims are as follows:
• To moderate externally, on a sampling basis, the results of self-evaluation carried out by the schools
• Evaluate the effectiveness of a school in terms of the national goals, using national criteria
• Increase the level of accountability within the education system
• Strengthen the support given to schools by district professional support services
• Provide feedback to all stakeholders as a means of achieving continuous school improvement
• Identify aspects of excellence within the system, which will serve as models of good practice
• Identify the aspects of effective schools and improve the general understanding of what factors create effective schools.

According to Davidoff and Lazarus (2002:84), the purpose of evaluation is to inform future planning and, ultimately development. However, in education the term “evaluation” is often considered in a negative light. Our history of “inspection” has provided us with many reasons to feel negative and to be cynical of any evaluation process. The shift in terminology from “inspection” to “Whole School Evaluation” is important. WSE encapsulates school self-evaluation as well as external evaluation. It also provides for schools to receive advice and support in a constant effort to improve their effectiveness (Department of Education, 2003:2).

International experience shows that standard setting assists in achieving three important goals:
• Commitment to high academic standards makes an unambiguous statement that all learners are expected to achieve academic excellence
• Standard setting engages parents and other key stakeholders in a broad based debate regarding what learners ought to know and be able to do, and it strengthens the link between the department and local community aspirations
• It involves all stakeholders within the institution’s community, including educators, parents, community structures and other interested parties so as to enhance educational processes (Gauteng Department of Education, 2001:9).

From the above discussion it can be deduced that for the education system to be effective, it is of utmost importance that it be monitored and evaluated and that its quality be assessed. The
aim behind this is to achieve a vision and goals for our education system. The focus is not on the old style of inspection, but rather on the gathering of information and providing of advice and support in order to improve the system.

2.3.5 Evaluation of an educator’s performance

The purpose of educator evaluation is to protect children, to reassure teachers that they are doing good jobs, to reassure audiences interested in teacher performance, to make personnel decisions, to inform teachers or educators, and to shape future practice (Peterson, 1995:30). It is a great responsibility as well as a necessity to evaluate teachers relative to their occupation, since their clients are young and non-voluntary learners (Peterson, 1995:30). Monitoring of teachers for protection of the young is essential. Also, most other professionals have strong evaluation mechanisms in the form of return clientele that educators do not have. Educators normally are assigned classes of students regardless of how well the teacher has performed in the past. Therefore educators should receive a relatively larger amount of evaluation than is visible in most other occupations (Peterson, 1995:30). The above is supported by Mcquade and Champagne (1995:212), who state that educator evaluation is a screening device to protect students from incompetence or abuse.

Mcquade and Champagne (1995:212) assert that schools trade their services for a price. There is an understandable need to evaluate the transaction. Those who pay, whether they pay through taxes or through tuition, want to know that their money is well spent. Their need is met partly by appraisal of student behaviour and partly by appraisal of the school. When the consumers of education become dissatisfied, they want to know if educators are doing their jobs properly. Educator evaluation is strongly influenced by common beliefs about “good teaching.”

The purpose of teacher evaluation is to document and acknowledge teacher achievement, influence and professional activity (Peterson, 1995:31). The most discussed purpose of teacher evaluation is to improve practice (Peterson, 1995:31).

When schools feel pressed to improve, the emphasis of evaluation is on teacher improvement. Teachers might be asked to set goals for their own professional development, and a satisfactory evaluation depends upon achievement of these goals.
Middlewood and Cardno (2001:164) concur with the above mentioned author and add that among the purposes for teacher evaluation is the need to emphasise the complementary need to ensure that teachers continually review and improve their practices in the light of contemporary research and profession-defined standards.

Tough evaluation identifies weak teachers who must improve their performance or lose their jobs. Evaluation at a higher level of performance identifies teachers who deserve to earn more than their colleagues. It is hoped that these incentives will eliminate incompetent teachers and raise the aspirations of mediocre teachers. Schools will improve, and highly qualified candidates will seek the higher rewards of a teaching career (Mcquade & Champagne, 1995:212-213).

When a change in curriculum requires teachers to acquire more knowledge or to learn new methods, evaluative criteria might embody these new expectations. Depending upon the sanctions employed, teachers are encouraged or forced to implement the change (Mcquade & Champagne, 1995:213).

2.4 GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF IQMS
IQMS implementation is guided by the principles of fairness, transparency and developmental process. These three principles are elucidated below:

2.4.1 Fairness
Evaluation must be fair and must be perceived by teachers to be fair (Mcquade and Champagne, 1995:216). Evaluators must respect the teachers that they evaluate – and be respected by those teachers in showing and earning their respect through practical knowledge of students, the classroom and teachers.

2.4.2 Transparency
Decisions that are reached must be clearly justified and argued and must then be made explicit and stated openly. Everard and Morris (1990:1) state the belief that subordinates as well as managers will listen to any criticism and use it as a basis for improvement. To silence criticism is to demonstrate insecurity.
Transparency ensures both democracy and accountability. This prevents appraisal from being done in secretive and corrupt ways. All decisions need to be clearly motivated and this makes it possible for decisions to be fair, just and balanced. According to Grobler et.al (2002:342), transparency ensures that access routes, perquisites and opportunities are clear, simple and understandable to all.

2.4.3 Developmental process
According to the Department of Education (1999:16), the appraisal of educators is in essence a developmental process that depends upon continuous support. It is designed and intended to entrench strength, develop potential and overcome weaknesses. Educators must not be intimidated and victimized, but supported in their professional growth.

The appraisal process is, in essence, a developmental process and it is not meant to intimidate and victimize educators. It is intended to enrich strengths, develop potential and overcome weaknesses.

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF INDIVIDUALS AND STRUCTURES INVOLVED IN IMPLEMENTATION OF IQMS.
There are four structures involved in the implementation of IQMS in the school situation. They include the principal, the educator, the school management team, the staff development team and the development support group (ELRC, 2003:2-3). Each of these structures has a distinct role to play in the implementation of IQMS, yet they need to work hand in hand in order for the evaluation process to be a success. Proper and successful implementation of IQMS requires a clear definition of roles and responsibilities. The prerequisite of any good appraisal programme is a clear and comprehensive definition of the duties and responsibilities of each position (Redfern, 1980:7).

2.5.1 The principal
The principal has a vital role to play during the implementation of IQMS. Staff appraisal is a very important managerial task (Squelch & Lemmer 1994:113). Putting the appraisal scheme into action is the responsibility of senior management, and as such it must be perceived as an integral part of future management practice. According to Jones (1993:10), the head teacher is responsible for the overall implementation of the school’s performance management policy and for ensuring that the performance management reviews take place. Mckibbin and Bruce
furthered this notion and support the value of a school climate characterised by an active, upbeat social climate where learning opportunities are compelling. They found that such an environment transformed educators who are normally passive consumers into active learners.

According to Personnel Administration Measurement (PAM) (1999:64) Section 4.2 (e) the principal has to participate in agreed school/educator appraisal processes in order to regularly review their professional practice with the aim of improving teaching, learning and management. The principal has to guide, supervise and offer professional advice on the work and performance of all staff in the school, and where necessary, he/she has to discuss and write or countersign reports on teaching and support non-teaching and other staff. This clearly indicates that it is obligatory for each school principal to carry out evaluation processes, since it is the employer’s policy.

Sallis (1996:76), states that the main reason for the failure of quality initiatives in our institutions is the lack of senior management backing and commitment. He goes on to say that without leadership at all levels of the institution the improvement process cannot be sustained. The principal has the overall responsibility to ensure that the IQMS is implemented uniformly and effectively at the school (ELRC, 2003: 2).

2.5.2 The Educator

Educators, according to Personnel Administration Measures (PAM) (1999:67) Section 4.5 (e) have to participate in agreed school/educator appraisal processes in order to review their professional practice with the aim of improving teaching, learning and management. It is obligatory for each and every educator to undergo the process of evaluation, even it is against his or her will.

The educator needs to undertake self-analysis and introspection in terms of his/her own performance. This is followed by self-evaluation in order to determine priorities for personal and professional growth. Self-appraisal gives educators a perspective on their work (Mayo 1997: 269). According to Squelch and Lemmer (1994:121) educators should be encouraged to appraise themselves regularly.
Self-appraisal provides a means of improving one’s own performance and can serve as a guide for setting goals and standards. Each and every educator has to measure his/her performance against a set of performance standards.

According to Wragg, Wikely, Wragg and Haynes (1996:16), self-appraisal is more important than analysis by others. Some believe that, ultimately, teachers must make their own decisions to do things differently.

2.5.3 School Management Teams

According to the Personnel Administration measures (PAM), (1999:64) Section 4.3 (e) the School Management Team (SMT) is tasked with managing the personnel at the school. The different aspects of human resource management that the members of the SMT must perform include participating in agreed school/educator appraisal processes in order to review teaching, learning and management techniques and practices and also to guide, supervise and offer professional advice on the work and performance of educators so as to bring about improvement if necessary. Together with this responsibility goes the countersigning of reports on staff, including teaching, non-teaching, support, or other staff.

According to the Personnel Administration Measures (PAM), (1999:65) Section 4.3 (e) the SMT is tasked to ensure that the school functions effectively and efficiently. It is for this reason that the SMT has to assist with broad planning and implementation of IQMS. The SMT is obliged to manage its employees effectively in order for the schools to be effective. Effective, satisfied and motivated educators will enhance the quality of teaching and learning and this will contribute towards realising the school’s vision.

2.5.4 Staff Development Team

Every school shall elect a staff development team (SDT) consisting of the principal, the whole school evaluation co-coordinator and the democratically elected post level one educators. The establishment of the SDT should be discussed at a staff meeting, and members should be voted for in an open and fair election (Department of education, 2002:66).

The purpose of the SDT is to initiate, coordinate and monitor the appraisal process in institutions and to ensure that training occurs in the developmental appraisal system (Pienaar & Mentz, 2001:22). The Department of Education (2002:67) concurs with the above
mentioned view regarding the roles of the SDT, which are to initiate the appraisal process, monitor the effectiveness of the appraisal system and report appropriately.

From the above discussion it is evident that the SDT will have to drive the process of IQMS implementation and that it needs to work hand in hand with all the other structures involved in the implementation of IQMS.

2.5.5 Development Support Grouping

Appraisal is seen as the right of all educators: something which is done with people rather than to people (Pillay, 2002:8). That is why it is important that the evaluator and evaluatee are actively involved in the process of evaluation.

A hierarchical or superior-subordinate model is necessary to organize staff appraisal in each and every school (Wragg, Wikely, Wragg & Haynes). The most logical structure for appraisal in strictly hierarchical organisations is for each person in the school to be appraised by a superior (Wragg et.al.1996:15). It is for this reason that the heads of departments (HOD) have to appraise post level one educators under their supervision, while deputies are expected to appraise HOD and principals are to appraise the deputies.

A second model, peer appraisal, occurs when two people of equal rank, such as two basic scale teachers, two deputy heads, or two HOD appraise each other (Wragg et.al.1996:16). It is believed that co-equal pairs will simply confirm each other’s practices, or engage in mutual congratulation. That is how the idea of involving a peer educator in the evaluation process came about.

The importance of the role played by the DSG in the implementation of IQMS cannot be overemphasized. The DSG are responsible for the baseline evaluation of educators (for developmental purposes) and for summative evaluation (for performance measurement). The DSG are there to provide mentoring and support.

2.5.6 District office/ local office

The District/local office has an important role to play during the implementation of IQMS, which includes advocacy, training, professional development programmes and moderation of evaluation results (ELRC, 2003:4). According to Frase and Hetzel (1990:51), encouragement
in the form of cheerleading alone will not do the job. In addition to offering quality programmes, it is necessary to assist (financially) with the payment of trainers, to fund transportation to conferences and to compensate educators for their time. Many educators today are reluctant to develop professionally due to financial constraints, including many of the above mentioned factors.

It is therefore incumbent upon the district officials and principals to strongly encourage training and to seek commitment from all staff members to engage in active training courses during the year. It is hoped this will greatly assist educators with regard to IQMS implementation.

2.6 IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

2.6.1 Advocacy Training and Planning

It is the responsibility of the senior management to put the appraisal scheme called IQMS into action. The principal or the SMT will have to hold a staff meeting where they will explain to educators what IQMS is and what the benefits will be for educators, learners, the school and the system.

Swanepoel (1998:414) states that procedures related to the implementation phase focus mainly on various training sessions and introductory exercises. The contents of such training may be determined by the level of involvement of users during the development phase, the complexity of the specific system and the existing competence in performance management of the supervisors. According to ELRC (2003:6), training must:

- Address issues relating to how the IQMS should be implemented in the school
- Enable officials and educators to plan and administer the IQMS in a uniform and consistent manner
- Enable all officials and educators to have a thorough understanding of the purposes, principles, processes and procedures

An effective appraisal programme requires a great deal of organisation and sensitivity in the way it is managed (Jones, 1993:21). It is of crucial importance that any appraisal scheme should be carefully planned so that it fits in with the many initiatives taking place at the school.
2.6.2 Self-evaluation by the educator

Self-evaluation by individual educators is done immediately after the initial advocacy and training, using the same instrument that will be used for both Developmental Appraisal and Performance Measurement.

The importance of self-appraisal by the educator is of significant importance. Different authors have outlined the importance of self-evaluation in a variety of ways. Squelch & Lemmer (1994:121) state that teachers should be encouraged to reflect on what they are doing and appraise themselves regularly. The above view is supported by Mayo (1997:167), who states that self-appraisal gives educators a perspective on their work. This notion is furthered by West and Bollington (1990:21), who assert that self-appraisal tends to give teachers a better understanding of their roles by prompting deeper thinking about what they do and by increasing their understanding of the links between behaviour and outcomes. It can also be a useful way to clarify those areas that an individual wishes to address, and in this way it can stimulate changes and development. The DSG should encourage this type of reflection (self-appraisal) since it is the only way in which the educator undertakes self-analysis and introspection in terms of his/her own performance.

2.6.3 Pre-evaluation discussion

The pre-evaluation stage involves setting up the appraisal panel, clarifying the roles of the members of the panel and allows the appraisee to complete the pre-evaluation profile checklist and the professional growth plan (Steyn, 2001: 99). DSG need to assist the appraisee in completing the above forms as well as any other forms pertaining to IQMS.

Teachers want to know what appraisers look for when observing appraisees in action (Chernow & Chernow 1992:242). This is supported by Steyn (2001:99), who asserts that educators need to know what appraisers look for when observing them in action. Furthermore, all appraisees and appraisers need to come to an agreement on their understanding of performance standards as well as their criteria as a lack of understanding could lead to conflict, which could detract from the effectiveness of the instrument. This is the preparation stage, where the appraisee and appraiser establish rapport and work collectively to assist the appraisee to identify needs, to formulate objectives and to select professional development activities.
2.6.4 Classroom observation

Classroom observation involves the direct observation of the educator performing in the classroom. Classroom observation allows educators to study the reality of their delivery of the curriculum. This is focused quality control (Poster, and Poster 1993:213) which is a very important matter in the management of schools today. This technique, coupled with interviews, is the mainstay of most educator appraisals (Pillay: 2002:47). It is still one of the most important criteria in performance appraisals being conducted in our schools today, especially when one considers DAS. Classroom observation can reveal a “… view of the climate, rapport, interaction and functioning of the classroom available from no other source” (Darling, Hammond, Wise & Pease, 1983:304). West and Bollington, (1990:24) is of the opinion that informed discussion of a teacher’s work can be considerably enhanced by appropriate classroom observation. Furthermore Mayo (1997:269) states that the goal of classroom observation is to obtain a representative sample of an educator’s performance.

However, this has limitations in that observer bias, insufficient sampling of performance, and poor measurement instruments can threaten the reliability and validity of results. Supervisory ratings have generally been found to lack reliability and validity (Darling et.al., 1983:306). Similar weaknesses in classroom observation in DAS have been noted where educators feel that a single classroom observation is not a true reflection of their total performance as an educator. DAS has also been subjected to tests of validity and reliability.

The DSG need to strictly adhere to the instrument with its performance standards and criteria when observing educators in practice. The DSG must remember that their objective is to identify educators’ strengths and areas in need of development as well as to draw up programmes for development. The DSG must also keep in mind that classroom observation is not a fault-finding mission and that their conduct must reflect the principles of fair play, transparency and democracy (Steyn, 2001: 46).

2.6.5 Outside classroom observation

It is incumbent upon the DSG to evaluate educators in respect of aspects outside the classroom observation. This means that their powers of observation should be well developed so as to make valid evaluations with regard to the involvement of educators in these activities.
2.6.6 Feedback and discussion

Chernow and Chernow (1992:242) state that after observations in the classroom and after having studied the portfolio of the educator, the appraisers should prepare for feedback to the appraisee. The Department of Education (1999:9) furthermore states that only after various documents have been completed, lessons observed and learner and educator portfolios have been reviewed, can the appraisal panel finalise the appraisal report. After the observation of the lesson, the whole panel including the appraisee, must have an open and honest discussion where the appraisee is given an opportunity to explain his/her professional practices. In this discussion the appraisee must be allowed to argue his or her case and engage in constructive debate with the panel members.

Performance-related feedback has been described as one of the most important methods for enhancing employee development and improving individual performance (Grobler et.al. 2002:300). Thus employees learn where they stand in the eyes of the organisation, and are coached and counselled about how performance may be improved.

According to Ivancevich and Matteson (2002:189), the feedback session provides information concerning the rationale for the evaluation of the individual. Where possible, objective information should be used to guide the evaluated employee so as to improve or sustain his/her performance.

People want to know how they are doing, how they are being perceived by others, and how they can make adjustments to perform better. Simply telling someone that “you are doing okay,” or to “keep up the good work” is too vague and subjective to be useful in bringing about improvement (Ivancevich & Matteson, 2002:189).

Feedback in the performance appraisal process means that employees will be provided with an objective appraisal of the current situation so as to let them know how their performance can be improved. It is important to note that feedback is most effective when it takes place immediately (or as soon as possible) after the appraisal (Gerber, Nel, Van Dyk 1998:182).
2.7 CHALLENGES FACING THE DSGS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IQMS

In this study, it is premised that the DSGs will encounter many challenges whilst exercising their roles and responsibilities with regard to the implementation of IQMS. The challenges may crop up in the system of evaluation (IQMS) or with regard to the appraiser or the appraisee (DSG). Expected challenges include:

- Attitude
- Time factor
- Rating error

2.7.1 Attitude
The negative perception of individual educators who believe that evaluation is simply used by an organisation to apportion blame and to provide a basis for disciplinary action, or to demote or find fault with employees, is the greatest challenge facing the DSG. Some people see it as a stick that management has introduced with which to beat people (Fisher, 1996:11). And if that is their attitude – with or without cause, performance evaluation is doomed to failure.

According to Grobler, et.al (2002:365), supervisors often prefer to avoid the appraisal process because uncomfortable face-to-face confrontations often result. The above view is supported by Gerber et.al. (1998:271), who states that many managers simply do not like the idea of appraising their subordinates and sometimes put it off until the last minute. Some of the reasons could be that managers try to avoid conflict between themselves and their subordinates, which could lead to bad relations between them.

2.7.2 Time factor
The frustration and loss of credibility and power of those in management over performance evaluation is matched by that of the users (Pillay,2002:11). Management often sees performance evaluation as another time consuming, personnel-paperwork requirement, having little utility in solving such “real” management problems, such as meeting deadlines and containing costs, as called for by the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996. Principals probably spend more time trying to contain costs and to balance their books because of the financial and budgetary demands being made by the department, than in any other aspect of their work.
As a result of this, principals often see performance evaluation as yet another time-consuming task that has to be completed. It is an important task that is often neglected, or it is rushed through merely for the sake of meeting deadlines or completing paperwork so that the school reflects “good” managerial skills, as seen by the department (Pillay, 2002:11). In actual fact performance evaluation is the one area that is sadly being neglected and rushed through as it offers little or no rewards for employees. It is no wonder that educators are so disillusioned that many of the skilled and experienced among them opt for early retirement or retrenchment packages. Others choose to immigrate or look for better career opportunities in the business sector.

Educator evaluation is not an event but a process. The steps involved include advocacy, training and planning, self-evaluation, pre-evaluation discussion, classroom observation, outside classroom observation, feedback and discussion and, only thereafter, development (ELRC, 2003:6-9). All this requires plenty of time, with the sad result that the process is often disrupted by the many changes taking place in the department. These changes include, inter alia, changes in the curriculum, classroom management, learner discipline, and learner assessment – and are not limited to only these few. It therefore becomes very difficult for most educators to multi-task, which results in less time being devoted to IQMS.

2.7.3 Rating error
Evaluators (DSG) may not be skilled and perceptive in making observations, and judgments may therefore be inconclusive and superficial (Swanepoel, 1998:413). This may be due to the very short period of training received by the DSG. In fact, observation as a major method of measuring success on the job often has dubious validity. Differences in pay based upon these evaluations further complicate matters.

Seemingly, most of the DSG experience problems when it comes to rating the performance of educators. The most common errors in rating include the halo effect and problems with regard to leniency and strictness (Grobler et.al.2002:291-292). Aamodt (1991:255) states that since many managers simply do not have the time or inclination to practice “management by walking around” and observing their subordinates at work, sampling errors such as the recency effect and infrequent observations may lead to invalid and subjective evaluations. This then creates problems, especially when the evaluation of aspects that fall outside the classroom observation is considered.
Swanepoel (1998:412) asserts that raters who feel uncomfortable about any confrontation with subordinates may, for instance, assign average ratings, where poor ratings would have been appropriate; ratees facing even the most accurate and objective criticism may resist or trivialise findings if they perceive the assessment as a blow to their self-esteem. Situational factors such as stress, sexual and racial biases, leadership style etc. have all been implicated in contaminating accurate and valid ratings (Cascio, 1991: 97). This therefore means that, in order for the process of educator evaluation to achieve its purpose, the DSG need to receive thorough training that will enable them to make sound and valid ratings.

2.8 CONCLUSION
The literature review of this research study has been established in this chapter. The literature review revealed that even though there are many educators who believe in IQMS, there are also large populations of appraisers and appraisees who are hostile and indifferent to the process. This is due to mistrust in the usefulness and validity of the procedure, a perceived lack of skill in handling evaluation discussions, a dislike of criticising people, and a dislike of any new procedure that is introduced.

The next chapter, Chapter three, will examine the research methodology and describe the various statistical methods used by the researcher.
CHAPTER 3

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The literature review in chapter two forms the basis of the structured questionnaire used in this research study to probe the perceptions of educators in respect of IQMS. The specific aims of this study were also highlighted in chapter one, with the main purpose of the study being to determine the challenges facing the DSGs in the implementation of IQMS. This chapter outlines the methodology that the researcher used to collect the data. The research design focuses on the following aspects:

- the purpose of quantitative research
- the design of the questionnaire
- composition of the questionnaire
- selection of the sample
- the administration of the instrument
- the return of questionnaire

A brief discussion to elucidate the merits of quantitative research follows.

3.2 THE PURPOSE OF QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH

According to Verma and Mallick (1999:3) the purpose of any research study is to collect new information or to utilise existing knowledge for a new purpose so as to answer worthwhile and fundamental questions by utilising valid and reliable techniques.

Researchers such as Borg, Gall and Gall (1993:195-196) believe that the purpose of quantitative research is to formulate objective descriptions of a limited set of phenomena and also to determine whether the phenomena can be controlled through certain interventions. Thus, initial quantitative studies of a research problem typically involve a precise description of the phenomena and a search for pertinent variables and their inter-relationships. Ultimately a theory is formulated to account for the empirical findings. Garbers (1996:282) posit that the purpose of quantitative research is to test theories, determine facts, analyze statistics, and demonstrate relationships between variables and predictions.
Creswell (1994:188), in this regard, states that the purpose of quantitative research is to describe the frequency, incidence and the distribution of the characteristics of an identified population and to explore relationships between variables. In this research study, data obtained from the respondents is transcribed in the form of scores that can be tabulated and analysed. Creswell (1994:4) furthermore describes quantitative research as value-free, formal and unbiased. The researcher is therefore able to report realities in a fruitful way. An important strength of quantitative research is that the reliability is much easier to establish, as it is not affected by the bias of the researcher, observer or interviewer.

3.2.1 Analysis of data
Quantitative research studies involve analysing data statically so that we may discern certain dynamic and potential forces that may be clues to areas that warrant further investigation (Leedy, 1997:243). It may also be defined as a numerical method of describing observations of materials or characteristics (Best & Kahn, 1993:208). If one uses a defined portion of the material or characteristics as a standard for measuring any sample, a valid and precise method of data description is provided. Bailey (1994:62) contends that any attribute measured in numbers may be called a quantitative attribute or variable. Quantitative research methodologies manipulate variables and control natural phenomena, thereby constructing hypotheses that “test” them against the hard facts of reality (Leedy, 1997:143). Therefore quantitative researchers use a deductive form of reasoning and begin with hypotheses and move towards proving these. In this research study, statistical hypotheses are used.

3.2.2 The Statistical Hypothesis
According to Pillay (2002: 78) statistical hypothesis usually postulates the opposites of what the research predicts or expects. In this form it is known as the null hypotheses and is usually represented by the symbol Ho. If the researcher thus expects that there will be statistically significant difference between the mean scores of male and female educators with respect to IQMS (research hypotheses), then the hypothesis will be stated in the form of a null hypothesis. It is the null hypothesis that will be tested using statistical techniques. In its null form, the hypothesis will then read:

- Ho: There is no significant statistical difference between the mean scores of male and female educators with respect to IQMS implementation.

The alternative hypothesis is stated thus.
• Ha: There is significant statistical difference between the mean scores of male and female educators with respect to IQMS implementation.

Should it be found that there is statistically significant difference between the mean scores of male and female educators with respect to IQMS implementation, then the null hypotheses (Ho) is rejected and the alternative hypotheses (Ha) is accepted.

The researcher finds the quantitative method most suitable in determining educators’ perceptions regarding IQMS implementation in both primary and secondary schools.

The design of the questionnaire as the research instrument used in this study is examined below

3.3 THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

3.3.1 The design of the questionnaire
The structured questionnaire consisting of closed ended questions guided the empirical study of this research. The questions were designed in order to achieve insight into the perceptions of educators with regard to the implementation of IQMS in the Vryheid district of the KwaZulu-Natal Province.

In constructing the questionnaire, the researcher ensured that the questions were standardised and that each respondent could interpret each question in a similar manner. The questions were kept very short and simple, and double-barrelled questions were avoided. Each question was formulated in such a way that the respondents could indicate their honest opinion regarding the implementation of IQMS in their schools.

Questions were formulated around the following dimensions:
• Understanding the purpose, processes and procedures followed in IQMS
• Developmental Appraisal System for educators
• Performance Measurement
• Whole school evaluation

3.3.2 The composition of the questionnaire
There are four sections in each questionnaire. Each section consists of questions intended to elicit responses that are deemed useful in answering the research question, as depicted in chapter one.

The questionnaire consists of 39 items, with 10 items in Section A, 13 items in Section B, 11 items in Section C, and 5 items in Section D. Questions were devised in order to obtain the perceptions of members of the teaching profession in the Vryheid district of KwaZulu-Natal regarding IQMS implementation in their schools.

Section A covered the biographical details of the respondents, which included the following: mother tongue, gender, employee organisation, teaching experience, post, nature of the school, number of learners, circuit, learning areas that an educator is responsible for, and finally, developmental support group that an educator is aligned with.

In Section B, 13 questions were presented to establish the educators’ perceptions regarding IQMS implementation in their schools. In Section C the researcher presented 11 questions on Whole School Evaluation. These questions endeavour to establish educators’ perceptions regarding WSE as it is being implemented in the Vryheid district schools as part and parcel of IQMS.

In Section D, 5 questions were presented to establish educators’ perceptions regarding the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) as it is being implemented in schools as part of IQMS. The opinions of educators are indicated on a five-point scale so as to establish the extent to which educators agree or disagree with the items. Babbie (1994:141) is in favour of a technique whereby the respondents can respond by indicating degrees of agreement or disagreement. This technique was chosen because the researcher believed that it made it easier to analyse data and questions (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995:157).

3.3.3 The scale
An example of the scale used is represented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The respondents had to indicate the extent to what they agree or disagree with the statements in the questionnaire where the figures indicate the following responses:

1= strongly agree with the statements;
2 to 4: forms equal intervals between 1 and 5; and
5= strongly disagree with the statement.

3.3.4 Selection of the sample
A sample is a group of subjects chosen from a larger group or population to which the finding is assumed to apply (Slaving, 1992:52). The purpose of sampling therefore is to obtain data about the population since a sample is just a portion of the population rather than the entire population, thereby saving money, time and energy. To be able to cover an acceptably informative sample of educators for this study, the following educators were selected:

- Educators (male and female) in public primary schools in the Vryheid district of KwaZulu-Natal.
- Educators (male and female) in public Secondary schools in Vryheid district of KwaZulu-Natal.

The sample was thus of a convenient stratified nature and representative of the educators in the province of KwaZulu-Natal in the Vryheid district.

3.3.4. The administration of the instrument
Questionnaires were distributed to selected schools in Vryheid district of KwaZulu-Natal. The questionnaires gave clear instructions for easy completion by the respondents themselves. The researcher approached principals in order to obtain their co-operation and the researcher then handed out questionnaires to the principals and collected them again after completion.
Co-operation in most instances was good and this enabled the researcher to obtain a good return of questionnaires.

Of the 1,080 questionnaires handed out to educators in the Vryheid District schools of KwaZulu-Natal, only 822 were returned as usable. This represents a return rate of 76.11%.

The completed questionnaires were then collected by the researcher, coded and checked for completeness. They were then submitted to the statistical consulting services (STATKON) of the University of Johannesburg, where data was transcribed and processed.

3.4 THE ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE USING DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS.

TABLE 3.4.1 MOTHER TONGUE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesotho</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IsiZulu</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IsiXhosa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThsiVenda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siswati</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepedi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total System</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IsiZulu = 93.6%
Non Zulu = 3.3%

The above table shows that the majority of the respondents are Zulu speakers representing 93.6% of the sample. The reason for this is that people who speak Zulu predominantly inhabit KwaZulu-Natal. The non-Zulu speaking respondents made up a percentage of 3.3. This could mean that even though their (non-Zulus) opinions may differ from that of the Zulu speakers, it will have little impact on the group’s responses because they (non-Zulus) form the minority group. The opinion of the Zulu speakers, who make up the largest group, will be taken into consideration. About 3.3% of the respondents did not answer this question, perhaps for the
The response indicated in the table above suggests that there are more female educators than male educators in this sample. 72.5% of the sample are female educators, whereas 22.5% are male educators. This is due to the fact that there are many primary schools in this sample, and female educators dominate primary schools. Alternatively, it could be that female educators dominate the teaching profession.

TABLE 3.4.3 EMPLOYEE ORGANISATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marked</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAPTOSA</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADTU</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAOU</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATU</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NATU = 59.9 %
SADTU = 31.0 %
The results in table 3.4.3 clearly indicate that the majority of respondents are members of NATU. Fifty-nine comma nine percent of the educators are members of NATU. Perhaps NATU in KwaZulu-Natal has a larger membership than all other unions because it is the oldest union (established in 1918). With respect to the percentage outcome of 31.0% of educators who are SADTU members, one can conclude that it may be due to the fact that SADTU is still in its teething stage, since it was only established in 1990.

**TABLE 3.4.4 POST LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Principal</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Principal</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management post = 28.9%
Post level one educator = 68.2%

The response indicated in the above table suggests that there are many post level one educators in schools, as compared to members of school management teams. 28.9% of the respondents occupy management posts. Of greater concern is the fact that 68.2% of the respondents are post level one educators, making one wonder how the SMT manages to effectively supervise so many educators. A possible explanation of the above problem with regard to percentages could be that managers are in the minority as compared to post level one educators, who form the majority. The low percentage of managers, with managers also being in the minority, could have a negative impact with regards to principals and SMT not being able to successfully drive the process of IQMS and providing guidance and support to DSG. Post level one educators make up about 71% of the total number of respondents.

**TABLE 3.4.5 NATURE OF THE SCHOOL**
The above table, with a percentage outcome of 77.6, reveals that the majority of educators teach in primary schools. This high percentage is due to the fact that there are more primary schools in the Vryheid district than high schools. The opinion of primary school educators then seems to predominate over that of secondary school educators. Secondary school educators represent nearly 18.00% of the sample.

About three comma zero percent of the respondents did not answer this question. This could be due to the many changes taking place within the department itself regarding the grading of schools. Educator postings had not been formally mandated at the time at which responses were requested.

TABLE 3.4.6 NUMBER OF LEARNERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Fewer than 500</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>501 to 700</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>701 to 1000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 1000</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>822</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fewer than 500=56.2%
More than 1000=4.7%
Table 3.4.6 reveals that most respondents teach in schools with less than five hundred learners. Where there are a reasonable number of learners, this could mean increased availability of opportunities for the proper implementation of IQMS. Six comma six percent of the respondents did not answer this question. This may be due to a lack of transparency in some schools whereby you find that educators are not informed by the management of the school enrolment figures.

TABLE 3.4.7 CIRCUIT EMPLOYED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhekzulu</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulpietersburg</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongoma</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahlabathini</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pongola</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mahlabathini circuit =29.0%
Nongoma circuit =28.3%
Bhekuzulu circuit=26.2%

In table 3.4.7 above it is indicated that the above three circuits have more or less the same percentages of educators. This is due to the fact that there are so many schools in these circuits with many educators. The bigger the circuits, the bigger are the challenges that the DSG must face in the implementation of IQMS. About 2.9% of the respondents did not answer this question. This could be due to confusion brought by restructuring within the districts in KwaZulu- Natal.
TABLE 3.4.8 LEARNING AREAS RESPONSIBLE FOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marked</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>619</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural science</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human and social science</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and management science</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life orientation</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>475</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Languages = 75.3%
Mathematics = 60.8%
Life Orientation = 57.8%

The above table shows that most educators teach Languages, Mathematics and Life Orientation. This is due to the fact that more periods are allocated to the teaching of Language, Mathematics and Life orientation. Another point of departure is that there are many primary schools with the foundation phase in this sample where only three learning areas (Language, Mathematics and Life orientation) are offered.
### TABLE 3.4.9 DEVELOPMENTAL SUPPORT GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total System</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One = 30.2%
Two = 28.1%

The table in 3.4.9 depicts that most respondents are involved in one or two DSG. A lower number of respondents are involved in three or more DSG. About 13.5% of educators are not involved in any of the DSG. This could possibly be due to a misconception about the questionnaire. Some educators thought that it was a document of the department that was handed out to them, since it was handed out to educators at the time when the districts were presenting information on IQMS.

### TABLE 3.4.10 TRAINING RECEIVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yes = 76.4%
No = 16.5%
Missing = 7.1%

The response indicated in the table above suggests that most of the respondents received IQMS training. 76.4 percent of the educators admitted to have received IQMS training. However, 16.5% of the educators indicated that they had not been trained. The reason for this may be that the training schedule was rigid, with no alternate days scheduled for
accommodating educators who could not attend at given times. This could have resulted in missed training, and for that reason they could not be accommodated in the response categories of the questionnaire. One wonders how educators will participate in the process of IQMS, not having undergone training.

**TABLE 3.4.11 WHEN WAS TRAINING RECEIVED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 04 - June 04</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 04 - Dec 04</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 05 - June 05</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 05 - Dec 05</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 06 - June 06</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After July 06</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total System</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before January 2005 = 54.00%
Before January 2006 = 21.4%
After January 2006 = 5.3%

The above table indicates that the highest percentage (namely 54 percent) of respondents received training before January 2005. It is also noted in this table that 21.4% of the educators received training before January 2006. This gives an indication that most educators have been put on board of IQMS before it could be implemented and perhaps, for this reason, there are now fewer educators who need training. About 19.2% of respondents did not answer this question. Perhaps they were not trained at all.

**TABLE 3.4.12 NOTIFICATION OF TRAINING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within a day</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within a week</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within a month</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than a month</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within a day = 16.4%
Within a week = 44.3%
The data in the table above reveals that a high percentage of respondents were notified of training within a week. 44.3% of educators were notified within a week. This could mean that most educators were notified of training in advance, thus giving them ample opportunity for making the necessary preparations so that they could attend the training. Their attendance of the training could assist in the proper implementation of IQMS. About 16.4% of the respondents were notified within a day. This indicates too short a notice, which could result in these respondents not attending the training. They would thus lack skills and knowledge to implement IQMS properly. About 19.5% of the educators did not respond to this question.

**TABLE 3.4.13 PERIOD OF TRAINING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Half a day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One day</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>326</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 days</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 days or longer</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One day = 39.7%
4 days or longer = 6.4%
Missing = 20.1%

The response indicated in the table above suggests that educators were trained in IQMS. 39.7% of educators received one day of training. Therefore a higher percentage of respondents appear to have received one day’s training. One-day training is not enough for understanding the processes of IQMS. There is much information that could be missed or cannot be clarified in one day. The result could be a negative attitude among educators who do not have sufficient knowledge to implement a new system. This potential bad attitude among educators may result in failure of the evaluation scheme (IQMS).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At my school</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a neighbouring school</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At another venue outside my school</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Missing                                   | System    | 163   | 19.8 |
| Total                                     | Total     | 822   | 100.0|

At my school = 41.7%
At another venue outside my school = 3.4%

Table 3.4.15 reveals that most of the respondents attended training in venues convenient to them. Forty-one comma seven percent of the educators attended training at their own schools. In this way the reasons for missing training were minimised. These educators are in a position to understand the process of IQMS to some extent and will be in a better position for implementation of the process.

TABLE 3.4.15 DSG AND IQMS TRAINING

The response to the following table was on the question: “Has the DSG of your school received IQMS training?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Missing                                   | System    | 147   | 17.9 |
| Total                                     | Total     | 822   | 100.0|

Received training = 69.6%
Did not know = 5.7%
No = 6.8%

The response indicated in the table above suggests that the educators were aware of the fact that DSG were trained. Sixty nine comma six percent of the educators indicated that DSG had
received training. However, 5.7% of the educators indicated that they did not know whether the DSG had been trained for the process. Of greater concern is the fact that 6.8% of the educators indicated that the DSGs had not been trained. One wonders how the important task of DSG participation in IQMS implementation can occur if DSG have not been trained.

TABLE 3.4.16 UNDERSTANDING THE PURPOSE AND THE PROCESS OF IQMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Purpose of IQMS</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>To no extent</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a large extent</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Process of IQMS</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Large to a very large extent = 34.1%
No extent to a small extent = 13.7%

The data in table 3.4.16 indicates a percentage outcome of 34.1% with regard to educators who understand the purpose of IQMS (from a large extent to a very large extent). A higher percentage of respondents seem to understand the purpose of IQMS when compared to those who do so to a moderate extent. This is indicated by a percentage outcome of 37.6%. However, 13.7% of the educators indicated that they do not understand the purpose of IQMS. This clearly indicates that there is a lot that needs to be done to capacitate educators so that they can fully understand the purpose of IQMS.

3.5 CONCLUSION

The literature study in chapter two formed the basis of the questionnaire that was designed to probe the perceptions of educators in respect of IQMS implementation as well as the challenges facing the DSG. In this chapter an attempt was made to outline the methodology that the researcher used in collecting data. The research design, principles of quantitative research, the design and composition of the questionnaire, data collection, sampling techniques and the rationale behind it, as well as the respondents and their biographical details was discussed in this chapter. Furthermore, the questionnaire as an instrument of research was discussed using tables of information accompanied by short discussions.
In chapter four, the following aspects will be examined:

- Reliability and validity of the research instrument
- A discussion of the factors
- A comparison of one of the independent pairs by stating appropriate hypotheses and interpreting the statistical tests involved
- A comparison of one of the independent groups containing three or more groups by stating the hypotheses and analysing the appropriate statistical data; and
- A discussion of the differences between the factor mean scores of the various groups for the factor involved
CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF A SELECTED SAMPLE OF EMPIRICAL DATA

4.1 INTRODUCTION
Chapter three concentrated on the design of the research instrument (questionnaire) and the description of the empirical investigation, which was discussed in line with the data researched in the previous chapter.

In this chapter, data obtained from the respondents will be presented and then analyzed empirically. Data shall be analyzed in terms of two or three independent groups.

- reliability and validity of the structured questionnaire
- discussion of the various factors involved
- comparison of independent groups by stating the appropriate hypotheses and analysis of the data by means of univariate statistical data
- discussion of the differences between the average mean scores of the independent variables, and
- conclusion

As it is important to establish the reliability and the validity of the research instrument used in the research, this aspect will now be discussed.

4.2 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY
In using a structured questionnaire, in this case to determine educators’ perceptions, it is important that the research instrument should be reliable and valid. Reliability refers to the consistency and dependability of the measures used. The validity aspect is concerned with whether what the researcher intends to measure is really measured. When a repeated measure of the same thing yields identical or very similar results, the instrument is said to be reliable. When different readings are obtained after using a bathroom scale for repeated measurements, then the instrument is not very reliable. If a certain object weighs 100 Newtons and your
measuring instrument repeatedly gives the weight as 90 Newtons, it might considered to be reliable, but not accurate or dependable (Vogt, 1993:195).

A valid instrument will measure what it is supposed to measure. Using a bathroom scale to measure height might be reliable because you get the same reading each time but it is not valid. A calibrated tape or metre stick would be more valid in measuring height than a bathroom scale (Vogt, 1993:240).

Although reliability and validity have been explained in broad terms above, there are different types of validity. For the purpose of this research only content and construct validity will be clarified.

4.3 CONTENT AND CONSTRUCT VALIDITY
Content validity has to do with whether the measuring instrument was expertly compiled so as to ensure that language mistakes and ambiguity have been eliminated and that the question items are relevant to the research study. To achieve this, the questionnaire was submitted to the Statistical Consulting Services of the University of Johannesburg. Content validity, however, is not a statistical property as such, but rather a matter of each item being scrutinized, as it were. An instrument has content validity to the extent that its items represent the content that it is designed to measure (Borg, Gall and Gall, 1993:120).

Construct validity, on the other hand, refers to the extent to which an instrument can measure a particular hypothetical construct. Such constructs are not directly observable but may be inferred on the basis of their effects on behaviour (Borg et al., 1993:120). The construct validity of this instrument was investigated by means of factor analysis. Factor analysis, according to Jaegar (1990:345), is a tool used to examine the validity of tests or the measurement characteristics of attitude scales.

4.4 FACTOR ANALYSIS
This is a technique whereby a large number of items are correlated in order to determine whether a small number of variables (factors) may be present and are able to convey the same information as the number of variables (Borg et al., 1993:269).
The first-order procedure involves principal axis factoring (PAF1), followed by another principal axis factoring analysis (PAF2). These procedures were performed using the SPSS14 programme to identify a number of factors that may facilitate the processing of the statistics. In a principle axis factoring analysis, all the variables are presumed to be dependent on underlying factors that are unique. The first order factor analysis of items in Section B of the questionnaire reduced the six (6) items to one first order factor. On the other hand, the first order factor analytical procedure on Section C of the questionnaire reduced the four (4) items to one first order factor. Lastly, first order factor analysis of the items in Section D of the questionnaire reduced the four (4) items to one first order factor. These three first order factors were then subjected to a second factor analytical procedure.

These procedures resulted in the following, on first-order analysis:

- Factor 1, which consisted of six items that were named the “Intended purpose of IQMS” with a Cronbach - alpha reliability co-efficient of 0.793.
- Factor 2 consisting of four (4) items was dubbed “Intended purpose of WSE factor” with a Cronbach-alpha reliability co-efficient of 0.850
- Factor 3 consisting of four (4) items and was named “Intended Performance Measurement” with a Cronbach –alpha reliability co-efficient of 0.774.

Section B of the questionnaire had 13 questions of which 6 were of a categorical nature. Questions 7 to 13 were related to the extent that respondents believed aspects about IQMS had been achieved. Q5 had an MSA value less than 0.6 and was left out of the factor analysis. Thus 6 questions of Section B on the intended purposes of IQMS were used in the overall analysis. Section C contained 4 questions relating to the consequences of WSE and Section D had 4 questions relating to Performance Measurement of educators. These 14 questions were subjected to two successive factor analytic procedures resulting in one factor that was named:

- Perceptions about the intended purposes of the quality control system and consisted of 14 items with an Alpha Cronbach Reliability coefficient of 0.77.

This factor was thus reliable to serve as the dependent variable in the research.
4.5 HYPOTHESES

Statistics tests were conducted on the second order factor. Hypotheses for the second order factor were formulated in respect of all the independent groups. Traditionally, statistics are divided into two main areas, namely:

- Descriptive statistics; and
- Inferential statistics

Organizing and summarizing data in order to make it more understandable is associated with descriptive statistics. Making inferences when generalising from a sample to the entire population is referred to as inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics are further divided into a number of variables that the research focuses on. However, when studying a single variable, it is referred to as univariate analysis, and when studying two variables it is called bivariate analysis. When more than two variables are studied, it is named multivariate analysis (Mouton, 1996:163).

Univariate analysis is the stage of “data chewing,” where a clear picture of the data emerges by examining one variable at a time. This analysis produced frequencies, percentage tables, graphs, charts and statistical indexes (Norusis, 2000). In this chapter, however, only univariate analysis will be discussed.

Hypotheses were formulated in respect of the two independent groups, which are compared below:

4.5.1 Hypothesis and testing for two independent groups

The student t-test was used to test for possible statistically significant differences between two groups at the univariate level. This test determines whether the observed difference between the average scores of two groups on a measurement has occurred by chance or whether it reflects a true difference in the average scores of the populations represented by the two groups (Borg et al., 1993:158).

The following is a discussion on possible differences between pairs of independent groups, as were identified by the data supplied by the questionnaire used in this research study. The formulated hypotheses are followed by a table that shows the possible significant differences
in their mean scores. The independent group chosen by the researcher for discussions with regard to gender and possible differences in the mean scores between male and female educators in respect of the first and second order factor are also investigated in this chapter.

Hypotheses testing for the single second order factor: the intended purpose of IQMS follows below:

TABLE 4.1 HYPOTHESIS WITH MALE AND FEMALE RESPONDENTS AS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE FOR “INTENDED PURPOSE OF IQMS”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differences at Univariate level</td>
<td>Gender of respondents</td>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>There is statistically no significant difference between the mean scores of males and females in respect of Intended purpose of IQMS</td>
<td>Student t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hat</td>
<td>There is a statistically significant differences in the mean scores of males and females in respect of Intended purpose IQMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.2 Significance of Difference Between Males and Females in Respect of the Intended Purpose of IQMS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE</th>
<th>STUDENTS TEST (P- VALUE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The intended purpose of IQMS</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N (Males) = 60  
N (Females) = 171  

** Statistically significant at the 1% level (p<0.01)  
* Statistically significant at the 5% level (p> 0.01 but p < 0.05)

Tables 4.1 and 4.2 reveal that there is no statistical significant difference (p=0.36) between the mean scores of males and females regarding the “Intended purpose of IQMS”. Hat is therefore rejected and Hot accepted. This indicates that males and females do not differ significantly statistically from one another in respect of the “Intended purpose of IQMS” factor. With respect to gender no significant statistical differences could be found in the factor mean scores of females (\( \bar{X} = 2.24 \)) and (\( \bar{X} = 2.25 \)).
TABLE 4.3 HYPOTHESIS WITH NATURE OF THE SCHOOL AS INDEPENDENT VARIABLE FOR “INTENDED PURPOSE OF IQMS”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differences at Univariate level</td>
<td>Nature of school</td>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>There is statistically no significant difference between the mean score of primary and secondary school educators with respect to the “Intended purpose of IQMS”.</td>
<td>Student t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hat</td>
<td>There is statistically a significant difference between the mean scores of primary and secondary educators with respect to the “Intended purpose of IQMS”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL EDUCATORS IN RESPECT OF THE “INTENDED PURPOSE OF IQMS”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE</th>
<th>STUDENT T-TEST (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The intended purpose of IQMS</td>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * Statistically significant at the 1% level (p< 0.01)
* Statistically significant at the 5% level (p> 0.01 but less than 0.05)

As revealed in tables 4.3 and 4.4, there is statistically no significant difference between the mean scale scores of primary and secondary school educators regarding the “Intended purpose of IQMS”. In this regard, Hot will be accepted and Hat rejected. Regarding respondents at
primary schools (\(\bar{X} = 2.26\)) and respondents at secondary schools (\(\bar{X} = 2.15\)), no statistically significant differences could be found and hence the finding could be the result of chance factors.

4.5.2 Hypotheses and testing for three or more independent groups

When three or more groups are tested for significant statistical differences between the mean scores then ANOVA (Analysis of variance) can be used to find the initial differences at the univariate level. Should any differences at this level be apparent then the Scheffé of the DunnetteT3 test can be used to compare the pairs. Only statistically significant findings will be analyzed.

4.5.2.1 Extent of understanding the purpose of IQMS as an independent variable

The relevant hypotheses are presented in Table 4.5, albeit be it in an abbreviated form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univariate</td>
<td>Grasp of IQMS</td>
<td>HoA</td>
<td>There is statistically no significant difference between the three understanding the purpose of IQMS groups regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaA</td>
<td>There is a statistically significant difference between the three understanding the purpose of IQMS groups regarding the perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair-wise comparison</td>
<td>Grasp of IQMS Groups</td>
<td>HoS/D</td>
<td>When compared pair wise (AB, AC and BC)there is statistically no significant difference between the three understanding the purpose of IQMS groups regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems</td>
<td>Scheffé/Dunnette T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaS/D</td>
<td>When compared pair wise (AB, AC and BC) there is a statistically significant difference between the three understanding the purpose of IQMS groups regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.6. SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE THREE GROUPS IN RESPECT OF UNDERSTANDING THE PURPOSE OF IQMS AS THE FACTOR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ANOVA (p-value)</th>
<th>Scheffé/ Dunnette T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A       B   C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions about the intended purpose of the quality control system relating to training received on IQMS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>A **     **  **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>B **     **  **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>C **     **  **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = to no, to a small extent  
B = to a moderate extent  
C = to a large and every large extent  
** = Statistically significant at the 1% level (P< 0.01)  
*    = Statistically significant at the 5% level (p> 0.01 but p= < 0.05)

Data from table 4.6 indicates that the null hypotheses HoA cannot be accepted. The three groups differ statistically significantly regarding their perceptions about the intended purposes of quality control systems. Although all three understanding the purpose of IQMS groups only agree to a small extent with the dependent variable the group which has the highest factor mean score (\( \bar{X} = 2.5 \)) agrees to the largest extent with the intended purpose of the quality control system. One would expect this group to have the largest factor mean score as they believe to a large extent that they understand the purpose of the IQMS system. One would thus have expected this group to have obtained a much higher factor mean score and to at least have agreed to a large extent with this factor.

4.5.2.2 Extent of training received on preparing you for implementing IQMS as an independent variable
### Table 4.7 Hypothesis with Extent of Training Received on IQMS Groups as Independent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univariate</td>
<td>Grasp of IQMS Groups</td>
<td>HoA</td>
<td>There is statistically no significant difference between the three training received on IQMS groups regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaA</td>
<td>There is a statistically significant difference between the three training received on IQMS groups regarding the perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HoS/D</td>
<td>When compared pair wise (AB, AC and BC) there is statistically no significant difference between the three training received on IQMS groups regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td>Scheffé/Dunnette T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaS/D</td>
<td>When compared pair wise (AB, AC and BC) there is statistically significant difference between the three training received on IQMS groups regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.8 SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE THREE TRAINING RECEIVED ON IQMS GROUPS REGARDING THE FACTOR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>ANOVA (p-value)</th>
<th>Scheffé/ Dunnette T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions about the intended purpose of the quality control system relating to training received on IQMS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>A ** **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>B ** **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>C ** **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = to no, to a small extent  
B = to a moderate extent  
C = to a large and very large extent  
** = Statistically significant at the 1% level (p≤ 0.01)  
* = Statistically significant at the 5% level (p≥ 0.01 but p≤ 0.05)

The data in Table 4.8 indicates that HoA cannot be accepted. The three groups that received training all have differing perceptions about the training received regarding the implementation of the IQMS. It is to be expected that the group, which has the most positive perceptions about training received, would have the best perception regarding the intended purpose of the quality control system. It would, however, appear that the training did not adequately prepare the respondents for the intended purpose of quality control systems.

4.5.2.3 WSE evaluates the effectiveness of the school in terms of national goals as independent variable
This independent variable was recoded to form three groups namely agree to a small extent, agree to a moderate extent and agree to a large to very large extent that evaluates the effectiveness of a school in terms of national goals.
### TABLE 4.9 HYPOTHESES WITH WSE EVALUATES THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SCHOOL IN TERMS OF NATIONAL GOALS GROUPS AS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univariate</td>
<td>WSE and effective school</td>
<td>HoA</td>
<td>There is statistically no significant difference between the three groups: WSE evaluates the effectiveness of a school in terms of national goals groups regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaA</td>
<td>There is a statistically significant difference between the three groups: WSE evaluates the effectiveness of a school in terms of national goals groups regarding the perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair-wise</td>
<td>WSE and effective school</td>
<td>HoS/D</td>
<td>When compared pair wise (AB, AC and BC) there is statistically no significant difference between the three groups: WSE evaluates the effectiveness of a school in terms of national goals groups regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems</td>
<td>Scheffé/ Dunnette T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td>HaS/D</td>
<td>When compared pair wise (AB, AC and BC) there is a statistically significant difference between the three groups: WSE evaluates the effectiveness of a school in terms of national goals groups regarding their perceptions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.10 SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE THREE GROUPS REGARDING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SCHOOL IN TERMS OF NATIONAL GOALS REGARDING THE FACTOR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ANOVA (p-value)</th>
<th>Scheffé/Dunnette T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>A ** **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>B ** **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>C ** **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceptions about the intended purpose of the quality control system relating to national goals.

A = agree to no, to a small extent
B = agree to a moderate extent
C = agree to large and very large extent.

** = Statistically significant at the 1% level (p<0.01)
* = Statistically significant at the 5% level (p> 0.01 but p= < 0.05)

The data in Table 4.10 indicates that the null hypothesis, HoA, cannot be accepted. The three groups differ statistically significantly on their agreement regarding the dependent variable. The group that agrees to a large and very large extent that WSE evaluates the effectiveness of a school in terms of national goals also has the most positive perception about the intended purpose of the quality control system. However, the factor mean score of this group is low (\(\bar{X}=2.48\)) and one would have expected this category to have agreed with the intended purpose of the quality control system to a much larger extent.

4.5.2.4 WSE provided feedback to all stakeholders as a means of achieving continuous Improvement as independent variable

This independent variable was recorded to form three groups namely agree to a small extent, agree to a moderate extent and agree to a large extent that WSE provided feedback to all stakeholders as a means of achieving continuous improvement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univariate</td>
<td>WSE and Feedback</td>
<td>HoA</td>
<td>There is statistically no significant difference between the three groups: WSE provided feedback as a means to achieving continuous improvement groups regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaA</td>
<td>There is statistically significant difference between the three groups: WSE provided feedback as a means to achieving continuous improvement groups regarding the perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair-wise</td>
<td>WSE and Feedback</td>
<td>HoS/D</td>
<td>When compared pair wise (AB, AC &amp; BC) there is statistically no significant difference between the three groups: WSE provided feedback as a means to achieving continuous improvement groups regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td>Scheffè / Dunnette T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td>HaS/D</td>
<td>When compared pair wise (AB, BC &amp; AC) there is statistically significant difference between the three groups: WSE provided feedback as a means to achieving continuous improvement groups regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.12 SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE THREE GROUPS RELATING TO FEEDBACK TO ALL STAKEHOLDERS AS A MEANS OF ACHIEVING CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ANOVA (p-value)</th>
<th>Scheffé/ Dunnette T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>A **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>B **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>C **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = agree to no, to a small extent  
B = agree to a moderate extent  
C = agree to a large and very large extent.  
** = Statistically significant at the 1% level (p<0.01)  
* = Statistically significant at the 5% level (p>0.01 but p=<0.05)

Table 4.12 indicates that the three independent groups differ statistically significantly from one another in their mean scores regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of the quality control system. Thus HoA cannot be accepted. Similarly HoD.AB, HoD.AC and HoD.BC cannot be accepted. Group C, has the highest factor mean score ($\bar{X} = 2.59$) and this WSE group, which agrees to a large and very large extent with feedback to all stakeholders as being necessary for achieving continuous improvement, should at least agree with the intended purpose of the quality control system. As one of the intended goals of WSE is to provide continuous feedback to all stakeholders one would have expected a higher factor mean score on the dependent variable indicating that the intended purpose of the quality control system was not achieved.
4.5.2.5 Lesson observation as being necessary for educator development as independent variable

The categories in this question were recoded in three groups namely, agree to no to a small extent, agree to a moderate extent and agree to a large and very large extent.

TABLE 4.13  HYPOTHESES THAT LESSON OBSERVATION IS NECESSARY FOR EDUCATOR DEVELOPMENT GROUPS AS AN INDEPENDENT VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univariate</td>
<td>Lesson observation</td>
<td>HoA</td>
<td>There is statistically no significant difference between the three groups: lesson observation is necessary for educator development groups regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaA</td>
<td>There is a statistically significant difference between the three groups: lesson observation as necessary for educator development groups regarding the perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair-wise comparison</td>
<td>Lesson observation</td>
<td>HoS/D</td>
<td>When compared pair wise (AB, AC and BC) there is statistically no significant difference between the three groups: lesson observation is necessary for educator development groups regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td>Scheffé/Dunnett T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaS/D</td>
<td>When compared pair wise (AB, AC and BC) there is a statistically significant difference between the three groups: lesson observation is necessary for educator development groups regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.14 SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE THREE GROUPS: WITH REGARDS TO THE FACTOR THAT LESSON OBSERVATION IS NECESSARY FOR EDUCATOR DEVELOPMENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ANOVA (p-value)</th>
<th>Scheffé/ Dunnette T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceptions about the intended purpose of the quality control system relating to lesson observation as a factor.

A = agree to no, to a small extent
B = agree to a moderate extent
C = agree to a large and very large extent
** = Statistically significant at the 1% level (p< 0.01)
* = Statistically significant at the 5% level (p> 0.01 but p=< 0.05)

The data in Table 4.14 indicates that HoA cannot be accepted. At the pair-wise level HoD.AC and HoD.BC also cannot be accepted. Group C which has the highest factor mean score (\( \bar{X} =2.38 \)) differs statistically significantly from both groups A and B at the 1% level. However, as the most positive group regarding lesson observation as a means of educator development, they only believe to small extent about the intended purpose of the quality control system. It would seem that lesson observation as a means of quality control is a controversial concept as all three groups obtained low factor mean scores on this dependent variable.

4.5.2.6 Development Support Grouping (DSG) contribute to educator development as independent variable This question was recoded to form three categories namely extent of belief to a small extent, extent of belief to a moderate extent and extent of belief to a large and very large extent.
TABLE 4.15 HYPOTHESES THAT DSG CONTRIBUTE TO EDUCATOR DEVELOPMENT GROUPS AS AN INDEPENDENT VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univariate</td>
<td>DSG and educator development</td>
<td>HoA</td>
<td>There is statistically no significant difference between the three DSG groups that contribute to educator development regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaA</td>
<td>There is a statistically significant difference between the three DSG groups that contribute to educator development regarding the perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair-wise</td>
<td>DSG and educator development</td>
<td>HoS/D</td>
<td>When compared pair wise (AB, AC and BC) there is statistically no significant difference between the three DSG groups that contribute to educator development regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td>Scheffé/ Dunnette T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td>HaS/D</td>
<td>When compared pair wise (AB, AC and BC) there is a statistically significant difference between the three DSG groups that contribute to educator development regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.16  SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE THREE DSG REGARDING THE FACTOR DSGs CONTRIBUTE TOWARDS EDUCATOR DEVELOPMENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ANOVA (p-value)</th>
<th>Scheffé/ Dunnette T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = extent of belief to no, to a small extent  
B = extent of belief to a moderate extent  
C = extent of belief to a large and very large extent.  

** = Statistically significant at the 1% level (p< 0.01)  
* = Statistically significant at the 5% level (p> 0.01 but p=< 0.05)

The data in Table 4.16 indicates that the three groups formed, all who have differing beliefs about the extent that the DSG contribute to educator development, only have a moderate belief in the intended purpose of the quality control system. As the quality control system prescribes the use of DSG this finding is unexpected. Surely the intended purpose of any quality control system for educators is educator development and it thus appears as if the function of DSG is the contested concept in the quality control mechanism.

4.5.2.7 Educators have sufficient time to serve on the DSG as independent variable  
This variable was recoded to form the three categories of belief: belief to a small extent, belief to a moderate extent and belief to a large and very large extent.
TABLE 4.17  HYPOTHESES WITH REGARDS TO THE GROUPS THAT EDUCATORS HAVE SUFFICIENT TIME TO SERVE ON THE DSG AS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univariate</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>HoA</td>
<td>There is statistically no significance difference between the three educator groups that have sufficient time to serve on DSG regarding the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HaA</td>
<td>There is a statistically significant difference between the three educator groups that DSG have sufficient time to serve on the DSG regarding the perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair-wise</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>HoS/D</td>
<td>When compared pair wise (AB, AC and BC) there is statistically no significant difference between the three educator groups that they have sufficient time to serve on the DSG regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems</td>
<td>Scheffé/Dunnette T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>HaS/D</td>
<td>When compared pair wise (AB, AC and BC) there is a statistically significant difference between the three educator groups that they have sufficient time to serve on the DSG groups regarding their perceptions about the intended purpose of quality control systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 4.18 SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE THREE EDUCATOR GROUPS RELATING TO SUFFICIENT TIME TO SERVE ON THE DSG GROUPS AS THE FACTOR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ANOVA (p-value)</th>
<th>Scheffé/ Dunnette T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions about the intended purpose of the quality control system relating to educator groups having sufficient time to serve on DSG.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>** *</td>
<td>A   **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>B **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>C **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = extent of belief to no, to a small extent
B = extent of belief to a moderate extent
C = extent of belief to a large and very large extent.
** = Statistically significant at the 1% level (p ≤ 0.01)
* = Statistically significant at the 5% level (p ≥ 0.01 but p ≤ 0.05)

Data from Table 4.17 indicates that the null hypothesis (p = 0,000) cannot be accepted. At the pair-wise level HoD.AB, HoD.AC and HoA.BC also cannot be accepted. The group that believes to a large extent and to a very large extent that educators have sufficient time only believes to a moderate extent with the intended purpose of the quality control system. One would have expected this group (X =2.52) to have more positive perceptions about the intended purposes of the quality control system because DSG functions are prescribed and it is intended that educators should serve on them.
CONCLUSION
In this chapter an analysis and interpretation of the empirical data was undertaken. The construct validity of the research instrument was investigated by means of two successive factor analytic procedures that resulted in one factor named:
Perceptions about the intended purpose of the quality control system and consisted of 14 items with an Alpha – Cronbach Reliability coefficient of 0.77
The statistical analysis was logically carried out by comparing two examples of one independent group and another example of two or more independent groups. Hypotheses were formulated and univariate statistical tests were used to analyze and interpret the data.

The questionnaire that was used was able to distinguish between groups which are known to differ from one another. These differences were briefly discussed and possible reasons for differences in the factor mean scores were postulated. An instrument has construct validity if it able to indicate that groups who are known to differ from one another. From the discussions reflected in this chapter, it is evident that the groups do in fact differ statistically significantly in their perceptions from one another. This shows that the factor “Perceptions about the intended purpose of the quality control system” has a construct validity and high reliability.

Significant statistical differences were found to be present between:

- understanding the purpose of IQMS;
- training received;
- WSE evaluates the effectiveness of schools;
- WSE providing feedback;
- lesson observation;
- DSG contribution to educator development; and
- educators having plenty of time to serve on DSG.

After having analyzed and interpreted the empirical data in chapter four, chapter five will present a summary of the research. Important findings will be discussed and appropriate recommendations will be provided.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. INTRODUCTION
The general aim of this research study was to investigate the challenges facing the DSG in the implementation of IQMS in schools. In order to consummate this general aim, the specific objectives were to:

- probe the perceptions of educators with regard to the roles and responsibilities of DSG in the implementation of IQMS
- determine the challenges faced by the DSG in the implementation of IQMS
- present guidelines and recommendations to improve the process of educator evaluation

In the previous chapter, data collected from educators by means of a structured questionnaire was analysed and interpreted. In this final chapter of the research, a summary is made of important findings and recommendations emanating from the research. Suggestions are also made with regard to topics for further research. In the conclusion of this chapter, an attempt is made to establish whether, and to what extent, the research questions have been answered.

5.2. SUMMARY
Chapter 1 focused on defining the problem and on setting out the general and specific aims of the research study. It also dealt with the research methodology used in the study and on clarification of concepts used in the study.

Chapter 2 was concerned with a literature review of the implementation of IQMS with special focus on the roles and responsibilities of the DSG.

Chapter 3 presented the design and composition of the research instrument, the sampling technique and administration of the instrument, as well as a description of the scale used in relation to question items presented in the various sections of the questionnaire. This chapter furthermore provided summaries of responses in the form of tables so as to show how essential data was obtained by means of the research instrument.
Chapter 4 presented an analysis and interpretation of empirical data gathered from the educators with regard to the challenges facing the DSG in the implementation of IQMS. The reliability and the validity of the structured questionnaire were also dealt with in chapter 4. The fourteen items in Sections B, C and D of the questionnaire were reduced to three second-order factors, named Intended purpose of IQMS factor, Intended purpose of WSE factor and Intended performance measurement factor.

The summary of the preceding four chapters, is followed by the findings of the research study, as presented below.

5.3 FINDINGS
The findings presented in this section are from the literature review and from data gathered by means of the research instrument.

5.3.1 Findings from the literature review
Finding 1
As a result of the many changes taking place in the education system, educators need to be capacitated on a continuous basis so as to keep abreast of the latest trends and developments. Professional development of educators is of great importance these days (cf 2.2.1 p. 16). For example, Guskey (2003:3) purports that every proposal for educational reform and every plan for school improvement emphasises the need for high quality professional development.

Educators today find themselves in a state of transition s– from trained instructors to educated professionals and from dispensers of information and skills to facilitators of knowledge, attitudes and values as stated in the policy documents. As educator preparation and continuing professional development become a reality for all educators, the term “professional staff development” begins to replace the old concept of “in-service training.”

Finding 2
There should be some form of integration between the individual and the organization as far as appraisal is concerned (cf 2.2.2 p. 17-18). Sergiovanni and Starrat (1993:82) claim that a school climate conducive to learning creates a positive psychological feeling in educators and learners with regard to their school. If educators can feel themselves as part of the organisation as a whole, and not in isolation, then this feeling will ultimately lead to a more
collaborative culture for appraisal to be successful. By integrating the individual and the organisation in the appraisal process, appraisal becomes two-fold. It involves identifying those areas that needs improvement and agreeing on the actions to be taken by all the individuals in a school. West and Bollington (1990:15), are of the opinion that linking whole school evaluation to educator appraisal results in a more powerful strategy for school improvement. Wilcox (1992:17-18) is of the opinion that regarding such notions as performance and standards as unproblematic aspects of objective reality is both naïve and potentially harmful. He furthermore states that the performance of a school is not an objective entity that exists outside those individual minds that construct it. Performance, according to Wilcox (1992: 17-18), is a construction by which we attempt to make some sense of that complexity that we call a school. This suggests that the constructions of different individuals should be shared, discussed and debated with the aim of producing more sophisticated, more meaningful, more inclusive and more consensual constructions.

5.3.2 Empirical findings (from the research questionnaire)

The six items of Section B of the questionnaire was reduced to one factor by means of two successive factor analytic procedures. This factor was named “Intended purpose of IQMS,” which consists of six items with a Cronbach-Alpha-reliability coefficient of 0.793.

Section C of the questionnaire after two successive factor analytic procedures was reduced to four items. These items were reduced to one factor that was dubbed “Intended purpose of WSE”, consisting of four items with a Cronbach-Alpha-reliability coefficient of 0.850.

The four items of Section D of the questionnaire were reduced to one factor by means of successive factor analytic procedures. This factor was named, “Intended performance measurement” consisting of four items with a Cronbach-Alpha-reliability coefficient of 0.774.

The findings discussed below are based on the responses to the questions on the Intended purpose of IQMS factor (Section B of the questionnaire).
5.3.2.1 Findings relating to the Intended purpose of IQMS factor

Finding 1
Question B1 reveals that few respondents seem to understand the purpose of IQMS. This is indicated by a percentage of 34.1% of respondents stating that they understand the purpose of IQMS (to a large extent to a very large extent).

Finding 2
Question B5 reveals that 36.9% of the respondents believe (from a large extent to a very large) that IQMS will result in DSGs becoming more accountable.

Finding 3
Question B3 reveals that 30.8% of the respondents believe (from a large extent to a very large extent) that the training they received had prepared them for implementing IQMS.

The following findings are based on the responses to questions on the WSE factor (Section C of the questionnaire).

5.3.2.2 Findings from Intended purpose of WSE factor

Finding 4
Most respondents do not strongly agree that WSE evaluates the effectiveness of a school in terms of national goals. About 34.4% of respondents agreed (from a large extent to a very large extent) that WSE evaluates the effectiveness of school in terms of national goals.

Finding 5
Question C2 reveals that a smaller percentage of respondents agreed (from a large extent to a very large extent) that WSE provides feedback to all the stakeholders as a means of achieving continuous improvement. The above is indicated by a percentage outcome of 29.7% of respondents who agree (from a large extent to a very large extent) that WSE provides feedback as a means of achieving continuous growth.

The following findings are based on the responses to questions on the intended performance measurement factor (Section D of the questionnaire).
5.3.2.3 Findings from intended performance measurement factor

In this question (D1), about 61.6 % of the respondents believed (from a large extent to a very large extent) that lesson observation is necessary for educator development.

Finding 6
Question D2 reveals that 51.4% of respondents believe (from a large extent to a very large extent) that DSG contribute to educator development.

Finding 7
Educators do not have sufficient time to serve on DSG. This is indicated by a percentage outcome of 25.8 % of respondents who believe (from a large extent to a very large extent) that educators have sufficient time to serve on DSG.

Having presented the key findings of this study, the recommendations will now follow.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

The main aim of this research study was to investigate challenges facing the DSG in the implementation of IQMS in schools. In order to realize this aim, a literature survey was undertaken and this served as the foundation upon which the empirical research could be based. The findings of this research are used to suggest the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1
There is a need to understand the purpose of IQMS. Those involved in the implementation of IQMS need enough time to understand the purpose, process, principles as well as procedures involved in the implementation of IQMS. The implementation itself requires plenty of time since it involves advocacy, training and planning, self-evaluation by the educator, pre-evaluation discussion, classroom observation, outside classroom observation plus feedback and discussion.

Recommendation 2
All the individuals involved in the implementation of IQMS should undergo full training by “expertly trained” facilitators. Training should cover all the aspects relating to IQMS prior to
implementation in order to ensure that the spirit of appraisal is observed in practice. Retraining is essential to sort out the finer issues as well as to update those involved with regard to the latest trends and developments. Structures should support all training initiatives.

Recommendation 3
Whole School Evaluation is a national policy that is aimed at evaluating the quality of education provided by individual school. The focus of WSE is not on individuals and their performance nor is it on isolated aspects of the school but on the school as a whole. It is for this reason that the nine key areas are being evaluated. These nine key areas include;

- basic functionality of the school;
- leadership, management and communication;
- governance and relationships;
- quality of teaching and educator development;
- curriculum provision and resources;
- learner achievement;
- school safety, security; and
- parents and community.

Educators need to understand that since WSE is a national initiative it is therefore legally binding. For our schools to be effective it is essential that its quality be monitored and evaluated in order to make improvements continually.

Recommendation 4
The main purpose of WSE is to facilitate improvement of school performance through approaches characterized by partnership, collaboration, mentoring and guidance (Government Gazette No. 22512) The stakeholders involved in WSE programme include the national Ministry, the province provincial supervisory units, district support services and schools. WSE enables schools and external supervisors to work together to identify the schools strengths as well as those areas in need of development. WSE tries to link evaluation carried out by the school itself with an external evaluation carried out by supervisors. These supervisors use agreed national criteria so that the conclusions they reach about one school
can be compared with the conclusions reached about another, no matter where it is in the country.

The approach recognizes that the key to whole school evaluation is ensuring that schools are meeting their responsibilities for improving their performance. The means of achieving this are through a co-ordinated, effective self-evaluation mechanism, an external evaluation framework, and adequate and regular district support and development programmes. Very important is the ongoing assistance and advice by district professional support services that should be given to individual staff members and schools to help them improve their performance.

Educators need to understand that WSE is not aimed at fault finding but rather on gathering information by different stakeholders and providing advice and support in order to improve performance in school.

**Recommendation 5**

The DSG have a crucial role to play in the implementation of IQMS. They are responsible for both baseline and summative evaluation of educators. Because of this tremendous responsibility placed on the shoulders of the DSG it is of utmost importance that they undergo thorough training prior the implementation of IQMS. Such training should cover all the aspects of IQMS. This training will enable the DSG to award sound and valid ratings, thus preventing rating errors. Their role is crucial in the sense that it is incumbent upon them to identify those educators who qualify for pay as well as grade progression. The issue of remuneration is a sensitive issue that needs to be handled with care. It is for this reason that the DSGs powers of observation as well as their listening skills should be well developed.

**5.5 TOPICS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

During the course of this research study, the researcher became aware of other areas of concern regarding evaluation in schools. These are:

- In the short term, IQMS has been found to be time-consuming as it adds to the workload of the already overloaded school management and its personnel. There is therefore a need to establish what can be done to make IQMS less time-consuming and more manageable.
• IQMS is aimed at enhancing the educator’s potential and professional development and it seems that there has been some resistance towards this in certain schools. It is therefore necessary to establish which schools are positive towards IQMS and how they achieve this.

5.6 CONCLUSION
This study revealed important information with regard to the challenges facing the DSGs in the implementation of IQMS. The perceptions of educators were gathered and analysed. These perceptions, together with the literature review, led to the recommendations, which might prove useful in the event that a refinement of the IQMS should be needed.

It is also essential for senior practitioners of IQMS to exercise care and understanding in the sometimes-difficult situation in which evaluated educators find themselves. Also, practitioners should be vigilant enough to discourage the manipulative endeavour of certain educators who might want to have their way by using the DSG inability to perform as a possible scapegoat. In order for educators to develop professionally enough to meet new challenges that come with the new education system, educators need to be ready to evaluate themselves. In order to allow this development to materialise, they must also allow themselves to be evaluated by the DSG.
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SECTION A PERSONAL AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions by circling the correct code or by filling in your answer in the space provided.

3 EXAMPLES

What is your gender? If your gender is female then circle 01 as follows:

1. What is your gender?

- Female 01
- Male 02

1. What is your MOTHER TONGUE? (choose one response only)

- Afrikaans 01
- English 02
- Sesotho 03
- IsiZulu 04
- IsiXhosa 05
- Setswana 06
- Xitsonga 07
- ThsiVenda 08
- Siswati 09
- IsiNdebele 10
- Sepedi 11
- Hindi 12
- Gujerati 13
- Tamil 14
- Other (Specify) 15

2. What is your GENDER?

- Female 01
- Male 02

3. Which EMPLOYEE ORGANISATION (Union) Do you belong to? (tick all applicable)

- NAPTOSA
- SADTU
- SAOU
- NATU
- Other (Specify)
4. How many years of TEACHING EXPERIENCE do you have? (e.g. If you have 32 yrs then enter 3 2)

5. What is your current POST?
- Principal 01
- Deputy Principal 02
- Head of Department 03
- Educator 04

6. What is the NATURE of your School?
- Primary 01
- Secondary 02
- Combined (primary and secondary) 03
- LSEN School 04
- Other (specify) 05

7. What is the NUMBER OF LEARNERS currently enrolled at your school?
- Fewer than 500 learners 01
- 501 to 700 learners 02
- 701 to 1000 learners 03
- More than a 1000 learners 04

8. In which CIRCUIT are you employed?
- Bhekuzulu 01
- Paulpietersburg 02
- Nongoma 03
- Mahlabathini 04
- Pongola 05

9. Which of the following LEARNING AREAS ARE YOU RESPONSIBLE FOR? (you may tick more than one)
   - Languages
   - Mathematics
   - Natural science
   - Human and social science
   - Economic and management science
   - Arts and culture
   - Life orientation
10. How many DEVELOPMENTAL SUPPORT GROUPS (DSG) are you involved in (Circle the appropriate number)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION B THE INTERGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (IQMS)

Please remember this is not a test of your competence. Mark your opinion by circling the appropriate number/code on the scale provided for each question.

1. Have you received any training for IQMS?

   01 Yes
   02 No

PLEASE NOTE:
IF YOU ARE ANSWERED ‘YES’, TO THE ABOVE QUESTION, PROCEED TO QUESTION 2 BELOW.
IF YOU HAVE ANSWERED ‘NO’, PLEASE PROCEED TO SECTION C.

3.4 Circle the applicable number to indicate your response

2. When did you receive training?

   Between January 2004 and June 2004
   July 2004 and December 2004
   January 2005 and June 2005
   July 2005 and December 2005
   January 2006 and June 2006
   After July 2006
3. How long before training commenced were you notified?
   - Within a day
   - Within a week
   - Within a month
   - More than a month

4. How long did the training last?
   - Half a day
   - One a day
   - 2 to 3 days
   - 4 days or longer

5. Where did the training take place?
   - At my school
   - At a neighbouring school
   - At another venue outside my district

6. Has the DSG of your school received IQMS training?
   Circle the applicable number to indicate your response
   - 01 Yes
   - 02 No
   - 03 I do not know

Please proceed to question 7 on next page

Please answer each of the following questions using the 5-point scale provided. Indicate your response by circling the number corresponding to your answer.
1. To no extent
2. To a small extent
3. To a moderate extent
4. To a large extent
5. To a very large extent

EXAMPLE
To what extent are educators committed to school development activities?
(If educators are moderately committed, then circle option 3)

NO EXTENT 1 2 3 4 5 VERY LARGE EXTENT
To what extent do you understand:

7. The purpose of IQMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO EXTENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>VERY LARGE EXTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. The processes of IQMS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO EXTENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>VERY LARGE EXTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. The procedure to be followed in IQMS?

To what extent do you believe:

10. The training you received has prepared you for implementing IQMS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO EXTENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>VERY LARGE EXTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. IQMS will result in DSG becoming more accountable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO EXTENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>VERY LARGE EXTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. IQMS will improve performance in school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO EXTENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>VERY LARGE EXTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. IQMS will result / has resulted in an increase in your workload?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO EXTENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>VERY LARGE EXTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
SECTION C WHOLE SCHOOL EVALUATION (WSE)

Please answer each of the following questions using the appropriate scale. The five-point scale implies the following response:

1  To no extent
2  To a small extent
3  To a moderate extent
4  To a large extent
5  To a very large extent

Please circle the number corresponding to your answer.

EXAMPLE

To what extent are educators involved in school development activities?
(If educators are moderately involved, then circle option 3)

NO EXTENT  1  2  3  4  5  VERY LARGE EXTENT

1. Has your school undergone Whole School Evaluation?

Circle the appropriate number to indicate your response

Yes  1  No  2  Do not know  3

NB. ANSWER QUESTION 2 AND 3 ONLY IF YOUR ANSWER IS “YES” TO QUESTION 1 ABOVE. IF YOU HAVE ANSWERED ‘NO’ OR ‘I DON’T KNOW’ PROCEED TO QUESTION 4.

2. At the end of WSE your school received a report?

Yes  1  No  2  Do not know  3

3. The school received support for improvement after WSE?

Yes  1  No  2  Do not know  3
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Respond on the scale provided.

4. WSE evaluate the effectiveness of a school in terms of national goals.
   
   NO EXTENT 1 2 3 4 5 VERY LARGE EXTENT

5. WSE provided feedback to all stakeholders as a means of achieving continuous improvement.
   
   NO EXTENT 1 2 3 4 5 VERY LARGE EXTENT

6. WSE serves as a tool to determine resources needs at a school.
   
   NO EXTENT 1 2 3 4 5 VERY LARGE EXTENT

7. WSE results in more resources being allocated to a school.
   
   NO EXTENT 1 2 3 4 5 VERY LARGE EXTENT

8. Has your school started to implement the Performance Management System (PMS)?
   (Circle the appropriate number to indicate your response).
   
   Yes 1 No 2 Do not know 3

NB. IF YOUR ANSWER IS “YES” TO QUESTION 8 ABOVE, KINDLY ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS THAT FOLLOW. IF “NO”, PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION 10.

9. Do the DSG of your school provide support and mentoring?
   
   Yes 1 No 2 Do not know 3

10. Are the DSG of your school well capacitated to carry out PMS?
    
    Yes 1 No 2 Do not know 3

11. Have District officials provided support with the implementation of IQMS?
    
    Yes 1 No 2 Do not know 3
SECTION D MANAGEMENT AND APPRAISAL OF EDUCATORS

Please answer the following questions using the following 5-points scale. Indicate your response by circling the number corresponding to your answer.

1. No Extent
2. Small Extent
3. Moderate Extent
4. Large Extent
5. Very large Extent

EXAMPLE
To what extent do educators welcome constructive feedback.
(If educators do not welcome constructive criticism at all, then circle 1).

NO EXTENT       VERY LARGE EXTENT

To what extent do you believe that:

1. Lesson observation is necessary for educator development?

NO EXTENT       VERY LARGE EXTENT

2. DSG (Appraisal Panels) contribute to educator development?

NO EXTENT       VERY LARGE EXTENT

3. Educators have sufficient time to serve on DSG?

NO EXTENT       VERY LARGE EXTENT

4. Ratings by the DSG always depict the actual performance of an educator?

NO EXTENT       VERY LARGE EXTENT

5. The attitude of the appraisee can affect the judgement of the DSG.

NO EXTENT       VERY LARGE EXTENT

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATION.
12 September 2006

Dear Colleague

RESEARCH ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IQMS:
CHALLENGES FACING THE DSG IN THE VRYHEID DISTRICT OF KWAZULU-NATAL

The Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) comprises three programmes namely; Developmental Appraisal (DA), Performance Measurement (PM) and Whole School Evaluation (WSE). The three programmes ought to complement each other and run concurrently. The role of the Developmental Support Groups (DSG) is of cardinal importance in the implementation of IQMS. Because of the tremendous challenges inherent in IQMS and the fact that the DSG are responsible for baseline and summative evaluation, it is necessary to ascertain the challenges that the DSG are likely to encounter whilst exercising their roles and responsibilities during the implementation of IQMS. Data reflecting the actual experience of educators, relating to evaluation and management of their performance needs to be obtained, if one wishes to suggest a pragmatic approach to IQMS.

It is against this background that a questionnaire was designed as it is one of the most effective ways of eliciting educator opinion. You have first-hand knowledge of the IQMS process at schools. We believe that without your opinion, we cannot make inferences about the possible effects of IQMS on schools but more specifically, the challenges that the DSG are likely to encounter.
Please note that you are at liberty to withdraw from this at any time without pressure from the researcher to provide reasons. We will undertake to ensure that you are not caused any detriment by participating in this study. It is also the researcher’s belief that there are possible benefits for you in participating in this study. The outcome of this questionnaire will be made available to you upon request.

Please bear the following in mind when completing this questionnaire:

- Do NOT write name on the questionnaire – we would prefer you to remain anonymous.
- There are no correct or incorrect answers in sections B, C and D. The researcher merely requires your honest opinion.
- Your first spontaneous reaction is most valid. So work quickly. Do not ponder too long over any particular question/item.
- Please answer all questions applicable to you.
- This questionnaire should not take longer than 30 minutes to complete.
- Please return the questionnaire to the person from whom it was received as soon as possible after completion.

Thank you for your kind cooperation.

_____________________
N. I. Khumalo
(Researcher)

I. D. Hariparsad
(Supervisor)

_____________________
Prof. T.C. Bisschoff
(Co-Supervisor)