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ABSTRACT

The Integrated Quality Management System is a national policy that was introduced in 2003 by the Department of Education – with the aim of improving the performance of educators in teaching and learning. The policy integrates three programmes, namely: Developmental Appraisal, Performance Management and Whole-School Evaluation, which ought to complement one another, and run concurrently.

The introduction and implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System is based on the premise that the quality of education in South African Schools would improve if the processes of the policy were used to evaluate and reward educators, and to institute corrective measures where necessary. The aim of the study was to evaluate the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System for improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools.

The study focused on schools in the King William’s Town Education District. Qualitative and quantitative research approaches were used to elicit the perceptions of educators, Senior Management Teams and District coordinators, with regard to the implementation process of the policy in the local schools.

The findings indicate that the Department of Education needs to improve the processes of educating the educators in the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management system – in order to increase the possibility of achieving the objectives of the policy.
# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAS</td>
<td>Developmental Appraisal System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSG</td>
<td>Developmental Support Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>Employment Equity Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELRC</td>
<td>Education Labour Relations Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSET</td>
<td>In-Service Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQMS</td>
<td>Integrated Quality Management Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGP</td>
<td>Personal Growth Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDT</td>
<td>Staff Development Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER ONE
GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1. INTRODUCTION
This study has investigated the implementation of the Integrated Quality-Management System policy for improving the quality of teaching and learning in selected schools in the King William's Town Education District. The Integrated Quality-Management System has been introduced as a management tool to improve the quality of teaching and learning in schools in the Province of the Eastern Cape (Collective Agreement no. 8 of Education Labour Relations Council).

The core of the Integrated Quality-Management System, as part of performance management, is the measurement and evaluation of employee performance, and the utilization of this measurement information, in order to improve management, to reward employees, and to correct any deficiencies (Thomas, 2005). Measurement and evaluation are based on set key-performance indicators. These indicators are used to measure or evaluate educators' teaching and the learning that takes place in schools.

This information is then used to reward outstanding performance, and to institute measures for improvement where necessary – that is, to improve teaching and learning in schools. Using selected schools in the King William’s Town District, the study examined the effectiveness of the implementation of Integrated Quality-Management Systems for improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools.

1.2. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY
The decision to transform the education system of South Africa was taken by the Council of Education Ministers in February 1997 – with the purpose of improving the quality of the South African education system (Department of Education, 2003). The Outcomes-Based Education System was introduced with the intention of bringing about changes in the education system. This was a paradigm shift from the traditional education system to a new one. The traditional system inherited from the apartheid era did not apparently improve the culture of teaching and learning in the country.
According to Van der Waldt, Van Niekerk, Doyle, Knipe and Du Toit (2002), Outcomes-Based Education has two key purposes: to ensure that all students are equipped with the knowledge, competencies and qualities needed to be successful after they exit the educational system; and to structure and manage educational institutions, so that those outcomes could be achieved and maximized for all students. These assumptions are based on three elements: firstly, that all learners can learn and succeed, but not always on the same day, or in the same way. Secondly, successful learning promotes even more successful learning. Lastly, the educational institution controls the conditions that directly affect successful learning.

The old system showed a culture of learning and teaching that was very low. This was manifested by the low pass rate in Grade 12 examinations. It was for this reason that the Department of Education had to come up with a strategy that would improve the culture of learning and teaching in schools. The strategy was the introduction of the Performance-Management System. The Education Labour Relations Council reached an agreement in 2001 on the Performance-Management System as a strategy to overcome the challenge of the poor culture of learning and teaching.

The Education Labour Relations Council introduced a programme known as the Developmental-Appraisal System (on 28 July 1998, Education Labour Relations Council Resolution number 4 of 1998). The purpose of the Developmental Appraisal System was to rate individual educators in a transparent manner, and to find the strengths and weaknesses of each one. The weaknesses were to be used in drafting programmes for the individual development of educators. The resolution was not implemented. A National policy on the Whole-School Evaluation was introduced for doing school evaluation. This policy was passed in 2001, and its purpose was to evaluate the effectiveness of a school and the quality of teaching and learning.

On 10 April 2003, the Performance-Measurement System was adopted, according to Resolution 1 of 2003. The purpose of the Performance Management System was to evaluate individual educators for salary progression, grade progression, and the confirmation of appointments, rewards and incentives. Resolution number 8 of 2003 that was agreed upon in the Education Labour Relations Council, which then
integrated these three programmes on quality management in education, and the new process was called an Integrated Quality-Management System.

The decision appears to have been taken to ensure that quality management initiatives were planned in school and aligned in a way that is coherent, in order to avoid duplications and unnecessary workloads.

The Senior Management Team, which consists of the principal, the deputy principal and the education specialist, is responsible for the effective implementation or utilization of the Integrated Quality-Management System. The Staff-Development Team, which is made up of the principal, the Whole-School Evaluation coordinator, elected members of the Senior-Management Team and post-level 1 educators are also participants in the implementation and utilization of the Integrated Quality-Management System.

The other participants in the Integrated Quality-Management System are: Development Support Groups, which are made up of an educator, the immediate supervisor of the educator, and a peer. The district office has the overall responsibility of advocacy, training and proper implementation of the Integrated Quality-Management System. It also has the responsibility for arranging professional development programmes – in accordance with the identified needs of the educators and the improvement plan. 

It would seem that the Integrated Quality-Management System, as a policy, has been introduced with the objective of improving teaching and learning in schools. One of the features of public policy is that it is an anticipated solution to a problem. In other words, policy is made for the future. The Integrated Quality-Management System is intended to provide a structured means to evaluate performance, and thereby to improve teaching and learning. Policy implementation involves participants who have to put the policy into effect.

For that matter, the implementation of public policy could be defined as the transmission of the law into effect by the use of resources, and the engagement of participants who identified the problem. However, new and unanticipated problems
may be encountered during the implementation. Furthermore, public policies are sometimes, because of lack of time, information or expertise, framed in general terms, and the formulation of the details of the policy for implementation purposes is left to the implementers, who may substitute their own views for those of the policy-maker (Hanekom, 1992:61).

This study is therefore intended to examine the effectiveness of the processes of Integrated Quality-Management System in evaluating educators, teaching and learning in the selected schools in the King William’s Town Education District.

1.3. CLARIFICATION OF TERMS AND CONCEPTS
To avoid possible ambiguities, meanings ascribed to these words and concepts used frequently in the research report include the following:

1.3.1. Performance management
Performance management may be defined as a holistic approach and process for the effective management of individuals and groups – in order to ensure that their shared goals, as well as the organizational strategic objectives, are achieved (Nel, Gerber, Van Dyk, Haasbroek, Schults, Sonon and Werner, 2008).

The opinion of Swanepoel, Erasmus, Van Wyk and Schenk (2003) is that “performance appraisal may be defined as a formal and systematic process by means of which the job-relevant strengths and weaknesses of employees are identified, observed, measured, recorded and developed"

1.3.2. Teaching and learning
Learning is related to processes and activities intended to bring about a relatively permanent change in an individual’s behaviour or behaviour potential – as a result of experience or practice. Educators cannot alter an individual's biology; but they can provide an opportunity for students to engage in experiences that would lead to relatively permanent changes in their behaviour.

Teaching may be considered as the purposeful direction and management of the learning process (http://www.scribd.com/doc/5769721/teaching-learning-process).
1.3.3. Quality
Quality may be defined in terms of quality education. Quality education includes processes whereby trained teachers use child-centred teaching approaches in well-managed classrooms and schools and skillful assessment, in order to facilitate learning and to reduce disparities. It may be further explained that quality education includes the outcomes that encompass knowledge, skills, and attitudes, and are linked to national goals for education, as well as positive participation (http://www.unicef.org/education/files/QualityEducation).

Brewster et al. (2003) define quality as the value, conformity to specifications, conformity to requirements, meeting or exceeding standards that must be met to achieve a specific purpose.

1.4. THE PROBLEM STATEMENT
The introduction and implementation of an Integrated Quality-Management System is based on the premise that this would improve the quality of teaching and learning and education generally in South African schools. The management tool is also intended to provide a structured means to evaluate performance, and to utilize the information to reward excellent performance, and to structure improvement strategies. The problem for the study therefore relates to the effectiveness of utilizing Integrated Quality-Management Systems to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the selected schools in the King William’s Town District.

1.5. HYPOTHESIS
The Integrated Quality-Management System does not have any influence on improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools in King William’s Town Education District.

1.6. RESEARCH QUESTIONS
The following provide the basis for the research questions:

• What are the challenges in the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System?
• To what extent are the participants educated on the purposes of an Integrated Quality-Management System, its implementation and utilization in schools?
• What management support is provided to schools for the implementation and utilization of Integrated Quality-Management Systems?
• Is the system effective in improving the quality of teaching and learning?

1.7. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
The objectives of the study include to:
• Examine the effectiveness of an Integrated Quality-Management System in schools, as perceived by educators.
• Analyze the extent to which the utilization of Integrated Quality-Management Systems could assist in identifying the strengths and weaknesses in the quality of teaching and learning.
• Establish whether the system has provided the support and opportunities for the development of educators.
• Suggest possible strategies for the utilization of the performance management system, in order to improve learner achievements.

1.8. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY
Educators in schools are amongst the stakeholders involved in the education system. They are responsible for the implementation of the policies and laws passed by the Department of Education. Public institutions perform functional activities, such as education, health services, and others (Cloete, 1993). In education, the personnel who are involved with the teaching of learners are the educators. Their performance must be evaluated to establish whether the work has been done according to the policy objectives.

The significance of the research is to evaluate the effectiveness of the Integrated Quality-Management System policy in improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools. The Department of Education, as custodians of the laws and policies, should be concerned as to why these policies are not being effectively implemented. The study is significant, as it may provide empirical findings that could make valuable contributions to improvements in educators’ appraisal.
1.9. THE LITERATURE REVIEW

A literature review, consisting of primary and secondary sources, was undertaken, in order to examine the implementation process of the Integrated Quality-Management Systems in schools.

1.10. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Babbie and Mouton (2005) define research design as a plan or blueprint on how the researcher intends conducting the research. The research design depicts elements of the research methodology, their interrelationships, the data collection and the data analysis, to ensure that the final report answers the research questions.

1.10.1. Research Methodology

In this study, both qualitative and quantitative methods were used. The study focused on educators, principals, Senior-Management Team members and district coordinators.

1.10.2. Data-Collection Methods and Techniques

Both primary and secondary data were collected and utilized to analyse and answer the research questions. Primary data were collected through mailed questionnaires and/or structured interviews. In addition, use was made of official reports, legislation, other research reports and journal articles. Above all, where appropriate, authorities in the field and in the discipline were consulted.

Self-administered questionnaires were used as a research data-collection technique. The questionnaires included semi-structured, close-ended questions, and open-ended question – thus allowing the respondents the opportunity to express their views. According to Singleton et al. (1988), the advantage of open-ended questions is the freedom the respondent has in answering – thereby, resulting in a veritable goldmine of information, revealing respondents’ logic or thought processes, the amount of information they possess, and the strength of their opinions or feelings. According to Babbie and Mouton (2005), close-ended questions provide a greater uniformity of response and are more easily processed.
1.10.3. Population
The population for this study consisted of high school educators from Dimbaza in King William's Town. The area has approximately 95 high school educators, of whom 20 educators, 8 Senior Management Team members and 2 Integrated Quality Management-System District Coordinators were targeted. This represented about 31% of the educator population of that area. It was not possible for the researcher to target all the educators in the district – due to financial constraints and the duration of the study.

1.10.4. The Sample frame
The population that was sampled was divided into groups called clusters. A random sampling was then taken from one or more selected clusters. The four high schools were the clusters, and the educators were randomly selected from each cluster. The researcher conducted interviews with semi-structured questions, with two members of the Senior-Management Team from each of the four high schools.

The research was conducted in selected high schools in Dimbaza in the King William's Town District. The area has about 95 high school educators, from which 20 educators, 8 Senior-Management Team members and 2 Integrated Quality-Management System-District Coordinators, were selected. The whole district has about 2 900 high-school educators. The study was limited to the area of Dimbaza, and not the whole of the King William's Town area.

Questionnaires were handed to the 20 educators (5 from each school), 8 Senior Management Team members (2 from each school) and 2 district Integrated Quality-Management System coordinators. The school principals formed part of Senior-Management Team members.

1.11. DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY
The study focused specifically on the implementation of the Integrated Quality-Management System in selected schools in the King William's Town Education District.
1.12. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS
The respondents were guaranteed that the information they provided in the questionnaires would be treated with the utmost confidentiality – to satisfy ethical considerations. They were informed that the information was being collected for the purpose of academic research only, and that care was taken not to invade their privacy. Participation in this research was completely voluntary, and the participants could withdraw at any point should they feel uncomfortable.

1.13. CHAPTER LAYOUT
The chapter layout provides a plan for the research, and outlines what will be covered in each chapter. It gives a researcher the framework for the direction of the study – indicating how the various elements of the research should fit together. The chapter layout provides a logical development agenda for the research.

CHAPTER I - GENERAL INTRODUCTION
The research methodology was discussed, together with the statement of the problem, hypothesis, objectives of the research and the instruments used to collect the data.

CHAPTER 2 - NATURE AND PLACE OF AN INTEGRATED QUALITY-MANAGEMENT SYSTEM IN SCHOOLS
Chapter Two explores the literature available on performance management and Integrated Quality-Management Systems, and its application in educational institutions.

CHAPTER 3 – RESEARCH METHODOLOGY ADOPTED FOR THE STUDY
Departmental policies with regard to a performance-management system were studied. The implementation of such policies in schools and also in the Department of Education was explained. The whole process of a performance-management system was expounded.

CHAPTER 4 – PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA
Investigation of a performance-management system in high schools in the King William's Town District was dealt with in this chapter.

CHAPTER 5 – FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The findings of the research were indicated and possible recommendations tabled. Findings as to whether the failure of a performance management system occurs as a result of poor implementation of the system; other variables were identified during the research process.

1.14. CONCLUSION
This chapter evaluates the performance-appraisal system for the quality of teaching and learning in high schools. A brief outline of the manner in which the study was conducted is provided here. The background to the study was introduced, and the research problem was put into context with regard to the effectiveness of the performance-appraisal system for educators. The theoretical framework was outlined by means of the literature review, and a brief description of the research methods was given.
CHAPTER TWO  
LEGISLATIVE AND POLICY GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND IQMS IN SCHOOLS

2.1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is to review the literature related to the implementation of the Integrated Quality-Management System (IQMS), drawing evidence from both the public and private sectors. The study aimed at evaluating the implementation of IQMS, which is a form of performance appraisal meant to improve the quality of teaching and learning in schools. IQMS is one of the policies that government has introduced – in an attempt to improve the performance of educators. It is a National Policy that is informed by Schedule 1 of the Employment of Educators Act (Act 76 of 1998), whereby the Minister is required to determine the performance standards of educators. It focuses on the conceptual framework adopted, the related literature in the implementation of the performance appraisal, and on its effectiveness in terms of ensuring teacher professional development and the improvement of the quality of teaching and learning.

Particular attention is given to the following issues drawn from the research objectives: performance-appraisal system-implementation: processes and procedures; teacher input in the design and development of a performance appraisal; the effects of performance appraisal on the development of teacher competence, and how it motivates teachers to perform. The link between teacher appraisal and quality education in schools is also reviewed.

This was done in line with the view of Asmah-Andoh (2012), who maintains that any guidelines for the establishment of IQMS for the management of performance in public institutions need to overcome conceptual difficulties, and also to meet the requirements of effectiveness and efficiency associated with its practical implementation.

The chapter begins by examining the legislative and policy guidelines for the implementation and utilisation of IQMS – to improve the quality of teaching and learning in South African schools. Furthermore, the concept of IQMS, as part of
performance management in public institutions was analysed. Literature on performance as an underlying objective in the theory and practice of public administration was reviewed to provide a framework for analysing and answering the research question. Policy implementation was also reviewed to provide a theoretical framework.

2.2. POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

Policy implementation involves participants who have to put the law into effect. For that matter, public policy implementation can be defined as the translation of the law into effect through the use of resources and the engagement of participants who identified the problem.

One of the features of public policy is that it is an anticipated solution to a problem. In other words, policy is made for the future. As such, new and unanticipated problems may be encountered during its implementation. Furthermore, public policies are sometimes, because of lack of time, information or expertise, framed in general terms, and the formulation of the details of the policies for implementation purposes is left to the implementers, who may sometimes substitute their own views for those of the policy-maker (Hanekom, 1992:61).

Problems that are prevalent with policy implementation in South Africa are outlined as follows (Doyle 2002:185).

- There are few incentives for public managers to correctly implement policies. In other words, there is no link to the performance-management system of the department.

- The rationalisation of the public service has been carried out in an uncoordinated, fragmented and ad hoc manner.

- Many skilled public employees (including non-white Directors-General) have been lost, creating a lack of expertise in institutions for policy implementation.
• There is a lack of consultation amongst stakeholders, and sometimes little transparency with the public at large.

2.2.1. Participants in policy implementation

Implementation of public policies involves a number of participants. Legislators, the primary policy-makers, can also implement policy. The more detailed the legislation passed by Parliament, the less discretion that is left for executive institutions and officials to implement. Policy could also be implemented by the judiciary, in the law-enforcement process. Laws that relate to crime, divorce, and bankruptcy are implemented by the courts through their interpretation of statutes, administrative rules, regulations, as well as the review of administrative decisions in cases brought before them (Anderson 2000:209).

The bulk of policy implementation is undertaken by public officials and administrative agencies. Officials collect taxes, operate the postal system, prisons, schools, regulate banks, utility companies, construct and maintain streets and highways, inspect food, meat, water, and medicines – to ensure their safety; provide medical benefits and services, and perform many other tasks of modern governments. Because officials perform most of the day-to-day work of government, their actions affect citizens more regularly and directly than other implementation participants (Anderson, 2000:205). Thus, it is imperative that the performance of these functions be managed, in order to enhance the achievement of the policy objectives.

2.3. TEACHER APPRAISAL AND QUALITY EDUCATION

One of the main reasons for introducing any policy or initiative in teaching is to exert a positive influence on classroom practice, and then hopefully make a concomitant impact on pupil achievement. Quality in education can be realised through an appraisal system that is based on the improvement of individual performance, which in turn, leads to improved working relationships and development of the individual’s career (Everard and Morris, 1996).
Those concerned with the search for quality in education believe that attention should mostly focus on the teaching and learning processes. Eshiwani (1993) postulated that the quality of education is heavily dependent on the quality of staff, their motivation, and the leadership they experience. In this regard, Walter et al., (1996) add that the quality of teaching depends on the quality of teachers, which in turn, depends on the quality of their professional development. UNESCO (2004) suggested that the quality of education depends mainly on the instructional methods used in the classroom.

What comes out clearly is that in pursuit of quality education, student achievement should prevail. High quality teaching thus is essential in improving student outcomes and reducing gaps in student achievement. Hence, the quest for quality education justifies the introduction of the performance-appraisal system, which should strive to equip teachers with strategies and competencies that aim to improve pupil performance. Essentially, teacher appraisal is about providing systematic opportunities for teachers to learn from their practice, in order to improve learning for pupils (Bell, 1988).

Hence, there is a strong belief that teacher quality affects educational quality – just as much as do the curricula, and that the performance-appraisal system plays a key role in improving teacher quality (Darling-Hammond, 1990). In the light of this, it becomes essential, therefore, that people are mobilized and empowered through the provision of knowledge and skills to enable them to participate in democratic structures that improve pupil achievement (Everard and Morris, 1996; Bell, 1988; Darling-Hammond, 1990; Schaeffer, 1992).

2.4. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

The Performance management system originated within the private sector. For private firms, the primary objective of a performance management system is to maximise profits. However, for the public sector it is to improve the general welfare of all the people of the country DeNisi (2000) and Spangenberg (1994, in Mafunisa and Masemula, 2004) define performance management as an approach to managing people that entails planning employee performance, facilitating the
achieved work-related goals and reviewing performance – as a way of motivating employees to achieve their full potential in line with the objectives of the organisation. The Department of Education (DoE), as an employer, is responsible for planning and facilitating the performance-management system, so that educators perceive it as a means of improving the standard of teaching and learning.

Performance management is a continuous and systematic process used to help individual educators with their professional development and career planning (Steyn and Van Niekerk, 2002). The authors further note that it is used to ensure that in-service training and the development of educators matches the complementary needs of both the individual educators and the schools. Thus, appraisal must be able to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of educators. Training and development must be given, according to those weaknesses that are identified by the process.

Additionally, appraisal must be about reviewing current practices, in order to revise the set targets. Schwella, Burger, Fox and Müller (2001) state that training in the evaluation system and its implementation are needed to ensure a proper knowledge of it, as well as an understanding of its particular standards. Training gives a broad-based understanding of the functions of the system.

Understanding what performance appraisal means is an important yet complex and challenging issue. As a concept that has developed over time, performance appraisal has been defined in numerous, often inconsistent ways, in the literature. It has been variously conceived as a systematic evaluation, as a general heading for a variety of activities, including a system for managing organizational performance, a system for managing the performance of individuals and a system for integrating the two. Armstrong (1994) defines performance appraisal as a means of getting better results from organizations, teams and individuals, by understanding and managing performance within an agreed framework of planned goals, standards and attributes/competence requirements. Bratton and Gold (2007) define appraisal “as a process that provides an analysis of a person’s overall capabilities and potential, allowing informed decisions to be made for a particular purpose”. Concurring with the above scholars were Swanepoel, Erasmus and Schenk, (2008) whose view is that,
Performance appraisal is a part of performance management, which is focused on organizational performance through a number of HR processes, including performance appraisal. Appraisal is a formal time-specific assessment or 'dipstick'-snapshot of individual employee's performance, whereas performance management entails a cyclical and ongoing endeavour.

A similar view is presented by Boninelli and Meyer (2004), who describe performance appraisal as a snap-shot of how a person is doing, and is typically taken once or twice a year. They add that performance appraisal is an opportunity to document performance and also a chance for the employee to discuss development opportunities with management. From the above citations, one can deduce that performance appraisal is about comparison of one’s performance against set standards and is a means of evaluating an employee against set standards in order to pass a judgment.

Performance appraisal is a necessary part of performance management (Cascio, 2003). Moreover, the manager must define the performance required from an employee so that they both have the same expectations of what must be accomplished during that period. The supervisor of an employee must facilitate the performance, which means the manager must eliminate the barriers that will hinder successful performance. The manager must ensure that there are adequate resources for the completion of tasks. The appraisal must be done in accordance with the laws and regulations of the country. The appraisal process must itself be relevant by measuring precisely what it has been designed to measure. The appraisal instrument must be reliable, giving the same results when used by different users to measure the same individuals.

However, Bacal (2000) highlighted a common error, namely the confusion of performance appraisal with performance management. The author reiterated that performance management was essentially continuous and developmental in the strategy to satisfy customer needs while performance appraisal; is a subset in the process, albeit an important one. Collaborating with this view were Swanepoel, Erasmus & Schenk, (2008) who state that while performance appraisal systems are often no more than a system of measurement, the concept of performance management signifies an attempt to entrench performance appraisal as a legitimate
and integral part of a manager’s job of getting subordinates to effectively achieve the results and expected goals.

2.5. THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR


2.5.1. Results orientation

Results orientation implies that the performance of a public service employee should be assessed on the basis of a work plan. The work plan must cover a specific period explaining the responsibilities of the employee as well as the objectives to be achieved (Swanepoel, Erasmus, Van Wyk and Schenk, 2011). Civil servants needed to be assessed on their actual performance in relation to well defined targets and tasks agreed upon between themselves and their supervisor. In order to motivate civil servants to perform and increase general productivity, a performance measurement tool that could link results to specific civil servants is introduced or key performance indicators are established. It is understood that the results-based performance appraisal system was particularly sponsored by the World Bank policy briefs and discussed in recommendations for civil service reform across the African continent (Karyeija, 2012). It can then be argued that the results-oriented individual performance appraisal system becomes inevitably a personnel management tool.

2.5.2. Training and development

Stressing the importance of training are Mohrman et al. (1989) who point out that performance appraisal is not something that most individuals are genetically or culturally programmed to do well. The basis of training is to instil in the minds of those conducting appraisal that they need to go through a process that follows designed steps (Edenborough, 2002).
Performance measurement was originally developed for the industrial sector and therefore has to be adapted for utilisation in the public sector. The conceptual derivation of performance appraisal should therefore not be seen as an abstraction. Current legislation in South Africa requires performance appraisal in education departments to have full participation of educators as well. NSG (1989) cited in Hattersley (1992) stresses that training is essential if teachers and heads are to be able to operate appraisal schemes in a manner which will help to improve the effectiveness of the schools. Hattersley further argues that training is vital in that it provides the heads with information about the principles and purpose of appraisal and raises their awareness for teacher appraisal. Training also helps to identify the strengths and weaknesses of employees and the Human Resource interventions that are needed to manage these (Swanepoel, Erasmus, Van Wyk and Schenk, 2011).

2.5.3. Rewarding good performance
Swanepoel, Erasmus, Van Wyk and Schenk (2011) note that the primary orientation of a performance appraisal is developmental that is used to recognise outstanding performance. This area of performance appraisal entails the awarding of incremental increases in salary. The prevailing philosophy places much emphasis on flexibility in the management of public services in order to improve morale and productivity, and that innovation should be encouraged and rewarded (Karyeija, 2012).

2.5.4. Openness, accuracy, efficiency, and fairness in teacher appraisal
Failure by managers to apply the principles of openness, fairness, and objectivity can have a negative effect upon the results of performance appraisal as it can make them seem untrustworthy. It is imperative that teacher evaluation be conducted correctly, efficiently, and fairly to determine the areas where further development and improvement of skills are needed. If done correctly, teacher evaluations could provide a vital step toward providing quality instruction for students and job satisfaction for teachers. The proper training necessary to produce an effective and proper evaluation involves both the evaluator as well as the person being evaluated. Both the evaluator and the evaluated are continual learners. Danielson and McGreal (2000) state that the only way teachers will improve their practices is to have professional dialogue about the art of teaching in a safe environment and to have
that dialogue led by teachers. The quality of teaching is more significant than any other factors in raising standards (Green, 2004). He further argues that first-rate accommodation, excellent resources, brilliant schemes of work; are all of limited value if the actual teaching, the point of delivery, the interaction between teacher and pupil is not of quality.

2.6. INTEGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM IN SCHOOLS

The purpose of performance management in schools is to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Swanepoel, Erasmus, Van Wyk and Schenk (2003) assert that the purpose of performance appraisal is to provide information about work performance. Furthermore, the developmental purposes of a performance appraisal can focus on the developmental functions of the individual as well as those of the organisation. Appraisals can serve the developmental purpose of the individual by providing employees with feedback on their strengths and weaknesses and how to improve future performance.

Grobler, Warnich, Carell, Elbert and Hatfield (2006) indicate that performance appraisal is an on-going process of evaluating and managing performance. It has evaluation and developmental objectives. The evaluative objectives are for compensation while the developmental objectives are to help educators grow professionally. The records of all employees must be accurate and fair so that it is easy to select the employees who will get merit increases, bonuses or other increases as well as promotions. The developmental objectives mean that the employees must be developed in order to improve their performance. Feedback helps both the supervisor and the employee to recognise the strengths and weaknesses of each employee. It also helps to identify the type of training that will be suitable for the employee.

Performance management systems are seen as the way to manage the employee performance (Nel et al., 2008). Employee performance must be line-driven, not personnel department-driven in order for it to be effective. According to Nel et al. (2008) the vision and objectives of employee performance must be communicated to all employees. The vision must be known and owned by everybody in the
organisation. There is a formal review of progress towards the set targets that are conducted.

Performance management involves a formal review of progress towards set targets. Performance is managed through the amount of value that the performance of the employee adds to the overall organisational performance. The value that is added can be in the form of knowledge, skills, abilities, competencies and innovation. Nel et al., (2008) fail to explain how the causes of problems in performance can be detected. However, Swanepoel, Erasmus, Van Wyk and Schenk (2003) state that South African research indicates that the problems in performance appraisal typically stem from technical issues in the system and from human issues related to perceptions and the interaction process between the supervisor and his or her subordinate.

2.7. THE HISTORY OF APPRAISALS IN SOUTH AFRICA

The desire for quality education has driven South Africa to develop teacher evaluation systems based on the belief that teachers are crucial elements in the teaching and learning processes that enhance learner achievement. Critiques claim that pre-1994 educator evaluation was closed, autocratic, and hierarchical in nature and was characterised by a purely judgmental appraisal that had prevalence of political bias (Thurlow and Ramnarain, 2001). Further allegations are that the system was tainted by unchecked powers wielded by previous inspectors, the incompetence of these inspectors and the secrecy surrounding the appraisal (Thurlow and Ramnarain, 2001).

Prior thereto, the education policy and system in South Africa were based on the political philosophy of Apartheid, which became the policy of segregation (Behr, 1998:14). During the Apartheid era, an Appraisal Inspections system was used to evaluate teachers, which collapsed because it was part of the Apartheid system that was imposed on the people of the South Africa. Thurlow and Ramnarain (2001) note that these Appraisal Inspections exhibited the characteristics of educational bureaucracy, namely; top-down, closed, hierarchical and authoritarian.
According to Ntombela, Mpehle and Penciliah (2010), the appraisees were not in any way involved in the process, and were also unaware of what was expected of them by the inspectors. Moreover, there was no feedback. It seems that appraisals were used as a fault-finding exercise, in order to gain social control. Frederickson (2004) states that in order to make an evaluation tool which teachers can use to improve the quality of education, there is a need to find and highlight alternative methods for evaluation, which would allow for a consideration of the complexity of the school environment, and one which afford teachers the chance to be part of the process.

James, Nolan and Hoover (2011) argue that professional judgements about the quality of teacher performance cannot be made arbitrarily. The basis for judgements must be clearly understood by all those involved in the system. One of the most viable ways to ensure that the process for making judgements is understood is to involve teachers and other stakeholders in developing the criteria. Chetty, Chisholm, Gardiner, Mgau and Vinjevold (1993) summarised the criticisms levelled against appraisal inspections as follows:

- Prevalence of political bias in the system.
- Unchecked power, which inspectors wielded.
- Incompetence of inspectors.
- Irrelevance of some evaluation criteria.
- Secrecy surrounding appraisal.
- Absence of contextual factors in appraisal.

It is against this background that the South African education system had to look at reforms that were in line with the achievement of political independence.

The advent of democracy in South Africa necessitated the restructuring of the Public Service – including the Education Sector. In keeping with the transformational imperatives of the country, performance-management policies had to be revised to reflect democratic principles through which the educators could be evaluated (Ntombela, Mpehle and Penciliah, 2010). When the democratic government of South
Africa came into power, many policies were introduced – with the hope of restoring the culture of teaching and learning.

What emerged from this process was an approach to teacher appraisal that rejected a bureaucratic, judgemental form of appraisal, and emphasised the development and support of teachers through a formative rather than a summative evaluation process (Chisholm, 2005).

Since 1994, the South African Department of Education has gone through a number of policy and legislation changes. These changes were promulgated, in order to create a framework for transformation in education and training (The Strategic Plan for 2011-2014, 2011). These changes were directed at the initiatives of teacher evaluation systems; and they set quality assurance of the education system as the paramount goal. Ntombela, Mpehle and Penciliah (2010) assert that it was imperative to address the issue of performance management in education.

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996) requires education to be transformed and democratised, in accordance with the values of human dignity, equality, human rights and freedom, non-racism and non-sexism. It guarantees access to basic education for all, with the provision that everyone has the right to basic education, including adult basic education.

**2.7.1. The Developmental Appraisal System (DAS)**

Firstly, in 1998 the Department of Education introduced a Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) to deal with the issues of relevance, transparency, development, efficiency and effectiveness in schools. Its aim was to appraise individual teachers in a transparent manner – with a view to determining areas of strength and weakness – and to draw up programmes for individual development (Formative evaluation). A teacher evaluated himself/herself and discussed the outcomes with the Development Support Group at every school (Education Labour Relations Council [ELRC], 2003).

Ntombela et al. (2010) claim that this was the first appraisal policy founded on democratic principles – in conjunction with all the stakeholders.
On the same issue, Mestry, Hendricks and Bisschoff (2009) affirm that it represented a radical shift from previous teacher evaluation exercises in South Africa, as it was a stakeholder-driven, transparent form of appraisal targeted specifically at teachers.

The DoE, RSA (1998) outlined the major principles of DAS as being transparency and development. The success of DAS was dependent on continuous support, strengthening weaknesses and entrenching strengths – in collaboration with the academic and managerial staff. The educator had to access the report made by the appraisee about himself or herself (DoE RSA 1998). Du Plessis, Conley and du Plessis (2007) also believe that the aim of the developmental appraisal system was to facilitate the personal and professional development of educators, in order to improve the quality of teaching practice and that of educational management.

Chapter C of the EEA (Act 76 of 1998) provides a model for developmental appraisal, which is based on the fundamental principle of lifelong learning and development. The aim of developmental appraisal is to facilitate the personal and professional development of educators, in order to improve the quality of teaching practice and education management. This implies that an individual has to prioritise areas of his/her own development and growth throughout his/her career in education.

Evaluating educators through the Developmental-Appraisal System started with an initial meeting in which there was agreement on time, place and what should be involved in the appraisal process, and then completion of the relevant forms. The programme progressed with class observation and feedback given to the appraisee, as soon as possible after the observation (Steyn, 1997). This author (Steyn, 1997) further stressed the need to avoid stereotyping, any central tendency, leniency and the halo effects.

According to De Clercq (2007), the government encountered resistance from schools over the implementation of the Developmental-Appraisal System. Some of the constraints that contributed to teacher resistance were grouped as operational, policy, training or attitudinal issues (Mathula, 2004). This author (Mathula, 2004) further highlights policy constraints as factors, such as the lack of user-friendly
format and language, complicated core criteria, and the lack of ownership, unclear roles and responsibilities. On the issue of training, the cascading model was perceived as ineffective; and the lack of training resources inhibited the successful running of the training. The Developmental Appraisal System had so many implementation challenges: lack of common understanding, unrealistic implementation plans, insufficient lines of accountability and lack of tangible rewards.

2.7.2. The Whole-School Evaluation

The Whole-School Evaluation is a policy that was initiated in 2001, to replace the Development-Appraisal System. Van Niekerk (2003) defines Whole-School Evaluation as a collaborative, transparent process of making judgements on a holistic performance of the school that is measured against agreed national criteria. It can also be viewed as a cornerstone of quality assurance, enabling schools to provide an account of school performance, and how it meets the national goals and needs of the public (Epochs, 2001).

The purpose of this policy was to evaluate the overall effectiveness of a school – including the support provided by the District, school management, infrastructure and learning resources – as well as the quality of the teaching and learning (System evaluation) (ELRC, 2003:3; IQMS manual, Section A:3).

Mestry, Hendricks and Bisschoff (2009) postulate that Whole-School Evaluation is meant to introduce an effective monitoring and evaluation process of teaching and learning, which is vital to the improvement of the quality and standard of performance in schools. According to Faulkner (2000), school evaluation was aimed at assisting the Quality-Assurance process. It was meant to improve reporting, to monitor and evaluate the school performance publicly. Its goals were to be predetermined, while the outcomes were to be agreed upon. This, in turn, would improve the school performance and accountability.

The duty of South African education then was to develop a new model for transforming the education system, so that school self-evaluation was to be an integral feature of school improvement (Faulkner, 2000).
DoE, RSA (2001b:6) states that Whole-School Evaluation was built on an interactive and transparent process that introduced monitoring and evaluation processes meant to improve quality and the standard of performance. It was designed to ensure that school evaluation was carried out, according to agreed-on national models. Through the Whole-School Evaluation, good schools would be recognised; while at the same time, there could be support rendered to the underperforming schools.

The fundamental principle of Whole-School Evaluation was to assign responsibility to all stakeholders to ensure an improvement of performance in schools. The emphasis was on monitoring and evaluation activities. These were to be characterised by openness and collaboration; and that all stakeholders were to take responsibility for the quality of their own personal performance (DoE, RSA, 2003a:1-22; Faulkner, 2000).

Along with the Whole-School Evaluation was the Performance Management, which was meant to evaluate individual educators for salary progression, grade progression, confirmation of appointments, and payment of rewards and incentives (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003: Section A). Like the Development-Appraisal System, teachers experienced implementation challenges, such as flawed consultation processes, advocacy process, a fear of victimisation, apathy and resistance to change with the Whole-School Evaluation system. The Performance Management that followed suffered a similar fate as that of the Developmental-Appraisal System and Whole-School Evaluation.

2.8. INTEGRATED QUALITY-MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (IQMS)

All three policies (the Development-Appraisal System, the Whole-System Evaluation and Performance Management) were faced with implementation problems because of the manner in which they were presented to school-based teachers (Daniels, 2007:5; De Clercq, 2008). The major teachers’ union also encouraged its membership to boycott the Whole-School Evaluation supervisors, and to refuse them access to schools (South African Democratic Teachers Union, 2002). This compelled the government to introduce the Integrated Quality-Management System (IQMS), which was gazetted as a national instrument for the evaluation of educators and
schools in 2003. According to the IQMS training manual (2003:1), this consists of three programmes that aim to enhance and monitor performance programmes in the education system.

In a way, introducing the IQMS was a way of reflecting collectively on the previously endorsed policies and modifying them. ELRC (2003:1) states that the IQMS is a national policy that aims to increase productivity among educators – by integrating all the existing programmes on quality management.

Schedule 1 of the Employment of Educators Act No. 76 of 1998 legalized the IQMS; and each individual educator’s performance was to be measured against the stipulated performance standards of the IQMS document. A four-point rating scale was employed to determine the level of performance for each educator. The ratings provided by the Development Support Grouping clearly indicate areas in need of development, as well as the strengths of individual educators, that need to be enhanced (Khumalo, 2008).

Section 3(1) of the National Education Policy Act 27 of (1996) prescribes that the Minister shall determine national education policy, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, 1996. Mathula (2004) states that the National Education Policy Act (1996) is designed to inscribe in law the policy, legislative and monitoring responsibilities of the Minister of Education, and to formalise relations between national and provincial authorities. It provides for the determination of National policies in general and further education and training for, inter alia, curriculum, assessment and quality assurance. The IQMS policy is informed by the Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003 of the Education Labour Relations Council.

The Agreement binds the employer and all the employees of the employer, as defined in the Employment of Educators Act of 1998 (as amended).

2.8.1. A Theoretical Framework for IQMS
The IQMS policy as a variant of performance-management systems operates through phases of input, processes output and impact. As such, the systems theory was used to explain the processes of IQMS. Public administration consists of
functions that are performed to fulfil the needs of the citizens of the country. These functions are performed within an environment influenced by decision-making and the goal of the government. This environment consists of the role-players involved in the execution of government programmes.

Minnaar and Bekker (2005) argue that organisations exist in close and constant interaction with their environment, and receive the production elements that they require to operate from their environment. Griffin (in Minnaar and Bekker, 2005) identifies the key concepts required for a proper understanding of the systems approach. These are:

- A system is an interrelated set of elements functioning as a whole.

- An open system is an organisational system that interacts constantly with its environment. In a democratic 21st century public sector environmental reality, public management systems have to function as open systems. They must constantly interact with their environment, in order to feed into their service delivery-management systems.

- A closed system is an organisational system that does not interact with its environment.

- A subsystem is a system within a broader system. The human-resource management component is an example of a subsystem within a bigger departmental-management process.

Fox, Schwella and Wissink, (1991) described open systems, school studies, management and organisational phenomena as complex systems consisting of sets of interrelated variables and parts collaborating – to reach objectives by using inputs from the environment. Griffin (in Minnaar and Bekker, 2005) stated that systems theory comprises an ongoing, repetitive process, consisting of inputs that are transformed into outputs – and thereafter outcomes of the process. The following diagram is a representation of the systems approach to management, as noted in
Minnaar and Bekker (2005). It is important for a public manager to view a public institution as a whole system that has systems within a bigger system.

Diagram 1: The Systems Approach

According to Minnaar and Bekker (2005), inputs are obtained from the environment, in order to enable the management process to function. De Clercq (2010) notes that by the time the IQMS policy was introduced in schools, the DoE and other provincial education departments did not have any implementation plans, strategies or budget lines for policy coordination, implementation and monitoring. There were no dedicated units and divisions within their structures; and already scarce human, financial and material resources had to be mobilised from within existing units and divisions.

Processes in the system convert inputs into outputs. These outputs are related to the objectives of the system, which refer to what the system is designed to do (Van Niekerk, Van der Waldt and Jonker, 2001). Inputs are transformed into needs-satisfying utilities by the organisational processing systems (Minnaar and Bekker, 2005). These include transaction-processing systems, decision-support systems and operating-management procedures.
The results of the inputs and processes components of the management process are known as outputs. The complete appraisal instrument, the personal growth plan, the school-improvement plan and the district-improvement plan serve as outputs in the process.

2.8.2. The Purpose of IQMS

According to DoE RSA (2003c:1), the purpose of the Integrated Quality-Management Systems is to identify educational needs, to provide support, to promote accountability, to monitor the schools’ overall effectiveness, and to evaluate the educator performance. It can also be argued that many authors collaborate on one major feature of IQMS, which is to develop educators, and to help them improve the quality of teaching and learning by providing regular support, training and motivation (DoE, RSA 2003c:3-10).

The IQMS policy was introduced to school-based educators to fulfil the following objectives:

- To identify the specific needs of educators and schools for support and development;
- To provide support for continued growth;
- To promote accountability;
- To monitor the overall effectiveness of the institution; and
- To evaluate the performance of the educator (ELRC, 2003).

2.8.3. The Guiding Principle of IQMS

The implementation of IQMS is guided by the principle of fairness, which must be ensured for the educators. There can be no sanction against an educator in respect of his or her performance before providing meaningful opportunities for development. There is a need to minimise subjectivity through transparency and open discussion. Moreover, there is also a need to use the IQMS instrument professionally, uniformly
and consistently (ELRC, 2003). DoE, RSA (2003c:3-10) further outlines the following principles of IQMS:

- To deliver quality public education, which would enable learners to have equal access to quality education;
- A need for IQMS to be understood, to be credible, valued and used professionally;
- A need for the formation of a positive and constructive system, where performance can be improved;
- People would need to be transparent and open during the entire process;
- To ensure fairness and ongoing support to educators and the schools; and
- A need for IQMS to provide and encourage directly.

However, for these principles to be actualised there is a need for the training of implementers.

2.8.4. Advocacy and Training for IQMS

Loock, Grobler and Mestry (2006) believe that advocacy must address the issues relating to the purposes, objectives and outcomes of Developmental Appraisal, Performance Measurement and Whole-School Evaluation. The focus of advocacy should be on quality education for all, transformation and the advantages for educators, schools and the system as a whole. Advocacy should also address the relationship between Developmental Appraisal, Performance Measurement and Whole-School Evaluation, and how they should inform and strengthen one another in an integrated system.

The whole process of the advocacy of IQMS is set out in the ELRC Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003. The Principal and Senior Management Team are required to conduct advocacy programmes so as to ensure the successful implementation of IQMS in schools. The aim is to provide every educator with all the relevant IQMS documents, and to explain IQMS and how it would benefit the educators and the school.

According to ELRC (2003), training must address issues relating to how IQMS should be implemented in the school. Furthermore, it must enable officials and
educators to plan and administer IQMS in a uniform way. Training must enable all the relevant officials and educators to have a thorough understanding of the purposes, principles, processes and procedures. The problem with advocacy is that the people responsible for advocating the system tend to select data that confirm their position.

Advocacy should, therefore, be combined with enquiry, and people should be allowed to question the expressed views. However, combining advocacy and inquiry is difficult to achieve in a highly politicised organisation that is not open to enquiry. Genuine enquiry is promoted by the integration of participative and reflective openness (Loock, Grobler and Mestry, 2006).

2.8.5. The Observation Instrument in Schools

One part of the observation instrument is made up of four performance standards, and is for observing educators in practice. The other part of the observation instrument comprises eight performance standards, and is related to the aspects of evaluation that fall outside the classroom (ELRC, 2003). The lesson observation instrument is one that is designed for the observation of educators in practice – for developmental appraisal, performance measurement and the Whole-School Evaluation. This part of the instrument consists of the following performance standards:

- The creation of a positive learning environment;
- Knowledge of the curriculum and learning programmes;
- Lesson planning, preparation and presentation;
- Learning assessment.
The other part of the observation instrument is designed to evaluate the performance of educators with regard to the aspects that are outside classroom observation. It is composed of the following performance standards:

- Professional development in the field and participation in professional bodies;
- Human relations and contribution to school development;
- Extracurricular and co-curricular participation;
- Administration of resources and records;
- Decision-making and accountability;
- Personnel;
- Leadership, communication and servicing of government body; and
- Strategic planning, financial planning and educational management planning (ELRC, 2003).

Each of the performance standards asks a question, and includes a number of criteria. For each criterion there are four descriptors, which are derived from the four points on the rating scale. According to ELRC (2003), the rating scale is as follows:

| Rating 1 | Unacceptable. This level of performance does not meet minimum expectations and requires urgent interventions and support. |
| Rating 2 | Satisfies minimum expectations. This level of performance is acceptable and is in line with minimum expectations, but development and support are still required. |
| Rating 3 | Good. Performance is good and meets expectations, but some areas are still in need of development and support. |
| Rating 4 | Outstanding. Performance is outstanding and exceeds expectations. Although performance is excellent, continuous self-development and improvement are advised. |

According to Loock, Grobler and Mestry (2006), the performance-management instrument appears to be designed according to the tenets of a performance-anchored grading scale. As such, it suffers from the same shortcomings, the most noticeable of which is scale. There is no doubt that the designers of this system have
attempted to design the subjective aspects of human decision-making out of the management of the system. By attempting to guard against subjectivity when using the observation instrument, there is still the danger of being subservient to the evaluation system, and hence bureaucratic accountability, which seeks to ensure that educators measure up to some predetermined, uniform standard.

2.9. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF A SUCCESSFUL APPRAISAL SYSTEM

The following are the characteristics of an appraisal system, as criteria to be used for judging the work performance of employees.

2.9.1. Relevance
According to Coetzee and Schreuder (2010), relevance implies that there are clear links between the performance standards for a particular job and the goals of an organisation, the critical job elements identified through a job analysis and the dimensions to be rated on an appraisal form. Thus, the appraisal system must be directly related to the objectives of the job and the goals of the organisation. Performance standards translate the job requirements identified in the job analysis process into levels of acceptable or unacceptable behaviour.

2.9.2. Reliability
Reliability requires the appraisal system to produce evaluations or ratings that are consistent and repeatable. Coetzee and Schreuder (2010) assert that for any given employee, appraisals made by raters working independently of one another should agree closely. In order to produce reliable data, each rater must have adequate opportunity to observe what the employee has done, and the conditions under which it has been done; otherwise, unreliability may be confused with unfamiliarity.

2.9.3. Sensitivity
Sensitivity means that despite being highly relevant and reliable, the appraisal instrument must also be able to distinguish between good performers and poor performers – because the results of the appraisal process are used for developmental or administrative decision-making. Appraisal systems designed for administrative purposes demand performance information on the differences
between individuals; while systems designed to promote employee development and growth demand information about differences within the individual (Coetzee and Schreuder, 2010).

2.9.4. Freedom from contamination
The appraisal system must be able to measure individual performance without being contaminated by factors that are outside the control of the employee, such as: a shortage of resources (Swanepoel, Erasmus, Van Wyk and Schenk, 2003).

2.9.5. Practicality
In order for an appraisal system to demonstrate practicality, it must be easy for managers and their subordinates to understand and use. It must be cost-effective and require manageable administration. Cascio and Aguinis (2005) indicate that it is vital for management to be thoroughly informed of the real benefits for using carefully developed criteria. Management may or may not have the experience to appraise the soundness of a criterion measure, or a series of criterion measures, but objections will almost certainly arise if record-keeping and data-collection for criterion measures become impractical, and interfere significantly with ongoing operations.

2.9.6. Acceptability
In securing acceptability, the support and legitimacy of a system – from both managers and employees – carry more weight in determining its success. In order to establish a positive attitude towards the system, the eventual end-users must be involved in its development, implementation and maintenance (Swanepoel, Erasmus, Van Wyk and Schenk, 2003). Coetzee and Schreuder (2010) argue that if an appraisal system does not have the support of those who are to use it, human ingenuity could be used to thwart or sabotage the system.

2.9.7. Legal compliance
The work-performance data are used for making management decisions with regard to, inter alia, promotions, dismissals and employment-equity rewards. The performance-management system must comply with the requirements of the relevant labour legislation.
2.10. THE ROLE-PLAYERS AND STRUCTURES INVOLVED IN IQMS

According to ELRC (2003), the implementation of IQMS in schools involves various individuals and structures, as listed below.

2.10.1. The Principal

Across the world, research findings indicate that head teachers (principals) are regarded as one of the most powerful single determinants of the overall quality and effectiveness of schools (Daresh, 1998). While school principals may focus on the administrative parts of their role (Kogoe, 1986), there is strong evidence that they play an important part in ensuring instructional quality (Togneri 2003). In the absence of other inspection and supervision structures, the responsibility for guiding and supporting new and often poorly trained teachers usually falls on the school head (de Grauwe 2001).

Assisting teachers to develop the quality of their teaching is a difficult and lengthy process, particularly where the teachers themselves have low levels of education (Condy, 1998: 20). With the growing importance of school-based in-service programmes, it is important that the supervision be focused on providing guidance, improving performance, and enhancing professionalism and morale, rather than simply on criticism of the teachers (Craig, 1999: 5). As such, this calls for school leadership that is well-trained in performance appraisal if they are to implement it to the advantage of the teachers and the pupils.

The fact that the quality of the principal’s leadership is the most important determinant of the success of a school is universally acknowledged, and supported by a considerable body of research evidence from a variety of sources (Leithwood, Jantzi and Steinbach, 2002; Mortimore et al., 1988; Rutter et al., 1979). The importance of the school leader, therefore, is continuing to expand – as schools are increasingly expected to deal with a range of social and economic issues.

Brandt (1995) reiterated that the head serves as a partner, guiding the teacher toward continuous development and improvement. The principal, consequently, is
viewed as a crucial factor in a school’s overall performance – and his/her influence is very considerable. Basically, appraising a principal is in many respects the same activity as appraising any teacher. The appraisal of the principal is the responsibility of the Education Officer, who is the direct-line supervisor.

The emphasis in educational policy is on raising standards, producing a well-equipped labour force, and also, in response to concerns over a deterioration in society’s values and norms, on developing citizenship (Department for Education and Employment, 1998). This was underpinned by five key themes (i.e., quality, diversity, choice, autonomy and accountability) that should, (Department for Education, 1992), act together to increase competition, so as to improve standards. The pressure on principals to manage these externally mandated changes has increased, and they are held accountable for any success or failure of their schools.

According to Ovando (2001:213):

*The current accountability demands represent a challenge for schools that aim to achieve academic success for all students through a comprehensive teacher-appraisal system. Therefore, teacher appraisal requires immediate attention from school leaders.*

Similarly, others affirm that it is time to rethink teacher supervision and appraisal (Marshall, 2005), so that teacher-performance appraisal is truly linked to student achievement. Appraisal of the principal cannot take place in isolation from teachers and the school environment, since the principal is ultimately responsible for all aspects of the school. Since the introduction of appraisals, there has been noted tension between the principal’s management and administrative role, and their professional role, and in particular, their role as curriculum leaders (Webb and Vulliamy, 1996).

Principals now spend more time on their overview of the curriculum, and less on classroom responsibilities and direct teaching. They also spend more time developing and monitoring the teachers, rather than doing any teaching themselves.
Supervising and appraising teachers is viewed as their core-business, whereby they are appraised.

Turner and Clift, (1988) identified a problem with appraisals that called upon the principal to account for aspects of school life, which are delegated to colleagues. They argue that although in theory a principal is accountable for all aspects of the school, any realistic appraisal of a principal’s work needs to take into account the shortcomings of his/her colleagues. In the same line of thinking, Glola and Longenecker (1997) observed that a number of studies suggest that managers regularly find the formal appraisal process to be frustrating, political and a less-than-meaningful experience, which does not bode well for management development.

The principal of the school has the overall responsibility of ensuring that the IQMS policy is implemented uniformly and effectively. The principal, together with the SMT or Staff Development Team members, is responsible for advocacy and training at the school level. The principal is required to organise a workshop on IQMS, where the individuals would have the opportunity to clarify any areas of concern. Additionally, s/he must facilitate the establishment of the staff-development team in a democratic manner. The principal is also responsible for the internal moderation of evaluation results, in order to ensure fairness and consistency (ELRC, 2003).

2.10.2. The Staff-Development Team (SDT)

The Staff-Development Team is made up of the principal, the Whole-School Evaluation coordinator, the democratically elected members of the school-management team, and the democratically elected post-level 1 educators. The institution should decide on the size of the Staff-Development Team, while taking into account the size of the school, the number of educators and the work that needs to be done. The ELRC Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003 stipulates that the roles and responsibilities of the SDT include the following:

- To prepare and develop the School-Improvement Plan;
• To monitor the process of developmental appraisal, mentorship and support provided by the personal Developmental Support Group of an educator;

• To give guidelines on how the Developmental-Support Group should perform its responsibilities, and to incorporate plans for the development of the educator in the School-Improvement Plan;

• To coordinate the internal Whole-School Evaluation process, and keep all records and documentation on IQMS in the school;

• To train educators on procedures and processes;

• To liaise with the district regarding high priority needs, and to develop programmes that include INSET – to address the identified areas for development; and

• To complete the necessary documentation and submit data for those educators who meet the requirements for progression to the district or local Departmental Office before the school closes in December (ELRC, 2003).

2.10.3. The Developmental Support Group (DSG)

The Development-Support Group of each educator consists of the immediate senior of the educator and another educator, known as a peer. The peer is selected by the educator on the basis of expertise that is related to the prioritised needs of the educator. The peer must have the confidence and trust of the educator, because s/he would offer constructive criticism, support and guidance (ELRC, 2003).

The educator must undertake self-evaluation of his or her performance. Loock, Grobler and Mestry (2006) specify that the emphasis on self-evaluation serves the following purposes:
• The educator becomes familiar with the instrument that will be used for Development Appraisal and Performance Measurement.

• The educator is compelled to reflect critically on his or her own performance, and to set his or her own targets and timeframes for improvement.

• The educator takes control of improvement, and is able to identify the priorities and to monitor his/her own progress.

• Evaluation, through a self-evaluation process, becomes an ongoing process, which is more sustainable in the long term, because fewer outside evaluations are required, thereby reducing the investment of time and of human resources.

• The educator is able to make inputs when being observed; thus, the process becomes more participatory.

• The educator is able to measure progress and successes and to build on these without becoming dependent on cyclical evaluations.

The educator must cooperate with the Development-Support Group and the external Whole-School Evaluation team. He or she must attend the in-service training and other programmes that have been identified for his or her development. The educator must first develop the Personal Growth Plan (PGP), so that he or she is able to prioritise the areas of real development.

The main purpose of the Development-Support Group is to provide mentoring and support. It is responsible for assisting the educator in the development and refinement of his or her Personal Growth Plan, and to work with the Staff-Development Team, in order to incorporate plans for the development of an educator into the school-improvement plan. The Development-Support Group is responsible for the baseline evaluation of the educator, which is needed for developmental purposes. It is also responsible for the summative evaluation at the end of the year that is used for performance measurement. The Development-Support Group must
verify that the information provided for performance measurement is accurate (ELRC, 2003).

2.10.4. The District Office

The District Office has the overall responsibility of advocacy, training and proper implementation of IQMS. It is responsible for the development and arrangement of professional development programmes, in accordance with the identified needs of educators, and its own improvement plan. The District Office is responsible for moderating the evaluation results of schools in its district, in order to ensure consistency. In cases where the evaluation results of a school are not consistent with the general level of performance of the school, or where the District Manager has reason to believe that the evaluation at a particular school was either too lenient or too strict, s/he must refer the results of the school for reconsideration.

The District Office should ensure that the implementation process in schools is monitored on an ongoing basis (ELRC, 2003).

2.11. RECORDS AND DOCUMENTATION OF IQMS

Various records and documents need to be maintained, which serve as evidence that the IQMS policy is being implemented in schools.

2.11.1. The Completed Instrument

The appraiser is required to record observations as clearly as possible in the appropriate columns of the instrument, namely: strengths, recommendations for development and contextual factors. The completed instrument would then serve as a report, and would be used for all official purposes (ELRC, 2003).

2.11.2. The Personal-Growth Plan (PGP)

The Personal-Growth Plan should be an outcome of the Strategic Plans of the relevant DoE and Developmental Appraisal. It is developed by the educator in consultation with members of the Development-Support Group. The Personal-
Growth Plan must be used to inform the School-Improvement Plan, which in turn would be submitted to the regional, district or area office, so as to inform the planning and deployment of the support staff (ELRC, 2003:13).

According to Steyn and Van Niekerk (2002:309), the Personal-Growth Plan covers the following:

- The formulation of objectives that indicate the areas requiring further development.
- The identification of specific activities to achieve the identified objectives.
- The statement of the resources that are required to achieve the set objectives.
- The statement of key performance indicators.

2.11.3. The School-Improvement Plan

The School-Improvement Plan enables the school to measure its own progress through a process of ongoing self-evaluation. The School-Improvement Plan is developed by the Senior-Management Team and the Staff-Development Team for monitoring progress and improvement (ELRC, 2003:14).

2.11.4. The Regional, District and Area-Improvement Plans

The regional, district and area improvement plans enable officials to plan, coordinate and monitor the delivery of support, and to develop opportunities in the schools in its areas. The plans are informed by the Strategic Plan of the relevant DoE, and the School-Improvement Plan submitted by the schools under its jurisdiction (ELRC, 2003:4).
2.12. CHALLENGES TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IQMS

The IQMS policy is aimed at the teachers who are employees of government. However, it does not explain the procedures involved in holding the National Education Department accountable. The idea that the DoE has the responsibility of providing facilities and resources to support learning and teaching is not followed through with explanations about what will be provided, how, or who would monitor and evaluate the adequacy of the provision and efficacy of the development of human resources (Weber, 2010). Ntombela et al. (2010) highlight the lack of resources, especially in rural schools, such as: a lack of educator and learner-support material, libraries, laboratories, electricity and classrooms, which result in overcrowding.

De Clercq (2010) asserts that most provincial departments lack material and human resources to carry out school-evaluation policies, and they are constrained by poor organisational capacity.

While performance appraisals are regarded and used as techniques to influence, control and drive employee behaviour towards increased productivity and effectiveness and accountability, Cleveland and Murphy (1989), Bollington et al. (1990), Bratton and Gold (2007), tend to believe otherwise. They tend to view the performance-appraisal process as a minefield of potential errors summarised by two terms: reliability and validity, which describe the qualities of the entire evaluation process, and refer to the adequacy of the information that is generated and used in subsequent decisions about employees (Szilagyi and Wallace, 1990).

They further elaborated on their idea, by stating that:

> *Reliability problems are caused by random source[s] of error; [the] characteristics of the measuring device, its administration, or its individual employee[s]. Validity problems are caused by constant error[s], including halos, stereotypes, contrast error, similar-to-me error[s] and first-impression error[s] (Szilagyi and Wallace, p. 527).*

Supporting their view on controversy surrounding appraisal schemes in the education system, is Oldroyd (2002), who warns that the schemes are often heavily
bureaucratic, and involve time and paperwork; but it is frequently hard to demonstrate any improvement in performance that follows the setting of targets. Concurring with Oldroyd is Perillo (2006), who postulates that the applicability of managerial informed notions of appraisal can be questioned – when there is a focus on enabling teaching excellence, rather than correcting any knowledge and skill deficits.

Another concern is the lack of capacity for educator monitoring, which might develop with training expertise and moderation. According to Bohlander and Snell (2004), a weakness in performance appraisal programmes is that managers and supervisors are not adequately trained for the appraisal task and provide little meaningful feedback to their subordinates. The issue of adequate and proper training remains the crucial factor that would make appraisals effective.

It could well be argued that due to inadequate training, supervisors lack precise standards for appraising subordinates' performance, and they fail to develop the necessary observational and feedback skills, hence their appraisal is often portrayed as ineffective, based on high subjectivity and ignoring individual objectives (Soltani et al., 2005).

The system requires authoritative evaluators, capable of making data-informed professional judgements. They need to have an understanding of how to uphold and raise evaluation standards and criteria; on how to work with the techniques of observations; and how to develop effective diagnosis and reports (de Clercq, 2008:14). The evaluation skills or competencies that evaluators need are crucial in the process of implementing IQMS (Loock, Grobler and Mestry, 2006:85). Problems associated with teacher appraisal include the tension between formative purposes and summative purposes of appraisal, the lack of agreement on appropriate appraisal criteria, concerns over the validity and reliability of evaluation methods, and the negative perceptions of teachers towards the appraisal system (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983; Lane, 1990; Peterson, 2000).
The cited scholars seem to suggest that the problem may relate to the way the design process and the implementation of performance appraisal has been handled in organisations.

Advocacy in the implementation of IQMS is another challenge. De Clercq (2010:110) indicates that the IQMS research commissioned by the DoE reveals that most districts and schools did not properly understand some of the IQMS processes and procedures, such as how to develop Personal-Growth Plans and incorporate them into School-Improvement Plans or how to incorporate School-Improvement Plans into a District-Improvement Plan. The IQMS training document, which details the steps to be followed by school and district personnel for the IQMS appraisal forms, is described as poorly written, cumbersome and difficult to use in practice.

IQMS combines the appraisal for development and for performance management. De Clercq (2008) argues that the two-teacher appraisal purposes tend to co-exist uneasily. The developmental purpose assumes that teachers trust one another, and want to improve their performance by reflecting together as professionals on their developmental needs. Monyatsi, Steyn and Kampar (2006, in De Clercq, 2010) maintain that the performance purpose, also known as the accountability model, provides management with information on the performance of teachers for their job confirmation, promotion or dismissal.

A conflict could easily develop in a procedure designed to be used to assist in professional development and as a management tool to identify those whose performance is above or below par. Teachers are unlikely to trust such a procedure, which is rarely perceived as a rational process with a common goal based on objective standards and procedures.

Educators regard appraisal as an accountability mechanism, a hostile device imposed upon them to meet the requirements of a centrally designed system. They find it threatening socially, morally and financially – especially when it is used to determine their increase or bonus payment at the expense of professional development (Brown, 2001). Generally, opposition to appraisal generated from
summative elements may include establishing direct accountabilities, determining pay levels or promotion prospects and improving performance (Bell, 1988).

The fear of appraisals by teachers was also noticed by Gene and Morgan (1992:45) who observed that:

*The mere mention of the word “appraisal” to a group of teachers or head teachers is almost guaranteed to produce the same effect as poking a stick into a hornet’s nest. Take cover quickly and get ready to repel a swarm of fears and anxieties, created by the coupling of incomplete knowledge with imperfect understanding, and nourished by an unhealthy diet of frustration and cynicism.*

It may be argued that how educators view the IQMS affects the way they accept and implement the system to the advantage of their students. The appraisal system is bound to have a significant impact on the attitudes and behaviours of educators, which, in turn, would affect the performance of educators and the learning outcomes of students.

Duke (1995) asserts that the accountability model in appraisals has been unpopular with teachers and their unions. Its key characteristics have been seen as an imposition, since the philosophy is the checking of competence, and it is designed to bring about a better relationship between pay, responsibilities and performance (Monyatsi 2003). Educators have questioned the capabilities of those making judgements, and the validity and reliability of the instruments used. Evidently, the model provokes a defensive response.

Minnaar and Bekker (2005) state that the outcome of a management process is the ultimate manifestation of the success or failure of the process. If the outputs of the public management process are able to continuously add or create value in the environment, government policy will be successfully implemented and the entire management process could then be regarded as successful. According to research by Ntombela et al. (2010), the Superintendents of Education Management were clear in their response that there had not been any performance improvement, since the introduction of IQMS as a performance-management system in schools.
They suggest that the implementation of IQMS has not had any impact on enhancing service delivery in schools, so that they then become economical, efficient and effective in satisfying the customer, namely, the learner.

Robbins and Barnwell (2002) claim that open systems receive information from their environment. This helps the system to adjust and allows it to take corrective actions to rectify any deviations from its prescribed course. The Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development (2011) notes that the Teacher-Development Summit (of 2009) called for the development and subsequent implementation of a new strengthened integrated Plan for teacher development in South Africa, which would respond effectively to the current challenges being experienced.

Thus, IQMS would be streamlined and rebranded. Mechanisms for identifying and responding to teacher development needs would be improved, particularly in relation to developing curriculum competence that would be able to enhance the quality of teaching and learning in schools. This should be done in a way that secures the trust and confidence of teachers, so that they are able to discuss their own challenges in a non-punitive environment, and are able to access relevant mentoring, support and training that is targeted to meet their needs.

2.13. CONCLUSION

This chapter has discussed performance management and the implementation of IQMS. It has noted that the purpose of evaluating educators is to identify the strengths and weaknesses of educators, in order to assist in choosing the correct developmental activities and support for the educator. Once the areas of improvement are identified, it is the responsibility of the DoE to provide support in terms of training educators, providing resources to schools, and monitoring the process. This should minimise the gap between policy goals and the implementation of the policy.
However, this chapter has also highlighted some key issues and challenges with regard to the implementation of performance management and appraisal systems with a focus on IQMS. Additionally, advocacy has been identified as one of the vital elements that is necessary in the implementation of the appraisal process, as it interprets the process and makes it understandable to the role players. The appraisal system needs to be user-friendly, so as to avoid tensions between the role-players.

The next chapter discusses the research methodology to be used in conducting the research study.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes and explains the methodology, as well as the overall design adopted in this research. A methodology is a plan of action. Fundamental to every purposeful human action, such as scientific research, is a method. This could be explained as a prescribed manner for performing the work, with adequate consideration of the research problem, objectives and the hypothesis.

The discussion in the previous chapter of concepts and the area covered on the Integrated Quality-Management System was an attempt to contextualise the IQMS. It also laid the foundation for the practical investigation that was to follow. While the literature review provided some tentative answers to the objectives of the research and created a theoretical framework in which the research question could be explained, the methodology will give guidance to the design, the data collection and analysis, and the population and sample from which the research questions will be answered.

3.2. PERMISSION TO CONDUCT THE RESEARCH

Hoepfl (1997:25) suggested that the “participants are the ones to grant someone access to their lives, their minds, and their emotions; therefore, permission has to be sought”. In line with the above assertion, permission was sought from three sources, that is: the Department of Education and the School-Management Teams, as well as from the educators.

A letter requesting permission to conduct the research was submitted to the District Director of the Department of Education in King William’s Town. The letter outlined the purpose of the research, and how the research was to be conducted with the participants. A letter granting permission was received from the District Director of Department of Education to conduct the research in schools in the King William’s Town area.
3.3. THE RESEARCH PARADIGM

A paradigm is a way of looking at the world. It comprises certain philosophical assumptions that guide and direct the thinking and the action, as researchers perceive reality, and hence represent what they think of the world (Guba and Lincoln, in Maree, 2007; Mertens, 2010). Paradigms are perspectives or world views based on sets of values and philosophical assumptions from which distinctive conceptions and explanations of phenomena are proposed. These philosophical frameworks give the researcher a starting point, from which they can reflect on the world, search for what they believe in, why they view them as such, and what philosophical framework shapes them (Gibson & Sanderson, 2003).

The choice of a paradigm to guide this study was influenced by the nature of the problem being investigated. The main objective of the study was to evaluate the implementation of IQMS in improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools. To get a more holistic picture of how the IQMS was implemented, there was a need for the researcher to be objective and to minimize the researcher's bias, while, at the same time, to be subjective enough to have a deeper insight into the issues surrounding the implementation of IQMS in improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools.

The post-positivistic paradigm was preferred, because the researcher wished to maintain an interest in some aspects of quantification (positivism); yet, at the same time, she wished to incorporate interpretivist concerns on subjectivity and meaning. Furthermore, the researcher was interested in the use of the pragmatic combination of qualitative and quantitative methods – in order to better understand the phenomenon of interest (Maree, 2007). The post-positivistic paradigm fitted well with the study because, as noted earlier, a paradigm opens the door to multiple methods and different worldviews, as well as to different methods of data collection and analysis.

3.4. THE RESEARCH DESIGN

Trochim (2006) defines research design as the structure of research, that is, the "glue" that holds all the elements in a research project together. A research design is
a strategic framework for action that serves as a bridge between research questions and the execution or implementation of the research (Terre Blanche and Durrheim, 2002). According to du Plooy (2002:81), a research design is a plan on how the research is going to be conducted, indicating who or what is involved, and where and when the study is to take place.

It could be argued that the research design depicts elements of the research methodology, their interrelationships, the data collection and the data analysis – to ensure that the final report answers the research questions (Babbie and Mouton, 2007). Research design refers to the researcher’s overall plan for obtaining answers to the research questions, and for testing the research hypotheses. It provides the framework and introduces the reader to the overall plan for executing the research.

From the definitions outlined, it may be said that the research design is the overall plan for conducting the whole research study.

A research approach or design can be qualitative, quantitative or a mixed-method approach – depending on the answers sought by the researcher to the following three questions, as suggested by Creswell (2003):

- What knowledge claims are being made by the researcher (including theoretical perspectives)?
- What strategies of inquiry would inform the procedures?
- What methods of data collection and analysis will be used? (p.5)

### 3.4.1. Qualitative research approach

Berg (2004:7) notes that qualitative techniques allow researchers to share in the understandings and perceptions of others, and to explore how people structure and give meaning to their daily lives. Researchers using qualitative techniques examine how people learn about and make sense of themselves and others. It is also noted that a qualitative researcher attempts always to study human action from the perspective of the social actors themselves (Babbie & Mouton, 2007). Through this technique, the researcher should be able to access information from educators, principals and district coordinators on their understanding and perceptions of the performance-management system in the department of education.
The primary goal of the study in using this approach may be defined as describing and understanding, rather than explaining, human behaviour (Babbie and Mouton, 2007).

In this study, the researcher utilises qualitative data to preserve the chronological flow, to assess local causality, and to derive fruitful explanations. Furthermore, qualitative data are generally viewed as a source of well-grounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes occurring in the specific context (Miles and Huberman, 1994). In general, qualitative research is based on a relativistic, constructivist ontology that argues that there is no objective reality; rather, there are multiple realities constructed by human beings who experience a phenomenon of interest (Krauss, 2005).

People impose order on the world, as they perceive it, in an effort to construct meaning. Meaning lies in cognition – not in elements external to us. Information impinging on our cognitive systems is screened, translated, altered, and perhaps rejected, by the knowledge that already exists in that system. The resulting knowledge is idiosyncratic, and is purposefully constructed (Lythcott and Duschl, 1990).

This type of research is primarily subjective in approach, as it seeks to understand human behaviour and the reasons that govern such behaviour. Researchers have the tendency to become subjectively immersed in the subject matter in this research method. Here, the researcher collects open-ended emerging data with the primary intention of developing themes from the data. However, findings from a qualitative research are often not suitable for generalisation, because of the small numbers and narrow range of participants used in the data-collection process.

### 3.4.2 Quantitative research approach

The quantitative method measures the properties of a phenomenon by assigning numbers to the perceived qualities of things (Babbie and Mouton, 2003). Maree (2007) describes quantitative research as a process that is systematic and objective
in its way of using numerical data from only a selected subgroup of a universe (or population) to generalize the findings to the entire universe that is being studied. Concurring with this author, Neuman (2006) asserts that quantitative researchers develop techniques that produce data in the form of numbers.

As can be deduced from the definitions, the three most important elements of quantitative research are: objectivity, numerical data and generalisability. According to Maree (2007), in the quantitative method, researchers tend to remain objectively separated from the subject matter. This is because quantitative research is objective in its approach, and only seeks precise measurements and the analysis of target concepts to answer the inquiry. The researcher moves deductively from abstract ideas, to specific data-collection techniques, to precise numerical information produced by these techniques.

The quantitative data collected through this type of research can reveal generalisable information for a large group of people. However, quantitative research is criticized for its inability to look at individual cases in any detail, and also because its highly structured nature prevents the researcher from following up unexpected outcomes or information (Ryan, 2006). In addition, quantitative data often fail to provide specific answers, reasons, explanations or examples. Mouton and Marais (1996:169-170) stated that the phenomena that are investigated in the social sciences are so enmeshed that a single approach would almost certainly not succeed in encompassing human beings in their full complexity.

If the two approaches are used in a complementary manner, the researchers could eventually come to understand more about human nature and its social reality.

3.4.3 The mixed-methods research design

A mixed-approach includes strategies from both qualitative and quantitative methods. The methods of data collection imply that the instruments used in the collection process could include interviews, questionnaires, focus group, observations and others, depending on whether the study is qualitative, quantitative...
or a mixed-method study. The mixed-methods approach was adopted for this study. This method is viewed as a class of research where a mixture or combination of qualitative (QL) and quantitative (QN) research techniques, methods approaches, concepts or language is used in a single study (Creswell, 2007).

Mixed methods involve the collection and analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data in a single study – where the data are collected concurrently, or sequentially. This involves the integration of the data collected, and the conducting of analyses and inferences at one or more stages in the process of the research (Fielding & Fielding, 1986; Creswell, 2007; Happ, 2009; Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007). Its aims and benefits appear rather simple: to take the best of QL and QN methods, and to combine them (Bergman, 2008).

The need existed to use both the quantitative and qualitative approaches in the study. De Vos, Strydom, Fouche, and Delport (2005:81) suggest that there is general agreement amongst most authors that human science in reality employs both qualitative and quantitative methodology: “sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously.” Both methods were used, in order to elicit the required responses from the participants.

Newman and Benz (1998) claim that qualitative and quantitative approaches are neither mutually exclusive nor interchangeable. Qualitative methods would be employed to describe the actions of the research participants. Quantitative methods could be utilized where quantities or figures are required.

### 3.4.4. The research design/approach that guided the study

This study employed a Triangulation Mixed-Method approach for the collection of the data that provided useful information on the implementation of IQMS in improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools in the Dimbaza area in King William’s Town. The strategy used was the Concurrent-Triangulation strategy, which uses both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection concurrently, in order to better understand the phenomenon of interest (Creswell, 2003). Concurrent procedures entail collecting both quantitative and qualitative data at the same time.
during the study, and then integrating the information in the interpretation of the overall results (Creswell, 2003).

In this study, the researcher used both quantitative and qualitative methods in an attempt to confirm, cross-validate or corroborate the findings.

The various methods of data collection yielded both qualitative and quantitative data. In some cases, the qualitative data were used to triangulate the quantitative data, while in others it was the reverse. In this way, the data supplemented each other during the data collection, the data analysis and the interpretation process, in order to give a good picture of how the Integrated Quality-Management System is being implemented in the Dimbaza area in King William’s Town. Dick and Swepson, (1997) alluded to this when they noted that a mixed-method approach is advisable, as it provides a good basis for data triangulation, and so adds to the overall reliability of the research process.

The mixed-method approach fitted well with this study, as the main goal of the study was to get a deeper understanding of how IQMS was being implemented in the King William’s District. Further, the mixed-method approach ensured that biases that might be inherent in any single method would neutralize or cancel the biases of other methods (Creswell, 2003). Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) concur with this when they say that the mixed-methods approach provides strengths that offset the weaknesses in the use of either the quantitative or qualitative approach alone.

The concurrent mixed-methods approach also reduced the time required for the data collection (Creswell 2003); and hence, it enabled the researcher to complete the study in the given period of time.

3.5. THE POPULATION

The population is the entire group in which the researcher is interested, and from which s/he wishes to describe or draw conclusions, the group to which the results of the study would ideally be generalised (Briggs and Coleman, 2007; Gay and Airasian, 2003). The population in a research context is any target group of individuals that has one or more characteristics in common, and that is of interest to
the researcher for the purpose of gaining information and drawing conclusions (Best and Kahn, 2003; Tuckman, 1999). Concurring with the above scholars, are Czaja and Blair (2005) who confirm that the population is the group or aggregation of elements that is to be studied, the group to which to generalize the results of the study.

The population depends on the research problem, what the author wants to study, and what s/he wants to know. In this study, the population consisted of high school educators, Senior Management-Team members and Integrated Quality-Management System-District Coordinators of Dimbaza area in King William's Town.

3.6. THE SAMPLE FRAME

A sample is a small portion of the total set of objects, events or persons that comprise the subjects of the study. Macmillan and Schumacher (1993: 598) defined the word “sample” as comprising a number of individuals selected from a population for study. It could be viewed as a subset of measurements drawn from a population in which the study is positioned (Denscombe, 2007; Cohen, et al., 2000; Springer, 2010). The process of deciding on a particular sample for particular entities in a study is called sampling (Leedy and Ormrod, 2005). Basically, sampling is about deciding the place or site and the respondents or persons from whom the data would be collected (Punch, 2006).

It is important that a sample accurately reflects the characteristics of the population from which it is drawn. Another important factor advanced by Flick (2002) is that the important issue of sampling is when the researcher decides on which persons to target, so as to obtain the relevant data. This calls for the researcher to understand the population well – so that drawing a sample is an easy task. The major reason for sampling is feasibility, as it may not be possible to collect data from the entire population. Ideally, one should select a sample which is free from bias. This is necessary, as the type of sample selected greatly affects the reliability of the subsequent generalisations.

In this study, the four high schools formed clusters, and the educators were purposively selected from each cluster. The researcher also purposively selected
respondents, namely, 20 educators, 8 Senior-Management Team members and 2 Integrated Quality-Management System-District Coordinators. These represented about 31% of the population of that area.

3.7. DATA-COLLECTION METHODS AND TECHNIQUES

Since the study has used a mixed-method approach to collect both the qualitative and the quantitative data, the researcher found the use of interviews, questionnaires and document reviews ideal data-collection methods for the study. Below is a brief description of the research methods that were used.

3.7.1 Interviews

The interview is the most widely used method of obtaining qualitative data on subjects’ opinions, beliefs and feelings about the situation in their own words (Cohen et al., 2000). An interview is a two-way conversation, in which the interviewer asks the participant questions, in order to collect data, and to learn about the ideas, beliefs, views, opinions and behaviours of the participants. They provide information that cannot be obtained through observation, but which could be used to verify the observation.

The qualitative interview is typically more probing, open-ended and less-structured than the interviews used in quantitative research; but it varies considerably in the way it is conducted (Cohen et al., 2000). The aim of qualitative interviews is to see the world through the eyes of the participants, who could be a valuable source of information, provided they are used correctly (Maree, 2007). Maree (2007) divides interviews into three. These are, open-ended interviews, semi-structured interviews, and structured interviews. In open-ended interviews, the focus is on the participant’s perceptions of an event or phenomenon being studied. To avoid bias in the data collected, it is advisable to conduct the interviews with more than just one informant.

In semi-structured interviews, the participant is required to answer a set of predetermined questions that define the line of inquiry. Probing and clarification of answers is allowed. In this type of interview, the researcher needs to be very attentive to the responses given by the interviewee, so as to identify any new
emerging lines of inquiry that are directly related to the phenomenon being studied.
In structured interviews, the questions are detailed and developed in advance, just
as in survey research (Maree, 2007).

There is not much probing in structured interviews, since the questions are overly
structured. These kinds of interviews are used frequently in case studies, or when
dealing with large sample groups – to ensure consistency.

The researcher used semi-structured interviews to gather information from principals
and district coordinators of IQMS. Open-ended interviews were preferred to other
forms of interviews in this study, because they offer a platform for conversation. The
researcher’s intention was to explore with the participant his/her views, ideas, beliefs
and attitudes concerning the implementation of IQMS. In so doing, the researcher
saw the world, that is, (implementation of IQMS) through the eyes of the participants
(Maree 2007).

The researcher was aware of the limitation of not getting comprehensive answers to
the questions. When that was the case, the researcher tried to probe into the
responses, and made sure that the questioning techniques guided the interviewees
to give comprehensive answers. The interviews were scheduled over a period of one
week, and each interview was allocated an approximate time of 30 minutes. The
respondents were interviewed in a relaxed, non-threatening environment, using a
less formal approach, in order to gather as much information about the topic as
possible.

3.7.2. Questionnaires

According to Tuckman (1997:195), a questionnaire is “a document containing
questions designed to solicit information appropriate for analysis”. The questionnaire
allows for anonymity and privacy, which encourages “more candid responses on
sensitive issues”. A questionnaire is a set of questions with fixed wording and a
sequence of presentation, as well as more or less precise indications of how to
answer each question (Bless and Higson-Smith, 2000). Questionnaires comprise a
widely used instrument for collecting information that provides structured and
numerical data, which can be easily administered by the researcher. The information
provided in this way is straightforward to analyse (Cohen, 2002).
The questionnaire has the advantage of being administered to many respondents in a large geographical area, making it possible to save time and finances, and generally, to provide a higher percentage of usable responses (Best & Khan, 1993; Bless and Higson-Smith, 2000; Cohen, et al., 2000; Tuckman, 1978). It has the disadvantage that because of its impersonal nature and openness to abuse by the respondents, they might not attach as much importance and relevance to some of the questions or decide to withhold vital information. Hence, Tuckman (1978:196) observed: “Some respondents may just withhold information, because they do not wish to give it for some reason”.

This was taken care of through a letter, which explained the purpose of the research, as earlier indicated in paragraph one of this section.

Nachmias and Nachmias (1989) cited the limitation of questionnaires as that of not giving the researcher an opportunity to probe – a view shared by Neuman (2000). The answers have to be accepted as final; there is no opportunity to probe beyond the given answer, to clarify ambiguous answers, or to observe the non-verbal behaviour of respondents. A low response rate is one of the limitations of using mailed questionnaires, since most people do not necessarily complete and return questionnaires; and above all there is no control over who fills out the questionnaire (Neuman, 1997:251; Nachmias and Nachmias, 1989). This was attended to in this study, through the use of interviews.

However, the researcher had to guard against the following: its impersonal nature and openness to abuse by the respondents, as some respondents might not attach much importance or relevance to some of the questions. These respondents could answer positively just to please the researcher, or say what the researcher wants to hear. However, this was taken care of through emphasising the importance of the research. Where respondents did not respond in time a reminder was sent to them.

Self-administered questionnaires were used as the research data-collection technique. According to Babbie and Mouton (2007), self-administered questionnaires are only appropriate when the population under study is adequately literate. The educators, SMT members, principals and the district coordinators are all literate.
individuals, and could complete the questionnaires themselves. The questionnaires were handed to the participants, and they contained semi-structured questions.

Babbie and Mouton (2007) affirm that, generally, questionnaires that are delivered or collected or both seem to have higher completion rates, than straightforward mailed surveys.

Some questions were close-ended, while others were open-ended, so that the respondents were given some freedom to express their views. According to Singleton et al. (1988), the advantage of open-ended questions is the freedom the respondent has in answering, resulting in a veritable goldmine of information, revealing respondents' logic or thought processes, the amount of information they possess, and the strength of their opinions or feelings.

The permission to conduct the research in selected high schools in King William’s Town was granted by the District Director of the Department of Education. The questionnaires were handed to educators of the selected high schools with the assistance of the principals. A letter explaining the purpose of the study was enclosed with each questionnaire.

3.7.3. Document study or content analysis

In document analysis, as a data-gathering instrument, the researcher focuses on all types of written communications that could shed light on the phenomenon that the researcher is investigating (Maree, 2007). This includes published and unpublished documents, company reports, memoranda, agendas, administrative documents, letters, reports, newspaper articles, minutes of meetings, or any other document that is connected to the investigation (Maree, 2007).

However, the researcher has to be cautious of the authenticity and accuracy of the records before using them. Nevertheless, such documents reveal what people do or did, and what they value. In addition, the behaviour occurred in a natural setting, so the data have strong validity (Maree, 2007).

The researcher is aware that document analysis is another important supplementary tool for the gathering of data in studies of this kind. The researcher accessed IQMS
implementation reports from IQMS programme facilitators. These reports were scrutinized to get a good idea of the implementation process. The establishment of IQMS in South African schools is a statutory requirement; and therefore, there is substantial official and other documentation available for analysis (Bailey, 1982; Popenoe, 1995). These documents vary greatly; some are primary documents, reports, legislation and other official documents; while others are secondary documents.

Documentary analysis involves indirect observation or non-participant observation. The process is not limited in size or sample, and is well-suited to study a phenomenon over a considerable area and time. The official documents are available in the official websites of government and the Department of Basic Education.

Information from school documents, district office documents assisted the researcher in discovering their meaning and to develop an understanding of the implementation of IQMS. School documents included minutes of the SDT, DSG and Staff meetings and school improvement plans. District-official documents included official documents, such as policies, legislation, and monitoring tools used by the district officials and district developmental plans for educators.

3.8. TRUSTWORTHINESS / VALIDITY / RELIABILITY ISSUES

The validity and reliability of the instruments used in this study were tested before their use, in order to reduce errors. According to Kothari (2004), Maree (2007) and Mark (1996), validity refers to the degree to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. Reliability has to do with the consistency or repeatability of a measure or an instrument, and high reliability is obtained when the measure or instrument gives the same results if the research is repeated on the same sample (Maree, 2007). However, total reliability is difficult to achieve, since human beings are not static.
One would not expect to have the exact findings in subsequent data-collection procedures, even though the sample remains the same.

Nevertheless, researchers need to strive towards achieving validity and reliability in research. Thus, in this research, the face and content validity of the data-collection instruments were ascertained by a panel of experts in education, including the supervisor of the researcher. Their main function was to add, edit or eliminate irrelevant items from the initial pool of items, and to ensure that there was adequate coverage of the topic being studied. In addition, a team comprising critical colleagues also validated the instruments.

3.9. THE DATA ANALYSIS

The researcher used both qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis. According to Maree (2007:99), the qualitative data analysis is usually based on an interpretive philosophy that is aimed at examining the meaningful and symbolic content of the qualitative data. Phrased differently, it tries to establish how participants make meaning of a specific phenomenon by analysing their perceptions, attitudes, understanding, knowledge, values, feelings and experiences – in an attempt to approximate their construction of the phenomenon. The questionnaire items formed the basis of discussion for the results of the study. The collected data were analysed and presented in the form of tables and graphs with values expressed in the form of percentages – to allow for comparison purposes.

Maree (2007) notes that when analysing quantitative data, the researcher’s goal is to summarise what the researcher has seen, or heard, in terms of common words, phrases, themes or patterns that would aid the researcher’s understanding and interpretation of that which is emerging. The researcher made use of a manual interpretation of the data.

3.10. CONCLUSION

This chapter has discussed all the technological aspects that guided this study. The chapter looked at the different research paradigms and placed this study in the post-positivistic paradigm because of its use of both quantitative and qualitative
approaches to research. The chapter further examined the different research
designs, in an effort to place the study in a suitable context. After a thorough
examination of the designs, the study fitted into the mixed-method design that uses
concurrent procedures in the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data.

The chapter also went further to look into the population, sample and sampling
techniques that were involved in the study. This gave insights into the population
from which the respondents had been solicited. The chapter then defined the actual
sample and the techniques that were followed, in order to arrive at the sample.
Thereafter, the data-collection instruments were detailed; and these included
questionnaires, interviews and document analysis.

Issues of validity/reliability/trustworthiness and data analysis were also discussed in
the chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR
PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

4.1. INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter provided an outline of the research design, the methods, and the sampling procedures that were used in the study. The research design used is based on selected samples, and both quantitative and qualitative analytical approaches.

The main aim of this chapter is, firstly, to present the data that have been collected from the research design of the study. The chapter will also be used to analyse the data that have been gathered in the research. The data will be interpreted and analysed within the conceptual framework established in Chapter Two.

4.2. RESPONSE RATE OF THE SAMPLED RESPONDENTS

A total of 30 questionnaires were given to 30 respondents from four high schools in the Dimbaza area. These were selected randomly. A response rate of 87% (26 out of 30) was obtained. The educators’ response rate was 85% (17 out of 20) and the Senior-Management Teams’ response rate was 88% (7 out 8). This response was regarded as adequate for providing data that are reliable. A presentation of the questionnaire data has been provided – to substantiate the interpretation of the information. In addition, interviews were conducted with two IQMS district coordinators.

4.3. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA COLLECTED

Questionnaires were collected from educators and Senior Management Teams from the four high schools. Additionally, interviews were conducted with the IQMS district coordinators.

4.3.1. Questionnaires from educationalists

The results of the questionnaires that were collected from the educators are presented as follows.
4.3.1.1. Gender

From a total of 17 educators who responded to the question, seven respondents were males, while ten were females. The sample of the respondents is representative, because female educators seem to dominate in teaching.

4.3.1.2. Age

The response from 17 educators indicates that the Dimbaza area has a small number of young educators, between the ages of 20 to 30 years; while that of the older educators fell between 51 and 60 years.
4.3.1.3. Educational qualifications

All the educators who took part in the research were reported to have a professional diploma, while 82% of the respondents had a bachelor's degree. As many as 47% of the respondents had honours degree. Only one educator had a Master's degree, however.
4.3.1.4. Teaching experience

From the 17 respondents, 3 educators (i.e. 18%) were reported to have been teaching for 10 years or less, whilst only one educator (i.e. 6%) had taught for more than 30 years. A total of 29% had been teaching from 11 to 20 years (i.e. 5 out of 17). Most educators' experience ranged between 21 and 30 years. All the educators had been teaching for more than 5 years when the IQMS was introduced in schools in 2004. This means that the responses regarding the IQMS are reliable, because they are from experienced teachers.

The fact that most educators had been teaching for more than 10 years is an indication that they were exposed to an appraisal before the introduction of IQMS. Such educators should know the successes and failures of an appraisal system.
4.3.1.5. Grades taught by educators

As many as 29% of the educators teach grades 8 and 9, whilst 71% are teaching grades 10 to 12.

4.3.1.6. Learners taught in each grade

Learners in each grade range between 45 and 60. A large number of learners could mean less opportunities for the proper implementation of IQMS.

4.3.1.7. Training and development of educators

All the schools are using IQMS as a policy of government to evaluate the educators. The majority of respondents felt that the training regarding the policy was not sufficient. A total of 82% of the respondents indicated that they were trained for 3 days or less; and 18% had not been trained at all. Only 60% of the respondents did
not regard IQMS as a tool or instrument that effectively measures performance. One educator commented that, “the policy-makers are not abreast of the physical development and environment of the schools in general and classrooms specifically”.

Most educators noted that the knowledge of the facilitators of the IQMS was fair. This means the facilitators were aware that they themselves were not sufficiently knowledgeable about IQMS. Some of the respondents said the facilitators showed gaps in their training. This implies that the facilitators were unsure or lacking in confidence about the training they were providing.

Most respondents indicated that they did not understand IQMS and its implementation. The answer of the group meant that they were in need of more training and support, so that they could gain confidence.

As many as 94% of the respondents indicated that they were able to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses with the assistance of a Developmental Appraisal; while only one educator (6%) was unable to do so. A total of 64% of the educators agreed that the Department of Education had programmes in place for individual development, but these programmes were for periods of between one to three days. Only 35% of the respondents indicated that the programmes were of value in their performance. As many as 65% of the respondents noted that these programmes were not very effective.

A total of 82% of the respondents agreed that they had received support from the School Governing Body; only 18% did not receive any assistance. The support they had received was in the form of finances – when there was a need to buy learner-support material. Others indicated that they were motivated by the School-Governing Body when they achieved good results.

4.3.1.8. Development-Support Groups

A total of 71% of the respondents indicated that the Development-Support Group meets once a month, and once a quarter; whilst 29% indicated that they did not meet at all.
Only 7 out 17 (41%) respondents indicated that the DSGs understand their role; whilst 8 out of 17 (47%) respondents indicated that the DSGs in their schools lacked any proper understanding of their role. Two out of 17 (12%) respondents indicated that they could not tell whether the DSGs know their roles or not. The last two groups represent the majority of the respondents and these responses imply that the DSGs are not functioning at all in some of these schools.

4.3.1.9. Personal-Growth Plans

As many as 94% of the respondents agreed that they were able to draw up their Personal-Growth Plans, whilst 6% were unable to do so. The majority of the educators indicated that they did not agree with the importance of Personal-Growth Plans, because these are not used for developmental purposes.

Most educators indicated that IQMS is implemented for the purpose of salary progression – and not just for development. Educators are giving themselves good scores, in order to get a salary progression of 1%.

4.3.1.10. Perceptions about improvement in performance

A total of 71% of the educators did not agree that their performance had improved; whilst 29% agreed that their performance had improved. Some of the respondents noted that there was not enough time and space in their busy schedules to improve performance, because of the lack of capital and human resources to conduct an intervention. Those who agreed on improvement noted that there is still a need to increase the visibility of Senior Education Specialists in schools, in order to engage educators in their work.

82% of the respondents indicated that the grade 12 results had not improved since IQMS was implemented. Only 18% noted that the grade 12 results had improved in their schools. The improvement was in terms of both quantity and quality.

The majority of educators suggested that the government should employ more educators, so that their workload could be reduced, to allow for improved
performance. Some suggested frequent monitoring and proper assistance by the
district officials. Most educators noted that the district officials did not give the
schools support on IQMS. The district officials only visited once a year; clearly, this is
not acceptable, as they should visit more frequently to offer educators the support
they require.

Other responses indicated that the district officials need to be capacitated, as they
do not have enough experience or enough information about the implementation of
the IQMS policy. Other educators indicated that some of their colleagues needed to
change their negative attitude towards the policy.

Only 76% of the respondents agreed that they were doing enough to ensure that
IQMS is properly implemented in their schools; whilst 24% indicated that they were
not doing enough.

4.3.2. Responses from Senior-Management Teams
Questionnaires were collected from six Senior-Management Teams of the four high
schools. The results of the questionnaires collected are presented as follows.

4.3.2.1. Gender
The results showed that 71% of the respondents were males and 29% were females.
This shows that managerial positions are occupied by more males than females.
4.3.2.2. Educational qualifications

TABLE 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Professional Diploma</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Postgraduate degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Master’s degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Doctor’s degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority had postgraduate qualifications; whilst all of them had professional diplomas and a Bachelor’s degree.

4.3.2.3. Number of educators in a school

A total of 86% of the respondent schools had more than twenty educators and less than thirty. Only one school had more than 31 educators.
4.3.2.4. Teaching experience in this position

FIGURE 4.7

Only one respondent in a managerial post had less than 5 years’ experience. In each of the ranges between 6 and 10; 11 and 15; and 21 and 30, there was only one respondent. The majority ranged from 16-20 years of experience.
4.3.2.5. Learner enrolment

The results show that six schools had large numbers compared to the number of educators employed in that school. This increases the workload of educators in school, making it difficult for them to improve their performance.

4.3.2.6. Implementation of the policy

Five out of seven indicated that educators understand the value of IQMS in schools; whilst two out seven did not understand. The majority of educators were provided with information pertaining to the procedures and processes of IQMS.

All the educators were evaluated before the external assessment commenced. This ensures that the final examinations would not be disturbed by the process. One respondent noted that “this assists school management to know what to include in their departmental development meetings”.

“As many as 86% of the respondents indicated that educators keep files with all the relevant evidence that IQMS is implemented. Only 14% indicated that not all educators keep the records as evidence that IQMS has been implemented.
4.3.2.7. School-Development Team
The majority of the respondents agreed that the IQMS coordinator liaises with the School-Development Team to ensure the effectiveness of the policy. A total of 86% of the respondents indicated that their schools had management plans, whilst 14% did not. Some respondents noted that the coordinator for school-based assessment worked with the IQMS coordinator to monitor the management plan for IQMS in the school. Some indicated that although the plan was on record; it was not properly monitored.

4.3.2.8. Support by the district office
The majority of the respondents noted that their schools were not being supported by the district office. As many as 86% liaised with the Department of Education; whilst 14% said they did not. Training programmes for the development of educators are not offered by the Department; and this is based on the response of 57% of the respondents who did not agree. Those who agreed, that is 46%, indicated that educators need to give reports to the Senior-Management Team after attending the programmes. Some respondents noted that educators attend the programmes because there are changes in the curriculum. That means they do not attend because of IQMS, but merely because it is compulsory.

Most educators are not enthusiastic in applying IQMS. A total of 86% indicated that educators lack enthusiasm; whilst a mere 14% are enthusiastic.

4.3.2.9. Personal-Growth Plan
As many as 86% of the respondents agreed that a Personal-Growth Plan is a basis for the School-Improvement Plan; but 14% did not agree. The respondents indicated that educators must be honest and give themselves performance scores that actually reflect their work. The educators must accept their weaknesses, and be responsible for their development.

4.3.2.10 Effectiveness of the tool
As many as 57% of the respondents indicated that they did not regard IQMS as an effective tool to measure performance; whilst 43% regarded the policy as an effective tool. The perception of the respondents is that IQMS has not been applied
correctly at schools; as a result it has not had a positive impact on the quality of teaching and learning. Some respondents indicated that the manner in which the educators respond to the tool does not mean it is the best or most effective in improving the quality of teaching and learning. Most respondents agreed that the quality and quantity of results of learners – especially Grade 12 -- had not improved.

4.3.2.11. Areas of improvement

The majority of respondents highlighted that IQMS could be a good tool for evaluation – if there were enough personnel to implement the policy. Other respondents noted that IQMS should not be linked to the developmental appraisal of educators. In the past, educators’ work used to be appraised without linking the process to any salary increases. The Senior-Management Team should do the appraisal and development of teachers, as they had done it previously. There is no need for Development-Support Groups and Staff-Development Teams. The Department of Education should give the necessary support to schools; and offer the necessary training programmes.

The perceptions of the respondents indicate that the district office had not given the schools enough support for the IQMS in their schools. The district had provided advocacy and training for the implementation of the IQMS. The office had not yet visited schools to find out how the process was being done, and to offer support. The office simply takes the information that arrives at the school. The district office does not moderate the evaluation results of schools, in order to ensure consistency.

4.3.3. The interviews with the IQMS district coordinators

The following data were collected from the district officials who participated in the research.

4.3.3.1. Implementation of the policy

One of the respondents indicated that there were still a large number of schools that did not implement IQMS. Senior-Management Teams did not seem to be monitoring the implementation process in schools; and the IQMS structures were largely dysfunctional. Another respondent noted that the IQMS scores of educators were very high, which meant they were doing a good job. The actual results of the
learners at school tell a different story, however: that the quality of teaching and learning is not improving.

Apparently, the IQMS has not revealed the strengths and weaknesses of educators. The respondent also indicated that IQMS in schools should identify the weaknesses and strengths of educators. The system must evaluate the performance of educators fairly and professionally. The IQMS must evaluate the overall effectiveness of the schools also.

4.3.3.2. Monitoring the implementation of IQMS

Both respondents of each specific group outlined that IQMS implementation is monitored through school-support visits. During these visits, they talk to principals or IQMS school coordinators to check the implementation process. The district is quite big; and there are not enough personnel in the district to monitor and support all the schools. The schools that are visited by the IQMS coordinators are those that had asked for help from the district, or those schools that had been identified by the district officials with problems regarding IQMS. The monitoring is made difficult by the fact that the schools are spread over a large geographical area.

The Whole-School Evaluation system has been a neglected leg of IQMS in the province in the last few years; but there is now a plan in the making as to how best this could be rectified.

During the visits, the type of evidence that shows that the policy is being implemented includes the minutes of Staff-Development Teams, and those of Development-Support Groups; the IQMS management plan; the schedule of class visits; the staff-development plans; the proper filing of IQMS documents; evidence of class observations and evidence of self-evaluations.

4.3.3.3. School-improvement plans

One respondent agreed that they make use of school-improvement plans to plan the development of educators. Another respondent indicated that the Department of
Education is still underutilising the school-improvement plan as a source of development for educators.

Both respondents noted that there are no programmes in place at the Department of Education for the professional development of educators.

### 4.3.3.4. Areas of improvement

One of the respondents indicated that Senior-Management Teams should monitor the implementation process of IQMS. Furthermore, the School-Improvement Plan should be treated as a working document for the development of educators. The other respondent highlighted that Staff-Development Teams should make and submit IQMS implementation reports to the district.

### 4.3.4. Document study

School documents, including School-Improvement Plans, Personal-Growth Plans and IQMS minute books were analysed, in order to obtain information about the implementation process. School-Improvement Plans were developed in some schools; however, these were not implemented. In some schools, respondents claimed that some of the programmes for development require the assistance of the Department of Education. An example was cited by one of the respondents, as being that of overcrowded classrooms with a shortage of furniture. The respondents claim that the funds allocated by the Department of Education are not enough to meet the requirements raised by the School-Improvement Plan.

In some schools, there was no evidence that the School-Development Teams and Development-Support Groups meet; that is, no minutes were available for those meetings. Educators are issued with forms to fill in during the last term for submission purposes.

### 4.4. CONCLUSION

The chapter has presented the data collected during the research by the questionnaires and the interviews. The data were analysed using the perceptions
and feelings of educators, Senior-Management Teams and the IQMS district coordinator regarding the evaluation of the IQMS on the quality of teaching and learning in selected high schools.

This chapter has shown that a large number of schools did not implement IQMS and the IQMS structures were largely dysfunctional in schools. The respondents also indicated that the district office had not given the schools enough support for the IQMS in their schools.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. INTRODUCTION
In Chapter One the background to the study was introduced and the research problem was put into context with regard to the effectiveness of the performance appraisal system for educators.
In Chapter Two literature related to performance management and the implementation of the IQMS in schools was reviewed.
Chapter Three discussed all the technological aspects that guided this study. The chapter examined the different research designs in an effort to place the study in a suitable context.
Chapter Four presented an analysis and interpretation of empirical data gathered from respondents with regard to the implementation of the IQMS policy in schools.

In this chapter, a summary of the findings is made. Secondly, the conclusions of the study are made, based on the findings of the research. Lastly, recommendations on what must be done to the IQMS so that it can improve the quality of teaching and learning in schools are provided.

5.2. SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS
The training of the educators lasted for between one and three days only. Surely, no policy can be explained in such a short period of time; and the department then expects all educators to have a clear understanding of it.

The Department of Education has not introduced the IQMS to educators in a positive manner. This means that the training could be considered to be ineffectual, as educators still do not understand the process, nor did they take ownership of it.

There is no initiative by the Department of Education to train newly appointed educators in the policy. In some schools, these educators are neither trained by the Staff-Development Team, nor by the Department of Education. This means they were merely issued with forms to fill in – for compliance purposes.
The educators are not evaluating themselves professionally; they are merely awarding themselves high IQMS scores. The majority of schools in the area have Development-Support Groups and Staff-Development Teams, which are the necessary structures for the IQMS. The main problem is that the Development-Support Groups are not taking part in the evaluation of educators; they just sign the evaluation forms. The Development Support Groups do not help the educators in finding their strengths and weaknesses – so that the educators can be developed professionally.

This research has discovered that Staff-Development Teams in schools are not functioning properly. These teams are not managing the IQMS to ensure that the DSGs are giving the educators the performance scores they deserve. The IQMS is not able to discover the strengths and weaknesses of educators. It has also been discovered that the IQMS cannot distinguish between good and poor performances. Another important finding is that the schools are not developing their educators.

The research has also established that personnel from the district office rarely visit the schools. This means that the monitoring of the schools is not being done; and not enough support is being given. The research has also discovered that the district office does not know what is happening in the schools. Another finding, on the positive side, is that the district does provide skills-development courses to educators. These courses should be specifically designed for identified educators who need such development.

The district office does not visit the schools to monitor the quality of teaching and learning; nor does it manage the operation of schools. The study on the IQMS of school-based educators has been done in the hope of determining the following objectives:

- To evaluate whether the IQMS has been able to find out the strengths and weaknesses on the quality of teaching of educators.
- To find out if the IQMS has provided the support and opportunities for the development of educators.
To assess the impact of the IQMS on the quality of teaching and learning.

The study has led to the following answers:

The IQMS has not been able to determine the strengths and weaknesses of educators during evaluation. The Development-Support Groups do not evaluate the educators; instead educators give themselves the scores they want. The IQMS has not been able to provide support and opportunities for development, because the system has not been able to come up with any weaknesses during evaluation.

The IQMS has failed to have any positive impact on the quality of teaching and learning. The learners’ results, especially the grade 12 results from Dimbaza area, have not improved during the last four years.

5.3. CONCLUSIONS

The IQMS had not been implemented professionally and fairly at the schools under review. The Senior-Management Teams and Staff-Development Teams have failed to ensure that the IQMS is implemented correctly, so that it is able to fulfil its objectives. The IQMS coordinators or Principals prepare the School-Improvement Plans on their own – without consulting the relevant stakeholders, namely, educators and the School-Governing Body. Educators are not informed about what needs to be improved; and feedback is not given to them on School-Improvement Plans.

The district officials have also failed to visit schools to monitor how the process is operating at the schools and to offer support. The IQMS for school-based educators is not effective in evaluating the quality of teaching and learning. The major problem of the Department of Education – as was ascertained from the district office and the schools – is that the leadership of the Department does not have managerial accountability. The management at the school does not take ownership of what is happening at the schools, in order to ensure that education policies are fully implemented.
The district officials do not visit the schools to ensure that schools apply the policies correctly, and to help them when there is a problem with non-compliance.

While steps have been taken to legalise the IQMS, a research project by Bisschoff and Mathye (2009) reveals that the system has implementation challenges. Issues, such as insufficient training, lack of clear goals and subjectivity, were raised. Furthermore, teachers allege that it was a paper-driven system that did not improve their competencies and was flawed, in that it did not consider the contextual factors that impact on the performance of a teacher.

It was against this background that the researcher decided to investigate the effectiveness of the Integrated Quality-Management System in improving the quality of teaching and learning in selected schools in the King William's Town District.

5.4. RECOMMENDATIONS
The research has established that the major reason for the failure of the IQMS in schools is that it has not being applied correctly. James, Nolan and Hoover (2011) suggest that a well-designed system of teacher evaluation must be based on a set of coherent beliefs. Identifying core beliefs or principles makes it more likely that all stakeholders within the system will have a clear understanding of the values that underlie teacher evaluation. The first principle is that teacher evaluation should be broad and comprehensive in nature, accounting for all of the duties that teachers are expected to perform.

It means that the evaluation system should embrace all the duties that the teacher does on a daily basis, which are geared towards producing a balanced individual.

Secondly, effective evaluation systems make use of a wide variety of data sources to provide an accurate and reliable portrait of teacher performance. It stands to reason that a thirty-minute observation of a lesson in one subject – done periodically – cannot, reveal the teacher’s capabilities. Studies on teacher appraisal indicate that classroom observation should be central to the business of the schools (Bennett, 1992; Horne and Pierce, 1994; Poster and Poster, 1992; Wragg et al., 1996). Basing
the appraisal results on classroom observation has been a bone of contention for teachers. 
Firstly, one badly carried out observation could condemn the teacher’s performance. Secondly, there is the fear that some form of checklist approach will be introduced and judgment would be based on it, could be made. Thirdly, teachers are always suspicious of the competency of the appraiser.

In order to assuage these anxieties, Goddard and Emerson (1995) suggested that it is important that both appraisee and appraiser are clear about the purpose of the observation; the role the observer should play during the lesson; and the criteria to be used during the observation. It then calls for organisations to have well-trained and properly qualified administrators as the appropriate personnel to make summative judgements concerning teacher performance.

Ongoing professional development that is focused on the teacher-evaluation system must be provided for all professionals in the organisation. Hargreaves and Fullan (1992) suggested that: “One way of providing teachers with ‘opportunities to teach’ is to equip them with knowledge and skills that will increase their ability to provide improved opportunities to learn for all their pupils”. They further stipulate that a teaching force that is more skilled and flexible in its teaching strategies and more knowledgeable about its subject matter, is a teaching force better able to improve the achievement of its pupils.

The process used to evaluate teacher performance should emphasise the use of professional judgement informed by a deep understanding of both the research on teaching and the specific teaching context.

The process used to develop and assess the teacher-evaluation system should be participatory and open to representatives from various stakeholder groups. Engelbrecht, Forlin, Eloff and Swart (2001) argue that the biggest challenge to education involves giving teachers the confidence to believe in themselves – that they can, in fact, accomplish the task at hand. Teachers are looked upon as the driving force behind pupil achievement.
Teacher evaluation is a function of human decision-making resulting from value judgements regarding the strength or weakness of a particular work performance (Loock, Grobler and Mestry, 2006). This is done using information that compares the actual work performance with predetermined performance standards, and is followed by feedback to the teacher on the strength or weakness of the work performance. It should be noted that educator evaluation is normative in nature, since a value judgement is given. This value judgement must be weighed against the criterion of fairness, and should always fulfil a certain function.

Educators are evaluated to ensure that the goal of quality teaching and learning is achieved. Many recent evaluation research studies and education department documents have indicated that teacher performance in South African schools remains low, and has contributed significantly to the poor results of learners in the last decade (Taylor and Vinjevold, 1999, cited in De Clercq, 2008). There is a great concern about the quality and quantity of results achieved in schools – especially for Grade 12 results.

Some schools obtained a 100% pass rate for Grade 12 learners, but the low percentage of university admissions for these learners to study towards a Bachelor degree suggests that these results, in reality, lack quality.

A teacher-appraisal system that would be able to identify the strengths and weaknesses of educators is necessary. This would assist in the development of those educators who need support. Some educators are negative about teacher appraisal; hence, it is important to change the attitude of educators. Steyn and Van Niekerk (2002) identify the means of changing the attitude of staff concerning the appraisal. Firstly, the appraisee should be actively involved in the appraisal process with each stage marked by active participation and negotiation between those concerned.

Therefore, those responsible for teacher education have a critical role to play in driving the change process forward; as they could help identify and shape the new competencies that the teachers need (Wagner, 2000). These competencies are necessary, as teachers are involved in curriculum development and implementation.
(Ornstein and Hankins, 2004). Like other learners, teachers need to learn by doing, just like their students. They must practise, and use the techniques they are expected to use in the classroom (Navarro and Verdisco 2000),

Secondly, the procedures should be formulated after consultation. As the employee develops the job descriptions, standards of performance, creating rating forms, the supervisor should monitor the progress through observations, keeping updates on the organizational goal, checking progress on the individual’s goal, providing resources and offering reinforcements and corrective advice where needed. These procedures, including the areas for appraisal, criteria, outcomes and reports, should be clear at the outset. Educators themselves should be involved in the drafting of the appraisal instrument putting emphasis on their core business.

Thirdly, observations of lessons or written appraisals should be a positive tool for growth, both for the appraisee and for the appraiser. Feedback should be given immediately after observation. Feedback is the exchange of information on the status and quality of the work produced, which provides the roadmap to success (Kreitner and Kinicki, 2008). Humphreys and Thompson, (1995); DeNisi and Kluger (2000) and Holbeche (2005) highlight the fact that while feedback does have the potential to help someone focus on what is to be done in performing a task or learning details, it usually improves performance and enables teachers to collaborate in a more focused way.

It ensures that the supervisor and the subordinate are in agreement on the standards and expectations of the work to be performed.

Fourthly, for appraisals to stand any chance of success in schools, teachers need to see them as an initiative that leads not only to higher standards of education for learners, but also for their own professional development and individual fulfilment. Monyatsi et al. (1998) advanced the notion that a well-planned and carefully implemented teacher-appraisal system could have a far-reaching impact on teacher effectiveness, which could, in turn, lead to improvement in the quality of student achievement. Examining the potential advantages of effective appraisals, Bell (1987) maintained that individuals become confident in their own performance, have clear
plans in terms of their own improvement and development, and can become assets to the school.

Fifthly, appraisals should assist in the ongoing growth of the teacher. Principals should be familiar with the complaints of teachers. They should assist teachers with disciplinary problems, provide resources and work with the teachers in solving problems. In a later edition, Bell (1988) postulated that appraisals improve the quality of education, as they are a two-way discussion that give individual teachers support, develop effective practices, identify areas for development, and generate action programmes.

The organization comes to know who is a high performer, and who is not. From this kind of data, organizations are able to conduct staff development or in-service (INSET) courses to develop underperformers. Through the appraisal, individuals are integrated into the organization. It then becomes easy for the harnessing of the unique talents of individuals, to co-ordinate their activities towards the achievement of the organization’s objectives – through effective and efficient means. The appraisal of teachers should not be shrouded in secrecy; instead an accountable and transparent procedure should be adopted.

The following recommendations from the educators, Senior-Management Teams, and the IQMS district coordinators may be applied to the IQMS, so that it could improve the quality of teaching and learning.

The Department of Education must organise for personnel who understand the IQMS to train the educators in the use of the system. Major innovations require detailed planning and careful preparation, and those affected need to be involved in this exercise. When an innovation is introduced, it is important to train those involved with the implementation. It is through training that those involved in the performance appraisal system learn to appreciate the modalities of the system, and how to implement it.

Bell (1988) postulated that, the need for training for appraisal review is apparent, particularly, where there is no previous experience. The district office must also
employ personnel who understand the IQMS, so that when the schools encounter problems they can be helped as soon as possible. Training should be offered annually to give those who were not trained in the policy a chance to participate in the process without hesitation.

The district office must ensure that circuit managers are also trained in IQMS, so that they can monitor the system in their circuits. The office must reduce the number of schools that are managed by the circuit manager. The office must also ensure that the schools have Development-Support Groups and Staff-Development Teams that are functioning properly, and who are managing the process properly.

Educators should be involved in the preparation of the School-Improvement Plan, so that they can make noticeable contributions with regard to management plans. This can be done by ensuring that educators understand the significance of the Personal-Growth Plans in school development.

The Department of Education must ensure that there are enough resources available to finance the developmental programmes to address the areas of improvement. This should be budgeted before the commencement of such training, to ensure that meaningful learning is taking place at schools.

The Department of Education must ensure that the parents serving on the SGB are trained and introduced to all the policies that are operational at schools, so that they can govern the schools effectively and efficiently.

The principal and the Senior-Management Team must undertake the professional management of the school. They must ensure that school policies, for example IQMS, that are responsible for improving the quality of teaching and learning are applied correctly. The principals must manage their schools properly, and not wait for the district officials to manage them. The district officials must not be afraid to identify problems that are barriers to the quality of teaching and learning in their circuits.

The major challenge that is facing the Department of Education is the implementation of policies. The policy-makers should develop evidence-based
policies – to ensure that the policy achieves its intended outcomes. Evidence-based policies are necessary in the South African context, as they ensure that the correct problem is addressed by the right policy. The second challenge is the lack of accountability by managers. Lastly, there is a challenge to the development of personnel. For IQMS to be effective, research on these challenges must be done, so that the process can attain its objectives.
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APPENDIX A

Date : 09 March 2012
To : The District Director (King William's Town Education District)
From : K. Mgijima
Dear Sir,

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO UNDERTAKE RESEARCH

I am currently registered for a Master's degree in Public Administration at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University. One of the requirements for the degree is to complete a treatise, i.e. a mini dissertation, and my topic is as follows:

Integrated Quality Management System in selected schools: King William's Town Education District

The purpose of the study is to evaluate the impact of the performance-management system on the quality of teaching and learning in high schools. Data will be collected from respondents and their participation will be voluntary – with the option of withdrawing at any time during the process. The researcher will request consent before conducting the process with the respondents.

The data collected will be confidential, and will be used only for the purposes of the study. The respondents will not be identified when collecting the data. Questionnaires will be used to collect the data from educators, principals and district officials. Respondents will be informed that they are not obliged to answer all the questions. The data collected could contribute towards the improvement of quality teaching and learning in schools.

The findings of the research will be disseminated to the Department of Education and to participating schools.

Your cooperation in this matter will be highly appreciated.

Yours in education,
Khayakazi Mgijima
APPENDIX B : PERMISSION LETTER

APPLICATION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

Permission is hereby granted for you to conduct research in schools of your choice in the King William’s Town District for the purpose of fulfilling the requirements for a master’s degree in (MPA), in the School of Postgraduate Studies, at the NMMU.

Please be informed that permission is only granted provided that school activities are not disrupted.

We wish you well in your endeavors.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

FC SOKUTU

[Logo: PGDP - Building skills for growth]
APPENDIX C
CONSENT FORM

Faculty of Arts
NMMU
Tel: +27 (0)41 504-xxxx Fax: +27 (0)41-504-xxxx
E-mail Faculty Chairperson: xxxx@nmmu.ac.za

Date ……

Ref:

Contact person: Khayakazi Mgijima

Dear

You are being asked to participate in a research study. I will provide you with the necessary information to assist you to understand the study and explain what would be expected of you (participant). These guidelines would include your rights as a study subject. Please feel free to ask the researcher to clarify anything that is not clear to you.

To participate, it will be required of you to provide an oral consent that will include your signature, date and initials to verify that you understand and agree to the conditions.

You have the right to query concerns regarding the study at any time. Immediately report any new problems during the study, to the researcher. Telephone numbers of the researcher are provided. Please feel free to call these numbers.

Furthermore, it is important that you are aware of the fact that the ethical integrity of the study has been approved by the Research Ethics Committee (Human) of the university. The REC-H consists of a group of independent experts that has the responsibility to ensure that the rights and welfare of participants in research are protected and that studies are
conducted in an ethical manner. Studies cannot be conducted without REC-H’s approval. Queries with regard to your rights as a research subject can be directed to the Research Ethics Committee (Human), Department of Research Capacity Development, PO Box 77000, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port Elizabeth, 6031.

If no one could assist you, you may write to: The Chairperson of the Research, Technology and Innovation Committee, PO Box 77000, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port Elizabeth, 6031.

Participation in research is completely voluntary. You are not obliged to take part in any research.

If you do partake, you have the right to withdraw at any given time, during the study without penalty or loss of benefits.

This informed consent statement has been prepared in compliance with current statutory guidelines.

Yours sincerely
APPENDIX D: QUESTIONNAIRES

QUESTIONS (MAKE USE OF (√)

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Age

| 20 – 30 | 31 – 40 | 41 – 50 | 51 – 60 |

Gender

| FEMALE | MALE |

2. Indicate your home language

| ISIXHOSA | ENGLISH | AFRIKAANS | ANY OTHER |

3. Indicate your highest educational qualification

| PROFESSIONAL DIPLOMA | BACHELOR’S DEGREE | POST-GRADUATE DEGREE | MASTER’S DEGREE | DOCTOR’S DEGREE | OTHER |

4. How long have you been teaching?

| 0 – 10 | 11 – 20 | 21 – 30 | 31 – 40 |

5. Which grades are you teaching?

| 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |

6. How many learners in each grade?

| 15 – 20 | 21 – 30 | 31 – 40 | 41 – 50 | 51 - 60 | 61-70 |

IQMS AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION

1. Is IQMS the policy that is used to evaluate educators in your school?

| YES | NO |
2. Were you trained on how to implement IQMS?

   YES   NO

3. For how long were you trained?

   ______________________________________

4. After training did you understand the purpose of IQMS?

   YES   NO

5. Do you accept IQMS as a tool or instrument that can effectively measure your performance?

   YES   NO

6. Do you, as an educator, benefit from the implementation of IQMS? 
   Give reasons for your answer

   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________

7. With the assistance of Developmental Appraisal (DA) are you able to identify your areas of strengths and weaknesses?

   YES   NO

   7.1. If “yes”, does the school or the Department of Education have programmes for individual development?

   YES   NO

   7.2. Were the programmes in the form of centralized workshops or in-service training and for how long did the training last?

   ______________________________________
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7.3. Can you comment on the value of the programmes for the performance of your functions?

8. Do you receive any support from the School-Governing Body?

   YES  NO

8.1. If “yes”, what type of support

9. How often do you meet as Development Support Group (DSG) members?

10. Is the time enough to meet the expected outcomes of DSG meetings?

   YES  NO

11. Does the DSG in your school know its role?

   YES  NO

12. Are you able to draw up a Personal Growth Plan (PGP)?

   YES  NO
13. Why is it important for educators to draw up PGPs?

14. In your view, is IQMS implemented for the purpose of salary progression or for the development of educators?

- [ ] SALARY PROGRESSION
- [ ] DEVELOPMENT

14.1. Elaborate

15. Would you say your performance has improved after the evaluations?

- [ ] YES
- [ ] NO

15.1. If “no”, what could be the possible reasons for not improving?

16. What effect does IQMS have in improving the quality of teaching and learning in your school?
17. Do you see any improvement in grade 12 results since IQMS was implemented?

YES  NO

18. If “yes”, is the improvement in terms of quality results or the quantity of results?


19. Can you suggest areas of improvement that could assist in the effectiveness of IQMS in schools?


20. Are you doing enough to ensure that IQMS is being properly implemented in your school?

YES  NO

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION
APPENDIX E
QUESTIONNAIRE
TO: PRINCIPALS AND SMT MEMBERS

QUESTIONS (MAKE USE OF A √)

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
1. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Indicate your home language?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISIXHOSA</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>AFRIKAANS</th>
<th>ANY OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Indicate your highest level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL DIPLOMA</th>
<th>BACHELOR’S DEGREE</th>
<th>POST-GRADUATE DEGREE</th>
<th>MASTER’S DEGREE</th>
<th>DOCTOR’S DEGREE</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. How many educators are in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - 10</th>
<th>11 – 20</th>
<th>21 – 30</th>
<th>31 - 40</th>
<th>41 – 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. For how long have been a principal/ deputy principal/ hod?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 – 5 YRS</th>
<th>6 – 10 YRS</th>
<th>11 – 15YRS</th>
<th>16 – 20YRS</th>
<th>21 – 30YRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. What is the learner enrolment in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100-200</th>
<th>201 – 400</th>
<th>401 – 600</th>
<th>601 – 800</th>
<th>801 - 1000</th>
<th>1001 – 1200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

IQMS AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION

Would you say all educators in your school understand the value of IQMS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. Are all educators provided with information pertaining to procedures and processes of IQMS?

   YES  NO

2. Do you ensure that educators are evaluated before external assessment commence?

   YES  NO

   2.1. If “yes”, how does this assist the school in the process of evaluation?

3. Does each educator have a file with all the evidence that IQMS is implemented?

   YES  NO

4. Does the IQMS co-ordinator liaise with Staff Development Team (SDT) to ensure the effectiveness of IQMS?

   YES  NO

5. Is there a management plan for the IQMS in the school?

   YES  NO

   5.1. If “yes”, how is it monitored?

   YES  NO
6. Do you liaise with the Department of Education in respect of high-priority needs such as in-service training, skills programmes or short courses?

| YES | NO |

7. Does the Department offer training programmes for development of educators?

| YES | NO |

7.1. If “yes”, how do you ensure that educators attend the programmes?

8. Do educators show enthusiasm in applying IQMS?

| YES | NO |

9. Do you regard the use of the Personal-Growth Plan as the basis for the School-Improvement Plan?

| YES | NO |

10. Do you think IQMS is an effective tool to measure the performance of educators?

| YES | NO |

10.1. Give reasons for your answer.

| | |
11. Is there any improvement in the school's grade 12 results since IQMS was implemented?

[ ] YES  [ ] NO

12. If “yes”, were the results improved in terms of quality or quantity?

13. Do you regard improvement in grade 12 results as a measure for quality teaching and learning?

[ ] YES  [ ] NO

14. Can you suggest any other areas of improvement in the implementation of IQMS?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION
APPENDIX F
QUESTIONNAIRE
TO: IQMS DISTRICT CO-ORDINATOR

QUESTIONS (MAKE USE OF √)

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
The following section is for statistical purposes only
1. Gender
   - FEMALE
   - MALE

2. Indicate your home language?
   - ISIXHOSA
   - ENGLISH
   - AFRIKAANS
   - ANY OTHER

3. Indicate your highest educational qualification
   - PROFESSIONAL DIPLOMA
   - BACHELOR’S DEGREE
   - POST-GRADUATE DEGREE
   - MASTER’S DEGREE
   - DOCTOR’S DEGREE
   - OTHER

4. How many schools are under your supervision?
   - 2 – 5
   - 6 – 10
   - 11 – 15
   - 16 – 20
   - 21 – 25

IMPLEMENTATION OF IQMS
1. Indicate the period for which IQMS has been implemented in your school(s). Is IQMS being properly implemented in schools?
   - 0 – 2 years
   - 3 – 4 years
   - 5 – 6 years
   - 7 – 9 years
2. Please give your opinion on the implementation of IQMS in your school to date.

3. How do you monitor implementation of IQMS? Elaborate

4. How often do you visit schools to conduct the Whole-School Evaluation?

5. During the visits, what type of evidence do you receive to ensure that IQMS is being implemented?

6. Do you use the School-Improvement Plan to plan the development of educators?
   
   [YES] [NO]
7. What type of programmes does the Department offer for the professional development of educators?


8. Are the programmes effective for the improvement of quality education?

YES  NO

9. After the training did you feel confident that IQMS would be implemented by the schools?

YES  NO

10. Can you suggest any areas of improvement to ensure that IQMS assists educators towards the improvement of their skills and abilities?


THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION
06 AUGUST 2012

Mrs K. L. Mgijima
P O Box 1532
KING WILLIAMS TOWN
5600

Dear Mrs Mgijima,

INTEGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS IN SELECTED SCHOOLS: KING WILLIAM’S TOWN EDUCATION DISTRICT

Your above-entitled application for ethics approval was presented at the RTI Higher Degrees sub-committee of the Faculty of Arts Research, Technology and Innovation Committee.

We take pleasure in informing you that the application was approved by the Committee.

The Ethics clearance reference number is **H/12/ART/PGS-0023**, and is valid for three years, from 27 June 2012 – 27 June 2015. Please inform the RTI-HDC, via your supervisor, if any changes (particularly in the methodology) occur during this time. An annual affirmation to the effect that the protocols in use are still those, for which approval was granted, will be required from you. You will be reminded timeously of this responsibility.

We wish you well with the project.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs N. Mngonyama,

FACULTY ADMINISTRATOR

cc: Promoter/Supervisor
    HoD
    School Representative: Faculty RTI