

Transkei College of Education lecturers' perceptions
of principles guiding the quality assurance policy
of the college's academic programme.

BY

MASIVUYE SIZIPHIWE NOMONDE SANGONI

A major dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION
in the
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
at the
UNIVERSITY OF NATAL (PIETERMARITZBURG)

SUPERVISOR: DR E S M KAABWE.

DECEMBER 1999.

DECLARATION

I, **MASIVUYE SIZIPHIWE NOMONDE SANGONI** of the SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF NATAL (PIETERMARITZBURG), declare that the copy of this dissertation submitted by me on 31 December 1999 is original. It has not previously been submitted for evaluation at another university, faculty, or department and is not being submitted concurrently for any other degree. It is the result of my effort through the professional guidance of my supervisor whose name and signature appear below.

CANDIDATE'S NAME : SANGONI, M S N

CANDIDATE'S SIGNATURE : 

DATE : 31 December 1999

SUPERVISOR : DR E S M KAABWE

SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE :

DATE :

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The successful completion of this study depended upon the assistance and contributions, directly or indirectly, of a number of persons all of whom have earned my sincerest appreciation.

Firstly, my supervisor, Dr E S M Kaabwe for her valuable and meticulous guidance. Her encouragement and perseverance have really made the study the success it is.

I gratefully acknowledge and appreciate the assistance I received from Prof S Imenda. His personal concern, patience, encouragement, and kindness will be remembered for a long time.

I also wish to acknowledge with gratitude the assistance I received from:

- the management and staff of Transkei College of Education, and in particular Mrs Z E N Bam who helped in collecting the completed RDQ;
- the management and staff of Cicira College of Education, in particular, Mr M Krexe and Mrs M Moruri who made my problem their problem.

Without the two institutions' support, this project would not have been completed easily.

Lastly, let it be known that if it was not for the support I received from Sisi Noluthando, my brother Chuma, my mother Lungelwa, my children Khusela, Siyabulela and Lwandile, my husband Zilindile, this study would not have been completed. I therefore dedicate this work to them.

I hereby declare that the opinions expressed or conclusions arrived at are those of the writer and are not to be regarded as a reflection of the views of the above-mentioned people.

M S N Sangoni, Umtata: December 1999.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to determine the views of the Transkei College of Education (TCE) lecturers concerning the principles that should guide a quality assurance (QA) policy of the academic programme of the institution. To address this, five sub-questions were raised, dealing with respondents' perceptions on: generic or specific skills; involvement in drafting teacher education outcomes; the criteria for outcomes' assessment; programme monitoring and the handling of the results of the monitoring process.

This case study, was conducted at TCE, in Umtata. Data were gathered by using a self-administered questionnaire distributed to all college lecturers, resulting in a (64%) return rate. Participating lecturers' responses revealed that they preferred that the teacher education programme contained both generic and specific skills/outcomes; that such outcomes be developed by stakeholders, the most important of which should be mastery of subject matter to be taught. The respondents regarded the establishment of a committee to oversee the self-evaluation process as the most important criteria to be used in the process of self-evaluation, while senior members of staff take on the responsibility of monitoring self-evaluation processes. The respondents felt that the results of self-evaluation should be used to improve and develop the programme.

Overall, the respondents exhibited a good understanding of the principles that should guide the development of both the college's educational outcomes and a QA system for the college. The respondents also showed alacrity of thought regarding the important elements in the development of criteria and outcomes for the programme offered at the college, as well as for the assessment and monitoring of the programme to ensure quality.

The study therefore, recommends that practical steps be put in place for the review of the educational outcomes of the college - which of necessity will entail maximum stakeholder participation - both from within the college and outside. Furthermore, it is also evident from the results of this study that the college is ready for a quality assurance system for its academic programme.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Title	(i)
Declaration	(ii)
Acknowledgement	(iii)
Abstract	(iv)
Table of Contents	(vii)
List of Tables	(x)
Glossary of Abbreviations used in the Study	(xi)
List of Appendices	(xii)

1. CHAPTER 1 BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

1.1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1.1	Brief historical background of education in South Africa, the Eastern Cape and Transkei	1
1.1.1.1	The period of National Party rule	2
1.1.1.1.1	The Tomlinson and the Eiselen Commissions and their contribution to the present dispensation in education	2
1.1.1.1.2	The period post-1994 and how it affected teacher education in South Africa, the Eastern Cape and TCE in particular	6
1.1.2	The Role Played by affiliation and the Eastern Cape Provincial Department of Education	7
1.1.3	The Effects of the National Teacher Education Audit of 1995	8

1.1.4	The Effects of the Higher Education Act of 1997	8
1.2	STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	10
1.3	CRITICAL RESEARCH QUESTION	10
1.4	THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY	11
1.5	RATIONALE OF THE STUDY	13
1.6	THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY FOR TCE	15
1.7	DEFINITION OF TERMS ASSOCIATED WITH QUALITY ASSURANCE USED IN THIS STUDY	19
1.8	ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY REPORT	19
<u>2.</u>	<u>CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE</u>	20
2.1	INTRODUCTION	20
2.2	ORIGINS OF PREOCCUPATION WITH QUALITY	20
2.2.1	The origins of preoccupation with quality in industry	20
2.2.2	General evolution of quality processes in education	22
2.2.3	Present realities of quality processes in South African higher education	23
2.3	OUTCOMES OF TEACHER EDUCATION	26
2.3.1	Definition of an outcome	27
2.3.2	Outcomes of teacher education programmes	27
2.4	LECTURERS' ATTAINMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION OUTCOMES	30
2.5	CRITERIA TO TEST THE ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOMES	35
2.5.1	Characteristics of acceptable criteria	35
2.5.2	Criteria for assessment of outcome achievement	37

2.6	MONITORING OF LECTURERS TOWARDS ACHIEVEMENT OF STATED OUTCOMES	39
2.7	HANDLING OF THE RESULTS OF THE MONITORING PROCESS OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMMES	41
2.8	CONCLUSION	42
<u>3</u>	<u>CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DATA ANALYSIS</u>	45
3.1	INTRODUCTION	45
3.2	RESEARCH SITE	45
3.3	RESEARCH DESIGN	48
3.4	RESEARCH POPULATION	48
3.5	DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUE AND INSTRUMENTS	49
	3.5.1 The data collection instrument	49
	3.5.2 Validity and reliability of the data collection instrument	51
	3.5.3 Administration of the questionnaire	52
3.6	DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES	52
	3.6.1 A definition and justification for data analysis tools used in the study	53
	3.6.2 Steps followed in analysing data in this study	55
3.7	CONCLUSION	56
<u>4</u>	<u>CHAPTER 4 PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS, AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS</u>	57
4.1	INTRODUCTION	57

4.2	PRINCIPLES OF QA FOR TCE'S ACADEMIC PROGRAMME	57
4.2.1	General and/or specific skills?	57
4.2.2	Responsibility for formulating teacher education outcomes	59
4.2.3.1	Essential outcomes of the teacher education programme	62
4.2.3.2	Essential activities that TCE college lecturers need to do to ensure that the outcomes set for their students are achieved	65
4.2.4.1	Criteria that TCE should follow to ensure that college lecturers successfully work towards student teachers' attainment of the identified outcomes	68
4.2.4.2	Responsibility for monitoring	71
4.2.4.2.1	Responsibility for putting monitoring measures/criteria in place	72
4.2.4.2.2	Responsibility for the monitoring process to ensure that the criteria are implemented as planned	74
4.2.4.2.3	Responsibility for the reporting on the monitoring process	75
4.2.5	Suggestions on what should be done with the results of the monitoring process	76
4.3	SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS	78
4.4	CONCLUSION	79

<u>5</u>	<u>CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	<u>80</u>
5.1	INTRODUCTION	80
5.2	SUMMARY OF THE STUDY	81
5.3	CONCLUSIONS	82
5.4	RECOMMENDATIONS	84
	LIST OF REFERENCES	87

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR EFFECTING CRITERIA	72
TABLE 11: LECTURERS' PERCEPTIONS OF STAKEHOLDERS' RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING CRITERIA ARE IMPLEMENTED AS PLANNED	74
TABLE 111: LECTURERS' PERCEPTIONS OF STAKEHOLDERS' RESPONSIBLE FOR REPORTING ON THE MONITORING PROCESS	75

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX I	:	Sample of questionnaire for TCE lecturers	95
APPENDIX II	:	Copy of letter for the Rector of TCE	98
APPENDIX III	:	Outcomes from single respondents	99
APPENDIX IV	:	Activities suggested by single respondents	101
APPENDIX V	:	Criteria cited by single respondents	104

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS APPEARING IN THE STUDY

CEs	Colleges of Education
CUP	Committee of University Principals
COLTS	Culture of Learning, Teaching and Service
DCE	Department of Collegiate Education
DoE	Department of Education
EC	Eastern Cape
ETQA	Education and Training Quality Assurance
HDI	Historically Disadvantaged Institutions
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
OBE	Outcomes Based Education
PDE	Provincial Department of Education
QA	Quality Assurance
RDQ	Researcher Designed Questionnaire
SA	South Africa
SAQA	South African Qualifications Authority
SAUVCA	South African Universities Vice-Chancellors' Association
SERTEC	Certification Council for Technikon Education
TCE	Transkei College of Education
TDE	Transkei Department of Education
The Act	The Bantu Education Act No. 47 of 1953
TQM	Total Quality Management
Unitra	University of Transkei
USA	United States of America

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of the lecturers of the Transkei College of Education (TCE) concerning the principles that should guide a quality assurance (QA) policy of the academic programme of the institution. For purposes of this study, QA referred to a two-sided process: self-evaluation and an external evaluation by the Education and Training Quality Assurance (ETQA) body review (Department of Education (DoE), 1997). The study focused on self-evaluation of the college's academic programme.

To understand the present situation at TCE with respect to QA, and to contextualise the research problem, a brief historical background of education and schooling in South Africa (SA) and “Transkei” is given, examining affiliation as an aspect of quality control; the role played by the Eastern Cape Provincial Department of Education; the National Teacher Education Audit of 1995; and the effects of the Higher Education Act of 1997.

1.1.1 Brief historical background of education in South Africa, the Eastern Cape and Transkei

To understand the evolution of teacher education for African people in SA generally, and Transkei in particular, one needs to look at two periods: the period from 1948 to 1994, that is the period of National Party rule, and the period from 1994 to the present.

1.1.1.1 The period of National Party rule

When the National Party took over government in 1948, it introduced apartheid: a policy of separate development for the different races of SA. This affected all South Africans and all organs of society including education. To implement the policy of apartheid, the National Party government appointed two commissions: the Tomlinson Commission and the Eiselen Commission. The following section describes how these two commissions contributed to the various dispensations which subsequently evolved in education in SA.

1.1.1.1.1 The Tomlinson and the Eiselen Commissions and their contribution to the evolution of apartheid education

Dr Verwoerd, Minister of Native Affairs, appointed the Tomlinson Commission, a Commission for the Socio-Economic Development of the Bantu Areas within the Union of South Africa, to investigate how the Africans could be provided for within the parameters of apartheid policy. The Commission recommended that the Bantu be allowed to develop in their own areas and be given limited self-government in the so-called homelands (Ngubentombi, 1984).

As a result of the recommendations of the Tomlinson Commission, the National Party government created ten homelands, namely: Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda, Ciskei, Lebowa, KaNgwane, KwaNdebele, KwaZulu, Gazankulu, and Qwaqwa for the various ethnic African groups out of the four provinces that already existed in the country. The homelands were encouraged to accept “independence” from SA. The

first homeland to implement the recommendations of the Tomlinson Commission was Transkei which was granted self-government in 1963 and “full independence” in 1976. Subsequently, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei also obtained their “independence” from the Republic of South Africa. Although these states were said to be independent, they were recognized as such only by the South African government which monitored their activities and controlled their finances. Their independence was independence in name only. On the other hand, the six other homelands did not accept independence. This meant that there were four “independent” states and six self-governing territories.

The National Party government also set up another Commission on Native Education under the chairmanship of Dr W. W. M. Eiselen. The Eiselen Commission was mandated to recommend principles, aims and administration of African education, including teacher education (Ngubentombi, 1984). The Commission recommended that African education should be removed from the provincial administrations and different providers, and be placed in a separate department for Bantu people. The National Party government accepted the recommendations of the Eiselen Commission and enacted them into the Bantu Education Act No. 47 of 1953. The Act provided for the transfer of control of Bantu education, including teacher education but excluding higher education, from the Provincial Administration to Central Government. The Act laid the basis for what became known as Bantu Education, which was the instrument used by the National Party government to ensure that Bantu education remained under-resourced and inferior (Ngubentombi, 1984).

At first, Bantu education was placed under the Department of Native Affairs, but in 1958 a separate department, the Department of Bantu Education was created for Bantu education, as per recommendation of the Eiselen Commission.

The recommendations of the Tomlinson Commission convinced the government to revise control of Bantu education, and this resulted in dual control of Bantu education (Ngubentombi, 1984) in the following way. The Department of Bantu Education controlled all financial and professional matters including the determination and provision of curricula and courses as well as examinations for all Bantu in SA whilst the management of other aspects of Bantu education was dispersed among various departments of education countrywide. For the Bantu living in the provinces, the day-to-day running of education was the responsibility of the Department of Bantu Education; for those living in the self-governing states and independent states, the day-to-day running of education was the responsibility of the respective homelands' departments of education.

Transkei, unlike the other independent states, wanted total control of education from the beginning. A few years after the territory was granted self-government in 1963, the Transkei government passed the Transkei Education Act of 1966 which replaced the Bantu Education Act of 1953 and led to the establishment of its own department of education. The Transkei Department of Education (TDE) took over complete control of Bantu education in Transkei except for teacher education which was administered by the TDE, while all professional matters still remained the sole responsibility of the Department of Bantu Education (Ngubentombi,

1984). TDE control over Bantu education continued even after the attainment of independence in 1976. Transkei also felt that because it had attained independence, it needed to have its own university; so the University of Transkei (Unitra) started to operate as from 1976.

After the 1976 Soweto students' uprising and because of opposition to the use of the name "Bantu", the National Party government decided to pass the Education and Training Act, No. 90 of 1979 (Harsthorne, 1992). The Act proposed that the name Department of Bantu Education be changed to the Department of Education and Training (DET).

Soon after "independence", the TDE appointed the Taylor Commission to formulate a teacher education policy for the homeland (Ngubentombi, 1984). The Commission criticised the Transkeian training schools for remaining under DET because it believed that TDE, together with Unitra, could produce more relevant curricula and have better control over the quality of teacher education, compared to what they received from the DET. The Commission therefore recommended that the Transkei teacher training schools should be upgraded to college status and affiliate to Unitra. Affiliation, an agreement between Unitra and the government of the former Republic of Transkei, was implemented in 1981 (Ngubentombi, 1984) to control the quality of teachers coming from Transkei CEs.

To implement affiliation, the TDE created and financed the Department of Collegiate Education (DCE) as part of the Faculty of Education at Unitra. The DCE, together with the TDE, prepared the curriculum, set and moderated external examination papers that were/are approved by the Senate and Council of Unitra (Ngubentombi, 1984). The DCE and TDE

also visited the CEs together to moderate Teaching Practice. This meant that both institutions quality-controlled the CEs. This arrangement between Transkei CEs and Unitra was still in existence during the time of this research.

1.1.1.1.2 The post-1994 period and how it affected teacher education in South Africa, the Eastern Cape and TCE in particular

In 1994, SA held the first truly democratic elections for all its citizens and a fully representative government took over. The new South African government abolished homeland governments and redrew the boundaries of the country, creating nine provinces namely: the Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal, Western Province, Northern Province, North-West, Free State, Mpumalanga, Northern Cape and the Gauteng Province. The government also did away with the various departments of education and created one national department of education (DoE) and nine provincial departments of education (Matoti, 1996). In the process, Transkei became part of the Eastern Cape (EC) Province.

When the EC Provincial Department of Education (PDE) took over, it found that the CEs in the province were under the following departments: the Cape Education Department for Whites, the Department of Education and Culture (House of Representatives) for Coloureds, the Ciskeian Education Department, the DET and the TDE (Matoti, 1996) for people of African origin. These departments have now been dissolved, as has been stated previously, and their functions taken over by the Eastern Cape PDE. The research site, TCE, is one of the CEs that were previously under the TDE.

1.1.2 The Role Played by affiliation and the Eastern Cape PDE

In this study it is argued that several factors have compelled TCE to be responsible for the quality of the institution's graduates. Firstly, when TDE decided to directly control Transkei CEs and affiliate them to Unitra, TDE's intention was to improve the quality of teacher education in Transkei. This study argues that affiliation and quality control in the former Transkei CEs were, at the time of writing, no longer working and that it was then up to individual CEs and TCE in particular to be responsible for the quality of the colleges' graduates.

Secondly, when Transkei rejoined SA in 1994, the Transkei CEs found that the South African CEs had not affiliated to universities as was the case in Transkei. This would not have been a problem if it were not for the fact that the new Eastern Cape PDE refused to honour the affiliation obligations with Unitra (interview with Professor Ngubentombi, 10th June, 1998). The PDE questioned the legality of affiliation (Ngubentombi, 1998). The PDE had, as a result, ended the practice and also cited the present financial constraints, unwillingness to treat CEs differently (other CEs in the province had no affiliations), and the proposed changes by the National government in higher education, as other reasons for the non-recognition of Transkei CE's affiliation to Unitra.

The PDE's decision has several implications for the CEs, and TCE in particular. Discontinuation by the PDE to meet affiliation obligations with Unitra, has forced the latter to work with the former Transkei CEs to perform the duties previously performed with the former TDE. This has resulted in CEs quality controlling each other. Lately, Unitra has decided

to absorb the DCE employees. Absorption has meant that the DCE visits to the CEs are becoming scarcer and irregular, thus having no or little effect on quality control. This meant that both Unitra and the PDE were no longer jointly responsible for quality control at the former Transkei CEs, as previously mentioned. Therefore, TCE has to take over control of the quality of her programmes in order to be certain about the achievement of set outcomes and the quality of teachers coming out of the institution.

1.1.3 The Effects of the National Teacher Education Audit of 1995

The National Teacher Education Audit of 1995 revealed that there was an overproduction of the wrong type of teachers in SA (DoE, 1997). It also showed that teacher education was not uniform as it was provided by autonomous institutions such as universities and technikons, and CEs that were treated and regarded as schools. This study hoped to show that appropriate QA principles would contribute towards enlightening TCE about the desired kind of teacher and enable it to join the higher education sector as a teacher education institution when this becomes mandatory.

1.1.4 The Effects of the Higher Education Act of 1997

The present political dispensation in SA forces TCE to have a QA programme. When the new South African government took over in April 1994, higher education was made national competence/responsibility and was placed under the DoE. This was followed by the passing of the Higher Education Act of 1997 which mandated that teacher education be part of the higher education sector (DoE, 1997). To the CEs, this meant

that they should join the higher education sector, although this was not going to be automatic, as the following paragraphs show.

To implement the Higher Education Act and enable the CEs to become part of the higher education sector, the DoE appointed two Technical Committees: one on Norms and Standards for Teacher Education, Training and Development (1997) and the other on the Incorporation of Colleges of Education into the Higher Education Sector (1998). The first Committee laid down standards for teacher education that included the introduction of QA. The second Committee, with the section responsible for colleges of education in the PDE, sent the CEs a discussion document entitled "The Incorporation of Colleges of Education into the Higher Education Sector: A Framework for Implementation". This document recommends that CEs should elect a College Council to govern the institution, manage funds and assure the quality coming out of the institutions in order to be considered for joining the higher education sector (DoE, 1998).

Coming to TCE, the institution meets some of the criteria for joining the higher education sector. This is shown by the fact that from the time TCE opened in 1990 the institution has been allocated a budget and has demonstrated its ability to control its finances. Secondly, policy decisions at TCE are taken by a College Council. The area where the institution has not made progress is in putting into place mechanisms for quality assuring itself. This is the area that the institution still needs to concentrate on if it hopes to join the higher education sector, hence the present study.

In addition to the above Commissions' recommendations, the DoE and PDE, are, from April 1999 to March 2000, to visit the CEs to find out if they have made the necessary preparations for joining the higher education sector by carrying out the recommendations of both Committees. The CEs that meet the criteria will be recommended for joining. This means that if TCE wants to be part of the higher education sector, it should be preparing to do so by formulating principles that will guide a QA programme for the institution. This study hoped to make a contribution in this regard.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to determine the views of TCE lecturers concerning the principles that should guide a quality assurance (QA) policy of the academic programme of the institution.

1.3 CRITICAL RESEARCH QUESTION

The study sought to answer the following critical research question having five sub-questions.

1.3.1 What do TCE lecturers regard as the guiding principles for a QA policy of the academic programme of the institution? More specifically:

1.3.1.1 What should be the outcomes of the teacher education programme of TCE that should be used in the self-evaluation process?

1.3.1.2 What should the lecturers do to achieve the espoused outcomes as part of self-evaluation?

1.3.1.3 What criteria should be used to test the achievement of these

outcomes during self-evaluation?

1.3.1.4 Who should monitor the achievement of the stated outcomes by the lecturers in the process of self-evaluation?

1.3.1.5 What should be done with the results of the monitoring of the TCE's academic programme in the process of self-evaluation?

It was envisaged that the individual responses to these more specific sub-questions would collectively build up a comprehensive profile of TCE lecturers' views regarding the essential guiding principles for a QA policy of the institution through a self-evaluation process.

1.4 THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

The objective of this study was to examine the perceptions of the Transkei College of Education (TCE) lecturers concerning the principles that should guide a quality assurance (QA) policy of the academic programme of the institution.

One of the main purposes for undertaking this study was related to the lack of consensus about the principles that should guide a QA policy, the outcomes and activities of the teacher education programme, the criteria for assessing outcome achievement, the location and the responsibility for the monitoring processes.

There are two broad views that influence teaching and learning: the technical-rational(TR)/objectivist view and the relativist/reflective practitioner view (Fish, 1995; Barnett, 1992).

The technical-rational(TR) /objectivist view is behaviourist, emphasising fixed standards and controls the course via inspection and appraisal. This view further contends that change can be imposed from outside the

profession, and that quality is measurable (Fish, 1995). On the other hand, relativist/reflective practitioners disagree and state that the most easily measurable attribute is often the most trivial. This view argues instead that professional judgements are preferable as they enable professionals to develop their own insights from inside (Fish, 1995). The relativist/reflective model, therefore, believes in professional answerability rather than narrow technical accountability.

A closer examination of the above two perspectives reveals that the TR/objectivist view contends that the goals for teacher education programmes should be set by society and that the teacher educators should implement the set goals (Fish, 1995). On the other hand, the relativist/reflective practitioners disagree and argue that many aspects of teaching a lesson cannot be pre-specified because practice is rapidly changing. This rapid change requires teachers to autonomously refine and update their practice (Fish, 1995).

Secondly, the TR/objectivist view is that the process of becoming a teacher involves the acquisition and mastery of knowledge and sets of individual competences which can be taught by training (Barnett, 1992; Fish, 1995). On the other hand, the relativist/reflective practitioner view rejects this notion on the basis that teaching and learning cannot be divided into simple skills (Fish, 1995) and argue that student teachers should be educated holistically, not drilled in specific skills. To relativists, therefore, teaching is based on professional competence - a holistic concept (Fish, 1995) and open-endedness (Barnett, 1992).

Thirdly, with regard to the criteria, the TR/objectivists believe that the criteria to be used should be based on quantifiable criteria, for example, results for a given programme of study (Barnett, 1992). On the other

hand, the relativists/reflectivists declare that the purpose of the programme should determine the criteria (Barnett, 1992; Lategan, 1996; Bunting, 1993; DoE, 1997).

Fourthly, in the case of the location and the responsibility for the monitoring processes, some theorists argue that QA promotion departments should be created to carry out the process (Juran, Gryna, & Bingham, 1974; SAUVCA, 1997). Other theorists argue that the responsibility for QA should rest with those who prepare the teachers (Cuttance, 1994; DoE, 1997; Morris, 1997; Betts, 1993; Silvermann & Propst, 1997; Sallis, 1993; Sutter, 1997).

Because of the above-mentioned reasons, it was felt that this study should be conducted at TCE so that the lecturers can decide on the process that should be followed during the self-evaluation of the academic programme. Secondly, this study was also undertaken to reveal if at TCE there was any level of consensus about the principles to guide the self-evaluation policy of the institution given these different perspectives on self-evaluation principles.

1.5 RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

Interest in this study was kindled by the discussion documents sent to all tertiary education institutions by the DoE in 1998. The documents were about the restructuring and rationalisation of teacher education in SA, and contained various recommendations and criteria that CEs must meet to join the higher education sector. One of the recommendations concerned QA.

As stated previously, at the time of writing, there was no QA programme at TCE. From its inception, TCE used to have a quality control policy

which was formulated and monitored by the former TDE and Unitra, as mentioned above. The policy became irrelevant for two main reasons. Firstly, research has found that externally imposed institutions, are generally unable to control quality (DoE, 1997) and this was the case at TCE. At TCE the new dispensation resulted in the PDE and Unitra becoming increasingly unable to fulfil TCE's QA requirements as DCE personnel were unable to visit the colleges and the PDE's reluctance to treat colleges differently, as has been stated previously. Secondly, quality control as opposed to quality assurance, is an after-event process which is unable to correct mistakes when they occur (Sallis, 1993). This means that TCE has to wait for student teachers to complete the course before knowing if they are properly qualified or not. Because of this, quality assurance rather than quality control is preferable.

On the other hand, Total Quality Management (TQM) has little chance of success at TCE and other historically disadvantaged institutions (HDIs) because it is based on an assumption that the institution will specify and provide all the necessary infrastructure and on that basis produce a pre-specified product. The HDIs, including TCE, (whose finances came from the DET in Pretoria which controlled all CEs), are unable to provide the necessary resources because the previous SA government ensured that these institutions remained under-resourced in terms of human and physical resources. This historical legacy therefore affects the product of these institutions. The DoE (1997) is aware of these differences in resources and has suggested that the institutions should, on the basis of the national norms and standards of teacher education, base their quality assurance programmes on what is realistic for each institution. This does

not excuse institutions like TCE but means that TCE has to introduce an appropriate quality assurance programme for its circumstances.

The above, notwithstanding, this study was thought to be significant given that the main purpose of introducing quality assurance is to improve the quality of education (Hargreaves & Hopkins, 1994). By improving the quality of the teachers produced at CEs, for example, improved quality at schools would result. This is because the quality of education is as good as the teachers who teach it (Morris, 1997; Ngubentombi, 1984). It was hoped that the study would contribute to accountability, development and staff development at TCE which are important benefits of QA (Cuttance, 1994; Wilkin & Sankey, 1994; Hargreaves & Hopkins, 1994; Elias & Merriam, 1980; Elliot, 1997).

In conclusion, this study was undertaken, in part, due to the lack of unanimity among theorists about the principles that should be followed in quality assuring an institution (Lomas, 1996; Noruwana, 1993; DoE, 1997). The lack of unanimity has led institutions to formulate QA principles that would be appropriate for the particular institution (South African Universities Vice-Chancellors' Association (SAUVCA), 1997). Furthermore, it was hoped that the findings of this study would contribute to the general body of knowledge in the area of QA by conducting a study in a SA college of education, particularly against the paucity of similar studies relating to SA institutions.

1.6 THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY FOR TCE

The present study is considered to be important for TCE in several ways. Firstly, TCE has never had a mechanism to quality assure itself, nor has it seen the need to do so because in the past Unitra and the PDE were

responsible for the quality of the college graduates. This suggests that the College could have been uncertain about the task of coming up with a self-regulated QA mechanism. This is very risky in a highly competitive environment where CEs have to compete for dwindling government funds on equal terms with other institutions of higher learning. The government has also declared that it will provide funding for good quality and deserving programmes only. This study therefore sought to make a vital contribution in starting the college on a path towards responding to the national educational imperative of setting up a QA system, aimed at causing sustained improvements to its teacher education programme.

Secondly, without a QA programme in place, the college will either be downgraded, or closed down (DoE, 1997). If this happens, it will negatively affect the economy of the region, already the second poorest province in the country, with an 80% illiteracy rate. Although many factors affect a region's economic growth, it is believed that producing quality teachers would contribute to raising educational standards, thereby contributing to the general improvement of the economic status of the region.

Thirdly, the institution employs about one hundred and fifty people (150), including ordinary workers, administrative and lecturing staff, and management. Closing the College would mean that the college staff together with their dependants, will lose their means of livelihood in a country with a high rate of unemployment (40%) (DoE, 1997).

In addition, the culture of learning, teaching and service (COLTS) has collapsed at TCE as it has done in many institutions throughout the country (DoE, 1997). The new SA government wants to restore COLTS

and feels that one of the strategies it can use is introducing QA. QA is based on the assumption that if educators and learners first agree about the outcomes of the educational programme, implement strategies to attain such outcomes, monitor and assess their achievement, such a process would improve the quality of graduates coming out of the educational institution and in the process restore COLTS. This also calls for high levels of responsibility and accountability on the part of TCE lecturers and administrators. This is why it is important for TCE to be self-monitoring because it is believed that through having its own QA programme in place, the institution can restore COLTS through self-monitoring.

The present arrangement of CEs in the Transkei region quality-controlling each other, is a short term measure which is not catered for in current policy. In addition, although collaborative efforts among CEs are encouraged, CEs are now in competition with each other. This means that TCE cannot rely on other colleges to be certain about its quality. It also means that the absence of quality assurance is the only criterion that may prevent TCE from joining the higher education sector because it meets other criteria. For example, the institution has highly qualified academic staff and the college's physical infrastructure is better than those of most CEs in the area. In addition, unlike most CEs in SA, TCE has ties with a university, Unitra, although at the time of writing the ties are under a great deal of stress. Thus, QA is the one area that the institution needs to concentrate on in order to guarantee its survival as an integral part of the South African higher education sector.

The DoE has also stated that one of the requirements for joining the higher education sector and obtaining government funding, is the institution's ability to quality assure itself. To indicate that it is serious about quality assurance, the DoE appointed technical committees, as has been mentioned previously, to formulate national principles that should serve as guidelines for institutions. However, the DoE has further admitted that although it has set guidelines, each institution is free to interpret the principles within the framework laid down by the DoE. By laying down guidelines, the DoE was reminding CEs that as autonomous bodies they should demonstrate the ability and capacity to formulate principles that would work in their particular situations. This is one of the factors that makes this study important; if TCE can produce guidelines for assuring quality in the institution that would be further proof of the institution's readiness to join the higher education sector.

The above, notwithstanding this study, was thought to be further significant because the main purpose of introducing quality assurance is to improve the overall quality of education (Hargreaves & Hopkins, 1994). In this regard, by improving the quality of the teachers produced at CEs, improved quality at schools would result. This is because the quality of education is as good as the teachers who teach it (Morris, 1997; Ngubentombi, 1984). It is therefore hoped that the outcomes of this study will contribute to accountability and organisational development and staff development which are important benefits of QA (Cuttance, 1994; Wilkin & Sankey, 1994; Hargreaves & Hopkins, 1994; Elias & Merriam, 1980; Elliot, 1997).

1.7 DEFINITION OF TERMS ASSOCIATED WITH QUALITY

ASSURANCE USED IN THIS STUDY

- 1.7.1 **Quality Control** refers to a process of inspection, auditing, control, and document review (Sallis, 1993). It is used in education to determine whether standards are being met.
- 1.7.2 **Quality Assurance** refers to a two-sided process: self-evaluation and an Education and Training Quality Assurance (ETQA) body review (DoE, 1997). This study concentrates on self-evaluation, that is, a process by which an institution evaluates itself.
- 1.7.3 **Total Quality Management** not only incorporates quality assurance, but extends and develops it. It is about creating a quality culture where the aim of every lecturer is to exceed students' expectations (Barnett, 1992).

1.8 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY REPORT

This study report is organised in the following manner: chapter 1 introduces the problem for investigation; chapter 2 reviews the literature pertaining to QA; chapter 3 presents the research methodology and data analysis procedures and techniques; the findings of this study and discussion thereof are presented in chapter 4; and chapter 5 completes the dissertation, with a summary of the whole study, conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter reviews the literature pertaining to quality assurance (QA), generally, and more specifically in terms of the critical research questions for this study. In this regard, the chapter starts by explaining the origin of preoccupation with quality, outcomes of teacher education, lecturers' attainment of teacher education outcomes, criteria to test the achievement of outcomes, monitoring of lecturers towards the achievement of stated outcomes, and the handling of the results of the monitoring process of teacher education programmes. The last section concludes the presentation.

2.2 ORIGINS OF PREOCCUPATION WITH QUALITY

This section is divided into three sub-sections: the first and second sub-sections give a brief background about the evolution of quality processes in industry and in education; and the third reviews literature on the state of quality in South African higher education.

2.2.1 The origins of preoccupation with quality in industry

The origins of preoccupation with quality in industry can be traced to the Americans Joseph Juran, W. Edwards Deming and Phillip Crosby (Betts, 1993; Sallis, 1993). In the 1950s Juran and Deming were invited to deliver lectures in Japan. Juran advised the Japanese to prevent, rather than cure, faults that raise costs and impair quality (Betts, 1993). Deming advised them to improve the quality of their goods, find out what the customer wants and then design their products to the highest

specifications (Sallis, 1993). Although implementation of their theories made Japan to acquire dominance in world markets and marked the beginnings of total quality management (TQM), their ideas did not receive the same enthusiasm in America as they got from the Japanese (Sallis, 1993; Sutter, 1997). Crosby, on the other hand, suggested that institutions should aim to have "zero defects" (Sallis, 1993: 54), that is, produce defect- and fault-free products.

The above-mentioned historical perspective has been dominated by three ideas: quality control, QA and TQM (Sallis, 1993). Quality control is historically the oldest quality concept and is an after-the-event process characterised by waste (Sallis, 1993; Sutter, 1997). QA is different from quality control, and is a before- and during- the event process concerned with preventing faults occurring in the first place (Sallis, 1993). TQM incorporates, extends and develops QA (Sallis, 1993) and is about introducing a quality culture whose intention is to surpass the expectations of the clients, and in this case students' expectations (Barnett, 1992). TQM succeeds if the institution first specifies and controls the students that come to the college and the resources to be used to achieve set outcomes (Sallis, 1993). Recently, quality control has declined in popularity, because as an after-event process, it is uneconomical, and this has resulted in a paradigm shift from quality control and inspection to QA and TQM (Sallis, 1993). In SA, the idea of TQM is not popular because the government realises that there are historical differences in human and physical resource allocations in the country that cannot be matched in the short-term. The awareness of the differences has led the DOE (1997) to suggest to institutions to set and meet realistic targets. Such a proposal fits in with the QA mould; not the

TQM whose aim is to exceed the expected. TQM therefore falls outside the scope of this study.

2.2.2 General evolution of quality processes in education

In education, just as in business, the three above-mentioned concepts dominate. Quality control has also lost popularity in education (Sallis, 1993) ostensibly because its judgements were based on individual performance at a certain point in time, and not overall course quality (Wilkin & Sankey, 1994). Also, QA in education is of more recent origin, and as a result there are few references in the education literature before the late 1980s' (Sallis, 1993). Huge interest in quality assuring education developed from the 1990 onwards (Sallis, 1993). It is believed that in the next decade assuring quality of service will dominate the educational landscape in all sectors of education (Department of Education (DoE), 1997).

Although there is now an upsurge of interest in QA in education, there is no unanimity about its meaning. However, there are two strands of thought: the relativist and objectivist conceptions of QA (Barnett, 1992). To the relativists such as Barnett (1992), Lategan (1996), Bunting (1993), and the DoE (1997) QA should be identified with the notion of fitness for purpose. On the other hand, the objectivist conception says that QA in education can be identified and quantified, and that the same assessment can be accorded to all courses or all institutions (Barnett, 1992). The objectivist approach is based on the assumption that research is superior to teaching and that there is a direct or positive relationship between the staff's research records and their ability to teach effectively (Barnett, 1992). The approach is therefore value-based and functions as an

ideology, protecting the objectivists' social interests of research (Barnett, 1992).

A review of literature reveals that most theorists favour the relativist definition of QA because to them there is no general definition. For example, Bagwandeem (1993) and Morris (1997) feel that QA should be dynamic and democratic, acceptable to staff and based on confidence and integrity. Lategan (1993) and Morris (1997) define QA as the extent to which goals have been achieved, but also considering the context and demonstrated value. Morris (1997) believes this can be done by the publication of measurable objectives and giving staff regular feedback on progress towards goal attainment. To the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) (1997) QA is a process that succeeds if providers formulate unambiguous outcomes, range statements, assessment criteria and moderation options. To Wilkin & Sankey (1994) QA is a system that requires that a teacher education programme should have clear objectives, systematic planning, closely monitored implementation, objective evaluation and active review that needs to characterise every stage of teacher education. The study sought to reveal if TCE lecturers preferred either a relativist or objectivist conception of QA or a combination of both.

2.2.3 Present realities of quality processes in South African higher education

In SA teacher education is provided by Colleges of Education (CEs), universities and technikons. These institutions, except for technikons, have lagged behind in introducing systematic QA mechanisms. The CEs are the worst off, mainly because the majority of CEs were previously

categorized as schools and had no autonomy (DoE, 1997). The racially defined departments of education prescribed centrally determined curricula and centrally set and marked examination papers. Although the system was characterised by highly prescriptive top-down quality procedures, defined as quality control, it failed to monitor and develop quality. On the other hand, the Transkeian CEs were/are affiliated to the University of Transkei (Unitra). Research has found that quality control rather than quality improvement has been the dominant philosophy in South African CEs (DoE, 1997) including those that are affiliated to Unitra (Ngubentombi, 1984). Moreover, at the time of writing, there is no study that shows that CEs have taken any attempt to promote quality.

In universities, there was a nonsystematic quality assurance system characterised by self-evaluation and peer review, mainly through moderation by external examiners and regular departmental reviews (DoE, 1997). Lately, the universities have established Quality Control Units, through the Committee of University Principals (CUP) - presently called the South African Universities Vice-Chancellors' Association (SAUVCA) (SAUVCA, 1997; DoE, 1997). The unit has been investigating a quality assurance system for higher education. However, most SA universities do not have in place the detailed and generally accepted sets of objectives that would enable evaluations to be made of their efficiency and quality (Bunting, 1993).

On the other hand, technikons have, over the years, developed and carried out a QA system through the Certification Council for Technikon Education (SERTEC) (DoE, 1997). Although SERTEC has played a leading role, it has been criticised by Prior (1995) who claims that its

programme of evaluation is limited and irrelevant because it does not use institutional norms as the basis for quality assurance. To Prior, this is a serious limitation in that a study of SA technikons suggests that they want goal formulation and realisation to be used as the basis of QA. This has led to a conclusion that SA evaluations are still in their infancy with respect to QA, and that one has to look elsewhere for valuable experiences.

The present realities do not bode well for higher education in SA. To make matters worse, government policy is forcing institutions of higher learning to introduce QA mechanisms, or else suffer subsidy cuts in their financial allocations (DoE, 1997; Higher Education Act, 1997). Besides, the government believes that QA has the potential to restore the culture of learning, teaching and service (COLTS) which has collapsed in the country (DoE, 1997). More specifically, the government is proposing that institutions of higher learning should formulate a QA policy that will be:

an agreed framework underpinned by: (i) clear criteria and procedures developed in consultation with higher education institutions; (ii) a formative notion of quality assurance, focused on improvement and development rather than punitive sanctions; and (iii) a mix of institutional self-evaluation and external independent assessment (DoE, 1997: 138).

It is hoped that the study would contribute to TCE being one of the first South African CEs to introduce QA.

2.3 OUTCOMES OF TEACHER EDUCATION

The first part of this section attempts to define the term **outcome** followed by an overview of outcomes that are expected in a teacher education programme.

2.3.1 Definition of an outcome

Different countries and writers define an outcome in different ways. The DoE for instance, sees an outcome in the following light:

An outcome is a culminating demonstration of the entire range of learning experiences and capabilities that underlie it and it occurs in a performance context that directly influences what it is and how it is carried out (1997: 80).

To Petty (1993: 293); outcomes "are *testable* statements describing the abilities to be learned..". Petty further advances a number of advantages of outcomes:

- they shift the focus from teaching to learning, that is, to what the students will be able to do because of their learning;
- they make clear what the students have to practise;
- they make lesson planning easier by suggesting learning activities; and
- it is easier to assess a student when a lecturer knows what the student should be able to do.

Although there is no agreement on the meaning of outcomes, there is consensus that outcomes must be clear, transferable from one setting to another, straightforward, flexible, must allow employers to know what to

expect of newly qualified teachers, and meet the national and local standards (McCulloch & Fidler, 1994).

The DoE (1997), on the other hand, wants a teacher qualification to have compulsory core outcomes and elective outcomes. The compulsory core outcomes include Communication, Life Orientations, Literacies and Teaching Studies. These are seen as forming the core curriculum, and are to be achieved by all learners in teacher education. The elective outcomes describe the particular knowledge, skills and values required by a teacher who is a specialist in an area or field of learning, to ensure that the purpose of the qualification is achieved (DoE, 1997).

2.3.2 Outcomes of teacher education programmes

A review of literature reveals that many practitioners are worried about the quality of teachers being produced at institutions of higher learning. Although there is such a concern few studies explicitly describe what should constitute the outcomes for a teacher education programme (Furlong, Hirst, Pocklington & Miles, 1988). This has led Ashcroft to admit that there is a "problem of establishing precise outcomes that a student must achieve,..." (1992: 124). McBride (1996) adds that there is also a dire shortage of models of learning to teach, and lack of systematic data on such central issues as teaching competencies. This, according to McBride, highlights the lack of a sound empirical base from which to develop teacher education. Such a state of affairs has resulted in different countries having different outcomes for the teacher education programmes. For example, in the USA institutions prefer as the teacher education outcomes:

effective communication, analytical capability, valuing in a decision-making context, effective social interaction, and taking responsibility for the global environment (Barnett, 1992: 145).

SA policymakers, on the other hand, believe that student teachers will need to acquire outcomes that are clustered into roles such as facilitators, learning materials developer, assessor, evaluator, needs analyst, designer, policy developer, learner supporter, teacher supporter, manager of learning systems, marketer, financial manager, strategic manager, access negotiator, community liaison officer and administrator (DoE, 1997). The DoE adds that teacher education courses should seek to establish the teacher as a competent, reflective practitioner and an autonomous professional (DoE, 1997; McCulloch & Fidler, 1994; McBride, 1996; Barnett, 1992). The outcomes proposed by the DoE give one the impression that the DoE favours a combination of the technical and reflective views of teacher education as suggested by Fish (1995). This study, as has been mentioned previously, sought to determine whether TCE lecturers preferred technical or reflective outcomes, or a combination of these.

Other practitioners add that student teachers should be technically, practically and critically reflective (McBride, 1996; Barnett, 1992), technically, clinically, personally, and critically competent (McBride, 1996), and subject-specific, generally intellectual, vocationally specific, and having general personal competence (Barnett, 1992). Barnett is also of the opinion that teacher education programmes should produce competent student teachers who could be readily assimilated into the

labour market (Barnett, 1992; Ashcroft, 1995). In such a case, institutions should identify those general capacities that graduates in their working roles are likely to need to carry them through the demands of the professional environment (Barnett, 1992).

To Fish (1995) and Barnett (1992) the outcomes of a teacher education programme are influenced by two broad views of teaching and learning to teach: the technical-rational(TR)/objectivist view and the relativist/reflective practitioner view. The TR/objectivist view states that the outcomes of a teacher education programme should be the mastery of skills and knowledge, and acquisition of sets of competences which can be taught by training (Barnett, 1992; Fish, 1995). Such outcomes, according to Barnett (1992), imply predictability and are "influenced by researchers from outside the teaching profession" (Fish, 1995: 41). On the other hand, the reflective/relativist practitioners reject the notion that the outcomes of a teacher education programme can be divided into simple skills (Fish, 1995) or can be predictable (Barnett, 1992). The proponents of the relativist/reflective view also feel that dividing

teaching into collections of skills which can be seen and measured distorts the nature of teaching because there is much more to being a professional teacher than that, nor will there be universal agreement about exactly how many skills are necessary (Fish, 1995: 45).

The relativist/reflective practitioners therefore favour a holistic view of teaching outcomes (Fish, 1995) and open-endedness (Barnett, 1992) which are the defining characteristics of higher education. Consequently, Barnett feels that the most important outcome of a teacher education

programme should be to enable its "graduates to cope with uncertainty" (1992: 160).

Literature review revealed that there was no consensus about teacher education outcomes and that theorists were divided about whether the outcomes should be reflective/generic or technical/specific. This study set out to determine whether staff share any consensus about the types of outcomes of TCE's teacher education programme. It was felt that this was important as it would reveal the extent of consensus about the guidelines to inform the QA policy.

2.4 LECTURERS' ATTAINMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION OUTCOMES

Theorists believe that an institution should involve the lecturers (Bittel & Newstrom, 1990) and student teachers (Berdahl, Moodie & Spitzberg, 1991) in drafting outcomes for a teacher education programme. The involvement of lecturers is perceived to be important because lecturers "can either make or break a quality program" (Bittel & Newstrom, 1990: 412).

To achieve this, first, the lecturers and the student teachers need to formulate and write down a programme of action (McCulloch & Fidler, 1994). McBride (1996) argues that there is a need for such an exercise because research shows that a commonly agreed set of competencies and levels of achievement binds student, teacher and supervisor to a common understood mission.

For their part, lecturers need to initiate the formation of academic committees (Barnett, 1992). Barnett feels that the committees could perform many functions such as:

- to identify and implement the general capacities that student teachers will need to be assimilated easily in the world of work;
- to promote communication within and between departments;
- to help in formulating, implementing and monitoring the outcomes for the whole institution; and
- involvement in staff development, staff appointments, course evaluation, academic support and development services.

The committees would also help departments to identify examples of innovative or imaginative teaching with which they are particularly pleased, and prompt links between departments to develop joint courses or multidisciplinary curricula (Barnett, 1992).

Lecturers could also experiment for a week or so, with a completely new teaching method for one of their classes (Barnett, 1992). Barnett states that such an experimentation with a new teaching method could be promoted and encouraged in the whole institution, and that its success would depend on the support and involvement of senior management. The students could also be encouraged to play an active role in advertising and promoting the new teaching method. By introducing a new teaching method, it is hoped that the lecturers would encourage student teachers to critically evaluate the lecturers' use of the method and thereby develop analytical skills (Barnett, 1992). Such a venture, according to Barnett (1992), would show that the institution is concerned about the quality and depth of its academic programme.

In addition, lecturers who have designed a successful teaching innovation would be encouraged to write about it, in a nontechnical way, so that other members of staff can adapt it to their subject areas (Barnett, 1992). It is believed that the student teachers, as well, can adapt the method, thus showing that they are actively involved in their own education. Students might also be invited to write critically about their course experiences (Barnett, 1992). The writing and publishing activity would be educationally valuable for the student authors (Barnett, 1992). Literature review has revealed that lecturers can engage in various activities that would empower student teachers. The study hoped that TCE lecturers would, through engaging in this study, also think of innovative ways of empowering students not only about the world of work but also about lifeskills.

Furthermore, lecturers could also keep records of samples handouts given to students, and evidence of the speed, detail and positive character of comments given to students on their essays (Barnett, 1992). Other activities that lecturers could engage in include:

- introducing students to criteria for selecting suitable books and other learning material;
- involving students in professional organizations and community projects;
- introducing them to management skills;
- providing them with career-based information;
- preparing and producing course guides;
- writing software for students to use computers as learning resources;
- producing overhead slides; and

- constructing student questionnaires for students to assess the course (Barnett, 1992; Prior, 1995).

The above-mentioned activities would indicate whether or not assessment procedures or examinations have been so shaped as to promote high-quality learning (Barnett, 1992). Keeping records of work prepared and given to students, for example, would serve two purposes: first, if the lecturer does the record keeping with the students, the students would leave the institution, knowing for example, how to compile a portfolio. This would satisfy one of the outcomes of teacher education: being ready to be assimilated into the labour market. Secondly, record keeping would help the lecturer in conducting self-monitoring/evaluation during a formal programme evaluation, and to check if students have satisfied the requirements of the course (Prior, 1995).

To assess the achievement of their outcomes, lecturers could:

- set aside time for reflective discussions with other lecturers and students (Barnett, 1992);
- arrange for the students to observe the other members of staff present their lessons (McCulloch & Fidler, 1994);
- use classroom observation (personal observation of student teaching) (McCulloch & Fidler, 1994);
- conduct interviews (Brighouse & Moon, 1995);
- use documents (Brighouse & Moon, 1995; Dunn, 1994);
- collect data through record keeping (Botes, 1994); and
- demonstrate the teaching skills before expecting the student teachers to teach (McCulloch & Fidler, 1994; Bittel & Newstrom 1990).

Demonstration of teaching skills must start right from the first day; stressing quality and competence (Bittel & Newstrom, 1990). Whenever a lecturer carries out a demonstration, he/she must be specific about the kinds of teaching that are acceptable and what kind will not meet the criteria (Bittel & Newstrom, 1990). It is necessary for lecturers to do this because if lecturers want to assess student teachers' competence, they will need to observe student teachers' teaching (Brighouse & Moon, 1995). It is envisaged that through activities such as these, the quality of teachers graduating from colleges of education will be greatly enhanced.

The above, notwithstanding, research studies conclude that although these methods are recommended they are not perfect. Personal observation of student teaching for example, (although it is the most popular method of ensuring that the teacher education outcomes have been achieved), is usually subjective and biased (Botes, 1994). On the other hand, the use of these methods might reveal, for example, that more attention should be given to training (Botes, 1994). Barnett (1992) adds that these methods could be used for diagnostic assessment to identify areas where improvements and useful developments can take place and for summative purposes intended to give judgements.

This section set out to investigate activities of lecturers who try to promote quality teaching in their institutions. The activities indicated that lecturers build into their teaching methods mechanisms for promoting quality learning. This study hoped to reveal whether TCE lecturers think that they should also engage in similar activities in order to produce quality teachers and whether they also have such inbuilt criteria in their teaching and proposals.

2.5 CRITERIA TO TEST THE ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOMES

There are difficulties of definition, specification and the related identification of valid and reliable criteria for assessment (McCulloch & Fidler, 1994). This is compounded by the fact that there is no unanimity about the criteria that one should use to assess the quality of teaching and learning (Lomas, 1996; Noruwana, 1993; DoE, 1997). Accordingly, the DoE (1997) suggests that each institution should formulate its own QA programme. This study was undertaken in that context. This section starts by explaining the characteristics of acceptable criteria followed by criteria that theorists feel should be used.

Although there is no fixed set of principles that should guide a QA policy of the academic programme of any institution (DoE, 1997), it is necessary, nevertheless, to bear in mind that the success of institutional self-evaluation depends on certain fundamental principles (Bitzer, 1993). Accordingly, theorists contend that QA should revolve around teacher education principles which, in turn, should,

meet national standards, be based upon criterion referenced processes and explicit criteria; that a wide and appropriate array of methods be employed; that work-based assessment be included; .. (McCulloch & Fidler, 1994: 138).

2.5.1 Characteristics of acceptable criteria

Before any monitoring can be done, two things are essential. First, the institution should formulate criteria that are to be used as a basis for judgement (Matoti, 1996) and this was one of the objectives of this study. Secondly, the institutions should involve the affected people in drawing

criteria (Botes, 1994; DoE, 1997). For this reason a question whose objective was to investigate who should be involved in drawing the outcomes and criteria of the programme was included.

At the same time, theorists state that the criteria must:

- be easily understood, realistic, written down and acceptable to everyone (Betts, 1993; Botes, 1994; Bittel & Newstrom, 1990);
- be credible, reliable and valid (Murphy & Broadfoot, 1995);
- allow direct observation (McCulloch & Fidler, 1994; Murphy & Broadfoot, 1995);
- be clear (Wilkin & Sankey, 1994);
- be just (Eraut, 1994);
- be measurable and reasonable (Betts, 1993);
- be diagnostic as well as judgemental (McCulloch & Fidler, 1994);
- make it possible to link the results of self-evaluation to appropriate action (Murphy & Broadfoot, 1995);
- be related to the value statements of the programme (Ashcroft, 1995);
- enhance learning (Ashcroft, 1995);
- investigate how the staff/student interactions are didactic (Barnett, 1992);
- provide opportunities for independent learning, groupwork, and students' self-assessment (Ashcroft, 1995);
- include evidence of how students' initiative in their own learning is encouraged (Ashcroft, 1995); and
- integrate professional and theoretical learning (Barnett, 1992).

The above characteristics have shown that different theorists, lecturers and institutions have different views about the characteristics of criteria for QA. It was therefore one of the purposes of the study, to find out if there are any similarities or differences between the TCE lecturers' views and those listed above.

2.5.2 Criteria for assessment of outcome achievement

There are two opposing views about the criteria that should be used to assess the achievement of teacher education outcomes: the objectivist/TR and the relativist/reflective views (Barnett, 1992; Fish, 1995). The objectivists/TR believe that the criteria should be based on outputs that include completion rates, degree results, and subsequent patterns of employment or postgraduate education (Barnett, 1992). Such criteria are quantifiable, and encourage a ranking of institutions by their numerical scores on any of these criteria (Barnett, 1992). On the other hand, the relativists/reflectivists argue that "... there are no absolute criteria to hand by which we can assess either thought or action" (Barnett, 1992: 48). The point that relativism wants to make is that the purpose should decide quality, rather than absolute criteria (Barnett, 1992; Fish, 1995). The review of literature has established that most theorists support the relativist position because they favour different criteria depending on the purpose of the institution (Cuttance, 1994; DoE, 1997; Morris, 1997; Betts, 1993; Silvermann & Propst, 1997; Sallis, 1993; Sutter, 1997). It was the intention of the study to determine whether TCE favours a relativist or objectivist conception of education or whether the evidence would point to something else.

Ashcroft (1995) and Barnett (1992), for example, say that employers and students prefer as criteria for a qualified teacher:

- competence in communication skills;
- problem-solving;
- leadership;
- teamwork;
- negotiation and persuasion;
- decision-making;
- ability to create opportunities;
- risk-taking;
- flexibility;
- being proactive;
- numeracy; and
- computer-literacy.

Ashcroft (1995) and Barnett (1992) believe that the emphasis must be on demonstrated competence by students. Barnett (1992) adds that general vocational competencies, personal transferable skills, generic occupational derived skills, and capabilities should also form part of the criteria. An institution should, in addition, draw criteria that include scrutinising examination papers, assignment exercises and projects as criteria for assessing teacher competence (Ashcroft, 1995).

Literature review showed that there is a lack of unanimity in the criteria that could be used to assess the achievement of outcomes. Some theorists favour criteria that support the relativist/reflective views whereas others support criteria that support objectivist/TR views. This lack of unanimity made the study important in the sense that it would give

TCE lecturers an opportunity to state the criteria they would like to be used to monitor the programme.

2.6 MONITORING OF LECTURERS TOWARDS ACHIEVEMENT OF STATED OUTCOMES

Monitoring is the day-to-day checking and improving of a course, with the aim of making relatively minor changes and improvements (Petty, 1993). It can be carried out informally, and it is common to have weekly or fortnightly course team meetings attended by all the tutors on the course and a few student representatives. The day-to-day running of the course is discussed, and improvements agreed upon (Petty, 1993).

The literature review has revealed differences concerning the location and monitoring of the quality assurance function. McCulloch & Fidler (1994), state that in the United States of America (USA), for example, there is no unanimity about whether people guiding students should also assess them. It is felt that it would be better if lecturers and students jointly developed formative records of the students' achievements and worked on the setting of future goals. Bittel & Newstrom (1990), on the other hand, say that the attainment of quality does not reside in a single person or even a single department. Bittel & Newstrom add that disputes usually arise mainly over who is the best judge of quality: the quality department or the lecturer and feel that this should be clarified in an institution or chaos will prevail. The study hoped that the TCE lecturers would come up with clear guidelines on who should be responsible for judging quality.

To some, separate QA promotion departments should be created to carry out the process (Juran, Gryna, & Bingham, 1974; SAUVCA, 1997).

Silvermann & Propst (1997) and Betts (1993) disagree and argue that the idea of separate QA departments has lost popularity because people did not care about the quality of goods and services they provided because of a misconception that quality is the province of inspection or the QA department alone. The loss of popularity of the idea of separate QA departments, according to Sallis (1993), led to a paradigm shift. The present paradigm argues that the responsibility for QA rests with those who prepare the teachers (Cuttance, 1994; DoE, 1997; Morris, 1997; Betts, 1993; Silvermann & Propst, 1997; Sallis, 1993; Sutter, 1997). Sutter (1997) adds that quality should no longer be a department, a discipline or a measure of compliance or conformance, but a way of life of professionals engaged in education. The study hoped that the TCE lecturers would categorically state who should be responsible for quality assurance.

To Ashcroft (1995) the process of monitoring and review, should be the duty of a committee consisting of senior members of staff. To SAUVCA (1997) monitoring and review should be done by a committee called Quality Promotion Unit. Barnes (1992), on the other hand, argues that monitoring and review should be done by an academic committee. Thus, there is consensus about the committee, although there is no consensus about its composition. The committee, according to Ashcroft, (1995) and SAUVCA (1997) is expected to state how its recommendations will be monitored, and should set up guidelines and policies for monitoring and reviewing programmes (Ashcroft, 1995).

Although there are such strong arguments about setting a separate department for monitoring of the QA process, it would appear that self-

monitoring without the assistance of a QA department can only work in institutions that have already started the process. In institutions where there is neither quality control nor QA, Bittel & Newstrom (1990) advise such institutions to assign people either on a part-time or a full-time basis to be responsible for QA. SAUVCA (1997), concurring, says that a group has to be formed to promote quality. The group can, according to SAUVCA, include academic staff, the students and the administrative staff, that is, people who will reflect the internal organisation of the institution. Cuttance (1994) adds that it is management's job to ensure that the attention given to quality is demonstrable and systematic.

In conclusion, the literature review further showed that theorists are divided about who should be responsible for monitoring the self-evaluation process. There are those who prefer monitoring to be done by a committee and those who feel that there should be self-monitoring. Such divisions show the importance of studies such as this one in revealing what the TCE lecturers themselves would like to see happening in their own institution. The study sought for instance, to find out TCE lecturers' views about who should be responsible for monitoring quality in the institution.

2.7 HANDLING OF THE RESULTS OF THE MONITORING PROCESS OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMMES

Research shows that if institutions are serious about QA, they must be careful about what they do with the results of the monitoring exercise. In some countries, it has been found that the results of monitoring have not had the desired effect as the lecturers do not take the results of monitoring seriously (ROMA IBS, 97; Imrie, 1998). To Imrie (1998) the reason for

the attitude is the absence of punishment attached to the evaluation and/or the weaknesses of the monitoring process and improvement aspects of the system (Segers & Dochy, 1996). The DoE (1997), like ROMA IBS and Imrie, also believes that various punishment options should be considered if institutions do not act on the results of monitoring. Robertshaw (1997), on the other hand, believes that an external review should be linked to improvement and development, not punishment, because when it is linked to punishment it forces the institution to put an unnecessary emphasis on external review. On the other hand, SAUVCA (1997) adds that institutions should follow the cyclic nature of self-evaluation.

The above paragraph suggests that self-evaluation would be effective if institutions used the results of monitoring to improve the process. It was important, in this regard to find out if TCE lecturers were also similarly concerned about the handling of monitoring results.

According to Botes (1994) there are important lessons that can be learned from the results of self evaluation: they can reveal that achievements are either equal to the prescribed criteria; higher than the prescribed criteria; or that the achievements are below criteria. Botes argues that none of the three outcomes should satisfy the institution. Instead, each should be followed by corrective measures. For example, if performance is above the stated criteria, this might imply that the criteria were too low and need revision. In cases where achievements are below the criteria, Botes (1994) states that short-term and long-term corrective measures should be undertaken.

Studies have also shown that there is usually confusion about who should own the results of monitoring. According to SAUVCA (1997), DoE

(1997), Hargreaves & Hopkins (1994), Cuttance (1994), and PROFESSIONAL DEVELO ... QUALITY ASSURANCE (1998), the results of monitoring should belong to the committee responsible for quality promotion/assurance in an institution. The committee should then distribute the report throughout the institution to encourage staff to be knowledgeable and self-evaluating (SAUVCA, 1997). It is this committee, with the support of senior management, which should see to it that its recommendations are enforced (DoE, 1997; Hargreaves & Hopkins, 1994; Cuttance, 1994; PROFESSIONAL DEVELO ... QUALITY ASSURANCE 1998; SAUVCA, 1997).

This section was intended to investigate what should be done with the results of the monitoring process. There is broad consensus among the theorists that for the process to succeed, the results should be taken seriously and be used to improve the programme. This study attempted to establish what TCE lecturers felt about this issue.

2.8 CONCLUSION

Although the idea of quality assuring institutions of higher learning has gained popularity, theorists are aware of limitations. Hargreaves & Hopkins (1994), for example, admit that in certain cases, the QA system in schools has failed because:

- of the heavy demands that it makes on teachers' time;
- of the lack of inservice training in the skills necessary to carry out analytical evaluations and reviews of school performance;
- the system involved only the teachers and excluded other stakeholders;
- the process of review has been too large and unmanageable;

- the period between reviews has often been too long to make a timely and significant impact on the development process in institutions;
- the participants have not had access to the requisite skills for managing and monitoring QA (Hargreaves & Hopkins, 1994).

Highlighting the failures, does not imply that the process should be abandoned. The objective is only to show that like any human invention, it has its shortcomings and that institutions should learn from mistakes of those who had already started. This is very important in a country like SA where the concept of quality assuring institutions of higher learning is new and many people are skeptical about it.

Theorists contend that institutions need to implement QA, and cite several reasons for this. For example, van Rensburg & Wolvaardt (1993) posit that no educational institution can excel without a QA system in place. Bitzer (1993) and Kells (1993) concurring, argue that institutions' future autonomy will depend on their own capacity for self-renewal and readiness to deal with effectiveness and efficiency problems. To Hargreaves & Hopkins (1994) the use of self-evaluation is a reflection of the growing professionalism of the teaching profession. Wilkin & Sankey (1994) add that pressures on the public purse, a concern for greater economy, efficiency and effectiveness in educational provision, and the need for funding bodies to be able to justify giving some institutions more money than others, are going to force institutions to set up more explicit and visible quality mechanisms than had existed until now. The above is meant to say that institutions of higher learning have no choice. They must either implement QA systems or face the prospect of extinction.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DATA ANALYSIS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the research design and the methods used to collect data for this study. It describes the processes followed: the design and administration of the questionnaire, and the techniques used to analyse the collected data. The contents of this chapter are presented in six sections; the first section explains the research site, the second is about the research design, the third section deals with the research population, the fourth section deals with the research technique and instruments, the fifth with data analysis procedures. The last section concludes the presentation.

3.2 RESEARCH SITE

This study was conducted at Transkei College of Education (TCE), in Umtata. TCE is one of fourteen Colleges of Education (CEs) of the former Transkei, a state that was created as a result of the recommendations of the Tomlinson Commission (refer to page 2). The former Transkei CEs were/are affiliated to the University of Transkei (Unitra) as a result of the recommendations of the Taylor Commission (refer to page 4). When the new South African government took over in 1994, Transkei became part of the Eastern Cape (EC) Province, one of the nine provinces of SA which were created by the new Constitution of SA. The EC is divided into six administrative regions namely: the Western, Northern, Butterworth, Central, East Griqualand-Kei, and

Eastern Regions. TCE (the research site) is in Umtata, situated in the Eastern Region of the EC.

TCE has 67 lecturers, 9 members of the administrative staff, 51 general assistants, and 732 students. The site was chosen because, at the time of writing, the college had no system for quality assurance (QA). As revealed in Chapter 1, the college needs to have a QA system to join the higher education sector. Formulating principles for QA is one way of working towards that goal.

3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN

To undertake the study, the case-study method was chosen as it was found to be the most appropriate for this study. The following paragraphs define a case study, justify why it was chosen for this study and then point out some of the limitations of this case study.

It is difficult to define what a case-study method is, because like most sociological concept, there are no agreed definitions (Bromley, 1986). The definitions that one comes across include one by Kerlinger (1979) who observes that in education, as in some other disciplines, the case study method is characterised by three separate traditions: the study of a single community or culture; the sociological study of social processes and institutions; and the study of curriculum and programme evaluation. Although there are these three traditions, case-studies usually have common characteristics as revealed by the following theorists:

- to Leary, for example, a case-study is a "detailed study of a single individual, group, or event .. (which) is used as a source of ideas" (1995: 305);
- to Rubin & Babbie, it "might be an individual, a program, a

decision, an organization, a neighbourhood, an event, .." (1993: 391);

- to Treece & Treece, it "focuses on a single subject or group .." (1986: 174).

For purposes of this study, a case study is an-indepth examination of a single community.

Other theorists concur that the purposes of using a case study are similar, just as the following examples illustrate:

- to Dyer, it is "to explore in some depth" (1995: 48);
- to Bailey (1987), it provides depth;
- to Treece & Treece, it is to do "an in-depth investigation" (1986: 174);
- to Huysamen case studies are directed at "understanding of uniqueness" (1994: 168);
- to (Wittrock, 1986) it is to provide fruitful information;
- to (Leary, 1995) it provides detail;
- to Bromley, case studies are used "to reveal important contextual factors" (1986: 22); and
- to Rubin & Babbie a case study is used because there is "a special case that seems to merit intensive investigation" (1993: 392).

Indeed, to Rubin & Babbie "case studies are distinguished by their exclusive focus on a particular case" (1993: 391), such as this study focused exclusively on TCE. A decision was taken to use quantitative analysis to analyse the data, although there was an awareness of the perception that data from case studies are usually analysed qualitatively (Dyer, 1995; McBurney, 1994; McMillan & Schumacher, 1993).

However, this perception is not universal. As Rubin & Babbie argue, it is "the mode of observation" that distinguishes a case study, and not the data analysis procedure (1993). This view is supported by Dyer (1995) and Treece & Treece (1986) who also posit that quantitative analysis of data can be used in a case study.

Although the case study was found to be the most appropriate for this study, case studies generally have some limitations, one of which is generalisability of findings. Accordingly, the findings of this study may not be generalised to other CEs, given that "case studies are weak in their capacity to generalise to other situations" (Cassell & Symon, 1994: 224); and lack breadth (Imenda & Muyangwa, 1996). Secondly, in a case study, all aspects of a case are normally examined. However, this present study concentrated only on one aspect. The study also excluded other college role players such as students and the management of the institution because one of the purposes of this study was quality assurance directed towards enhancing academic staff development. Consequently, it was felt that in this process other role players would not benefit directly, nor would they provide information particularly useful for the exercise. Thirdly, the study excluded other areas of the institution such as residences and admissions because of financial and time constraints, although one was aware that the DoE favours a quality assurance programme that takes into account all aspects of an institution. The study is limited in this context.

3.4 RESEARCH POPULATION

The research population consisted of all the 67 full-time members of the lecturing staff of TCE. The study was intended to find out what the

lecturers thought the principles should be that should inform a QA system of the college's academic programme. The lecturers were targetted because all quality assurance processes are a means to an end, namely, better teaching and, more particularly, better teachers (Barnett, 1992). Quality assurance processes are therefore implemented to improve teaching and learning. A lecturer's duties are directly related to teaching and learning.

The study excluded other college role players such as students and the management of the institution, as has been stated above.

3.5 DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUE AND INSTRUMENTS

3.5.1 The data collection instrument

A researcher designed questionnaire (RDQ) was used as a data collection instrument. To design the questionnaire, QA ideas were borrowed mostly from Wilkin & Sankey (1994) and Prior (1995) as reviewed in chapter Two.

The original intention was to use a structured interview as a data collection technique; but later a decision was taken to use the questionnaire because of the following reasons:

- Firstly, the questions that were used in the questionnaire were the same questions that were to be used for a structured interview. So one was confident that the same ground would be covered.
- Secondly, one was aware that in an interview there is provision for clarification of unclear questions and proding for further detail. However, because the researcher worked in the same institution, she also felt that some respondents may be inhibited in

their honesty of response on certain issues. As such, the use of a questionnaire would give them the necessary confidentiality - allowing for frank, honest responses. However, this notwithstanding, respondents were encouraged to phone the researcher on her internal telephone extension for the purpose of clarifying any ambiguities in the questions.

- Thirdly, a questionnaire was chosen because it enabled the attainment of a high response rate (64 per cent) which time and financial constraints would have made impossible with a structured interview.
- Lastly, the literature review had also revealed that questionnaires are used in a case study (Treece & Treece, 1986) because they are "the least expensive means of data collection and the most likely to preserve the anonymity of the respondents" (Matoti, 1996: 78); also easier to analyse compared to other techniques such as interviews (Cohen & Manion, 1994).

For these reasons the questionnaire data collection tool was used.

The questionnaire (attached as Appendix I) consisted of open-ended questions:

QUESTION I - This dealt with what the respondents considered should constitute the core skills of the teacher education programme. The intention here was to find out if respondents preferred specific or generic skills or a combination of both.

- QUESTION II -** This focused on who should be involved in drafting teacher education outcomes. This was based on the contention that the success of the self-evaluation process will depend on the support it receives.
- QUESTION III-** This question sought to unpack what the respondents considered should constitute teacher education outcomes for TCE, and the activities that lecturers would need to engage in to achieve the stated outcomes. The outcomes and the activities were to be used to inform the QA policy of the institution.
- QUESTION IV-** This question aimed to reveal the criteria the respondents envisioned for assessing the attainment of programme outcomes as part of the self-evaluation process. It also examined programme monitoring, one of the cornerstones of QA, and the question of who should be responsible for and report about it.
- QUESTION V -** This focused on what should be done with the results coming out of the monitoring process.

3.5.2 Validity and reliability of the data collection instrument

Before the actual data collection, the RDQ was checked for validity and reliability.

Validity, according to Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh (1972) and Kerlinger (1979) is the extent to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. To check the validity of the RDQ two researchers; one from the School of Education, University of Natal (Pietermaritzburg), and

another from the Faculty of Education, University of Transkei assessed it. The two researchers' recommendations have been included in the final version of the RDQ.

Reliability, on the other hand, is the extent to which a measuring device is consistent in measuring whatever it measures (Kerlinger, 1979). To check the reliability of the RDQ, a pilot study in the form of the test-retest method was done before the actual data collection. The RDQ was given twice, within an interval of two weeks, to the same group of lecturers of Cicira College of Education (CCE), yielding 74% consistency in response. CCE lecturers were chosen because the college offers a similar teachers' course similar to the one at the research site. CCE lecturers' responses, to both RDQ's, were consistent giving confidence that the tool was reliable.

3.5.3 Administration of the questionnaire

Before embarking on data collection, a letter (attached as Appendix II) was written to the Rector of TCE requesting permission to administer the questionnaire. After permission had been obtained, questionnaires were given to all the lecturers constituting the research population. This was a self-administered questionnaire (although the researcher was available to help with clarification) in that the respondents reacted to the items in their own time before the completed questionnaires were collected.

3.6 DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

This section is sub-divided into two and deals with the analysis of data collected. The first sub-section is devoted to a definition of and a justification for choosing content analysis, categories, and unit of analyses

as data analysis tools. The second section explains how data were analysed using these tools.

3.6.1 A definition and justification for data analysis tools used in the study

To analyse the data, content analysis was used. Content analysis is: "a systematic, objective analysis of a text .." (Treece & Treece, 1986: 348); "a method of studying and analyzing communications in a systematic, objective, and quantitative manner to measure variables" (Kerlinger, 1986: 477); and "a systematic procedure .." (Wimmer & Dominick, 1983: 138).

For this study, content analysis was chosen because it is a procedure used to analyse open-ended survey questions (Wimmer & Dominick, 1983; Bailey, 1987), observational field notes and documents (Bailey, 1987; Huysamen, 1994) and in a survey of written materials or periodicals (Treece & Treece, 1986). On the other hand, there was an awareness that like any other method, content analysis has limitations. The most important of these is that its findings "are limited to the framework of the categories and definitions used in that analysis" (Wimmer & Dominick, 1983: 141).

As part of content analysis, the questions and responses, were classified into categories and units of analysis, respectively. To Kerlinger, a category "is a partition or a subpartition" (1986: 127) which also "cover(s) the main areas of content" (Cohen & Manion, 1994: 56). Theorists believe that categories should be mutually exclusive, exhaustive, and reliable (Wimmer & Dominick, 1983; Kerlinger, 1986). On the other hand, a unit of analysis is "the smallest independent unit of

data: a group or individual" (McMillan & Schumacher, 1993: 528). (The use of categories and units of analysis in this study is explained below).

In content analysis, units of analyses are either a single word, a theme, a character, an item, or space-and-time measures (Bailey, 1987; Kerlinger, 1986). In this analysis, it was decided not to use:

- a single word because it is usually used in studies dealing with readability (Bailey, 1987);
- a character because it is usually limited to documents such as a novel (Bailey, 1987);
- an item because it is usually used when referring to the whole document (Bailey, 1987);
- space-and-time measures because they are the actual physical measurement of content (Kerlinger, 1986), which was not the object of this study.

Instead, a theme/topic/main idea was chosen as the unit of analysis. A theme is: "a single assertion about one subject" (Wimmer & Dominick, 1983: 146); "often a sentence, proposition about something" (Kerlinger, 1986: 480). A theme was chosen as a unit of analysis because it enabled taking statements from respondents and using such statements to quantify the data, and in such a process, themes are useful (Kerlinger, 1986).

To analyse the data, the following steps were followed: Each question of the questionnaire was changed to a category. Each theme in the responses became a unit of analysis and was placed under a particular category, "a process that is called coding" (Wimmer & Dominick, 1983:

146). This was followed by quantifying the data and this was based on Bailey's suggestion who states that:

There are four chief ways to enumerate or quantify the data in content analysis: (1) simple binary coding to indicate whether or not the category appears in the document; (2) frequency with which the category appears in the document; (3) amount of space allotted to the category; and (4) strength or intensity with which the category is represented (1987: 319).

To categorise the data, a decision was taken to use frequency of the theme to categorise the data. The decision was influenced by "the purpose of the study" (Bailey, 1987: 319) which was to investigate what the majority of TCE lecturers want as principles to inform the institution's QA policy. The frequency with which a theme appeared in the responses obtained was noted. Therefore, statements that appeared more frequently than others were used as base for inferring (Cohen & Manion: 1994) and were regarded as what the majority would like to see as constituting the principles.

3.6.2 Steps followed in analysing data in this study

The return rate of the RDQ was very slow. This could be attributed to the respondents' reluctance to answer in writing. This late return slowed down the process of data analysis. The last RDQ came a month after the first, as a result the analysis took longer than expected. As part of the analysis procedure, the RDQs were allocated numbers as soon as they came in. The first RDQ to arrive was given the number 1 and the last was number 42. After allocating numbers to the RDQ, the categories

were written down; and below each category were written all the responses/themes. This constituted the units of analyses, obtained from the first RDQ. The same was done with all the RDQ's. Where responses were similar, a tick was marked next to a similar theme to indicate that the responses were similar. After completing the coding process, the frequency of the themes was counted after allocating the number one to the theme that was first written. The themes that appeared more frequently than others were regarded as the majority view, as has been said previously.

3.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter has discussed the research design and the methods used to collect data that would answer the research question. It has described the processes that were followed in the design, administration, and analysis of the questionnaires. The following chapter presents and interprets the results of the analysed data.

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents and interpretes the results of the study. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section presents the views of TCE lecturers' about the principles that should inform the QA policy of the college's academic programme. The second section summarises the findings and the third section concludes the presentation.

4.2 PRINCIPLES OF QA FOR TCE'S ACADEMIC

PROGRAMME

4.2.1 General and/or specific skills?

The first item of the questionnaire required respondents to choose whether the college programme should be dominated by specific or generic skills. This question was included in order to indicate whether TCE lecturers were influenced either by the technical or reflective views of teaching and learning to teach. Declaring the dominant skills that should influence the programme is important in the process of self-evaluation because the criteria to be used have to reflect the dominant philosophy.

Twenty [(20), (48%)] of the respondents stated that they preferred the programme to have both generic and specific skills. The reasons they gave were that:

- (a) Both are important in teacher education.

- (b) Generic and specific skills would produce flexible teachers who could fit in any field and could change professions if they wanted to.
- (c) Such a curriculum would create job opportunities for all trainees and widen the candidates' knowledge base.
- (d) Teachers would be empowered to serve in different skills in different communities with different needs.

One respondent added that student teachers should spend one year on generic skills to give the teacher trainees a broader perspective and the rest of the training period on specific skills to equip the trainee adequately for specific competencies. The above responses lead one to conclude that TCE lecturers want the teacher education programme to contain both generic and specific skills, thereby sharing a similar view with the Department of Education (DoE) (1997).

Seventeen [(17), (40%)] of the respondents believed that emphasis should be put on specific skills rather than general skills. These respondents said that they preferred specific skills, as opposed to general skills, because the general skills usually cover a relatively wide scope that lacks depth and thorough treatment of everything covered. The respondents further observed that they wanted to prevent the production of jacks of all trades, and that each subject required specific skills and competencies.

Four [(04), (10%)] respondents stated that the teacher education programme should be general, arguing that the products of such a teacher education programme could apply such skills and competencies to specific needs in their profession and life in general. They further stated that teacher trainees should be able to concern themselves with any skill

that they may meet in the field; and that such generic skills would make the student teachers open-minded, enabling them to handle different learners and situations. This view is in line with Barnett's (1992) who expresses the opinion that institutions should identify those general capabilities that graduates in their working roles are likely to need to carry them through the demands of the professional environment.

One [(01), (2%)] respondent chose neither of the mentioned skills and stated that there were merits and demerits in each of these approaches.

The majority view concurred with the view of the DoE (1997) that a teacher education programme should consist of generic and specific skills. This also meant that one could not claim that TCE lecturers favour either a technical or reflective view of education. This implies that a self-evaluation policy for the college will have to reflect elements of both the technical and reflective views of education. The DoE is also of the same opinion and adds that those who are concerned with assuring the quality of teachers have to go beyond looking for mastery of practical (specific) competences and examine also mastery of the reflective competences which are implied in generic skills. This implies that the respondents' thinking on teacher education outcomes is in line with the proposed changes in higher education.

4.2.2 Responsibility for formulating teacher education outcomes

The question sought to find out respondents' views concerning whose responsibility it is to formulate teacher education outcomes. This was considered important because such outcomes are to be used in the process of self-evaluating the programme as part of the QA process. As such, it was thought that the lecturers who would be implementing the

programme should identify and support whoever was entrusted with the responsibility for formulating outcomes.

The results showed that twenty-two 22, or 52% of the respondents felt that all interested parties/stakeholders; that is, educationists, management of the college, college lecturers, university lecturers, practising teachers, the public, economists, politicians, and government officials should be involved in formulating teacher education outcomes. The respondents explained the reasons for preferring stakeholder involvement as including the following:

- (a) It is not appropriate for a certain section of the community to impose its decisions on others as would be the case if only one section was allowed to draft the teacher education outcomes.
- (b) Previously, Black people were not part of the mainstream education. Consequently, if stakeholders were part of drafting the outcomes, they would feel responsible for the product that came out of the college.
- (c) It is in the interest of the nation as a whole to involve the stakeholders in drafting the outcomes.

Twenty [(20), (48%)] of the respondents argued that lecturers should be the only ones responsible for drafting teacher education outcomes. The reason given for the dominant role of the lecturers was that the lecturers were already involved in the curriculum development and they knew what was expected of teacher trainees. One of the respondents who preferred lecturers to draft the outcomes added that such outcomes should "dovetail with the outcomes that are written down nationally or by the employer/department". These respondents concur with Bittel &

Newstrom (1990) who also feel that the lecturers should also be involved in drafting outcomes for a teacher education programme.

However, four [(04), (10%)] respondents believed that educational planners and policy-makers are capable of deciding on meaningful outcomes for teacher education through their professional experience and knowledge.

Two [(02), (5%)] respondents believed that students, together with lecturers, should draft the outcomes because they "are the best group of people who can come up with what the results of learning should be like" and they would also "provide on the spot information". Berdahl, Moodie & Spitzberg (1991) also feel that students should be involved in drafting outcomes for a teacher education programme, although they specify that they should be part of the team drafting the outcomes.

Two [(02), (5%)] other respondents added that practising teachers should also pool in their experiences and expertise in drafting outcomes of teacher education institutions as part of the team. This is based on the belief that practising teachers are, by virtue of their work, knowledgeable about the outcomes of a teacher education programme.

At the same time, two [(02), (5%)] other respondents wanted teacher education providers to formulate teacher education outcomes in consultation with potential recipients and in line with the teacher education providers' needs. The DoE (1997) also supports this view. The view of the majority of the (22 or 52%) respondents is in line with the views of South African Universities Vice-Chancellors' Association (SAUVCA) (1997) and the DoE (1997) which favour stakeholder involvement in drafting teacher education outcomes. This means that the

credibility of the programme depends on wide consultation and representativity. In other words, for TCE lecturers, the QA process would get their support and be credible if stakeholders are allowed to be part of the team that draft the teacher education outcomes.

4.2.3.1 Essential outcomes for the teacher education programme

The first sub-question for investigation in this question concerned what the respondents regarded as the essential teacher education outcomes for the programme at TCE. The outcomes, as has been mentioned previously, are regarded as an important component of the QA policy. It is therefore important that there should be broad agreement about them. In this regard, the lecturers were asked to supply a list of essential outcomes for the teacher education programme at TCE.

The most popular outcome, mentioned by twenty-six [(26), (62%)] respondents, was competency as regards the subject content that the student teachers were going to teach. This implies that to the respondents technical competence, which is the mastery of knowledge and skills, should be the most important outcome of TCE's teacher education programme. In this instance, the respondents share a similar view with the technical rational (TR) or objectivist view (McBride, 1996; Barnett, 1992; Ashcroft, 1995; Fish, 1995) as opposed to the relativist/reflective practitioner view which favours a holistic view of teaching outcomes and open-endedness (Fish, 1995; Barnett, 1992). Therefore respondents expect most of the learning and teaching time of the institution to be devoted to the mastery of the subject content and that students' mastery of the content should be used as the most important criterion in assessing the quality of the programme. This response shows the importance of

allowing institutions to decide the principles to guide their QA policy. For example, in institutions that do not produce specialist teachers this might not be an important outcome; but in institutions like TCE, whose core business is producing teachers for secondary schools, specialised in specific subject areas, this is an important outcome.

The second important outcome, the ability to communicate effectively, mentioned by nine [(09), (21%)] respondents, forms part of the compulsory core outcomes that include Communication, Life Orientations, Literacies and Teaching Studies suggested by the DoE (1997). This outcome has also been cited by Barnett (1992) as one of the most important teacher education outcomes of the United States of America (USA) teacher training colleges and universities. This suggests that TCE lecturers are aware of what is expected of present day teachers and are preparing teachers along similar lines and would like to use similar methods to assure the quality of the college products.

The third most popular outcome, mentioned by seven [(07), (17%)] respondents, was the ability to teach effectively and efficiently.

Six [(06), (14%)] respondents believed that the ability to develop critical thinking is one of the most important outcomes of the teacher education programme.

The following outcomes were each mentioned by four [(04), (12%)] respondents:

- problem solving;
- decision-making using critical and creative thinking;
- producing independent learners;

- skills for self-reliance;
- developing flexibility to cater for a variety of pupils' talents;
- ability to analyse information and to arrive at an objective conclusion.

Such critical thinking, and the six outcomes cited above by four respondents each, can contribute to the open-mindedness that has been previously mentioned.

The following outcomes were each mentioned by three [(03), (7%)] respondents:

- being well informed and trained in Outcomes Based Education;
- helping pupils to think creatively;
- identifying and solving problems;
- adopting the critical outcomes decided upon in the education system;
- developing facilitators able to instil in learners the desire to learn, reason and think;
- working effectively with others as a member of a team.

The following outcomes were each mentioned by two [(02), (5%)] respondents:

- co-operative and collaborative approach to college work;
- being innovative;
- developing self-esteem;
- developing responsible citizens of our society;
- resourcefulness;
- facilitators who can guide a learner to successfully

complete/reach the outcomes in the school curriculum.

The above outcomes, like the ones before them, can contribute to the development of reflective practitioners.

Responses from single respondents have been attached as Appendix III.

Although most of the respondents said that they preferred TCE graduates to be technically competent, the evidence leads one to conclude that the respondents also favour producing reflective graduates. This conclusion has been reached because the themes that recur (after the most popular outcome such as ability to think critically and teach effectively) result in reflective practitioners. This suggests that TCE, like the DoE (1997), favours a combination of the technical and reflective views of teacher education. This implies that the QA programme for the institution would largely be similar to the one in the guidelines proposed by the DoE.

4.2.3.2 Essential activities TCE college lecturers need to engage in to ensure that the outcomes set for their students are achieved

The respondents had different ideas about what should be done to achieve the set outcomes. This question was included in order to generate guidelines that can be used in the process of self-evaluation. This was in response to the item intended to answer the second sub-question of the third question.

Four [(04), (10%)] respondents mentioned that students should be assigned projects that would require them to collect and analyse data, and draw conclusions. This implies that TCE lecturers share the same view with Barnett (1992) who feels that lecturers should sharpen the research

skills of student teachers by involving them in projects that would require them to collect, analyse and interpret data.

The following activities were each mentioned by three [(03), (7%)] respondents:

- demonstration of appropriate teaching strategies;
- giving trainee teachers a chance to demonstrate their special skills and talents;
- involving the student teachers in all the learning and academic activities;
- the need for in-service training which is relevant and necessary to the educational programme of the college;
- engaging in lifelong learning by lecturers;
- engaging in research by lecturers.

The following activities were each mentioned by two [(02), (5%)] respondents:

- More time should be catered for micro-teaching and practise teaching to expose students to the real situation.
- Students should be given tasks to work on in groups.
- Lecturers should provide the necessary resources for student teachers.
- Lecturers should organise and conduct workshops.
- Lecturers should attend seminars.
- More practical lessons and outings should be emphasized.
- Lecturers should guide the student teachers.

The activities that were suggested by single respondents each, have been attached as Appendix IV.

Some activities suggested by respondents have also been suggested by theorists and organisations: for example, demonstration of teaching skills (Bittel & Newstrom, 1990; Brighouse & Moon, 1995; Dunn, 1994; McCulloch & Fidler, 1994); involvement of learners in learning activities (Berdahl, Moodie & Spitzberg, 1991; McCulloch & Fidler, 1994); engaging lecturers in lifelong learning (Barnett, 1992; DoE, 1997); emphasis on the practical aspect (Prior, 1995); engaging in continuous assessment (Barnett, 1992; DoE, 1997); producing of high quality learning and teaching materials (Barnett, 1992; Prior, 1995); and reflective discussions with students (Brighouse & Moon, 1995).

The above responses show, however, that although there is some broad consensus about what the outcomes of the teacher education programme should be, there is no unanimity about what to do to achieve the outcomes. These responses, suggest that the respondents feel that each lecturer should decide what to do to achieve the set outcomes. This is in keeping with the policy of the DoE (1997) that is opposed to prescribing to institutions what they should do to achieve set outcomes. The large variation in mechanisms to achieve the outcomes will require the institution to be sensitive about its selection of performance indicators in order to cater for the different interests. This will mean that before any self-evaluation exercise is undertaken, the institution will need to draw, together with the affected parties, flexible performance indicators that will cater for the divergence of opinion in mechanisms to achieve the programme outcomes and investigate if the mechanisms fit the purpose of the programme.

4.2.4.1 Criteria that TCE should follow to ensure that college lecturers successfully work towards student teachers' attainment of the identified outcomes

This part of the responses looks at the criteria cited by respondents as suitable for the teacher education programme. This is based on the belief that the process of self-evaluation succeeds if there are clearly agreed upon criteria for the self-evaluation process. This forms the response profile for the first sub-question of the fourth question of this study which asked for the criteria that should be used to test the achievement of these outcomes, and also to find out if what is done at TCE is fit for the purpose it was set up for and, in the process, implement QA.

In response to the sub-question, eleven [(14), (34%)] respondents proposed that the college establish a stakeholder committee to monitor the work of both students and lecturers, to facilitate planning, administration and management within the institution;

Eight [(08), (19%)] respondents said that the college should put in place a staff development programme. A further eight [(08), (19%)] respondents suggested that the college should organise workshops or seminars where lecturers can share ideas and become conversant with changes in the education system as a way of ensuring QA.

The following criteria were cited by three [(03), (7%)] respondents each:

- The college must have a clear policy on lecturer qualifications (academic and professional) to make sure that lecturers have the relevant qualifications.
- The college should embark on performance appraisal to ensure that the outcomes are achieved.

- The college should invite experts to address lecturers on issues necessary to achieve the set outcomes.
- Academic programmes should be modified to emphasize projects and long essays rather than tests and examinations.
- Departmental meetings should be held to share information on what members are doing and to new information gained from papers, journals, and newspapers.
- The college should use of a variety of assessing procedures both to students and lecturers.
- The lecturers should let the students discover the information on their own.

The following criteria were each cited by two [(02), (5%)] respondents:

- The institution should provide resources.
- The institution should interview the lecturers thoroughly before appointment.
- The management and staff should have a clear vision of their goals.
- The institution needs to invite an external quality audit and evaluation.
- The institution needs to embark on a capacity building exercise for TCE lecturers.
- The college needs to hold regular meetings to check whether everything is going according to plan.
- The institution has to expose students to other similar institutions outside their own environment.

The criteria that were mentioned by single respondents each, have been attached as Appendix V.

The above responses show that most of the respondents are conversant with the changes taking place within the education system. Such ideas are in themselves a form of self-monitoring. This means that even if there is no QA programme in place, TCE lecturers are aware of what they should be doing in order to improve the quality of the programme. Thus it is evident from the results of this study that lecturers know what they would like to see happening at TCE. What is needed is implementation. Also, the idea of forming committees to facilitate planning, administration and management within the institution has been advocated by Barnett (1992) who feels that such committees could perform many functions that would enhance the quality of a teacher education programme.

At the same time, there is a lack of unanimity in the criteria cited by respondents. The responses indicate that TCE lecturers support the relativist/reflective view of QA which argues that "... there are no absolute criteria at hand by which we can assess either thought or action" (1992: 48). This view, according to Barnett (1992), Betts (1993), Cuttance (1994), DoE (1997), Fish (1995), Morris (1997), Sallis (1993) Silvermann & Propst (1997), and Sutter (1997), means that the respondents are opposed to pre-determined or externally imposed criteria, and prefer that the purpose of the programme should decide the criteria. In the case of TCE, this means that the college should continuously re-visit its purpose to find out if what is being done at the college is still consistent with the purpose of the institution and this according to the respondents should be the benchmark of the QA policy of the college.

4.2.4.2 Responsibility for monitoring

This section dealt with the responsibility for monitoring the academic programme of the college. This question was included because QA succeeds if there is an ongoing monitoring. Monitoring is therefore an important component of QA, as QA is not only a before- but also a during-the event process of self-evaluation. It is therefore important from the beginning that stakeholders are clear about who is to perform this important function. The following three sub-questions therefore deal with this important aspect of QA. This is in keeping with the second part of the fourth question which sought suggestions of who should monitor the achievement of the stated outcomes by the lecturers. The responses to this question have been presented in three sub-sections.

4.2.4.2.1 Responsibility for putting monitoring measures/criteria in place

The respondents felt that the responsibility for putting such measures/criteria in place should rest with the following stakeholders as shown by Table 1:

TABLE 1: RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR EFFECTING CRITERIA

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR EFFECTING CRITERIA	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Lecturers	14 (33%)
Management of the institution	12 (29%)
Stakeholders	10 (24%)
Heads of departments	08 (19%)
Students	04 (10%)
University of Transkei	01 (02%)
Department of Education	01 (02%)
Non-Governmental Organisations	01 (02%)
Parents	01 (02%)
Governing Council	01 (02%)
Provincial and regional education officers	01 (02%)

The above results indicate that the majority of the respondents felt that the criteria or measures that would contribute to the success of the programme should be put in place by the lecturers who actually do the job. This is in keeping with the view of theorists and organizations such as Cuttance (1994), DoE (1997), Morris (1997), Betts (1993), Silvermann & Propst (1997), Sallis (1993), and Sutter (1997). This is another example of the respondents' willingness to participate directly in the process. This could be interpreted as meaning that the lecturers are aware that the process of self-evaluation involves accounting for one's actions. Willingness to be involved in all areas of self-evaluation is a form of empowering one's self.

4.2.4.2.2 Responsibility for the monitoring process to ensure that the criteria are implemented as planned

This subsection was intended to investigate who, according to TCE lecturers, should be tasked with monitoring, an essential aspect of QA. Overall, the respondents felt that the responsibility for the monitoring process, to ensure that the criteria are implemented as planned, should rest with the following stakeholders as Table 11 shows:

TABLE II: LECTURERS' PERCEPTIONS OF STAKEHOLDERS' RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING CRITERIA ARE IMPLEMENTED AS PLANNED

RESPONSIBILITY TO ENSURE THAT CRITERIA ARE IMPLEMENTED AS PLANNED	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Heads of departments	19 (45%)
Management of the institution	12 (29%)
A fully representative committee	08 (19%)
Lecturers	05 (12%)
Department of Education	03 (07%)
Students' Representative Council	03 (07%)
Senior lecturers	01 (02%)
University of Transkei	01 (02%)

The results indicate that most of the respondents feel that the responsibility for monitoring to ensure that the criteria are implemented as planned should rest with the heads of departments, the management, and the stakeholder committee. This view is shared by Ashcroft (1995), DoE (1997), SAUVCA (1997) who argue that the process of monitoring and review should be performed by a committee consisting of senior members of staff.

4.2.4.2.3 Responsibility for reporting on the monitoring process

According to the respondents, the responsibility for reporting on the monitoring process should rest with the following stakeholders as Table 111 indicates:

TABLE 111: LECTURERS' PERCEPTIONS OF
STAKEHOLDERS' RESPONSIBLE FOR
REPORTING ON THE MONITORING PROCESS

RESPONSIBILITY FOR REPORTING ON THE MONITORING PROCESS	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Heads of departments	15 (36%)
Management	11 (26%)
Stakeholder committees	08 (19%)
Lecturers	05 (12%)
Students' Representative Council	03 (07%)
University of Transkei	02 (05%)
Government officials	02 (05%)
Senior lecturers	01 (02%)

The results indicate that the majority of the respondents felt that the responsibility for monitoring and reporting on the process should rest with the heads of department and the management of the institution. This is because they are the final accounting officers in the institution. The respondents' view concurs with Cuttance's (1994) who argues that it is management's job to ensure that the attention given to quality is demonstrable and systematic. This gives the impression that the lecturers feel they will accept and trust the process, as long as they are comfortable with the principles that would be followed. The lecturers would then leave the implementation and monitoring to the people who have been employed to carry out these responsibilities.

4.2.5 Suggestions on what should be done with the results of the monitoring process

This question was based on the assumption that the nature of the QA process is cyclical. Usually, the results of the monitoring process reveal the strengths and weaknesses of the programme and if they are treated seriously they contribute to improved quality (DoE, 1997). The following suggestions were on the fifth and last sub-question concerning what should be done with the results of the monitoring process of TCE's academic programme:

Respondents stated that:

- Since the lecturers would be involved in the implementation of the criteria, a meeting should be held where the results would be reported, discussed and recommendations made [eleven (11) (26%) respondents].

- The recommended improvements of the monitoring process should be implemented immediately [nine (09) (21%) respondents].
- The lecturers must be informed of their strengths and/or weaknesses [eight (08) (19%) respondents].
- The results should be used for the development of the programme [six (06) (14%) respondents].
- The results should be used for evaluating progress [five (05) (12%) respondents].
- The results should be used for rectifying shortcomings, if any [four (04) (10%) respondents].
- The results should be used to spot mistakes or shortcomings [three (03) (7%) respondents].

The above responses indicate that the respondents want the results of the monitoring process to be made available, discussed and recommendations made and implemented. They also indicate that the respondents want the results to be used to improve and develop the programme, and that is one of the cornerstones of QA. This gives one the impression that the lecturers prefer the cyclic nature of QA that has been suggested by SAUVCA (1997).

The above responses are also in line with what has been suggested in the review of literature. Imrie (1998) and ROMA IBS (1997) for example, have noted that in some countries the lecturers do not take the results of monitoring seriously because of the absence of punishment. SAUVCA (1997), on the other hand, believes like the respondents, that the results of the monitoring process should be distributed throughout the institution to encourage staff to be knowledgeable and self-evaluating. Other theorists

and organizations add that the institution should see to it that the monitoring recommendations are enforced (DoE, 1997; Hargreaves & Hopkins, 1994; Cuttance, 1994; PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND QUALITY ASSURANCE 1998; SAUVCA, 1997).

4.3 SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

The following are the key findings of the research study:

For the first question that dealt with whether the principles that should inform the QA policy should be based on generic or specific skills or a combination of both, the highest percentage of respondents (48%) proposed that TCE must formulate principles that will ensure that the teacher education programme consists of both generic and specific skills.

In the second question that investigated who should be involved in drafting teacher education outcomes. The results showed that the majority of the respondents (42%) preferred relevant stakeholders' involvement in drafting teacher education outcomes.

The third question was divided into two sub-questions. The first sub-question sought to enlist the essential outcomes for the teacher education programme; and the second sub-question required the essential activities that need to be done to ensure that the outcomes are achieved. The majority of the respondents (62%) stated that competency as regards the subject content should form part of the essential outcomes. The second had inconclusive evidence, but ten percent of the respondents stated that the lecturers needed to engage in learner-centred teaching strategies.

The fourth question was divided into two sub-questions. The first sub-question was about the criteria for monitoring the academic programme;

and the second sub-question was about the responsibility for monitoring. With respect to criteria, the highest percentage of the respondents (26%) preferred that the institution should establish a stakeholder committee that would drive the self-evaluation process at the college. Forty-five percent of the respondents stated that the lecturers should be involved in drawing monitoring guidelines, but that the responsibility for monitoring and reporting on the monitoring process should rest with the senior members of staff who had been employed to perform such duties.

The fifth question focused on what should be done with the results of the monitoring process. Twenty-six percent of the respondents stated that a meeting should be held where the report will be disseminated, discussed, recommendations made and later implemented.

4.4 CONCLUSION

This chapter presented data on the views of TCE lecturers about the principles that should guide a QA policy of the academic programme of the institution. What came out from the data was that the lecturers: want the programme to combine generic and specific skills; prefer subject mastery to be the most important outcome of the programme; have neither strong feelings about the strategies that should be used to achieve the programme outcomes, nor the criteria that should be used to assess outcome achievement; want to participate in formulating principles for monitoring, but prefer that the actual monitoring should be done by the management.

The next chapter makes conclusions and recommendations about principles that could be used in formulating a QA policy of TCE's academic programme based on the research findings.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a summary of the whole study, conclusions reached and recommendations made in the light of the findings and conclusions. The contents of the chapter are presented in three sections; the first section presents a summary of the study, the second section presents conclusions drawn from the findings and the last section contains recommendations on the basis of evidence collected and conclusions reached.

5.2 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The aim of this study was to determine the views of the Transkei College of Education (TCE) lecturers concerning the principles that should guide a quality assurance (QA) policy of the academic programme of the institution. For purposes of this study, QA referred to a two-sided process:- self evaluation and an external evaluation by the Education and Training Quality Assurance (ETQA) body review (DoE, 1997). More specifically, the study sought to answer the following research question, “What do TCE lecturers regard as the guiding principles for a QA policy of the academic programme of the institution?”

Review of literature revealed two major points about QA which formed the basis of the study. The first point was that there are two major conceptions of QA: the relativist and the objectivist conception. Based on the two conceptions, the review revealed differences concerning the definition of QA, its outcomes and how lecturers can attain them, location

of monitoring processes and how to monitor the process, and how to handle the results of monitoring. Secondly, at the time of writing, QA in South African higher education was still in its infancy, and that one had to look at the experiences of other countries in order to gain insight into the concept.

The research site was TCE in Umtata and a case-study method was found to be the most appropriate. The research population were the lecturers of TCE. To collect the data, a researcher-designed questionnaire (RDQ) was used, checked for validity and reliability, and was also self-administered. To analyse the data, content analysis was used together with categories and unit of analysis as data analysis tools.

The analysis of data revealed that the majority of TCE lecturers:

- favoured a teacher education programme that combined both generic and specific skills;
- felt that all interested parties/stakeholders should be involved in formulating teacher education outcomes;
- regarded mastery of the subject content as the most essential teacher education outcome;
- preferred that students should be assigned projects that would require them to collect, analyse data, and draw conclusions;
- preferred the establishment of a committee to monitor the work of both students and lecturers as the most important criteria;
- posited that the results of the monitoring process be made available, discussed and that recommendations be made and later implemented;

- expected the results to be used to improve and develop the quality of the programme.

5.3 CONCLUSIONS

The analysis and interpretation of data led to the following conclusions.

Firstly, the results showed that TCE lecturers were influenced by both technical/objectivist and reflective/relativist views of teaching and learning. However, they went further to place importance and a special emphasis on the primacy of the subject content to be taught by the student teachers when they complete the programme. This emphasis represents a long-standing contention that teachers ought to be well schooled in their subject. Indeed, the importance of this cannot be over-emphasised. This indicates a bias in favour of a technical/objectivist influence.

At the same time, the same respondents stated that they preferred that the programme should be dominated by learner-centred and reflective approaches to teaching. This indicates the influence of reflective/relativist thinking. The study therefore showed there was no dominant influence at the institution. This ambivalent view of TCE lecturers about the dominant type of outcomes leads one to conclude that TCE lecturers are aware that if they concentrate exclusively on technical competency they would be sacrificing one of the cherished ideals of higher education, open-mindedness. For the self-evaluation process, this means that the process will have to contain elements of both. By endorsing the importance of both the content and facilitation skills, it is evident that the respondents are aware of the important elements which should guide the development of educational outcomes for the college's academic programme.

Secondly, the results suggest that TCE lecturers feel that those who are to be affected by the programme and/or the process of self-evaluation should be involved in the discussion and evolution of the programme outcomes. This is another important finding of the study because it is only through such stakeholder participation that the college's core business can attain the intended outcomes. This also shows that the respondents are quite aware of this critical ingredient of programme development.

Thirdly, the results showed that the majority of lecturers preferred that a committee should be formed to work out the criteria, implement and monitor a self-evaluation process. This is also important - as long as the work of the committee is transparent and all-inclusive.

Fourthly, there was no consensus about the activities and the criteria that lecturers should engage in to achieve the programme outcomes. This is a clear indication that TCE lecturers realize that as academics it would be difficult to prescribe to others what they should do as activities and criteria for assessing them depend on the particular subject/context. Although this is so, it is believed that lecturers need to agree on broad activities and criteria which could be used as principles in the process of self-evaluation.

Fifthly, the lecturers preferred that the actual monitoring should be the responsibility of the management of the institution. This suggests that although the lecturers are to be involved in the process of coming up with the criteria for self-evaluation as an aspect of QA, the ultimate responsibility lies with senior management. However, it should be emphasised that self-evaluation, as a component of QA, succeeds if those

who are engaged in the process are self-monitoring. This requires that the lecturers themselves engage in self-critical analysis and introspection when confronted with information concerning their performance.

Overall, it is important to state that in the process of self-evaluation, the institution will need to be vigilant about the criteria that would be used to monitor the programme and the role of the lecturers in the monitoring process.

These conclusions, together with the findings, form the basis of the following recommendations.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations, which emanate from the major findings of the study and the conclusions reached, should serve as the principles that should guide a QA policy of TCE's academic programme:

- Based on data obtained in this study, and within the context of on-going South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) inspired curriculum renewals, it is recommended that TCE engages stakeholders in re-designing its academic programme. Apart from coming up with teacher education outcomes that will be suitable for the college, such stakeholder participation will legitimise the programme, thereby enabling them to buy into the process, and support the college in its endeavours to achieve its set goals. In this regard, stakeholders, including the lecturers will agree on broad outcomes for the programme, through a process of give-and-take. Indeed the question of accommodating both generic and specific outcomes/skills, and the balance that needs to be struck between the two, will have to be

negotiated within this process. The analysis of results has shown that TCE lecturers want subject mastery to assume a level of special significance. This should also be a matter of negotiation with all stakeholders - including professional bodies operating within the aegis of the SAQA and the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). In addition, the programme outcomes, will have to reflect objectivist and reflectivist influences as the lecturers' responses have shown that lecturers preferred a programme that reflects both views. Furthermore, since the college prepares student teachers for the school system, TCE needs to allocate sufficient resources towards this outcome, particularly given that the Outcomes Based Education (OBE) approach is a resource-intensive way of offering instruction. Such resources might include: more time on the timetable; prioritising resource allocation according to agreed-to centres of excellence; mounting a staff development programme whose objective would be to strengthen lecturers' competency in facilitating student teachers' acquisition of subject competency; and biasing the overall college budget towards providing more resources for the more important outcome.

- It is also recommended that student teachers' mastery of the content should be one of the critical criteria in assessing the quality of the programme. This recommendation is based on the lecturers' perception that subject mastery should be an important outcome of the programme. The institution will meet the criterion if the lecturers choose and prioritise activities that would lead student teachers to demonstrate such mastery. At the same time, the criteria should include the ability to teach effectively, and think critically and

creatively. The college should also, in its staff development programme, include a course which will sensitise the lecturers about the criteria for assessing the programme outcomes.

- The college should set up a committee to deal with the self-evaluation process of the institution. Such a committee will succeed if it is involved in the programme from the beginning. Such involvement will serve two purposes: first it will establish its legitimacy during the process of setting criteria, bringing together all the important stakeholders; secondly, self-evaluation as an aspect of QA is an ongoing process, involving the participants at every level. Indeed, self-monitoring is not an option for lecturers, but a requirement as it is a cornerstone of self-evaluation - which in turn forms a critical variable of QA.

REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C. & Razavieh, A. (1985). *Introduction to Research in Education* (3rd ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Ashcroft, K. & Foreman-Peck, L. (1994). *Managing Teaching and Learning in Further and Higher Education*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Ashcroft, K. & Foreman-Peck, L. (1995). *The Lecturer's Guide to Quality and Standards in Colleges and Universities*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Bagwandeem, D. (1993). Quality assurance in colleges of education. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 7(2), 95 - 98.
- Bailey, K. D. (1987). *Methods of Social Research* (3rd ed.) New York: The Free Press.
- Barnett, R. (1992). *Improving Higher Education: Total Quality*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Berdahl, R. O., Moodie, G. C. & Spitzberg, I. J. (1991). *Quality and Access In Higher Education: Comparing Britain and the United States*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and the Open University Press.
- BEST - ROMA IBS 97 ...ccreditation of HEE Topic 2: Quality assurance And accreditation of HEE <http://www.virtuald...ibs-roma/topic2.htm>
- Betts, P. W. (1993). *Supervisory Management*. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Bittel, R. N. & Newstrom, J. W. (1990). *What Every Supervisor*

- Should Know*. (6th ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.
- Bitzer, E. (1993). Identifying criteria for institutional self-evaluation at universities. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 7(2), 28 - 37.
- Botes, P. (1994). *Aspects of Supervision: A Guide for the Contemporary Public Manager*. Halfway House: Southern Book Publishers.
- Breakwell, G. M., Hammond, S. & Fife-Schaw, C. (Eds) (1995). *Research Methods in Psychology*. London: Sage Publications.
- Brighouse, T. & Moon, B. (1995). *School Inspection*. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Bromley, D. B. (1986). *The Case Study Method in Psychology and Related Disciplines*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bunting, I. (1993). Rationalization, quality and efficiency. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 7(2) 17 - 27.
- Carl, P. (Ed.) (1994). *Quality Improvement in Education: Case studies in schools, colleges and universities*. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Carruthers, J. (1990). A Rationale for the Use of Semi-structured Interviews. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 28(1), 63 – 68.
- Cassell, C. & Symon, G. (1994). *Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research: A Practical Guide*. London: Sage Publications.
- Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1994). *Research Methods in Education*. (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Craft, A. (Ed.) (1994). *International Developments in Assuring Quality in Higher Education*. London: The Falmer Press.

- Cuttance, P. (1994). Quality Assurance in Education Systems Studies. *Educational Evaluation*, 20(1), 99 - 112.
- Department of Education (1996). Green Paper on Higher Education Transformation.
- Department of Education (1997). South African Qualifications Authority, Government Gazette No. 1240.
- Department of Education (1997). Norms and Standards for Teacher Education, Training and Development - Discussion document Pretoria.
- Department of Education (1998). The Incorporation of Colleges of Education into the Higher Education Sector: A Framework for Implementation - Discussion document Pretoria.
- Dunn, W. N. (1994). *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction*. (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Dyer, C. (1995). *Beginning Research in Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods and Statistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Earley P., Fidler, B. & Ouston, J. (1996). *Improvement Through Inspection? Complementary approaches to School Development*. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Elias, J. L. & Merriam, S. (1980). *Philosophical Foundations of Adult Education*. New York: Robert Krieger Publishing Company.
- Elliot, B. (1997). Implementing Learning Organization Principles and Quality Assurance: The Department Director's View. *Performance Improvement*, 36 (9) 39 - 41.
- Ellis, R. (1993). *Quality Assurance for University Teaching*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and the Open University Press.

- Eraut, M. (1994). *Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Fish, D. (1995). *Quality Mentoring for Student Teachers: A Principled Approach to Practice*. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Furlong, V. J., Hirst, P. H., Pocklington, K. & Miles, S. (1988). *Initial Teacher Training and the Role of the School*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Galloway, R. L. & Wearn, K. (1998). Determinants of Quality Perception in Educational Administration: Potential Conflict between the Requirements of Internal and External Customers. *Educational Management & Administration*, 26(1), 35 - 48.
- Gardner, W. E. (1995). Developing a Quality Teaching Force for the United Arab Emirates: mission improbable. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 21(3), 289 - 301.
- Gevers, W. (1998). Report by SAUVCA representative on the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA). misc\sauvca-1.
- Hargreaves, D. H. & Hopkins, D. (Eds) (1994). *Development Planning for School Improvement*. London: Cassell.
- Harsthorne, K. (1992). *Crisis and Challenge: Black education 1910 1990*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Huysamen, G. K. (1994). *Methodology for the Social and Behavioural Sciences*. Halfway House: Southern Book Publishers.
- Imenda, S. N. & Muyangwa, M. M. (1996). Introduction to Research in Education and Behavioural Sciences. (Unpublished document).
- Imrie, B. W. (1998). Professional Development As Quality Assurance: Now And Zen [http://www.cityu.ed...s/brad/inqaahe.html](http://www.cityu.edu...s/brad/inqaahe.html)
- Juran, J. M., Gryna, F. M. & Bingham, R. S. (Eds) (1974). *Quality*

- Control Handbook* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kells, H. R. (1993). Patterns of quality assurance and self-regulation in higher education: a multi-national perspective. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 7(2), 8 - 12.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1979). *Behavioural research: A conceptual approach*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). *Foundations of behavioural research* (3rd ed.). New York: CBS Publishing.
- Lategan, L. O. K. (1996). Open learning and quality assurance. *OLiSA Review*, 2, 67- 70, (December).
- Leary, M. R. (1995). *Introduction to Behavioural Research Methods* (2nd ed). Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Leedy, P. D. (1974). *Practical Research Planning and Design*. New York: MacMillan.
- Lewis, R. G. & Smith, D. H. (1994). *Total Quality in Higher Education*. Delray Beach: St Lucia Press.
- Matoti, S. M. (1996). Teacher Evaluation in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa: A Review of Policy and Practice in the Primary School Sector (1985 -1995). A dissertation submitted to the University of Bristol in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in the Faculty of Social Sciences, School of Education. (unpublished document).
- McBride, R. (Ed.) (1996). *Teacher Education Policy*. London: The Falmer Press.
- McBurney, D. (1994). *Research Methods* (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- McCulloch, M, & Fidler, B. (1994). *Improving Initial Teacher Training?*

- New roles for teachers, schools and higher education.* Essex: London.
- McMillan, J. H. & Schumacher, S. (1993). *Research in Education: A Conceptual Introduction* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Morris, J. (1997). Ensuring ongoing commitment to a quality system. *Human Resource Management*, 12(10), 62 - 64.
- Murphy, R. & Broadfoot, P. (1995). *Effective Assessment and the Improvement of Education: A Tribute to Desmond Nuttall*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Murphy, S. E. (1997). Implementing Learning Organizational Principles and Quality Assurance: A Practical Model. *Performance Improvement*, 36 (9) 33 - 36.
- Ngubentombi, S. V. S. (1984). Teacher Education in Transkei: A Critical and Comparative Study of the Evolution of Selected Aspects of its Administrative, Curricular and Course Structures as an Indicator of Future Policy and Planning in the Provision of Teachers. A thesis submitted to satisfy the requirements of Doctor of Philosophy. University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg. (Unpublished).
- Ngubentombi, S. V. S. (1998). Interview with Professor Ngubentombi. (10th June, 1998).
- Noruwana, J. M. (1993). A developing university's perspective on quality assurance. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 7(2), 38 - 41.
- Petty, G. (1993). *Teaching Today: A Practical Guide*. Cheltenham: Stanley Thornes (Publishing).
- Phala, J. M. (1994). Quality management in higher education. *South*

African Journal of Higher Education, 8(2), 37 - 39.

Prior, F. (1995). Criteria for academic programme evaluation and Accreditation in SA technikons. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 9(2), 113 - 125.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELO... QUALITY ASSURANCE (1998)

<http://www.cityu.edu...s/brasd/inqaahe.html>

Rensburg, C. A. J. & Wolvaardt. W. S. (1993). Perspectives on quality assurance at South African technikons. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 7(2), 89 - 93.

Act: Statute of the Republic of South Africa (1997). Higher Education Act. Act No. 101 of 1997.

Robertshaw, D. (1997). Some reflections on the experiences of the Open Learning Institute of Hong Kong.

<http://www.ouhk.edu...website/beijing.htm>

Rubin, A. & Babbie, E. (1993). *Research Methods in Social Work* (2nd ed.). Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Sallis, E. (1997). *Total Quality Management in Education*. London: Kogan Page.

Segers, M, & Dochy, F. (1996). Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Evidence Studies. *Educational Evaluation*, 22(2), 115 - 137.

Silverman, L. & Propst, L. A. (1997). The Quality Professional and the Future. *Human Resource Management*, 12(10), 68 - 69.

Soutar, G. & McNeill, M. (1996). Measuring service quality in a tertiary institution. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 34(1), 72 - 82.

Strydom, A. H. (1993). Future quality assurance in universities in South Africa. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 7(2), 83 - 88.

- Treece, E. W. & Treece, J. W. (1986). *Elements of Research in Nursing* (4th ed.). St Louis: The C. V. Mosby Company.
- University of Transkei, (1990). The Course Outline of the Faculty of Education (unpublished document).
- Wilkin, M. & Sankey, D. (Eds) (1994). *Collaboration and Transition in Initial Teacher Training*. London: Kogan Page.
- Walker, R. (1985). *Doing Research: A Handbook for Teachers*. London: Routledge.
- Wimmer, R. D. & Dominick, J. R. (1983). *Mass Media Research: An Introduction*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Wittrock, M. C. (Ed.) (1986). *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. (3rd ed.) New York: McMillan.

APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE TO IDENTIFY PRINCIPLES FOR FORMULATING A QUALITY ASSURANCE (QA) POLICY OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAMME OF TRANSKEI COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (TCE).

Before responding to the questionnaire, please read the following information - it will take you less than a minute to read:

1. The purpose of this questionnaire is to identify principles that the lecturers think should constitute criteria for a quality assurance system at TCE.
2. You are kindly requested to fill in this questionnaire, and please answer all the questions as honestly as you can.
3. There are no wrong or right answers in this questionnaire.
4. It is not necessary to place your name or sign the questionnaire. The information you provide will be treated in the strictest confidence and will be used for the purpose of this study which is being carried out under the guidance of the University of Natal (Pietermaritzburg).
5. Thank you for your valuable time and input.

PRINCIPLES OF QA FOR AN ACADEMIC PROGRAMME

INSTRUCTION:

Given below are a number of open-ended statements concerning the teacher education programme at TCE. Please read, each statement carefully and respond by giving as much information as possible. The success of this study will depend on the information you provide.

1. Some educationists contend that teacher education programmes should concern themselves with generic (general) skills and competencies, while others feel that the focus must be on specific skills and competencies. What are your views about this?

.....
.....
.....

2. Various authors and theorists think differently about who should be responsible, or involved, in formulating teacher education outcomes. In your professional opinion, who should decide upon or be involved in formulating teacher education outcomes?

.....
.....
.....

- 3.1 In your opinion, what would you regard as the essential outcomes of the teacher education programmes at TCE? Please give as much detail as possible. You may give a list of such outcomes.

.....
.....

.....
.....

3.2 What would you consider to be the essential activities that TCE college lecturers need to engage in to ensure that the outcomes set for their students are achieved?

.....
.....

4.1 What criteria should, TCE as an institution, follow to ensure that college lecturers successfully work towards student teachers' attainment of the outcomes you identified under (3.1) above?

.....
.....
.....

4.2 Who would be responsible for:

4.2.1 putting such measures/criteria in place?

.....

4.2.2 the monitoring process to ensure that the criteria are implemented as planned?.....

.....

4.2.3 reporting on the monitoring process?

.....

5. What should be done with the results of the monitoring process?

.....
.....

APPENDIX II

17 Millar Street

Umtata

2 November 1998

The Rector
Transkei College of Education
Umtata

Dear Sir

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT A STUDY

I am requesting permission to conduct a study among the lecturers of Transkei College of Education. The purpose of the study is to determine the views of the lecturers of Transkei College of Education (TCE) concerning the principles that should guide a quality assurance (QA) policy of the academic programme of the institution.

I have enrolled for a course in the Faculty of Education at the University of Natal (Pietermaritzburg). I am conducting the study as part of the course.

Yours sincerely

MSN Sangoni

APPENDIX III

The following outcomes were each mentioned by one (01) respondent:

- have values;
- producing marketable teachers;
- technological outcomes;
- empowering;
- eligible for all lifelong occupations;
- training and producing teachers that are competent enough to face the challenging needs of a multi-racial South Africa;
- self-employment;
- life skills;
- curriculum designers;
- assessors;
- creative participants in school management;
- good, general and professional conduct;
- teachers who will meet the needs of their different communities;
- ability to discriminate between falsehood and truth, right and wrong;
- produce teachers who are reflective;
- investigative teachers;
- competent educators who can develop the child as a whole being;
- specific skills in methodology;
- how to make learners work at their own pace in a given subject;
- ability to plan, organise and manage not only their activities but themselves as well;
- ability to think and analyse issues.

APPENDIX IV

The following activities were each mentioned by one (01) respondent:

- create an environment that would ensure that the outcomes mentioned are achieved;
- lecturers need to be more informed, committed and assertive;
- more time for student teaching practice;
- need teacher development to keep up with modern methods and skills;
- be exemplary in their teaching;
- should set norms and standards;
- set clear guidelines/objectives which students should be made aware of;
- plan the programme to suit the 21st century;
- motivate students;
- must be enthusiastic;
- must have a patriotic spirit;
- read a lot;
- there should be a follow-up programme whereby lecturers and the former students of TCE meet to discuss progress and difficulties encountered in the field;
- engage in continuous assessment;
- plan the programmes in full consideration of the changes taking place in the education system of South Africa (SA), e. g. change towards Outcomes Based Education (OBE);

- lecturers themselves be well-equipped so that they can be of great benefit to their students who have to acquire these skills;
- consistency;
- be dedicated to the teaching programme;
- ensure that adequate lectures, tasks and assignments are given and assimilated;
- plan and work together;
- formulation of teaching aids;
- communicate freely;
- public speaking;
- build the teacher trainees' confidence and self-concepts;
- deal with the student teachers' learning areas effectively;
- those dealing with the major subjects for instance must work hard to achieve the specific outcomes of the learning areas;
- a specific set of criteria should be used;
- undergo training so that lecturers will in turn be better equipped to help the students with the skills needed for them as future educators;
- grant them the opportunity to be creative;
- set standards and achieve them;
- need to see to it that students do their tasks effectively;
- lecturers must be highly qualified in their areas so that they are better, if not best, critical thinkers and problem solvers;
- to spend as much time as possible with teacher trainees in and out of lecture rooms;
- evaluate on a regular basis;

- they should empower the students with knowledge concerning the subjects that they are doing with the associated teaching skills;
- the student teachers should espouse and live by the values of the teaching profession.

APPENDIX V

The following criteria were cited by one (01) respondent:

- prepare, plan, and organise work;
- at least one and half years of practise in schools;
- lecturers should be conversant with the teacher education programme as a whole so that they are able to guide the student teachers properly;
- allow lecturers to attend courses;
- random visits by heads of departments during lectures;
- checking on quality of test questions, assignments, etc.;
- constant check on class attendance of students and lecturers;
- inculcate a sense of responsibility and commitment in students by basing their teaching on a needs analysis;
- regular seminars focusing on methodology in each of the departments;
- the management, rectors and HOD should work closely together; need to update the lecturers about revised outcomes;
- further study, publications, research;
- lecturers to be treated as academics who can work independently;
- professionals follow and adhere to their mission statements;
- students to be monitored closely to ensure maximum or full participation by all students;
- the college could award certificates to those lecturers who are devoted to their work;
- references/publications on the desired programmes;

- a strong teaching practice programme where professional studies are a priority;
- competence and skills must be nurtured;
- have a practising school;
- the use of learning aids and class activities will facilitate learning and in that way the lecturers objectives may be achieved;
- teachers' centres would be of great help;
- setting up a plan to state objectives and sticking to the plan;
- to choose students who have a calling in teaching by conducting interviews before they are taken as students of the college;
- have college sufficiently equipped and of course tightly secured;
- improve in its technology facilities;
- inculcate the culture of learning and teaching;
- the college must have a well-defined mission statement known by all lecturers. There should be a system of ensuring that everyone involved is dedicated and committed to it;
- there should be a code of conduct for the students and lecturers;
- organise some fundraising so that the necessary material could be bought if the lecturers want the student teachers to understand outcomes based education that is relevant today.