

**Quality assurance practice
in online (web-supported) learning in higher education:
An exploratory study**

**A thesis by
Jill W Fresen**

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Philosophiae Doctor

in the Department of Curriculum Studies

Faculty of Education

University of Pretoria

Supervisor: Prof Dr J.C. Cronjé



2005

ABSTRACT

Keywords: online (web-supported) learning, quality assurance, self-evaluation, client feedback.

The fields of quality assurance in higher education and e-learning, or technology-enhanced learning, are current and topical, yet seldom overlap (Reid, 2003). Higher education institutions are experiencing pressure to become more client focused and compete on the global stage, especially with respect to technology-enhanced learning. We are on the brink of a genuine pedagogical revolution (Moon, 2003) and calls for quality promotion, accountability, self-evaluation, value for money and client satisfaction cannot go unheeded.

Three knowledge domains provide the context for this study: quality assurance, higher education and web-supported learning. Their intersection locates the research problem that was investigated, namely the quality assurance of web-supported learning in higher education.

The research design is an instrumental case study, focusing on web-supported learning as a supportive medium in a flexible, blended learning model at the University of Pretoria, South Africa. The research methods include the literature survey, case analysis meetings, a student survey, lecturer interviews, expert consultation and task teaming.

The conceptual framework for this study (Figure 2.5) is based on the confluence of the existing theories: quality assurance theory, instructional systems design and systems theory. The updated conceptual framework (Figure 7.1) and the synthesized findings (Table 7.1) reflect the holistic nature of the process-based quality management system for web-supported learning that characterises this study.

The value of this study to the academic community is in the findings, which include a taxonomy of critical success factors for web-supported learning, the identification of factors which promote student and lecturer satisfaction (or frustration) with web-

supported learning experiences, and lessons learnt by applying standard quality assurance theory to the instructional design process.

The self-evaluation exercise in an academic support unit provides a precedent and contributes criteria that will be useful to the Higher Education Quality Committee in South Africa, as well as to other higher education institutions.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank sincerely the following people who made valuable contributions to this study and the writing of this research report.

My supervisor, Prof Johannes Cronjé, for his perspicacious and enthusiastic support, suggestions and creativity. He achieved a remarkable reading turnaround time towards the end of this thesis and would ask “What do you have for me to read next?” He pushed me relentlessly to continuous improvement (in the spirit of thorough quality assurance) and to a level of intellectual growth that I never anticipated.

My adviser, Prof Sarah Howie, for her academic rigour, thoroughness and experience in research methodology. Her time, advice and attention to detail were much appreciated.

My dear friend, colleague and voice of wisdom, Lesley Boyd. I thank her for my immersion in knowledge and understanding of the quality movement and quality assurance theory. She was a wise sounding board whenever I was tempted to take short cuts. We collaborated on several research papers and conference presentations and grew together in our search for understanding of quality in e-learning.

My colleagues on the instructional design team in the E-Education Unit at the University of Pretoria. They contributed willingly to the task teams and participated in the evaluation of the quality management system. A special word of thanks to those who conducted some of the Lecturer Experience surveys in their faculties and to the group of critical colleagues who validated the taxonomy of critical success factors. The graphic artists in the Unit assisted with re-drawing some of the figures, where scanned versions were inadequate.

My dear friend, confidante and fellow wine connoisseur, Rinelle Evans, for her succinct remarks with respect to language usage and for her unwavering supply of reference articles that might be applicable to my study.

My long-suffering family, John, Daniel and Anna, who had to handle domestic issues and shoulder additional burdens while I was 'otherwise engaged'. They encouraged and supported me in many ways. Anna proofread the thesis, checked all the references and helped with the printing and collating. Daniel, on the brink of his own postgraduate studies, encouraged my academic aspirations. John's outpouring of creative poems was inspiring, supportive and humorous. He was also my private consulting statistician. *Thank you for all you have done for me and mean to me.*

for e-lady	e-lesson
doing e-work	
on e-lessons	e-nough's
on e-learning	e-nough
e's-slow	e-silly
on e-uptake	e-stuff
of e-offers	
of e-love	e-need
here's e-lesson	e-love
for e-lady	e-me
in e-language	
of e-love	e-mmediately

John Fresen

7 February 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	
1.1	Introduction.....	1
1.2	Problem statement and purpose of this study.....	2
1.3	Research questions.....	4
1.4	Rationale	5
1.5	Beneficiaries of this study	8
1.6	Terminology.....	8
	1.6.1 <i>Learning</i> terminology	9
	1.6.2 <i>Quality</i> terminology	10
1.7	Context	12
	1.7.1 Institutional context	12
	1.7.2 National and global context.....	15
	1.7.2.1 Quality assurance in general.....	16
	1.7.2.2 Higher education	17
	1.7.2.3 Web-supported learning.....	20
1.8	Basic assumptions of this study.....	21
1.9	Limitations of this study.....	22
	1.9.1 Constraints.....	22
	1.9.2 Items outside the scope of this study	23
	1.9.3 Generalisability	23
1.10	Overview of this thesis	24
2.	LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1	Overview of this chapter	26
2.2	Literature sources	27
2.3	Quality in general	28
2.4	Quality Assurance in higher education.....	30
	2.4.1 Quality Assurance and education: perspectives on the debate.....	30
	2.4.2 Quality Assurance as an emerging issue in universities	34
	2.4.3 Quality Assurance in higher education in various countries.....	35
	2.4.4 Quality Assurance in higher education in South Africa	38

2.5	Factors to promote quality WSL.....	43
2.5.1	Classic benchmarks, indicators and principles.....	44
2.5.2	Criteria for exemplary or promising courses.....	48
2.5.3	Meta-analysis: Taxonomy of factors to promote quality web-supported learning	51
2.6	Client satisfaction with web-supported learning	54
2.6.1	Student satisfaction.....	54
2.6.2	Lecturer satisfaction.....	60
2.7	Quality management systems for web-supported learning	63
2.8	Conceptual framework	67
2.9	Summary.....	73
3.	RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	
3.1	Overview of this chapter	77
3.2	Research philosophy	77
3.3	Research design	78
3.3.1	Design choices.....	78
3.3.2	Validity	83
3.3.3	Reliability.....	85
3.4	Research methodology	87
3.4.1	Sampling and participants.....	87
3.4.2	Instruments	89
3.4.3	Procedures.....	91
3.4.4	Data collection	99
3.4.5	Data analysis	102
3.4.6	Justification for and limitations of the research methodology	105
3.5	Summary.....	108
4.	FINDINGS: FACTORS TO PROMOTE QUALITY WEB-SUPPORTED LEARNING	
4.1	Overview of this chapter	111
4.2	Corroboration by recent publications	112
4.2.1	The Sloan-C framework	112
4.2.2	Methodological framework for online teaching and learning	115

4.2.3	Pedagogical framework	117
4.2.4	Importance of the Institute for Higher Education Policy study (2000).117	
4.2.5	Brief overview of the findings of other studies.....	119
4.3	Extension and re-organisation of the taxonomy	120
4.4	Answer to research question 1.....	126
4.5	Summary	129
5.	FINDINGS: STUDENT SURVEY AND LECTURER INTERVIEWS	
5.1	Overview of this chapter	131
5.2	Student survey	132
5.2.1	Demographic and usage results	133
5.2.2	Frustration Index	135
5.2.3	Factors contributing to student frustration with web-supported learning	138
5.2.4	Satisfaction Index.....	144
5.2.5	Factors contributing to student satisfaction with web-supported learning	146
5.2.6	Analysis of open questions	150
5.3	Lecturer interviews.....	153
5.3.1	Findings from closed questions.....	153
5.3.2	Findings from open questions	159
5.3.3	Factors contributing to lecturer satisfaction with web-supported learning	162
5.3.4	Suggestions for refinement of the instrument.....	163
5.4	Summary.....	164
6.	FINDINGS: PROCESS-BASED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	
6.1	Introduction	168
6.2	Overview of methodology	170
6.3	Findings	171
6.3.1	Lesson 1: Instructional design model.....	171
6.3.2	Lesson 2: Analysis and evaluation phases	173
6.3.3	Lesson 3: Quality assurance training	178
6.3.4	Lesson 4: Doubts about usefulness of the QMS	181

6.3.5	Lesson 5: Reflection on own practice	183
6.3.6	Lesson 6: Guidance for lecturers	185
6.3.7	Lesson 7: Unrealistic expectations.....	187
6.3.8	Lesson 8: Auditable artifacts of an ISO 9000-compliant QMS	189
6.4	The formal QMS.....	193
6.4.1	Synthesis of lessons learnt and artifacts produced	193
6.4.2	Analysis of the online QMS and its early use	195
6.4.3	Benefits of the QMS	198
6.5	Summary.....	199
7.	REFLECTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
7.1	Overview of this chapter	202
7.2	Summary of this research	202
7.2.1	Research question 1	204
7.2.2	Research question 2	205
7.2.3	Research question 3	208
7.3	Synthesis	209
7.3.1	Summary of findings	209
7.3.2	Updated conceptual framework	214
7.4	Discussion and reflection	217
7.4.1	Methodological reflection	217
7.4.2	Substantive reflection.....	220
7.4.3	Scientific reflection	225
7.4.4	Reflection on the exploratory journey.....	226
7.5	Recommendations	228
7.5.1	Recommendations for policy and practice	228
7.5.2	Recommendations for further research.....	230
7.6	Conclusion	233
	REFERENCES	235
	APPENDICES.....	261

Appendix A	Five interpretations of the construct <i>quality</i> (summarised from Harvey & Green, 1993)261
Appendix B	Overview of established theories that support the conceptual framework for this study263
	B1 Quality assurance theory264
	B2 Instructional systems design theory264
	B3 Systems theory265
Appendix C	Frameworks for quality teaching and learning with respect to web-supported learning268
	C1 Standards and Guidelines for best practices in (technology enhanced) distance education269
	C2 Twenty four benchmarks (IHEP, 2000)272
	C3 Quality indicators (Barker, 1999)273
	C4 Seven Principles (Chickering & Ehrmann, 1996)276
	C5 Criteria for WebCT Exemplary Courses (Graf & Caines, 2001)278
	C6 Criteria for USA Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) (Confrey, Sabelli & Sheingold, 2002)279
	C7 Ten Keys (Alley, 2000)281
	C8 Pedagogical framework (Herrington et al., 2001)284
	C9 Five pillars (Bourne & Moore, 2002)285
	C10 Taxonomy of factors to promote quality web-supported learning287
	C11 Overview of factors for quality web-supported learning found by other studies289
Appendix D	Student Survey292
	D1 WebCT Experience Questionnaire393
	D2 Data format, coding and transformation297
	D3 Coding frame for open questions305
	D4 Coding of open questions307
	D5 Items contributing to the Technical Adequacy (TA) Index308
	D6 Items contributing to the Education Support (ES) Index311
	D7 Items contributing to the Affective Domain (AD) Index312

D8	Items contributing to the Communication Tools (CI) Index314
D9	Items contributing to the Perceived Learning (PL) Index315
Appendix E	Lecturer Interviews317
E1	Lecturer Experience and Satisfaction interview schedule318
E2	Samples of data from open questions322
Appendix F	Artifacts in the Quality Management System (QMS) for web-supported learning326
F1	Project Timeline (versions 1 and 6)327
F2	Needs Analysis Checklist329
F3	Template for a procedure331
F4	Example of a completed procedure333
F5	Sanity Checks (Boyd, 2003)335
F6	Guiding Questions (Boyd, 2003)336
F7	Minimum Requirements for web-supported courses338
F8	Roles and Responsibilities341
F9	Service Level Agreement with lecturers344
F10	Quality Pledge349
F11	Master Document List350



LIST OF ACRONYMS

ADDIE	Instructional Design Model: Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, Evaluation
AIS	Academic Information Service (Library) at the University of Pretoria
ALN	Asynchronous Learning Networks
ASQ	American Society for Quality
ASTD	American Society for Training and Development
BSI	British Standards Institute
BEM	Business Excellence Model
CBE	Computer-Based Education
CHE	Council on Higher Education
CMC	Computer-mediated Communication
CUP	Committee for University Principals
EFMD	European Foundation for Management Development
EFQM	European Foundation for Quality Management
ELIP	E-Learning Quality Improvement Programme
ETD	Education, Training and Development
ETQAs	Education and Training Quality Assurance bodies
EQO	European Quality Observatory
FOTIM	Foundation of Tertiary Institutions of the Northern Metropolis
HEQC	Higher Education Quality Committee
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
IHEP	Institute for Higher Education Policy
ID	Instructional Design
ISD	Instructional Systems Design
IT	Information Technology
IR	Information Retrieval
LMS	Learning Management System
NADEOSA	National Association for Distance Education of South Africa
NCHE	National Commission on Higher Education
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
NSBs	National Standards Bodies
ODL	Open and Distance Learning
QA	Quality Assurance
QC	Quality Control

QMS	Quality Management System
QPU	Quality Promotion Unit
SA(B)EM	South African (Business) Excellence Model
SAEF	South African Excellence Foundation
SAIDE	South African Institute for Distance Education
SAQA	South African Qualifications Authority
SAQI	South African Quality Institute
SAUVCA	South African Universities Vice Chancellors' Association
SERTEC	Certification Council for Technikon Education
SGBs	Standards Generating Bodies
SLA	Service Level Agreement
SNQAF	SAUVCA National Quality Assurance Forum
SSM	Soft Systems Methodology
TLEI	Department of Telematic Learning and Education Innovation
TQM	Total Quality Management
UNISA	University of South Africa
UP	University of Pretoria
VLE	Virtual Learning Environment (used in the UK synonymously with LMS)
WSL	Web-Supported Learning

LIST OF TABLES

2.1	Seven principles of Chickering & Gamson (1987) applied by Chickering & Ehrmann (1996) to online environments47
2.2	Some categories commonly used to classify guidelines or best practices52
2.3	Taxonomy of factors to promote quality web-supported learning53
2.4	Motivating and inhibiting factors for faculty members to participate in technology-enhanced distance education (from Schifter, 2000)60
2.5	Lecturer perceptions of online learning (from Shea et al., 2002)61
<hr/>		
3.1	Research strategies with respect to the research questions81
3.2	Lecturer Experience and Satisfaction interviews conducted88
3.3	Student WebCT experience questionnaire: sample of html data100
3.4	Categories classified according to the implication of either frustration or satisfaction103
<hr/>		
4.1	Additional quality indicators listed by academic staff (Yeung, 2002)119
4.2	Expanded taxonomy122
4.3	Underlying assumptions and exogenous factors forming the foundation of the taxonomy124
4.4	Resulting taxonomy of factors to promote quality web-supported learning125
<hr/>		
5.1	Age distribution of respondents133
5.2	Sources of student support134
5.3	Response to 'good memory' requirement135
5.4	Cross tabulation of Student CD-Rom and Student Training141
5.5	Frequencies for Positive comments151
5.6	Frequencies for Negative comments152
5.7	Frequencies for Suggestions152
5.8	Lecturers' assessment of the value of the e-learning component154
5.9	Lecturers' use of the communication tools in WebCT155
5.10	WebCT staff training courses attended157
5.11	Level of satisfaction with services rendered158
5.12	Summary of problems experienced160
5.13	Summary of benefits gained161
5.14	Summary of lessons learnt161

6.1	Reporting structure for findings: research question 3171
6.2	Lessons learnt and the resulting artifacts in the QMS194
7.1	Synthesis of research questions and their findings211



LIST OF FIGURES

1.1	Web-supported learning is a subset of e-learning9
1.2	Role players in web-supported learning in terms of products and processes14
1.3	Knowledge domains forming the context of this study15
1.4	Overview of this thesis25
<hr/>		
2.1	Plan for the literature review27
2.2	Legislative structures within South African higher education41
2.3	Established theories informing the conceptual framework for this study67
2.4	ISO 9001 model of a process-based quality management system (SABS, 2000)68
2.5	Conceptual framework: A process-based quality management system for web-supported learning70
<hr/>		
3.1	Elements of a quality management system (Boyd 2001b – adapted from Waller, Allen & Burns, 1993)96
3.2	Paper based procedure names according to the project timeline98
3.3	Home page of the quality management system (2002)102
<hr/>		
4.1	Mapping between Sloan-C framework, the research questions and the taxonomy of factors for quality web-supported learning126
4.2	Simplification of Ingwersen's (1996) cognitive model of IR interaction127
4.3	Graphic interpretation of the taxonomy for quality web-supported learning mapped onto Ingwersen's (1996) cognitive model of IR128
<hr/>		
5.1	Distribution of Internet browsers used by students134
5.2	Distribution of the Frustration Index136
5.3	Categories for the Frustration Index136
5.4	Ideal shape of an inversely proportional graph137
5.5	Categories for the Technical Adequacy Index138
5.6	Categories for the Educational Support Index140
5.7	Categories for the Affective Domain Index142
5.8	Distribution of the Satisfaction Index144
5.9	Categories for the Satisfaction Index144
5.10	Ideal shape of a directly proportional graph145
5.11	Categories for the Communication Tools Index146

5.12	Categories for Perceived Learning Index147
5.13	Box plots of the conditional distribution of the Satisfaction Index (SI) for each given value of the Frustration Index (FI)149
5.14	Lecturer satisfaction with service levels of TLEI and AIS158
6.1	Icons indicating mandatory or optional supporting documents180
6.2	Home page of the final online QMS183
7.1	Quality assurance of web-supported learning216



LIST OF EXHIBITS

3.1	Interaction with critical colleagues93
5.1	Sample of open responses in html format150
5.2	Qualifying remarks made by respondents155
5.3	Positive comments on services rendered159
6.1	Tabular timeline172
6.2	Lack of an instructional design model in the E-Education Unit172
6.3	The analysis phase was not done by instructional designers174
6.4	Lack of student access to technology174
6.5	Low student numbers175
6.6	The summative evaluation phase was not done by instructional designers176
6.7	Should web-supported learning products be evaluated according to the achievement of student learning outcomes?177
6.8	Booking the first QMS Steering Team meeting, February 2003179
6.9	Preparation for QMS Steering Team meeting179
6.10	Confidential discussion181
6.11	No time for implementation training182
6.12	Pressure of development takes precedence184
6.13	Basic requirements for a web-supported course185
6.14	What about scanning and copyright?186
6.15	Clarity on roles and responsibilities186
6.16	Immediate service expected by some lecturers188
6.17	SLA is now to be enforced189
6.18	Requirements for a quality policy190
6.19	Document control conventions191
6.20	Need for a master document list191
6.21	Referring a designer to the guidelines in the QMS196
6.22	Referring other designers to the standards in the QMS197

LIST OF TERMINOLOGY

Asynchronous Learning Networks (ALN)	“Asynchronous learning networks (ALN) – an important variant within what is commonly known as ‘online learning’ or ‘e-learning’ – emphasizes computer and Internet technologies to facilitate interactive communication between an instructor(s) and students in an online environment” (Lorenzo & Moore, 2002, p. 3).
Benchmarking	Benchmarking is “a means of establishing ‘good’ and ‘best’ practice to diagnose problems and see oneself in the mirror of ‘best’ practice elsewhere. The central purpose is to provide an external reference for evaluating quality, cost-effectiveness of activities and processes” (Schofield, cited by Ogunrinade, 2000, p. 141).
Blended learning	Blended learning is a mixed methodology of traditional, face-to-face classroom sessions, and remote asynchronous learning sessions where material is made available and interaction takes place in a virtual learning environment (Whaymand, 2004).
Computer-based education	The use of a computer, whether standalone or networked, to manage and access large amounts of information and present it in a novel, interactive and interesting way (Volery & Lord, 2000).
Distance education Distance learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distance education covers the various forms of study at all levels, which are not under the continuous immediate supervision of tutors present with their students in lecture rooms or on the same premises. Students nevertheless, benefit from the planning, guidance and teaching of a supporting organisation (Holmberg, 1995). • Distance learning refers to learning environments centering upon the physical separation of the learner, or a group of learners, from the source of learning (Kochtanek & Hein, 2000). • “Distance learning can be defined as any approach to education delivery that replaces the same-time, same-place, face-to-face environment of a traditional classroom” (Volery & Lord, 2000, p. 217).
Distributed learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distributed learning describes a learning community with multiple sources of information, including the students themselves. “The focus is not so much on delivery mechanisms as it is on learning experiences and resources in support of student interactions and learning” (Kochtanek & Hein, 2000, p. 282). • A blended model, incorporating asynchronous, synchronous, face-to-face sessions, and a heavy reliance on technology and self-learning on the part of the student (Volery & Lord, 2000).

e-learning e-education	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The design, development and delivery of technology-enhanced learning experiences, using a variety of media, for example web-based (online), computer-based (multimedia CD-Roms), interactive television broadcasting, audio- and video-tape, video conferencing.• Instructional content or learning experiences delivered or enabled by electronic technology. It includes a variety of learning strategies and technologies (American Society for Training and Development, n.d.).• “e-Learning is content, tasks, problems and most importantly feedback and collaboration, mediated through a networked computer” (Reeves, 2001, workshop).
Flexible learning	<p>The creation of student-oriented teaching and learning environments, which allow the student flexibility in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• entrance to and exit from the learning programme;• modes in which teaching and learning take place;• programme compilation;• assessment methods;• time and place of study;• pace at which learning occurs. <p>(University of Pretoria, 1998).</p>
Formative evaluation (in Instructional Design)	<p>“Formative evaluation is a judgement of the strengths and weaknesses of instruction in its developing stages, for purposes of revising the instruction to improve its effectiveness and appeal” (Tessmer, 1993, p. 11).</p>
Instructional Design	<p>The art of designing instructional interventions that promote student cognition, learning, interaction and performance - putting yourself in the shoes of the student, anticipating their difficulties, accommodating different learning styles, offering meaningful learning activities, all in order to enhance the achievement of the desired learning outcomes.</p>
Online / web-based learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use of the Internet and the World Wide Web (WWW) to deliver interactive learning experiences to students, independent of distance, time and place. This includes both synchronous and asynchronous modes of interaction.• “Any learning that uses the Internet to deliver some form of instruction to a learner or learners separated by time, distance or both. Online learning may occur among people scattered across the globe or among co-workers at a single facility via corporate intranets and local area networks (LANs). What defines online learning is the use of network communications systems as the delivery medium” (Reiser & Dempsey, 2002, p. 283).

Open learning	Open learning means that the learner has a certain degree of choice with respect to entry criteria, time, pace and place of learning. Learners can work through an open learning programme on their own, and make choices to suit their life style and learning styles (Race, 1989).
Prototype	A prototype is a “preliminary version or a model of all or part of a system before full commitment is made to develop it” (Smith, p. 42, quoted by Nieveen, 1999, p. 128).
Quality Assurance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A planned and systematic set of procedures which are designed to build quality into a product or service, that is, to carry it out correctly the first time (Boyd, 2001b). • “Quality Assurance is about ensuring that there are mechanisms, procedures and processes in place to ensure that the desired quality, however defined and measured, is delivered” (Harvey & Green, 1993, p. 21).
Quality Control	A procedure for checking work after it is done and then correcting it if faulty (Boyd, 2001b).
Quality Management System (QMS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “A quality management system can be defined as a system designed to manage the continuous improvement of all processes in an organisation in order to meet customer expectations” (Meyer, cited by Fourie, 2000, p. 51). • “A quality management system is the sum of the activities and information an organisation uses to enable it to better and more consistently deliver products and services that meet and exceed the needs and expectations of its customers and beneficiaries, more cost effectively and cost efficiently, today and in the future” (SAQA, 2001b, p. 9).
Six Sigma	A recent and popular (in the USA) quality improvement methodology, based on statistical methods (Hoerl, 2002).
System	“A system is defined as a set of two or more interrelated elements of any kind. It is not an ultimate indivisible element but a whole that can be divided into parts” (Fourie, 2000, p. 52).
Telematic learning	The University of Pretoria extends the semantic definition of the word ‘telematic’ (<i>tele</i> – over a distance; <i>matic</i> – by means of) to incorporate a flexible learning model delivered through a variety of media and enhanced by technology (Fresen, 2002).

Total Quality Management (TQM)

A holistic management philosophy which harnesses the efforts of everyone in the organisation to achieve continuous improvement (Fresen, 2002).

“It is a philosophy with a number of practical suggestions for its own self-perpetuation and implementation. Essentially it is a philosophy that can be simply summed up as ‘doing things properly’ in order to maximize competitiveness and profit” (Harvey & Green, 1993, p. 30).

“Total Quality Management focuses on achieving quality and can be defined as a philosophy and a set of guiding principles that intend to meet and exceed the needs and expectations of various external and internal customers” (Steyn, 2000, p. 175).

“TQM is an approach to improve the competitiveness, effectiveness and flexibility of an entire organisation. It is essentially a way of planning, organising and understanding every activity in the organisation and depends on each individual at all levels within the organisation” (Smit, 2001, p. 50).

