CHAPTER SIX

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

In Chapter Five, the purpose of the study, content validation of measuring instruments, sampling methods, the use of the questionnaire and open-ended interviews as methods of data collection, as well as the research approach, were discussed. Descriptive and inferential statistics, such as factor analysis and analysis of variance, were also described as statistical procedures for data analysis. In this chapter, the analysis and interpretation of the results are provided. More specifically, the following aspects of the study are dealt with in detail:

- A discussion of the five factors identified in this study;
- The interpretation of data obtained on items associated with the impact of the READ programme on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies;
- A discussion of the significance of differences between the factor means of the group for each of the factors that contribute to the impact of the READ programme on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies; and
- A discussion of the results of the qualitative study.

Data collected using the questionnaire was captured for analysis using the Microsoft (MS) EXCEL computer programme. MS-EXCEL is a spreadsheet program that allows quality control checks to be set so that the data captured has minimal errors. Data captured by MS-EXCEL can be easily converted to various statistical programmes (such as SPSS and SAS) for analysis. The data were then cleaned of errors and prepared for further application by the SAS program as part of the statistical analysis. Initially, descriptive statistical techniques were applied to describe the sample of educators and to lay the foundation for the testing of the hypotheses for the study. Inferential statistics, such as Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), are used to test for differences or relationships among key variables. A principal component factor analysis with a Varimax rotation was used to identify the underlying factors among the items (questions) in the educator questionnaire. Other statistical procedures used are explained where appropriate. These results are presented and discussed in the following sections.

Table 6.1 Biographical information of the educators who participated in the investigation

Personal characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Gender (V3)		
Male	41	27.3
Female	109	72.7
Total	150	100
Age Category (V4)		
Less than 30 years	9	6.0
30-39 Years	52	34.7
40-49 Years	66	44.0
50-59 Years	21	14.0
60+ Years	2	1.3
Total	150	100
Teaching Experience (V5)		
≤ 10 years	56	37.3
> 10 years	94	62.7
Total	150	100
Educational qualifications (V6)		
< Grade 12	2	1.3
Grade 12	6	4.0
Post School diploma	64	42.7
B-Degree	29	19.3
Honours Degree only	15	10.0
Honours degree plus diploma/certificate	23	15.3
Masters or doctorate degree only	4	2.7
Masters or doctorate degree plus a Teacher's Diploma/Certificate	7	4.7
Total	150	100

Forty four percent of the respondents fell into the 40-49 years age category, followed by those in the 30-39 year category (34.7%). Only a few were older than 50 years (15.3%), while the smallest proportion of educators was under 30 years of age.

Age might affect the participation of Grade 4 language educators in training and development programmes such as those offered by organizations such as READ Educational Trust. For instance, older educators might show little interest in training and development programmes because they are basically at the sunset of their careers and are

therefore no longer interested in further staff development. On the other hand, younger educators might be energetic and enthusiastic to learn more to further their careers. This might also impact on the manner in which language programmes such as those offered by READ are implemented at the school level. The above finding suggests that the majority of Grade 4 language educators fall within the "30 to 49" years category. This finding could also influence their perception of the READ programme as they are still capable of implementing it more effectively.

With regard to teaching experience, the majority of Grade 4 language educators in this sample (62.7%) had been teaching for over ten years with only 37.3% of the respondents having teaching experience less than ten years.

When compared according to their highest qualifications, about 42.7% of the educators had a general qualification of M+3 (post school diploma) while 19.3% were graduates. About 1.3% of Grade 4 language educators have not attained matric, while 4.7% have masters or doctoral degrees plus a teaching diploma. The findings suggest that Grade 4 language educators in general are well qualified to implement the READ programmes in primary schools.

In addition to the analysis and interpretation of the qualitative results, a discussion of the qualitative results is presented in this chapter. A discussion and probable explanation of significant differences between the variables is also dealt with in the sixth chapter.

6.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EDUCATION PHASES, LEARNING AREAS TAUGHT AND LANGUAGE USED FOR INSTRUCTION BY GRADE 4 EDUCATORS

The distribution of Grade 4 educators by the education phase taught and other factors is presented in Table 6.2 below. This table shows that the highest proportion of respondents (68.7%) teach English language at the Intermediate Phase (which includes Grade 4 level), while 15.3% teach at the Foundation Phase, and 16.0% at the Senior Phase.

Given that the programme being evaluated in this study involved writing skills, it was encouraging to find that the highest proportion of Grade 4 educators teach the Languages learning area (32.0%). The distribution of the other learning areas offered is also provided in Table 6.2.

When asked to indicate the language they used for instruction, it was found that 62.0% of the Grade 4 language educators use English as a language of instruction. However, other South African languages are also commonly used for instruction in Grade 4. Details presented in Table 6.2 show that educators use Sepedi (10.7%), Xitsonga (8.7%), Afrikaans (6.0%), Tshivenda (4.7%), Isindebele and Setswana (2.7%), Isiswati (2.0%) and Isizulu (0.7%). Table 6.2 presents the descriptive statistics of education phase, learning area taught, and language used for instruction by Grade 4 educators.

Table 6.2 Descriptive statistics of education phases, learning areas taught and language used for instruction by Grade 4 educators

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Education Phase taught (V8)		
Foundation Phase	23	15.3
Intermediate Phase	103	68.7
Senior Phase	24	16.0
Total	150	100
Learning Areas (V7)		
Communication, Literacy & Language	48	32.0
Numeracy	10	6.67
Social Sciences	16	10.7
Natural Sciences	17	11.3
Arts and Culture	11	7.33
Economic and Management Sciences	16	10.7
Life Orientation	20	13.3
Technology	12	8.0
Total	150	100
Language of instruction used (V9)		
Afrikaans	9	6.0
English	93	62.0
Isiswati	3	2.0
Isindebele	4	2.6
Sepedi	16	10.7
Xitsonga	13	8.7
Tshivenda	7	4.7
Setswana	4	2.7
Isizulu	1	0.6
Total	150	100

Table 6.2 above indicates that more than 30% of the educators surveyed were not teaching in the Intermediate Phase. The reason for this is that primary school educators also do subject teaching and they were not given the opportunity to mention more than one option. Basically, this is a limitation of the questionnaire as a data collection tool because it did not make provision for the respondents to make mention of more than one option. The same reason applies to the 70% of Grade 4 educators who appears as if they were not teaching the Languages learning area. In the light of this explanation, one would

say that all the respondents were actually involved in the implementation of READ's training programmes in schools.

The respondents' involvement in the implementation of READ's training programmes was also confirmed by the findings of the qualitative research. The same respondents who participated in the quantitative study were involved in the qualitative research and they clearly indicated that they were teaching the Languages learning area at the Intermediate Phase.

The data in Table 6.2 also indicate that 62% of educators used English as a medium of instruction. In fact, all Grade 4 language educators were expected to implement the READ programme in English as language development was the underlying objective of the programme of interest, however, is that both the literature review in the second chapter and the findings of the qualitative research clearly shows that the majority of Grade 4 educators mentioned that English as a medium of instruction is a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes in schools.

Table 6.3 below indicates the distribution of Grade 4 educators by type of school, post level held and their classification of learners' writing skills.

Table 6.3 Distribution of Grade 4 educators by type of school, post level held and classification of learners' writing skills

Personal characteristic	Frequency	Percent
Type of school (V10)		
Primary school	119	79.9
Combined school	30	20.1
Total	149	100
Post Level (V11)		
Principal	12	8.0
Deputy Principal	19	12.7
Head of Department	39	26.0
Educator	80	53.3
Total	150	100
Medium of instruction (V12)		
English	134	89.3
Afrikaans	16	10.7
Total	150	100
Classification of level of grade 4 learners' writing skills (V13)		
Excellent	46	30.7
Good	81	54.0
Average	23	15.3
Total	150	100

* Missing frequency=1

Participation in the READ programme would have been negatively affected if educators had too many other responsibilities. The results indicated that 53.3 % were serving as educators, 26% as Heads of Department, 12.7% as Deputy Principals and 8% as School Principals. It appears that 20% of the educators were either Principals or Deputy Principals. This might have affected the general implementation of READ's training programmes as these educators were involved in other management activities, which could also have impacted on their perceptions of the READ language programme.

Asked about their own personal assessment of the level of writing competence amongst their learners, about 30.7% of Grade 4 language educators classified the level of the learners' writing skills as excellent, 54% as good and 15.3% as average. Interestingly, none of the educators classified the level of Grade 4 learners' writing skills as poor. It

appears that Grade 4 educators rated the impact of READ's training programmes on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies from 'average' to 'excellent'.

A discussion of the results of the factor analysis is presented in the next section.

6.3 REPORTING AND DISCUSSING THE RESULTS OF THE FACTOR ANALYSIS

For the purpose of this study, factor analysis was designed to help the researcher answer the first research question, namely what is the impact of a teaching and learning programme intervention offered by service providers such as READ Educational Trust on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies and what influence does it have on the classroom practices and professional development of educators who were involved in the application of such programmes?

A principal component factor analysis procedure with a Varimax rotation was applied. Discussion of the factor analysis procedure is provided in the methodology chapter. The items that had the highest loading on each factor were identified and are presented in Table 6.4 below. The description of the factors is done using the content of each item that is loaded on a given factor. The first sub-section deals with outcomes of the first order (generation) factor analysis.

6.3.1 Outcomes of the First Order (Generation) Factor Analysis

A first order factor analysis was done as an exploratory procedure to identify all the potential factors. Initially a twelve-factor solution was obtained. According to the correlation matrix of the rotated factor patterns of the 68 items, it appeared that the responses of educators could best fit into twelve diverse clusters or categories. The twelve isolated factors explained close to 38.06 percent of the total variance and produced eigenvalues of 18.30, 4.59, 2.57, 2.28, 1.75, 1.56, 1.39, 1.24, 1.18, 1.15, 1.03 and 1.01 respectively. The scree test as well as the calculated Eigenvalues confirmed the dominance of the twelve factors, which are:

- Factor 1: Impact of READ's programme on language teaching and learning;
- Factor 2: Acquisition of writing skills;
- Factor 3: Impact of programme on staff development;
- Factor 4: Availability of school resources;
- Factor 5: School effectiveness and language teaching and learning;

- Factor 6: Impact of programme on school climate;
- Factor 7: Language learning;
- Factor 8: Lack of school resources;
- Factor 9: School rating in terms of language development;
- Factor 10: Application of language skills;
- Factor 11: The relationship between school resources and performance; and
- Factor 12: Management support.

A description of the twelve factors is presented in Table 6.4.

Table 6.4 Description of the factors (1st order factor analysis)

Factor	Items with highest loadings	Description
1	V17, V19, V21, V14, V30, V22, V29, V15, V39, V28, V27, V26, V49	Impact of programme on language teaching and learning
2	V41, V42, V45, V37, V34, V38, V36, V40	Acquisition of writing skills
3	V35, V25, V20, V24, V56, V16, V32, V18, V51, V44	Impact of programme on staff development
4	V63, v64, v62, v68, v65	Availability of school resources
5	V60, V52, V59, V48, V58	School effectiveness and language teaching and learning
6	V57, V53, V55, V33	Impact of programme on school climate
7	V46, V47, V43	Language learning
8	V66, V67	Lack of school resources
9	V61, V70	School rating in terms of language teaching and learning
10	V23, V54	Application of language skills
11	V69, V50	The relationship between school resources and performance
12	V36, V31	Management support

Table 6.5 indicates the amount of variance explained by each of the twelve factors revealed by the first order factor analysis. These twelve factors explained close to 38.05 percent of the total variance. Details are presented in Table 6.5.

Table 6.5 The Variance Explained, Eigenvalues and Cronbach's alpha for the Twelve Factors

Factor	Variance explained	Eigenvalue	Cronbach's Alpha
1	18.298	18.2983232	0.907
2	4.588	4.5880186	0.882
3	2.567	2.5668975	0.891
4	2.288	2.2884780	0.724
5	1.752	1.7523514	0.795
6	1.557	1.5571210	0.782
7	1.386	1.3857449	0.702
8	1.245	1.2453276	0.755
9	1.183	1.1830277	0.671
10	1.147	1.1468097	0.573
11	1.033	1.0333787	0.297
12	1.011	1.0108099	0.517

Based on the outcomes of the first order (generation) factor analysis, a decision was taken to extract only five factors using the same factor extraction and rotation procedures.

6.3.2 Outcomes of the Second Order (Generation) Factor Analysis

An item was allowed to be associated with only one of the factors by selecting the items in each factor that had the highest loading. A scree plot that graphically indicated the main factors was used to interpret the results. Details of the loading of each item to its respective factor are summarized in Table 6.4, and each factor is described in Table 6:6.

Varimax Rotation (Rotated factor loadings representing five factors)

Table 6.6 Results of the second order Principal Component factor analysis

Item number and description	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
V14 Impact of READ's language programmes on language teaching	0.769	-0.141	-0.041	-0.097	-0.011
V15 Correlation between READ's method of training and the improvement of language teaching skills	0.662	0.205	0.124	0.089	0.145
V16 Relationship between READ's course content and language development	0.688	0.159	-0.048	0.183	0.047
V17 Impact of READ's language programme on Grade 4 educator's ability to use assessment skills	0.632	0.195	0.041	0.073	-0.036
V19 Impact of READ's training programme on personnel development	0.635	-0.030	0.293	0.059	-0.079
V20 Correlation between READ's training programme educator's professional growth	0.725	-0.193	0.032	0.034	0.096
V21 Attendance of READ's workshop and of language development	0.582	0.214	-0.177	-0.050	0.170
V24 Relationship between READ's language programme and the quality of language teaching	0.583	0.108	-0.078	-0.106	0.237
V25 Impact of READ's language programme on the improvement of vocabulary	0.552	0.352	-0.040	0.030	0.221
V27 Impact on READ's language programme on the acquisition of writing skills	0.505	0.385	0.012	-0.023	0.304
V28 Impact on READ's language programmes on Grade 4 learners ability to write words	0.501	0.293	0.147	0.042	0.257
V30 Impact of READ's language programmes on the development writing skills	0.587	0.162	-0.058	0.019	0.280
V31 Impact of READ's language programmes on Grade 4 learner's writing competences	0.585	0.273	0.104	0.075	0.055
V50 Relationship between READ's language programme and the improvement of language teaching	0.612	0.127	0.094	-0.203	0.200
V51 Impact of READ's language programme on the overall improvement of language teaching	0.509	0.171	0.048	-0.099	0.576
V52 Relationship between READ's language programme and educator performance in terms of language teaching	0.408	0.410	0.177	-0.026	0.309
V56 Impact of READ's language programme on the creation of a positive classroom atmosphere	0.631	0.151	-0.040	-0.042	0.337
V22 Impact of READ's training programmes on Grade 4 language educator's ability to use assessment techniques	0.710	0.238	-0.167	-0.023	0.016
V68 READ's language programme has contributed to excellent language development	0.533	0.203	0.188	-0.052	0.367
V34 Impact of READ's language programme on Grade 4 learner's ability to write meaningful paragraphs	0.324	0.655	0.047	0.141	0.026
V35 Impact of READ's language programme on Grade 4 learner's ability to use prepositions correctly in the writing process	0.287	0.558	0.096	0.166	0.263
V36 Impact of READ's language programmes on Grade 4 learner's ability to use adjectives correctly in the writing process	0.312	0.604	0.001	0.180	0.009
V37 Impact of READ's language programme on Grade 4 learner's ability to use pronouns correctly in the writing process	0.362	0.655	0.029	0.004	0.094
V38 Impact of READ's language programme on Grade 4 learner's ability to use the adverbs correctly in the writing process	0.142	0.639	0.058	0.109	0.402
V40 Impact of READ's language programmes on Grade 4 learner's ability to use punctuation marks correctly in sentences	0.300	0.592	0.042	0.016	0.053
V41 Impact of READ's language programme on Grade 4 learner's ability to differentiate between proper nouns and pronouns	0.235	0.782	0.068	0.069	-0.037
V42 Impact of READ's language programme on Grade 4 learner's ability to know prepositions and adjectives	0.069	0.740	-0.013	-0.098	-0.144
V54 Management support	0.101	0.586	0.192	-0.087	0.299
V57 School climate is conducive to language teaching	0.107	0.535	0.110	-0.254	0.022
V58 Our school is the most effective in terms of language teaching in the province	0.135	0.567	0.390	0.135	0.275
V59 Our school is more effective than most schools in the province	0.256	0.498	0.453	0.062	0.018

V70 READ's language programme worsened language development in class	-0.148	0.308	0.042	0.654	-0.237
Item number and description	**Factor 1**	**Factor 2**	**Factor 3**	**Factor 4**	**Factor 5**
V26 Impact of READ's language programme on language development in general	0.588	0.350	0.087	0.111	0.048
V29 Relationship between READ's training programmes and staff development	-0.036	0.229	0.673	-0.017	0.258
V32 Impact on READ's language programme on the improvement on Grade 4 learner's handwriting	0.530	0.072	0.488	0.123	0.181
V33 Impact of READ's language programmes on Grade 4 learner's ability to write and design texts	-0.021	0.186	0.740	-0.014	0.072
V39 Impact on READ's language programme on language development	0.051	0.248	0.612	-0.030	0.251
V43 Impact of READ's language programme on Grade 4 learner's ability to give opinions and express feelings in writing	0.144	0.227	0.694	0.031	-0.134
V44 Impact of READ's language programmes on Grade 4 learner's writing competences	0.067	0.190	0.728	-0.067	-0.008
V45 Impact on READ's language programme on Grade 4 learners ability to write stories	0.270	0.116	0.728	0.006	0.053
V47 Impact of READ's language programmes on the development of writing skills	-0.062	0.083	0.610	0.163	0.245
V48 Relationship between READ's language programme and the mastery of writing skills	0.578	0.227	0.346	-0.100	0.198
V49 Impact of READ's language programme on Grade 4 learner's performance in writing	0.459	0.243	0.352	-0.017	0.054
V18 Correlation between READ's language programme and professional growth	0.011	0.108	0.611	0.115	0.177
V23 Impact of READ's training programme and educator's ability to apply the acquired teaching skills	-0.051	0.213	-0.034	0.654	-0.155
V46 Impact of READ's language programme on Grade 4 learner's ability to do sequencing.	0.034	0.263	0.213	0.494	0.011
V53 Correlation between educator involvement in READ's training programmes and the improvement of language teaching	-0.147	0.179	0.117	0.561	-0.089
V55 Impact of READ's language programme on the creation of a positive classroom environment	0.550	-0.091	0.087	0.395	0.027
V61 Our school is less effective than most schools in the province	-0.041	0.030	0.404	0.459	0.482
V62 Our school is amongst the least effective schools in the province	-0.229	0.087	-0.014	0.5088	0.479
V63 Relationship between the availability of school resources and school effectiveness	-0.15	0.146	0.111	-0.009	0.697
V64 Availability of resources and language teaching	0.011	0.214	0.174	0.137	0.779
V65 Our school is about as resourced as other schools	0.151	-0.082	0.014	0.081	0.610
V66 Minimal school resources	0.081	0.150	-0.140	-0.114	0.774
V67 Lack of school resources	-0.096	0.093	0.022	0.247	0.835
V60 Our school is more effective as other schools in the province	0.081	0.445	0.265	-0.164	0.367
V69 READ's language programme has contributed to average performance in terms of language development	0.336	0.001	0.067	0.406	0.314
Variance explained by each factor	13.695	6.779	3.424	2.901	2.695
Eigenvalues	18.29831	4.58801	2.56689	2.28848	1.75235
Final communality estimates		29.494			
Total variance explained by factors		29.49%			
Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient		0.702			

To resolve the issue of items correlating highly with items representing other factors, a second-order rotated factor loading was performed on the remaining variables. The results are illustrated in Table 6.7 below.

Table 6.7 Description of the five factors

Factor	Items with highest loading	Description
Factor 1	V14, V15, V16, V17, V19, V20, V21, V24, V25, V27, V28, V30, V31, V50, V51, V52, V56, V22, V68	Grade 4 educators' opinions of the READ training programme
Factor 2	V34, V35, V36, V37, V38, V40, V41, V42, V54, V57, V58, V59, V70, V26	Impact of programme on school effectiveness
Factor 3	V29, V32, V33, V39, V43, V44, V45, V47, V48, V49, V18	Impact of programme on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies
Factor 4	V23, V46, V53, V55, V61	Impact of READ's training method on Grade 4 educators' ability to apply the acquired knowledge
Factor 5	V62, V63, V64, V65, V66, V67, V60, V69	School Resources

The results provide evidence of construct validity by showing that items loaded significantly to the respective factors were in actual fact measuring the underlying attribute. Table 6.6 indicates that five factors were revealed by the second order factor analysis in this study, namely:

- Factor 1: Grade 4 educators' opinions of the READ training programme;
- Factor 2: Impact of READ's training programmes on school effectiveness;
- Factor 3: Impact of READ's training programmes on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies;
- Factor 4: Impact of READ's training method on Grade 4 educators' ability to apply the acquired knowledge; and
- Factor 5: School resources.

The five factors explained close to 29.49 percent of the total variance (see Table 6.6) and produced Eigenvalues of 18.298, 4.588, and 2.567. 2.288 and 1.752, respectively.

Table 6.8 The Variance Explained, Eigenvalues and Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficience calculated for five Hypothetical Factors

Factor	Variance explained	Eigenvalue	Cronbach's Alpha
1	13,695	18.29831	0.922
2	6,779	4,58801	0.866
3	3,424	2.56689	0.885
4	2,901	2.28848	0.747
5	2,695	1.75235	0.735

6.3.3 A Discussion of the Factors Extracted during the Second Order Analysis

The first factor identified and illustrated in Table 6.6 consists of 19 items and was named "Grade 4 educators' opinions of the READ training programme factor", with a Cronbach-Alpha reliability coefficient of 0.922. Factor one was meant to assess the reaction of Grade 4 educators towards READ's training programme. Reaction measures satisfaction of programme participants along with their plans or ability to apply what they have learned. Thus reaction or client satisfaction is the first level of the ROI model that has been used in this investigation.

Factor two, consisting of 14 items in Table 6.6, was named "Impact of READ's training programmes on school effectiveness", with a Cronbach-Alpha reliability coefficient of 0.866.

This factor was meant to determine whether READ's training programmes yielded some results in the project schools. Business impact can be defined as the final results that occurred because the participants attended the programme (Kirkpartrick, 1998:23). Business impact or results is the fourth level of the conceptual framework that has been used in this investigation.

The third factor identified and illustrated in Table 6.6 consists of 11 items and was named "Impact of READ's training programmes on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies", with a Cronbach-Alpha reliability coefficient of 0.885. The third factor was used to measure the perceptions of educators towards the impact of READ's language programmes in terms of Grade 4 learners' writing competencies. In other words, this

factor was used to gauge Grade 4 educators' peceptions towards the extent to which learning has occurred. Learning is the extent to which participants change attitudes, improve knowledge, and/or increase skill as a result of being exposed to a programme (Kirkpartrick, 1998:20). Learning is the second level of the conceptual framework that has been used in this study.

Factor Four, consisting of 5 items in Table 6.6 was named "Impact of READ's training method on Grade 4 educators' ability to apply the acquired knowledge", and had a Cronbach-Alpha reliability coefficient of 0.747. The forth factor was used to assess the impact of READ's training method on Grade 4 language educators' ability to apply or implement the acquired knowledge. Application or implementation is related to the extent to which change in behaviour has occurred (Kirkpartrick, 1998:20). Application or implementation is the third level of the ROI model that has been used in this study.

The fifth factor identified and illustrated in Table 6.6 consists of 8 items and was named school resources, with a Cronbach-Alpha reliability coefficient of 0.735. The fifth factor was meant to check whether project schools were well resourced or not. It is very important to determine the availability of school resources when conducting programme evaluation. In other words, the fifth factor was meant to determine whether the school climate was conducive to the implementation of READ's training programmes or not.

6.3.4 Interpretation of the Results

This section deals with the comparison of mean factor scores to gender of educators. A discussion of the reasons that might have contributed to the results on gender as a variable is also presented in this section. The main focus is on the five factors, namely Grade 4 educators' opinions of the READ's training programme, impact of programme on school effectiveness, impact of programme on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies, impact of READ's training method on Grade 4 educators' ability to apply the acquired knowledge and school resources. The 5-factor analysis explains almost 30% of the variance in the total responses. Details are presented in Table 6.9.

Table 6.9 Comparison of Mean Factor Scores to Gender of the Educator

	Mean scores			F-Value	P-Value
Factor	**Female (N=108)**	**Male (N=41)**	**Total**		
MF 1	3.92	3.57	3.82	15.92	0.0001
MF 2	3.65	3.47	3.60	4.25	0.0411
MF 3	3.82	3.43	3.71	16.30	<0.0001
MF 4	3.85	3.50	3.75	12.10	0.0007
MF 5	3.39	3.19	3.24	3.13	0.0789

*Significant at 0,05 (p>0, 01 but p<0,05)

When the mean factor scores were compared by the gender of the educator, there was evidence of statistically significant differences at 0.05 level of significance in all the factors except for the mean of factor five, namely school resources. The probability values (p-values) associated with the F-values should be less than or equal to 0,05 for the mean score differences to be significant. Female educators had consistently higher mean scores than male educators in all the five factors. In this study, factor variable-correlations of 3.00 and higher are taken seriously when assessing the perceptions of Grade 4 educators towards the impact of READ's language programme on their opinions in terms of language teaching as well as its impact on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies.

Using the data in Table 6.9, it follows that there is a statistically significant difference at a 0,05 significance level between factor mean scores of male and female educators in respect of factor one, which is Grade 4 educators' opinions of the READ programme. Female educators had consistently high mean scores (3.92) than their male counterparts (3.57) in this factor. A possible explanation could be that the READ programme has impacted differently on female and male educators' opinions as shown in Table 6.9. It might also imply that male educators were making realistic judgements of the READ programme than their female counterparts in this investigation.

It would appear that both male and female educators have a positive reaction towards READ's training programmes as illustrated in Table 6.9. A total factor mean score of 3.82 has been obtained by both male and female educators in respect of factor one, namely Grade 4 educators' opinions of the READ training programme. It is very important to gauge customer satisfaction when conducting programme evaluation.

Organizations with high customer satisfaction have great potential for growth and sustainability.

Using the data in Table 6.9, it follows that there is a statistically significant difference at a 0,05 significance level, between the factors mean scores of male and female educators in respect of factor two, namely impact of READ's training on school effectiveness. Female educators had consistently higher mean scores (3.65) than their male counterparts (3.47). The data suggest that male and female educators have different perceptions of the impact of READ's language programme on school effectiveness in primary schools. The differences could be attributed to their general perceptions of the READ programme on school effectiveness.

In respect of factor three, namely impact of programme on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies, female educators obtained a mean score of 3.82 whilst male educators obtained a mean score of 3.43. The results suggest that male and female educators have different views of the impact of READ's programme on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies. The results also show a statistically significant difference between male and female educators in respect of factor two, namely impact of programme on writing. An explanation for these differences could be that female and male educators held different views of the READ programme in this study. It would also appear that the READ programme might have impacted differently on female and male educators' opinions in respect of factor three, namely impact of programme on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies.

In respect of factor four, namely, the impact of READ's training method on Grade 4 educators' ability to apply the acquired knowledge, female educators obtained a mean score of 3.85 while male educators obtained a mean score of 3.50. The results show that this is a statistically significant difference. The data also suggest that male and female educators held different views regarding the impact of READ's training method on their ability to implement or apply the acquired knowledge in the classrooms. These findings also imply that READ training method might have impacted differently on Grade 4 educators' ability to apply the acquired knowledge in the classroom.

There is no statistically significant difference between the factor mean scores of male and female educators in respect of factor five, namely school resources. Female educators had

a mean score of 3.39 whilst their male counterparts obtained a mean score of 3.19. A total factor mean score of 3.24 has been obtained by both male and female educators in respect of factor five. However, the findings of the qualitative study clearly show that rural and deep rural schools are not well-resouced.

A discussion of mean factor scores by location of school follows.

Table 6.10 Comparison of mean factor scores by location of school

Factor	Rural (N=83)	Urban (N=60)	Total	F-Value	P-Value
MF 1	3.92	3.71	3.82	6.31	0.0131
MF 2	3.71	3.47	3.60	9.22	0.0028
MF 3	3.82	3.58	3.71	6.84	0.0098
MF 4	3.86	3.62	3.75	6.07	0.0149
MF 5	3.27	3.21	3.24	0.34	0.5600

*Significant at 0,05 (p>0, 01 but p<0,05)

When compared by the location of the school, there were statistically significant differences at a 0.05 level of significance in all the factors except for school resources. Educators from rural schools had consistently higher mean scores than those from urban schools. It is important to determine whether or not the READ programme has impacted differently on urban, rural, female and male rural educators' perceptions in respect of all the factors. It is equally imperative to determine why these differences occur so that READ Educational Trust and similar service providers could be able to address the differences during the implementation of future intervention programmes.

Using the data in Table 6.10, it follows that there is a statistically significant difference at a 0,05 significance level between the factors mean score of educators from rural and urban schools in respect of factor one, namely Grade 4 educators' opinions of the READ training programme. Educators from rural schools had a mean score of 3.92 whilst educators from urban schools had a mean score of 3.71. A total factor mean score of 3.82 have been obtained by both educators from rural schools and those from urban schools.

The above data suggest that educators from rural and urban schools have different perceptions of the impact of READ's language programme in respect of factor one,

namely Grade 4 educators' opinions of the READ programme. It would also appear that the READ programme might have impacted differently on Grade 4 educators' perceptions in respect of factor one, namely Grade 4 educators' opinions of the READ programme.

Using the data in Table 6.10, it follows that there is a statistically significant difference at a 0,05 level of significance, between the mean factor scores of educators from rural schools, and those of educators from urban schools in respect of factor two, namely impact of programme on schools effectiveness. Educators from rural schools obtained a mean score of 3.71 whilst educators from urban schools obtained a mean score of 3.47. A total factor mean score of 3.60 has been obtained by both educators in respect of factor two.

The data in Table 6.10 suggest that educators from rural and urban schools had different perceptions of the impact of READ's language programme in respect of factor two, namely impact of programme on school effectiveness. It might also imply that the READ programme has impacted differently on educators from rural and urban schools in respect of factor two, namely impact of programme on school effectiveness.

Table 6.10 indicates that there is a statistically significant difference at a 0,05 level of significance between the factor mean scores of educators from rural schools and those of educators from urban schools in respect of factor three, namely impact of programme on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies . Educators from rural schools obtained a mean score of 3.82, whilst educators from urban schools obtained a mean score 3.58 in respect of factor three namely, impact of programme on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies A possible explanation for this could be that educators from rural and urban schools held different views of the READ programme in respect of factor three, namely impact of programme on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies. It would also appear that the READ programme has impacted differently on the above-mentioned educators' perceptions in respect of factor three. Another explanation for these differences could be that educators from rural schools were making realistic judgements of the READ programme than those in the urban schools.

Worth mentioning is the fact that a total mean factor score of 3.71 have been obtained by both educators from rural schools and those from urban schools. The results suggest that both educators from rural and urban schools have positive perceptions of the impact of

READ's language programme in respect of factor three, namely impact of programme on Grade learners' writing competencies. This is a very important finding to note because the general aim of this research was to determine Grade 4 educators' experiences with a READ Educational Trust training programme and the extent to which it has impacted on their classroom practices and professional development. The study also seeks to assess the impact of a teaching and learning intervention programme offered by service providers such as READ Educational Trust on the writing performance of Grade 4 learners.

Table 6.10 indicates that there is a statistically significant difference at a 0,05 level of significance between the mean factor score of educators in rural and urban schools in respect of factor four, namely impact of READ's training method on Grade 4 educators' ability to apply the acquired knowledge. Educators from rural schools obtained a mean score of 3.86 and those in urban schools obtained a mean score of 3.62. A total mean factor score of 3.75 has been obtained by educators from urban and rural schools in respect of the forth factor. An explanation for these differences could be that educators from rural and urban schools held different views of the impact of READ's training method on their ability to apply the acquired knowledge. It might also imply that the READ programme has impacted differently on educators from rural schools and those from urban schools.

Based on the above findings, one would argue that both educators in rural schools and those in urban schools have positive perceptions of the impact of READ's training method on language teaching and learning. It would appear that READ's training method is still relevant to the enhancement of effective language teaching and learning in primary schools.

In respect of factor five, namely, school resources, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean factor scores of educators in rural schools and those of educators in urban schools. Educators in rural schools obtained a mean score of 3.27 and those in urban schools obtained a mean score of 3.21. A total mean factor score of 3.24 has been obtained by both educators in rural and urban schools in respect of factor five, namely, school resources. An explanation for these results could be that educators from rural schools held the same view as educators from urban schools in respect of factor five, namely school resources.

The data also suggest that both educators in rural and urban schools agree that there is a correlation between effective implementation of language programme and the availability of resources in schools. This finding is supported by the literature in chapter three when it indicates that school factors contribute to organizational effectiveness and sustainability (Armstrong, 1996: 223).

This completes the discussion of mean factor scores by Gender of the Educator and the Location of School in respect of the five factors, namely Grade 4 educators' opinions of the READ programme, impact of programme on school effectiveness,, impact of programme on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies, impact of READ's training method on language teaching and learning and school resources. It is anticipated that the above findings would enable READ Educational Trust to identify effectively its focus areas when implementing its language programmes within the South African context.

6.3.5 Results of the Qualitative Investigation

This section analyses the results or findings of the qualitative research process that the researcher gathered from Grade 4 language educators who were involved in the implementation of READ's training programmes in schools. In other words, it covers all their opinions and experiences regarding the general implementation of READ's training programmes. The researcher has also included the results from READ' staff, which cover their opinions and experiences regarding critical issues such as the relevance of READ's mission statement to the development of training programmes and evaluation strategies.

6.3.5.1 Results of the qualitative research

A discussion of the results from Grade 4 educators is presented first.

6.3.5.2 Discussion of results: Grade 4 educators

When the respondents were asked whether READ's training programme should be regarded as an 'added on' activity or as an integrated component of the learning area curriculum, the majority of the respondents, as illustrated in Table 6.12, mentioned that the programme was integrated into the current curriculum. An explanation for this

positive finding could be that READ's training programmes are based on the National Curriculum Statement as the concept of integration is central to the latter. Only two respondents (R1.4 and R 1.19) (see Table 6.12), mentioned that the READ programme was applied as an alternative to the existing curriculum. Interesting, however, is that twenty-one respondents mentioned that books formed part of the tuition material. A probable explanation for this finding could be that the provision of resources is one of READ's critical functions. It would also appear that the provision of resources assisted Grade 4 educators in integrating READs' training programmes into the current curriculum. Another interesting finding to mention is that nine respondents (R2.3, R2.4, R1.8, R2.13, R2.14, R1.6, R1.17, R2.17 and R2.19) (See Table 6.12), indicated that Grade 4 learners were actively involved during the integration process. A possible explanation for these responses could be that READ's training programmes are OBE-based. Learner participation is one of the principles of outcomes-based education. Surprisingly, one respondent (1.5) mentioned that Grade 4 educators interpreted pictures as they integrated READ's training programmes into the current curriculum. An explanation for these responses is that READ's approach to language teaching encourages educators to start with the interpretation of pictures from the cover of the book.

The study shows that from the forty respondents, who were interviewed at the twenty different schools, thirty seven of them mentioned that READ's training programmes are not an 'added on' activity as they are an integrated component of the learning area curriculum. Educator 1 of School 1 said *"We integrate the READ programme into the traditional teaching practices"* (sic).

This also concurs with the researcher's experience during this project and the literature review in the Fourth Chapter. For example, Du Plessis (2002:18) postulates that READ's training programmes incorporate all the theorical foundations of learning, language acquisition and literacy acquisition, which makes it easy to integrate into the current curriculum. In addition, Rae (2004:5) stipulates that it is important to determine whether the participants used the most effective methods to implement the training programme or not.

In the light of the above findings, one would say that READ's training programmes are not an 'added on' activity as they are integrated into the curriculum. This finding addresses the first research sub-question, namely how are supplemental language

programmes structured in order to support and complement formal classroom teaching and learning environment?

Table 6.11 Coding system explaining the implementation of the READ programme as an alternative to the traditional method of language teaching or as an integration to the traditional classroom practices

Response	Code
We integrate READ into the traditional classroom practices	IRT
We implement the READ programme as an alternative	IRA
Books were supplied to enhance the integration	IBS
Learners were active during the integration process	ILA
Educators interpret pictures	EIP
Learners are able to work independently	LWI

Table 6.12 Frequency explaining the implementation of the READ programme as an alternative to the traditional method of language teaching or as an integration to the traditional classroom practices

Response	Code	Frequency
We integrate READ's training programmes into the traditional classroom practices	IRT	1.2,2.1.,1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4,1.5, 2.5,1.6, 2.6, 1.7,2.7, 1.8, 2.8,1.9,2.9, 1.10, 2.10, 1.11,2.11, 1.12, 2.12, 1.13, 2.13,1.14, 2.14, 1.15, 2.15, 1.16, 2.16, 1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20.
We implement the READ programme as an alternative	IRA	1.4,1.19;
Books were supplied to enhance the integration	IBS	1.2,1.3,1.5, 1.9,2.4, 2.5, 2.9, 2.10, 1.11, 2.11, 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.16,2.16,1.17,1.18, 2.18, 1.19,1.20, 2.20
Learners were active during the integration process	ILA	2.3, 2.4, 1.8, 2.13, 2.14, 1.6,1.17, 2.17, 2.19,
Educators interpret pictures	EIP	1.5
Learners are able to work independently	LWI	1.17, 2.17, 2.18, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20,

When respondents were asked whether READ's training has impacted on their application skills, the majority of the respondents as illustrated in Table 6.14, mentioned that the programme has impacted on their application or implementation skills. An explanation for these findings could be that the implementation of READ's training programmes is the core function of READ as a service provider. Educators are trained in such a way that they are able to apply the acquired knowledge in the classroom. Only five respondents (R2.1, R1.13, R 2.13, R 1.14 and R 2.17) (see Table 6.14), mentioned that they needed more training. What is amusing though is that eighteen respondents indicated that the READ's training programme encourage the involvement of the educator and the learners. Of interest,

however, is that twelve respondents indicated that READ's language programmes replace the traditional method of teaching as they are learner-centered. A possible explanation for these findings could be that READ's training programmes are OBE-based as indicated earlier on. In addition, eight of the respondents (R1.1, R2.1, R1.2, R2.2, R 1.7, R 2.16, R 1.18, and R 1.20) (see Table 6.14), indicated that READ provided them with the training manuals. What is fascinating to note though is that ten of the respondents (R1.3, R2.4, R2.1, R2.9, R2.18, R1.19, R1.1, R2.5, R1.7 and R1.17) (see Table 6.14), mentioned that READ's training was systematic (see Table 6.14). A probable explanation for these findings could be that READ provides all the trainees with training manuals to ensure that they implement the language programme in a similar and systematic way. It would appear that the systematic nature of training has indeed enabled them to implement READ's training programmes. It is also not clear whether the training manuals enabled them to implement READ's language programme effectively.

The study shows that from the forty respondents who were interviewed at the twenty different schools, thirty-four of them mentioned that READ's training programmes had an impact on their application skills. Possible explanations for this finding have been provided in the preceeding paragraphs. The literature review also indicates that learning is the extent to which participants change attitudes, improve knowledge, and or increase skill as a result of attending the training programme (Kirkpatrick, 1998:20). According to Phillips (2003:34), learning focuses on what participants learned during training. Rae (2004:2), in support of this view, postulates that it is vital to determine whether participants know what language teaching skills to apply and how to do it if programme evaluation is to be well undertaken.

In respect of this aspect, it appears that READ's training programmes have impacted on Grade 4 educators' implementation skills. For instance, thirty-five of the respondents mentioned that READ's training programmes impacted positively on their implementation skills as indictated earlier on. For example, Educator 2 of School 2 said "*I have been well trained. I am able to refer to the material. They also trained us on how to apply the acquired knowledge"* (sic).

This is in line with the findings of the quantitative research where Grade 4 educators agree that READ's training programmes have impacted on their general performance (see Table 6.9). The quantitative data in Table 6.9 also suggest that both male and female educators agree that READ's training programmes have impacted on their ability to implement its language programmes.

In view of the above findings, READ's training programmes appear to impact on Grade 4 educators'application or implementation skills. This finding addresses the third research sub-question, namely how do language programmes such as those offered by READ contribute to effective language teching?

Table 6.13 Coding system explaining the impact of READ's training on Grade 4 educators' application skills

Response	Code
READ had an impact on our application skills	ITA
We need more training	NMT
READ encourages the involvement of educators and that of the learners	IEL
Training manuals were provided to enhance effective implementation of the language programme	TMI
READ's training programmes replace the traditional method of teaching	RTM
READ's training was systematic	RTS

Table 6.14 Frequency explaining the impact of READ's training on Grade 4 educators' application skills

Response	Code	Frequency
READ's training had an impact on our application / implementation skills	ITA	1.1, 1.2,1..3,1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4,1.5, 2.5, 1.6, 2.6, 1.7, 2.7, 1.8, 2.8, 1.9, 1.10, 2.10, 2.10, 1.11, 2.11, 1.12, 2.14, 1.15, 2.15, 1.16, 2.16, 1.17, 1.18, 2.18, 1.19, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20.
We need more training	NMT	2.1, 1.13, 1.13, 1.14, 2.17,
READ's training programmes encourage the involvement of educators and learners	IEL	1.1, 2.1, 1.2, 2.2, 1.4, 2.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.7, 2.9, 1.10, 2.10, 2.11, 1.13, 1.14, 2.14, 2.16, 2.18.
Training manuals were provided to enhance effective implementation of the language programme	TMI	1.1, 2.1, 1.2, 2.2, 1.7, 2.16, 1.18, 1.20
READ's training programmes replace the traditional method of teaching	RTM	1.8, 2.8, 1.9, 1.11, 2.11, 1.12, 1.13, 2.13, 1.14, 1.15, 2.15, 1.16
READ's training was systematic	RTS	1.3, 2.4, 2.1, 2.9, 2.18, 1.19, 1.1, 2.5, 1.7, 1.17

When respondents were asked whether READ's training has impacted on their teaching practices, the majority of the respondents as illustrated in Table 6.16 mentioned that the READ training programmes have impacted on their teaching practices. Only one respondent (R1.19) (see Table 6.16), mentioned that the programme has not impacted on

her teaching practices. Fascinating though, is that fifteen respondents (R2.1, R2.3, R2.4, R1.6, R1.7, R2.7, R1.8, R1.9, R1.12 and R1.13) (see Table 6.16), mentioned that READ's training programmes encourage independent learning (see Table 6.16). Another important finding to mention is that seven respondents (R2.6, R 1.11, R 2.11, R 1.14, R 2.14, R 1.7 and R 2.16) as shown in Table 6.16, mentioned that READ's training programmes improve teamwork, story-telling and dramatization skills.

The study shows that from the forty respondents who were interviewed at the twenty different schools, thirty-nine of them mentioned that READ's training has impacted on their teaching practices. For example, Educator 1 of School 2, which is in the urban area, said "*READ's training has impacted on my teaching practices. I have been empowered by READ"* (sic).

In addition, Educator 1 of School 13, which is rural, said "*READ changed my teaching practices* (sic). The study also revealed that the majority of the respondents shared the same view regarding READ's impact on their teaching practices.

This concurs with the findings of the quantitative research where both educators from the rural schools and those in urban schools agree that READ's training programmes had an impact on language teaching and learning (See Table 6.10).

Seemingly, READ's training programmes changed Grade 4 educators' teaching practices. The findings of this investigation are corroborated by the literature review in the fourth chapter. According to Phillips (2003:34), learning as the second level of the conceptual framework focuses mainly on what participants learned during training, using tests, skill practices, role plays, simulations and group evaluations. Kirkpatrick (1998:20), in support of this view, stipulates that it is imperative to determine the extent to which change in behaviour has occurred because the participants attended training workshops.

Based on the above findings, one would conclude that Grade 4 educators are of the opinion that READ's training programmes have impacted on Grade 4 educators' teaching practices. These findings address the seventh research sub-question, namely how do intervention programmes offered by service providers such as READ contribute to effective language teaching?

Table 6.15 Coding system explaining the impact of READ's training on Grade 4 educators' teaching practices.

Response	Code
READ's training programmes have an impact on our teaching practices	ITP
READ encourages independent learning	EIL
READ has not impacted on my teaching practices	NIT
READ has improved team-work, story-telling and dramatization skills	TSD

6.16 Frequency explaining the impact of READ's training on Grade 4 educators' teaching practices

Responses	Codes	Frequency
READ's training has an impact on our teaching practices	ITP	1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 1.4, 2.4, 2.5,1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 2.7, 1.8, 2.8, 1.9, 2.9, 1.10, 2.10, 1.11, 2.11, 1.12, 2.12, 1.13, 2.13, 2.14, 1.15, 2.15, 1.16, 1.13, 2.13, 2.14, 1.15, 1.16, 2.16, 1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20.
READ has not impacted on my teaching practices	NIT	1.19.
READ has improved team-work, story-telling and dramatization skills.	TSD	2.6, 1.11, 2.11, 1.14, 2.14, 1.7, 2.16.
READ encourages independent learning	EIL	2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 1.6, 1.7, 2.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.12, 1.13, 2.15, 1.16, 1.17, 2.19, 2.20.

When respondents were asked whether READ's training programmes brought some notable changes at their schools, all the respondents, as illustrated in Table 6.18, mentioned that Grade 4 learners wrote 1–5 activities per week before the implementation of READ's training programmes. Interesting however, is that thirty-two of the respondents as shown in Table 6.34, mentioned that they still wrote 1-5 activities per week after the implementation of READ's training programmes. A possible explanation for these responses could be that READ proposes that five written activites be written per week as educators have to do one written activity per lesson. Surprisingly, only five

respondents (R 2.2; R 2.10, R 2.11, R 1.19 and R 1.20) (see Table 6.18), mentioned that Grade 4 learners wrote six activities per week since the introduction of the READ programme. The majority of the respondents as shown at the above given table mentioned that they wrote 1-5 tests quarterly before the implementation of READ's training programme. Fourteen respondents mentioned that they wrote 6-12 tests per quarter since the implementation of READ. Most of the respondents as illustrated in Table 6.18, mentioned that the improvement levels of Grade 4 learners' writing performance ranged from from 55–100%. The data suggests that READ's training programmes have impacted on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies. Only eleven respondents (R1.4, R 1.7, R 1.17, R 2.17, R 1.18, R 2.18, R 2.18, R 1.19, R 2.19, R 1.20, and 2.20) (see Table 6.18), mentioned that the improvement levels of Grade 4 learners' writing performance ranged from 10–50 percent.

When the respondents were asked about the pass rate of the learning area of Languages before the implementation of READ's training programmes, the majority of the respondents as shown in Table 6.18, mentioned that the pass rate of the learning area of Languages ranged from 10–50% before the implementation of READ. Only one respondent (R1.10) (See Table 6.18), mentioned that it ranged from 60–100% before the implementation of READ's training programmes. Very intriguing though is that one respondent as illustrated in Table 6.18, mentioned that the pass rate of the learning area of Languages ranged from 10-50% since the implementation of READ's training programmes at their schools. Thirty-five respondents mentioned that the pass rate of the learning area of Languages ranged from 60-100% since the implementation of READ's training programmes at their schools. The data suggests that READ's training programmes brought measurable results in the project schools. This is an important aspect of the conceptual framework that has been used in this investigation. When the respondents were asked whether the changes could be attributed to READ's training programmes, fifteen respondents as shown in Table 6.18, mentioned that the changes could be attributed to READ's training programmes.

When the respondents were asked about the situation at their schools, ten respondents (R 1.2, R 1.4, R 2.5, R 2.9, R 1.12, R 1 .13, R 1.14, R 2.14, R 1.19, and R 2.20) (See Table 6.18), mentioned that the situation was bad before the implementation of READ's training programmes. The data suggests that the majority of the respondents indicated that the above changes could be attributed to READ's training programmes.

In fact, the study shows that from the forty respondents who were interviewed at the twenty different schools, thirty-five of them mentioned that there were some notable changes at their schools that could be attributed to the READ's training programmes. For instance, Educator 1 of School 11 said "*Grade 4 learners wrote 2 activities per week before the implementation of READ and that they wrote 5 written exercises per week since the implementation of READ*" (Sic). In addition to that, Educator 1 of school 11 said "*The pass rate of LLC was 39% before the implementation of READ, the pass rate of the learning area of Languages has improved to 100% since the implementation of READ"*. (sic). These findings are corroborated by the results of the quantitative study were both male and female agree that READ's training programmes have an impact on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies

This also concurs with the researcher's experience during this project and the literature review. For example, Phillips (2003:35) postulates that this aspect measures the actual results achieved by programme participants as they successfully apply what they have learned. Brown and Seidner (1998:107), in support of this view, postulate that it is imperative to measure the actual results achieved by the participants after going through training. The above data suggests that there are notable changes or measurable results at the project schools that could be attributed to READ's training programmes. In view of this, one would conclude that language programmes offered by service providers such as READ Educational Trust have an impact on Grade 4 learners' writing performance. These findings address the fifth research sub-question, namely to what extent does the READ Educational Trust's training programmes impact on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies? Details are illustrated in Table 6.18.

TABLE 6.17 Coding system explaining notable changes that could be attributed to READ's training programmes

Responses	Codes
Written activities per week before the implementation of READ	ABR
Written activities per week since the implementation of READ	ASR
Written tests per quarter before the implementation of READ	TQB
Written tests per quarter since the implementation of READ	TQS
Improvement levels of Grade 4 learners' writing performance	TLW
The pass rate of the learning area of Languages before the implementation of READ	PBR
The pass rate of the learning area of Languages since the implementation of READ	PSR

Table 6.18 Frequency explaining notable changes that could be attributed to READ's training programmes

Responses	Codes	Frequency
Written activities per week before the implementation of READ ranged from: (i) (1-5)	ABR	1.1, 1.2, 2.1,2.2, 1.3, 2.3, 1.4, 2.4, 1.5, 2.5, 1.6, 2.6,1.7, 2.7, 1.8, 2.8, 1.9, 2.9, 1.10, 2.10, 1.11, 2.11, 1.12, 2.12, 1.13, 2.13, 1.14, 2.14, 1.15, , 2.15, 1.16, 2.16,1.17, 2.17,1.18, 2.18,1.19,2.19,1.20,2.20
Written activities per week since the implementation of READ are ranging from: (i) (1–5) (ii). (6)	ASR	1.3, 2.3, 1.4, 2.4, 1.5, 2.5,1.6, 2.6, 1.7, 2.7, 1.8, 2.8, 1.9, 2.9, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12, 2.12, 1.13, 2.13, 1.14, 2.14, 1.15, 2.15, 1.16, 2.16, 1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 2.18, 2.19, 2.20, 2.11, 1.19, 1.20,2.2,2.10
Written tests per quarter before the implementation of READ ranged from: (i) (1-5) (ii). (6-10)	TQB	1.1, 2.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.3, 1.4, 2.4,1.5, 2.5, 1.6, 2.6, 1.7,2.7, 1.8, 1.9, 2.9, 1.10, 2.10, 1.11,2.11, 1.12, 2.12, 1.13, 2.13, 1.14, 2.14, 1.15, 2.15, 1.16, 2.16, 1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 2.18, 1.19, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20 2.2
Written tests per quarter since the implementation of READ are ranging from: (i) (1-5)	TQS	1.3, 2.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 1.8, 1.9, 2.9, 1.10, 2.10, 1.12, 2.12,

(ii) (6-12)		1.13, 2.14, 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 2.18, 1.19, 2.19, 2.20 1.1., 2.1, 2.2, 1.6, 1.7, 1.11, 2.11, 2.13, 1.14, 1.15, 2.15,2.16, 2.17,1.20
Improvement levels of Grade 4 learners' writing performance range from: (i). (10-15) (ii). (55-100)	TLW	1.4, 1.5, 1.7, 1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 2.18, 1.19, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20 1.2, 1.3, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 1.6, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 1.9, 2.9, 1.10, 1.2, 2.12, 1.13, 1.14, 2.14, 1.15, 2.10, 1.11, 2.11, 2.15, 1.16, 2.16
The pass rate of the learning area of Languages before the implementation of READ ranged from: (i). (10-50%) (ii). 60-100%	PBR	2.1, 1.2, 1.3,2.3, 2.2, 2.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.6, 1.7, 2.7,2.8, 1.9, 2.9, 2.10, 1.11, 2.11, 1.12, 2.12, 1.13, 2.13, 1.14, 2.14, 1.15,2.15, 1.16, 2.16,1.17, 2.17,1.18, 2.18,1.19, 2.19, 1.20, 2.10. 1.10
The pass rate of the learning area of Languages since the implementation of READ is ranging from: (i).10-50% (ii). From 60-100%	PSR	1.5, 2.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.3, 2.2, 2.4,1.6, 2.6, 1.7, 2.7, 2.8, 1.9, 2.9, 1.10, 2.10, 1.11, 2.11, 1.12, 2.12, 1.13, 2.13, 1.14, 2.14, 1.15, 2.15, 1.16, 2.16, 1.17, 2.17, 1.18,, 2.18, 1.19, 2.19, 1.20, 2.10
Changes that could be attributed to READ because of its materials	CRM	2.1, 2.2, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 2.8, 1.10, 2.11, 1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 2.18, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20
The situation was bad before the implementation of READ	SPR	1.2, 1.4,2.5, 2.9, 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 2.14, 1.19, 2.20

When the respondents were asked whether the READ training programmes had an influence on their own professional development, the majority of the respondents as illustrated in Table 6.20, mentioned that the READ's training programmes had an influence on their own professional development. The majority of the respondents indicated that they were furthering their studies at various institutions of higher learning because of READ's training programmes. Only seven respondents (R1.1, R 1.9, R 1.10, R 2.10, R 1.18, R 2.18 and R 2.19) (See Table 6.20), mentioned that the READ training

programme had an influence on their teaching skills in the classrooms. Interesting however, is that nine respondents as shown in the above table, mentioned that READ's training programmes enabled them to apply the acquired language teaching skills in their classrooms. When the respondents were asked whether the differences could be attributed to READ's training programmes, or to their own commitment, eighteen respondents as illustrated in Table 6.20, mentioned that the differences could be attributed to READ's training programmes. An explanation for these responses could be that READ Educational Trust was the only service provider which offered language programmes in English.

The study shows that from the forty respondents who were interviewed at the twenty different schools, twenty-five of them mentioned that READ's training programmes had an impact on their own professional development.

For example, Educator 1 of School 13 said "*My professional development was influenced by the READ programme*". (sic). A possible explanation for this positive response is that READ Educational Trust offers courses that afford educators the opportunity to receive credits towards National Diplomas and Degrees.

This is also in line with the findings of the quantitative research where Grade 4 educators have a positive reaction in terms of READ's impact on their professional development. These findings address the fourth research sub-question, namely how do the methodologies of service providers such as READ Educational Trust advance staff development?

This also concurs with the researcher's experience during this project and literature review. For example, Belzer (2005:34) posits that it is important to gauge the participant's reaction towards the training programmes in terms of their professional development.

The data suggest that the majority of Grade 4 educators have a positive reaction to READ's training programmes in terms of their professional development. These findings also answer the second research sub-question, namely what are the perceptions of Grade 4 language educators towards language programmes offered by organizations such as READ Educational Trust on the achievement of the curriculum outcomes?

Table 6.19 Coding system explaining the impact of READ's training on Grade 4 educators' professional development

Responses	Codes
READ has an influence on our professional development	IPD
READ has an influence on our teaching skills in the classroom	ITS
READ's training enabled us to apply the acquired language teaching skills in the classroom	RAC
READ provided us with the material	RPM

Table 6.20 Frequency explaining the impact of READ's training on Grade 4 educators' professional development

Responses	Code	Frequency
READ's training influenced our professional development	IPD	1.3, 2.2, 1.4, 1.7, 2.7, 1.9, 2.9, 1.11, 2.11, 1.12, 2.12, 1.13, 2.14, 2.15, 2.16, 1.2, 2.6,1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 2.18, 1.19, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20
READ's training influenced our teaching skills	ITS	1.1, 1,9, 1.10, 2.10, 1.18, 2.18,2.19
READ's training enabled us to apply the acquired language skills in the classroom	RAC	2.14, 1.6, 2.8, 1.14, 1.18, 2.18, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20
READ provided us with the material	RPM	1.1, 2.1, 1.2, 2.2, 1.3, 2.4, 1.5, 2.5, 1.8, 1.9, 1.11, 2.14, 1.15, 1.16, 2.16, 1.17, 2.17, 2.20

When the respondents were asked whether READ's training programmes had an impact on Grade 4 learners' writing skills, twenty-four of the respondents, as illustrated in Table 6.22, mentioned that their ability to spell words was good. Seven respondents mentioned that their ability to spell words was average and seven of the respondents mentioned that their ability to spell words was excellent. A possible explanation for this finding could be that READ's training programmes put more emphasis on the usage of key words which enable learners to improve their spelling. Only one (R2.1) (see Table 6.22), mentioned that their spelling was poor. The majority of the respondents as illustrated in Table 6.22, mentioned that the usage of adverbs was good, while six respondents mentioned that the usage of adjectives was good. Fascinating though, is that four respondents (R 2.3, R 2.5, R 2.9 and R 1.19) (see Table 6.22), mentioned that it was average. Only three respondents (R 2.6, R 2.11 and R 2.17) (see Table 6.22), mentioned that the usage of pronouns was poor, twenty–nine of the respondents mentioned that it was good, while ten

respondents mentioned that it was excellent. Only one respondent (R 2.10) (see Table 6.22), mentioned that the usage of pronouns was average.

When the respondents were asked about Grade 4 learners' ability to do sequencing, twenty-nine respondents as illustrated in Table 6.22, mentioned that their ability to do sequencing was good, while eight respondents mentioned that their ability to do sequencing was excellent. Only three respondents (R2.6, R 2.10, and R 1.10) (see Table 6.22), mentioned that their ability to do sequencing was average. The majority of the respondents mentioned that Grade 4 learners' ability to complete fill-in questions was good, while eight respondents mentioned that it was excellent. Only one respondent (R2.15) (see Table 6.22), mentioned that their ability to complete fill-in questions was average. Most of the respondents as illustrated in Table 6.22, mentioned that Grade 4 learners' ability to construct sentences was good, while seven respondents mentioned that their ability to construct sentences was average. Only two respondents mentioned that their ability to construct sentences was excellent. Interesting, however, is that one respondent (R1.12) (see Table 6.22), mentioned that Grade 4 learners' ability to construct sentences was poor. When the respondents were asked about Grade 4 learners' ability to use tenses, twenty–eight of them as shown in Table 6.22, mentioned that their ability to use tenses was good while seven respondents mentioned that it was excellent. Only four respondents (R2.5, R 2.10, R 1.13 and R 2.16) (see Table 6.22), mentioned that their ability to use tenses was average. A possible explanation for these positive findings could be that READ's training programmes cover all aspects of writing.

The study shows that from the forty respondents who were interviewed at the twenty different schools, most of the respondents mentioned that the impact of READ's training programmes on the level at which Grade 4 learners developed their writing competencies ranged from 'good' to 'excellent'. In view of these findings, it may be concluded that READ's training programmes had an impact on the level at which Grade 4 learners developed their writing competencies.

This concurs with the findings of the quantitative research where Grade 4 educators indicate that READ's training programmes had an impact on the level at which Grade 4 learners develop their writing competencies. This finding addresses the sixth research sub-question, namely how do intervention programmes offered by organizations such as

READ impact on the level at which Grade 4 learners develop their language competencies?

Table 6.21 Coding system explaining the impact of READ's training programmes on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies

Responses	**Codes**
Spelling	SP
Use of Punctuation Marks	UPM
Use of Prepositions	UP
Use of Adverbs	UA
Use of Adjectives	UADJ
Use of Pronouns	UP
Sequencing	SQ
Fill in Questions	FQ
Sentence Construction	SC
Use of Tense	UT

Table 6.22 Frequency explaining the impact of READ's training programmes on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies

Responses	Code	Frequency				
Spelling	SP	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent	
		2.1	1.3,1.4, 2.5,2.9,2.15, 2.18,1.19	1.2,2.3,2.4, 1.5,2.6,1.7, 2.7, 1.8, 2.8,1.9,1.10,1.11,2.11, 1.12,2.13,2.14,1.15, 1.16, 2.17,2.16,1.17, 1.18, 2.19, 1.20,2.20	1.1, 2.2, 1.6,2.10, 2.12, 1.13, 1.14	
Use of Punctuation Marks	UPM	Average		Good	Excellent	
		1.4, 1.5, 2.7, 1.8, 2.14, 2.15,2.16		1.1, 2.1, 1.2, 2.2, 1.3, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9, 2.9, 1.10, 2.10, 2.11, 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 2.18, 1.19, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20	2.6, 2.8, 1.11, 2.12, 2.13
Use of Prepositions	UP	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent	
			1.4,2.5,2.15	1.1,2.1,1.2,2.2,1.3,2.3,2.4,1.5,1.6,2.6,1.7,2.7,1.8,2.8,1.9,2.9,1.10,2.10, 1.11,1.12,2.14,1.15, 1.16,2.16, 1.17, 2.17,1.18,2.18,1.19,2.19,1.20,2.20	2.11, 2.12, 1.13, 2.23, 1.14

Responses	Codes	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
Use of Adverbs	UA		1.1, 1.2, 2.5, 2.9, 2.16, 2.19	2.1, 2.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.6, 1.7, 2.7, 1.8, 2.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 2.11, 1.12, 2.12, 1.13, 2.13, 2.14, 1.15, 2.15, 1.16, 1.17, 2.17,1.18, 1.19, 1.20, 2.20	1.14
Use of Adjectives	UADJ		2.3, 2.5, 2.9, 1.9	1.1, 2.1, 1.2, 2.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 2.7, 1.8, 2.8, 1.9, 1.10, 2.10, 1.11,1.12, 2.12,1.13,2.13,1.14, 2.14, 1.15, 2.15,1.16, 2.16, 1.17, 1.18, 2.18, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20	2.6, 2.11,2.17
Use of Pronouns	UP		2.10	1.1, 2.1, 1.2, 2.2, 1.3, 2.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.5, 2.6, 1.7, 1.8, 2.8, 1.9, 2.9, 1.10, 2.11, 1.12, 2.12, 2.13, 1.14, 2.14, 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20	2.4, 1.6, 2.7, 1.11, 1.13, 1.15, 2.15, 2.17, 1.18, 2.18
Sequencing	S		2.6, 2.10, 1.20	1.1, 2.1, 1.2, 2.2, 1.3, 2.3, 2.4, 1.5, 2.5, 1.6, 1.7,2.7, 1.8, 1.9,2.9,1.10, 1.11,1.12, 1.13, 2.13,2.14, 1.15, 1.16, 2.16, 1.17, 2.17, 2.18, 1.19	1.4, 2.8, 2.11, 2.12, 1.14, 1.18, 2.19, 2.20
Fill in Questions	FQ		2.15	1.1, 2.1, 1.2,2.2,2.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.5, 1.7, 2.7, 1.9, 2.9, 1.10, 1.11,2.11, 1.12, 2.12,1.13,2.14, 1.16, 2.16, 1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 2.18, 1.19, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20	1.3, 1.6, 2.6, 1.8, 2.8, 2.12, 1.14, 1.15
Sentence Construction	SC	1.12	1.4,2.5,1.7, 2.10, 1.17, 2.17, 1.19	1.1, 2.1, 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 1.5,1.6, 2.6, 2.7,1.8, 1.9, 2.9, 1.10, 1.11, 2.11, 2.12, 1.13, 2.13, 1.14, 2.14, 1.15, 2.15, 1.16, 2.16, 1.18, 2.18, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20	1.3, 2.4
Use of Tense	UT		2.5, 2.10, 1.13, 2.16	1.1, 2.1, 1.2, 2.2, 1.3,2.3, 1.4, 2.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.6,1.7, 1.8, 1.9,1.10, 2.11, 1.12, 2.12, 2.13, 1.14, 2.14, 1.16, 1.17, 2.17, 2.18, 1.19, 2.19, 2.20	2.7, 2.9, 1.11, 1.15, 2.15, 1.18, 1.20

When the respondents were asked whether the monitoring of READ's training programmes was effectively implemented, the majority of the respondents as illustrated in Table 6.24, mentioned that the monitoring component of READ's training programmes was effectively undertaken. Most of the respondents as illustrated in Table 6.24, mentioned that READ's trainers supported them by following-up through monitoring visits. Interesting however, is that twenty respondents as illustrated in Table 6.24 mentioned that the trainers visited their schools monthly, while thirteen respondents mentioned that they visited them regularly. Only six respondents (R2.1, R 1 .3, R 2.5, R 1.8, R 1.12 and R 2.19) (see Table 6.24), mentioned that they visited them quarterly. An explanation for this response could be that monitoring forms an important aspect of READ's training programmes. In fact, monitoring and implementation are closely intertwined. When the respondents were asked about the general coordination of READ's language programme, nineteen respondents as illustrated in Table 6.24, mentioned that the overall co-ordination of READ's training programmes was satisfactory.

The study shows that from the forty respondents who were interviewed at the twenty different schools, twenty-two of them mentioned that the monitoring of READ's training programmes was effectively undertaken. For example, Educator 1 of School 15 said "*READ trainers did follow-up visits. They monitored us during our classroom periods. They visited us once per month".* (sic).

This also concurs with the researcher's experience during this project and literature review as shown in Chapter Four, where the concept of whole school monitoring has been highlighted. READ Educational Trust sustains its training programmes through the monitoring system. The data also suggest that the general monitoring of READ's training programmes was well undertaken. Details are reflected in Table 6.24 below.

Table 6.23 Coding system explaining the monitoring of READ's training programmes

Responses	Codes
READ monitors the implementation of training programmes	RMP
READ offered us support after training	ROS
Schools that have been visited weekly	SVW
Schools that have been visited monthly	SVM
Schools that have been visited quarterly	SVQ
Overall co-ordination of the READ programme was satisfactory	OCP

Table 6.24 Frequency explaining the monitoring of READ's training programmes

Responses	Code	Frequency
READ monitors the implementation of training programmes	RMP	1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 2.8, 1.9, 2.9, 1.11, 2.11, 2.12, 1.13, 1.14, 2.14. 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 1.19, 2.19, 1.20, 2.10.
READ offered us support after training	ROS	1.1, 2.1, 1.2, 2.2, 1.3, 2.3, 1.4, 2.4, 1.5, 2.5, 2.6,1.7, 2.7, 1.8, 2.8, 1.9, 2.9, 1.10, 2.11, 1.12, 2.12, 1.13, 2.13, 1.15, 1.16, 2.16, 1.17, 1.18, 2.18, 1.19, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20,
Schools that have been visited weekly	SVW	1.2,1.7, 2.9, 1.10, 1.11, 1.13, 1.14, 2.16, 1.1., 2.6, 2.8, 1.9, 1.16
Schools that have been visited monthly	SVM	2.2, 2.3, 1.4, 2.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.7, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 1.15, 2.15, 1.17, 2.17,1.18, 2.18, 1.19, 1.20
Schools that have been visited quarterly	SVQ	2.1, 1.3, 2.5, 1.8, 1.12, 2.19
Overall co-ordination of the READ programme was satisfactory	OCP	1.1, 2.2, 1.3, 2.3, 1.4, 2.4, 2.6, 1.8, 2.8, 1.9, 2.9, 1.10, 2.10, 1.11, 2.11, 1.12, 2.12, 2.14, 2.15

When the respondents were asked whether they received some incentives as a token of appreciation for and recognition of their ability to implement READ's training programmes at their schools, thirteen respondents as shown in Table 6.26, mentioned that certificates were received by their schools. When the respondents were asked whether they received any rewards as individuals, most of the respondents mentioned that they received certificates, t-shirts, mugs and caps which had READ's logo. Only eleven respondents as illustrated in Table 6.26, mentioned that they haven't received anything. A possible explanation for these responses could be that READ Educational Trust emphasizes the importance of reinforcing good behaviour during and after its training sessions.

The study shows that from the forty respondents who were interviewed at the twenty different schools, twenty–nine respondents and thirteen schools received awards or

certificates. For example, Educator 1 of school l4 said "*We received certificates, cups and charts"*. (sic).

This concurs with the literature review and the researcher's experience during this project.. For example, Kirkpatrick (1998:21-22) postulates that it is necessary to check whether participants are being rewarded for implementing the training programmes as one of the conditions for level 3 of the conceptual framework.

Based on the above-mentioned data, it may be concluded that READ Educational Trust provided Grade 4 educators with some incentives as a token of recognition for their ability to implement its training programmes at classroom level. Details are illustrated in Table 6.26 below.

Table 6.25 Coding system explaining the incentives that were provided by READ Educational Trust

Responses	Codes
Our school received some incentives from READ	IRS
READ gave some incentives to individual educators	IRE
Educators who didn't receive any award or certificate	EDA

Table 6.26 Frequency explaining the incentives that were provided by READ Educational Trust

Responses	Codes	Frequency
Our school received some incentives from READ	IRS	1.6, 2.5, 2.8, 2.9, 1.11, 2.11, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 2.15, 2.16, 2.18, 2.20
READ gave some incentives to individual educators	IRE	1.1, 2.1, 1.2,2.2, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 2.7, 1.8, 1.9, 2.9, 1.10, 2.10, 1.11, 2.11, 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 2.15, 1.16, 2.16, 1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 2.18, 1.19, 2.19, 1.20,
Educators who didn't receive any award or certificate	EDA	1.3, 2.3, 1.4, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 2.20

When the respondents were asked whether READ's training programmes covered all aspects of writing, as it relates to language teaching, most respondents as shown in Table 6.28, mentioned that READ's training covered all aspects of writing. Only three respondents (R.18, R 2.12 and R 1.19) (see Table 6.28), mentioned that READ does not cover all aspects of writing. Eleven respondents, as illustrated in Table 6.28, mentioned that time allocated for the learning area of Languages periods must be reviewed while six

respondents mentioned that READ's training programmes must be implemented up to Grade 12 level and that it needs to focus on other languages as well. A probable explanation for these responses could be that educators are not aware that such decisions can only be made by the Department of Education and not READ Educational Trust as the service provider. Surprisingly, only two respondents (R1.8 and R 1.19) (see Table 6.28), mentioned that READ's trainers must improve their attitudes during monitoring. An explanation for these two responses could be that it is very difficult for any service provider to satisfy all its customers. Another important finding was that four respondents (R1.8, R 1.15, R 2.12 and R 1.19) (as shown in Table 6.28), mentioned that READ's trainers must concentrate on the writing of compositions and letters, sentence construction and handwriting.

The study shows that from the forty respondents who were interviewed at the twenty different schools, thirty-seven respondents mentioned that READ's training programmes covered all aspects of writing. For example, Educator 2 of school 8 said *"READ covers every aspect of writing"*. (sic).

This concurs with the researcher's experience during this project and literature review in Chapter Four (see Figure 4.1), which clearly shows that READ covers every aspect of writing in terms of Learning Outcome 4, namely writing. However, scholars such as McNeil (1985:227), Kirkpatrick (1998:17) and Rae (2004:3) postulate that it is vital to determine whether service providers have to improve specific areas of their training programmes or not.

In view of the above findings, one would conclude that READ Educational Trust has to improve on aspects such as sentence construction, letters and compositions and handwriting. These findings address the fifth research sub-question, namely to what extent do READ Educational Trust's intervention programmes impact on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies?

Table 6.27 Coding system explaining writing skills covered by READ's training programmes

Responses	Codes
Writing skills covered by READ	SCR
Writing skills not covered by READ	SNR
READ must provide intervention programmes in other languages.	RPL
READ's training programmes must be implemented up to Grade 12 level.	RTL
READ's trainers must improve their attitude during monitoring	TAM
Allocated time to be reviewed	ATR
READ must concentrate on the writing of compositions, letters, sentence construction and hand writing	RCS

Table 6.28 Frequency explaining the writing skills covered by READ's training programmes

Responses	Codes	Frequencies
Writing skills covered by READ	SCR	1.1, 2.1, 1.2, 2.2, 1.3, 2.3,1.4, 2.4,1.5, 2.5, 1.6, 2.6,1.7, 2.7, 2.8, 1.9, 2.9, 1.10, 2.10, 1.11, 2.11, 1.12, 1.13, 2.13, 1.14, 2.14, 1.15,2.15,1.16, 2.16, 1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 2.18, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20
Writing skills not covered by READ	SNR	1.8, 2.12, 1.19
READ must provide intervention programmes in other languages. .	RPL	1.2, 2.2, 1.7, 2.18, 1.20, 2.5
READ's training programmes must be implemented up to Grade 12 level	RTL	1.2, 2.2, 1.7, 2.18, 1.20, 2.5
READ's trainers must improve their attitude during monitoring	TAM	1.8, 1.19
Allocated time to be reviewed	ATR	2.6, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 2.7, 1.9, 1.11, 2.11, 2.14, 2.15, 2.16
READ must concentrate on the writing of compositions, letters, sentence construction and hand writing	RCS	1.8, 1.15, 1.19, 2.12,

When the respondents were asked about the challenges facing them as educators who implement READ's training programmes, the majority of the respondents as illustrated in Table 6.30, mentioned that they were facing different challenges during the implementation of READ's training programmes. For instance, the majority of the respondents mentioned that the duration for the learning area of Languages period was 30 minutes while four respondents (R1.12, 2.12, 2.5 and R 2.6) (see Table 6.30), indicated that the duration ranged from 45-60 minutes. An explanation for these responses could be that the duration of the learning area of languages periods is not the same in the primary schools.

Three respondents (R 1.6, R 2.3 and R 1.18) (See Table 6.30), mentioned that the duration for the LLC period was 20-25 minutes. The study shows that the majority of the respondents mentioned that there were 5-10 LLC periods per week, while eighteen

respondents mentioned that they had 18-20 LLC periods per week. Only one respondent (R1.1) (See Table 6.30), mentioned that there were 32 LLC periods per week. An explanation for these responses could be that the number of LLC periods is not the same in all the primary schools.

When the respondents were asked whether English as a medium of instruction was a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes, twenty-two respondents mentioned that it was a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes while eighteen respondents mentioned that English as a medium of instruction was not a barrier at all. A possible explanation for these findings could be that Grade 4 learners are second-language speakers.

When the respondents were asked whether management was supportive of the implementation of READ's training programmes, the majority of the respondents as shown in Table 6.30, mentioned that their school principals were supportive of the implementation of READ's training programmes. Only one respondent (R 1.8) (See Table 6.30) mentioned that her school principal was not supportive of the implementation of READ's training programmes. A possible explanation for these positive responses could be that READ Educational Trust also offered training programmes for school managers. It is probable that such training programmes might have influenced their attitudes towards the overall implementation of READ's training programmes.

When asked about the conduciveness of the school environment for the implementation of READ's training programmes, most of the respondents mentioned that their school environment was enabling. It appears that the attitudes of school managers led to the establishment of a tranquil school environment which was conducive to the implementation of READ's training programmes.

Intriguing however, is that twelve respondents mentioned that their schools were well-resourced while eighteen respondents mentioned that their schools were not well-resourced. When analysing the availability of resources in terms of the location of schools, it became evident that seven of the eight urban schools were we1l-resourced. It was also found that one urban school, namely school eight was not well-resourced. The data also indicates that from the nine rural schools, one of them, namely school eleven was well-resourced. The data suggest that most rural schools are not well-resourced. In

view of the above findings, one would say that it is not justifiable to conclude that all rural schools are not well-resourced and that all urban schools are well-resourced. However, the analysis clearly shows that all deep rural schools are not well-resourced. The data also suggest that Grade 4 educators were faced with a myriad of challenges during the implementation of READ's training programmes..

This concurs with the researcher's experience during this project and literature review. For example, Nieman and Monyai (2006:48) clearly stipulate that learners who study through the medium of a language other than their home language struggle to cope with the linguistic demands of academic study. This aspect might have affected the manner in which READ's training programmes were implemented in primary schools where English was used as a medium of instruction.

According to Monyai and Nieman (2006:159); Kirkpatrick (1998:21); and Rae (2004:2), it is imperative to determine whether the participants work in the right climate as one of the conditions for level 3 of the conceptual framework.

Table 6.29 Coding system explaining the challenges that were faced by Grade 4 educators

Responses	Codes
Time allocated for the LLC period	TAP
LLC periods per week	PPW
English as a medium of instruction becomes a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes	EMB
English as a medium of instruction is not a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes	ENB
School principal supports the implementation of READ's training programmes	PSP
School principal does not support the implementation of READ's training programmes	PNS
School principal is supportive because he transported us to the workshops and even bought some materials for us	STM
The school environment is conducive for the implementation of READ's language programmes	ECL
Our school is well-resourced	SWR
Our school is not well-resourced	SNR

Table 6.30 Frequency explaining the challenges that were faced by Grade 4 educators

Responses	Codes	Frequency
Time allocated for LLC periods between (i) (20-25)	TAP	1.6, 2.3, 1.18
(ii). 50min		1.1, 2.1, 1.2, 2.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.4, 1.5, 1.7, 2.7, 1.8, 1.9, 2.9, 1.10, 2.10, 1.11, 2.11, 1.13, 2.13, 1.14, 2.14, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 2.17, 2.18, 1.19, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20
(iii).45-60		1.12, 2.12, 2.5, 2.6
LLC periods per week (i). (5-10) periods	PPW	2.1,1.2, 2.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.4, 2.6, 1.8, 2.8, 1.9, 2.10, 1.11, 1.12, 1.13, 2.13,1.14, 2.14, 1.15, 2.15, 1.16, 2.16
(ii). (11-20) periods		2.3, 1.5, 2.5, 1.6, 1.7, 2.7, 2.9, 1.10, 2.11, 2.12, 1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 2.18, 1.19, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20
(iii). 32 periods		1.1
English as a medium of instruction becomes a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes	EMB	1.1, 2.1, 1.2, 2.2, 1.4, 2.4, 1.5, 2.5, 2.6, 1.7, 1.8, 2.8, 2.9, 1.12,2.14, 1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 2.18, 1.19, 2.19, 2.20
English as a medium of instruction is not a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes	ENB	2.3, 1.6, 2.7, 1.9, 1.10, 2.10, 1.11, 2.11,2.12, 1.13, 2.13, 1.14, 1.15, 2.15, 1.16, 2.16,1.20
The school principal supported the implementation of the READ programme	PSP	1.1, 2.1, 1.2, 2.2, 1.3, 2.3, 1.4, 2.4, 1.5, 2.5, 1.6, 2.6,1.7, 2.7, 2.8, 1.9, 2.9,1.10, 2.10, 1.11,2.11, 1.12, 2.12,1.13,2.13, 1.14, 2.14,1.15,2.15,1.16, 2.16,1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 2.18, 1.19, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20
The school principal did not support the implementation of the READ programme	PNS	1.8
The school principal is supportive because he transported us to the workshops and even bought some materials for us	STM	1.3,2.6, 1.7,2.7,2.12, 2.14, 1.5, 2.3, 1.6, 2.9, 2.10,2.11,2.13, 1.14, 1.15
The school environment is conducive to the implementation of READ's language programmes	ECL	2.10, 1.5, 2.5, 2.8, 1.12, 2.12, 1.13, 2.15, 1.16, 2.16, 1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 2.18, 1.20
Our school is well-resourced	SWR	1.1, 2.2, 2.3, 1.4, 2.4, 2.8, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12, 1.13, 2.13, 2.16
Our school is not well-resourced	SNR	1.3, 1.5, 2.5, 1.6, 2.8, 1.10, 2.12, 2.14,2.16, 1.17, 2.17, 1.18, 2.18, 1.19, 2.19, 1.20, 2.20

This completes a discussion of results from Grade 4 educators who were involved in the implementation of READ's training programmes. Following is a discussion of results from READ staff.

6.3.5.3 Discussion of results: READ staff

When respondents were asked whether READ's mission statement is relevant to the development, implementation and maintenance of training in schools, all the respondents (TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4 and T5) (See Table 6.32), mentioned that READ's mission statement guides the development, implementation and maintenance of training in schools. The data also indicates that seven respondents (TM, PC1 T1, T2, T3, T4 and T5) (see Table 6.32), mentioned that READ's mission statement takes the learners' level of development into consideration. Five respondents (PC1, T1, T2, T3 and T4) (see Table 6.32), indicated that READ's mission statement encourages effective integration of training programmes into lesson plans. These findings are in line with the results from Grade 4 educators as illustrated previously. Of the eight respondents that were interviewed at READ, two of the respondents (TM and PC1) (see Table 6.32), mentioned that READ's mission statement promotes the implementation of language programmes through quality assurance and mentoring systems. Only one respondent (TM) (see Table 6.32), mentioned that READ's mission statement promotes the development of entrepreneurial courses.

The study shows that from the eight respondents who were interviewed at READ, all of them maintained that READ's mission statement guides the development, implementation and maintenance of training in schools. For example, The training manager said "*READ's mission statement seeks to develop people throughout South Africa by developing their reading, writing and communication skills so that they can become lifelong independent learners"* (sic).

This concurs with the researcher's experience during this project and literature review. For example, Basarab and Root (1992:4) postulate that it is imperative for programme evaluators to determine whether the organization's mission statement articulates and takes into account the diversity of general and public interests and values that are related to the concept of training. They further stipulate that a philosophy statement, at times called a mission statement, is a guide to the development, implementation and maintenance of

training. It is, therefore important to understand the philosophy as a testimony to company practices concerning evaluation.

Based on the findings of this study, it may be concluded that READ's mission statement serves as a guide for the development, implementation and maintenance of training in project schools. Table 6.32 highlights the findings on READ's mission statement.

Table 6.31 Coding system explaining the significance of READ's mission statement to the development of its training programmes.

Response	Code
Mission statement guided the implementation of READ's training programmes	MGT
Mission statement and learners' level of development	LLD
Integration of READ's training programmes into lesson plans	IPL
Mission statement and the development of entepreneurial courses	DEC
Quality assurance and mentoring programmes	QAM

Table 6.32 Frequency explaining the significance of READ's mission statement to the development of its training programmes

Response	Code	Frequency
Mission statement guided the implementation of READ's training programmes	MGT	TM, PC1,PC2,T1,T2,T3,T4,T5
Mission statement and learners' level of development	LLD	TM,PC1,T1,T2,T3,T4,T5
Integration of READ's training programmes into lesson plans	IPL	PC1, T1, T2, T3,T4
Mission statement and the development of entepreneurial courses	DEC	TM
Quality assurance and mentoring systems	QAM	TM, PC1

When the respondents were asked whether READ's training programmes achieved the national aims and outcomes specified by the national curriculum statement, all the respondents (TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4 and T5) (see Table 6.34), maintained that READ's training programmes achieved the national aims and outcomes specified by the National Curriculum Statement. A possible explanation for this finding could be that READ's training programmes are based on the National Curriculum Statement. Intriguing though, is that five respondents (PC1, PC2, T1, T2 and T3) (see Table 6.34), indicated that there was a difference between READ's training programmes and the traditional teaching practices. This finding is corroborated by the results from Grade 4

educators as shown in the preceeding sub-section. An explanation for these findings could be that READ's training programmes are OBE-based as illustrated in the Fourth Chapter. When the respondents were asked whether one would expect to find major differences between READ's training programmes and traditional teaching methods and strategies, three respondents (PC1, TM and TS) (see Table 6.34), mentioned that there were major differences between the international standards and other learning areas, while two respondents (TM and T3) (see Table 6.34), mentioned that there is a close relationship between READ Educational Trust and the Department of Education. Only two respondents (TM and PC1) (see Table 6.34), mentioned that the differences could be linked to issues relating to quality assurance and compliance standards.

The study shows that, from the eight respondents who were interviewed at READ, all of them mentioned that READ's training programmes achieved the national aims and outcomes specified by the national curriculum statement. For example, Project coordinator 1 (PC1) said "*READ Educational Trust is effective in achieving the national aims and outcomes specified by the NCS*" (sic). This is also in line with what has been discussed in Chapter Four, where it has been indicated that READ develops its language programmes in accordance with stipulations of the National Curriculum Statement.

Based on the above findings, it may be concluded that READ's training programmes are based on the National Curriculum Statement and that they are not an 'added on' to the curriculum. This is also indicative of the fact that READ Educational Trust works in collaboration with the national Department of Education as was indicated in Chapter One.

This concurs with the researcher's experience during this project and literature review. For example, Brown and Seidner (1998:97) purport that it is important to determine whether the programme under evaluation is effective in achieving the national aims and outcomes specified by the National Curriculum Statement. Details are illustrated in Table 6.34 below.

Table 6.33 Coding system explaining the relationship between READ's training programmes and the NCS

Response	Code
READ's training programmes achieve the aims and outcomes specified by the National Curriculum Statement	RCS
READ uses Quality Assurance mechanisms for compliance purposes	QAC
There is a relationship between READ's training programmes and international standards	RIS
READ works in partnership with the Department of Education	RDE
There are differences between READ's training programmes and the traditional teaching practises	DRT

Table 6.34 Frequency explaining the relationship between READ's training programmes and the NCS

Response	Code	Frequency
READ's training programmes achieve the aims and outcomes specified by the National Curriculum Statement	RCS	TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, T5
READ uses Quality Assurance mechanisms for compliance purposes	QAC	TM, PC1
There is a relationship between READ's training programmes and international standards	RIS	PC1, TM and T5
READ works in partnership with the Department of Education	RDE	TM, T3
There are differences between READ's training programmes and the traditional teaching practices	DRT	PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3

When the respondents were asked whether READ has obtained some tangible or measurable results in the last three years of organizational success, seven respondents (TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, and T5) (see Table 6.36), mentioned that READ's training programmes have yielded measurable results in the last three years of organizational success. They further indicated that READ's training programmes are evaluated internally and externally. The data also indicates that six respondents (TM, PC1, PC2, T3, T4 and T5) (see Table 6.36), mentioned that READ Educational Trust does baseline and post–programme analysis.

One respondent (T1) (see Table 6.36), mentioned that READ's training programmes had impacted on 800 000 learners and that READ trained 13 940 educators in 800 schools form 1999– 2004. Another respondent (TM) (see Table 6.36), mentioned that external evaluation results showed that learner performance has improved by 10% in less than a year.

The study shows that from the eight respondents who were interviewed at READ, seven of them mentioned that READ's training programmes yielded tangible results in the last three years of organizational success and that the programmes are evaluated internally and externally. For instance, Trainer (T1) mentioned that READ has achieved measurable or tangible results through its training programmes as illustrated previously. According to Rae (2004:6-7); Kirkpatrick (1998:3); and Brown and Seidner (1998:106), it is imperative for the evaluator to determine whether measurable results have been achieved as a result of the training programme or not. This is also in line with the objective of level 4 of the ROI model that has been used in this investigation.

In the light of the above findings, it may be concluded that READ Educational Trust has yielded measurable or tangible results through the implementation of its training programmes. Details are reflected in Table 6.36 below.

Table 6.35 Coding system explaining measurable results achieved by READ in the last three years

Response	Code
READ's training programmes are evaluated internally and externally	EIE
READ has impacted on 800 000 learners from 1999-2004	RIL
External evaluation results showed that learners' results have improved by 10% in less than a year	ERI
READ trained 13 940 educators in 800 schools from 1999-2004	RTE
READ does baseline and post-programme analysis	RBP

Table 6.36 Frequency explaining measurable results achieved by READ in the last three years

Response	Code	Frequency
READ's training programmes are evaluated internally and externally	EIE	TM, PC1, PC2, T2, T3, T4, T5
READ has impacted on 800 000 learners from 1999-2004	RI	T1
External evaluation results showed that learners' results improved by 10% in less than a year	ERI	TM
READ trained 13 940 educators in 800 schools from 1999 – 2004	RTE	T1
READ does baseline and post-programme analysis	RBP	TM, PCl,PC2, T3, T4 ,T5

When the respondents were asked whether there are differences between READ's approach to language teaching and that of the traditional school, all the respondents (TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, and T5) (see Table 6.38), mentioned that there were differences between READ's training programmes and the old method of teaching. Basically, all the respondents mentioned that READ's training programmes are OBE based. In addition to that, seven respondents (PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, and T5) (see Table 6.38), mentioned that there is a difference between READ's training programmes which are learner-centred and that of the traditional school which is teacher-centred. Interesting though, is that five respondents (PC1, PC2, T3, T4, and T5) (see Table 6.38), mentioned that READ's approach to language teaching is book-based while three respondents (T2, T3 and T4) (see Table 6.38), mentioned that READ's approach promotes the establishment of print-rich classrooms. Only one respondent (TM) (see Table 6.38), reiterated that the differences are caused by READ's ability to benchmark its training programmes against best practices of the world.

The study shows that from the eight respondents who were interviewed at READ, all of them mentioned that READ's approach to language teaching is OBE based, for example, The training manager (TM) said *"READ's training programmes are OBE based*." (sic). The study also indicates that from the eight respondents who were interviewed at READ, seven of them mentioned that there are major differences between READ's training programmes and that of the traditional method of teaching. In view of these findings, it may be concluded that READ's training programmes are OBE-based. Details are illustrated in Table 6.38 below.

Table 6.37 Coding system explaining the differences between READ's approach to language teaching and that of the traditional school

Response	Code
There is a relationship between READ's training programmes and OBE	RPO
READ benchmarks its training programmes	RBT
READ's approach is book–based	RBB
READ's approach encourages the establishment of print-rich classrooms	RPC
There are differences between READ's training programmes and the traditional method of teaching	RTT

Table 6.38 Frequency explaining the differences between READ's approach to language teaching and that of the traditional school

Responses	Code	Frequency
There is a relationship between READ's training programmes and OBE	RPO	TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, T5,
READ benchmarks its training programmes	RBT	PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, T5,
READ's approach is book-based	RBB	TM,
READ's approach encourages the establishment of print-rich classrooms	RPC	T2, T3, T4
There are differences between READ's training programmes and the traditional method of teaching	RTT	PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, T5

When the respondents were asked whether READ covers all aspects of writing at Grade 4 level, seven respondents (TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3 and T5) (see Table 6.40), mentioned that READ's training programmes covered all the aspects of writing. A probable explanation for this finding could be that READ's training programmes are based on the National Curriculum Statement. Only one respondent (T4) (see Table 6.40), mentioned that spelling and use of punctuation marks were not covered by READ's training programmes. Intriguing however, is that three respondents (TM, PC1 and T4) (see Table 6.40), mentioned that READ's training programmes are achieving the national aims and outcomes specified by the National Curriculum Statement. The study also revealed that three respondents (TM, PC1, and PC2) (see Table 6.40), mentioned that educators were provided with workbooks while one respondent (T5) (see Table 6.40), mentioned that READ's approach to language teaching is systematic and that it involves skills development.

The study shows that from the eight respondents who were interviewed at READ, seven of them mentioned that READ's training programmes covered all aspects of writing at Grade 4 level. For example, Project coordinator 1 (PC1) said "*READ covers all aspects of*

writing that are prescribed by the national Department of Education" (sic). In the light of these findings, it may be concluded that READ's training programmes cover all aspects of writing.

This concurs with the views of Grade 4 educators who were interviewed at the twenty different schools as illustrated in section A. In addition, READ's annual report clearly indicates that the organization covers all aspects of writing at Grade 4 level (READ educational Trust, 2006:3). Details are highlighted in Table 6.40 below.

Table 6.39 Coding system explaining aspects of writing covered by READ's training programmes at Grade 4 level

Response	Code
Aspects of writing covered by READ of Grade 4 level	ACG
READ's training programmes cover all aspects of writing except spelling and use of punctuation marks	ESP
READ covers aspects of writing that are reflected in the National Curriculum Statement	CAN
Educators are provided with workbooks	EPW
READ uses a systematic way of writing at different levels	SWD
Skills development is an important aspect of writing	SDW

Table 6.40 Frequency explaining aspects of writing covered by READ's training programmes at Grade 4 level

Responses	Code	Frequency
Aspects of writing covered by READ at Grade 4 level	ACG	TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, T5
READ's training programmes cover all aspects of writing except spelling and use of punctuation marks	ESP	T4
READ covers aspects of writing that are reflected in the National Curriculum Statement	CAN	TM, PC1, T4
Educators are provided with workbooks	EPW	TM, PC1, PC2
READ uses a systematic way of writing at different levels	SWD	T5
Skills development is an important aspect of writing	SDW	T5

When the respondents were asked about the implementation of READ's training programmes, all the respondents (TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, and T5) (see Table 6.42), mentioned that READ's training programmes were implemented according to its

training objectives. However, five respondents (PC1, PC2, T1, T3 and T4) (see Table 6.42), mentioned that the balanced literacy model is underpinning READ's training programmes. Three respondents (TM, PC1 and T3) (see Table 6.42), mentioned that the implementation of READ's training programmes was done through quality assurance mechanisms and the mentoring system. Only one respondent (TM) (see Table 6.42), mentioned that READ's training programmes are based on Kirkpatrick's training evaluation model. Fascinating though, is that five respondents (TM) T1, T2, T3, and T5) (see Table 6.42), rated the implementation of READ's training programmes as being 'excellent'.

The study shows that from the eight respondents who were interviewed at READ, all of them mentioned that the implementation of READ's training programmes was achieved according to its objectives. For example, Trainer 5 (T5) said "*READ implements its training programmes succefully. It involves well-trained trainers in the implementation of its training programmes*". (sic).

These results are in line with the views of Grade 4 educators who were interviewed at the twenty different schools. The study shows that from the forty respondents, thirty-six of them mentioned that READ's training has impacted positively on their implementation or application skills.

According to level 3 of the R01 model that has been used in this investigation, it is important to assess the general implementation of training programmes when programme evaluation is being undertaken (Kirkpatrick, 1998:17).

The data suggest that READ' training programmes have been implemented according to its training objectives. Details are reflected in Table 6.42 below.

Table 6.41 Coding system explaining the implementation of READ's training programmes

Responses	Code
READ's training programmes were effectively implemented	TEI
I would rate the implementation of READ's training programmes as being 'good'	RIG
I would rate the implementation of READ's training programmes as being 'excellent'	RIE
Educators are able to apply the acquired knowledge in terms of READ's objectives	EAR
Balanced literacy model is underpinning READ's training programmes	BLR
KirkPatrick's training evaluation model is underpinning READ's training programmes	KMR
Implementation of READ's training programme was done through quality assurance mechanisms and the mentoring syatem	IQM

Table 6.42 Frequency explaining the implementation of READ's training programmes.

Response	Code	Frequency
READ's training programmes were effectively implemented	TEI	TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, T5
I would rate the implementation of READ's training programmes as being 'good'	RIG	TM, T1, T2, T3, T5
I would rate the implementation of READ's training programmes as being 'excellent'	RIE	PC1, PC2, T4
Educators are able to apply the acquired knowledge in terms of READ's objectives	EAR	TM,PC1,PC2,T1,T2,T3,T4,T5.
Balanced literacy model is underpinning READ's training programmes	BLR	PC1, PC2, T1, T3, T4,
KirkPatrick's training evaluation model is underpinning READ's training programmes	KMR	TM
Implementation of READ's training programme was done through quality assurance mechanisms and the mentoring syatem	IQM	TM, PC1, T3

When the respondents were asked whether READ Educational Trust had a monitoring system in place to sustain its training programmes, all the respondents (TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, and T5) (see Table 6.44), mentioned that the organization had a consistent monitoring system in place to achieve the above goal. An explanation for this finding could be that monitoring is an important component of READ's training programmes. In addition to that, seven respondents (TM, PC1, T1, T2, T3, T4, and T5) (see Table 6.44), mentioned that the READ trainers use standardized checklists and monitoring forms to

monitor the implementation of READ's training programmes. Fascinating however, is that five respondents (TM, PC1, PC2, T1 and T5) (see Table 6.44), indicated that the READ trainers did support visits and not inspection visits.

The study shows that from the eight respondents who were interviewed at READ, all of them mentioned that READ Educational Trust has a consistent monitoring system in place to sustain its training programmes. For example, The training manager (TM) said *"READ trainers make follow-up visits to all the projects schools. The monitoring system is very consistent as they use standardized checklists and monitoring forms. We do support visits and not inspection visits*". (sic).

This aspect is also highlighted in READ's annual report which clearly indicates that the organization has a consistent monitoring system in place to sustain its training programmes (READ Educational Trust, 2006: 10). These findings are also in line with the views of Grade 4 educators who participated in the qualitative study. In fact, Grade 4 educators mentioned that the monitoring of READ's training programmes was effectively undertaken. Monitoring is an important aspect of programme implementation.

In view of the above data, it may be concluded that the monitoring of READ's training programmes was well-undertaken. Details are highlighted in Table 6.44 below.

Table 6.43 Coding system explaining the monitoring of READ's training programmes

Responses	Code
READ's training programmes were effectively monitored	MTP
READ's monitoring system is consistent	MSC
READ trainers use standardized checklists and monitoring forms	TSM
READ trainers did support visits and not inspection visits	SN1

Table 6.44 Frequency explaining the monitoring of READ's training programmes

Response	Code	Frequency
READ's training programmes were effectively monitored	MTP	TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, T5
READ's monitoring system is consistent	MSC	TM, PC1, T1, T2, T4, T5
READ trainers use standardized checklists and monitoring forms	TSM	TM, PC1, T1, T2, T3, T4, T5
READ trainers did support visits and not inspection visits	SN1	TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T5

When the respondents were asked about some notable changes in the last three years of organizational success in acquiring new projects, all the respondents (TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, and T5) (see Table 6.46), mentioned that READ Educational Trust has acquired quite a number of projects in the last three years of organizational success and growth. In fact, all of them cited examples of projects that were acquired by READ Educational Trust in the last three years of organizational success. A probable explanation for these responses could be that READ Educational Trust has already developed a good reputation which makes it easy for the organization to acquire new projects. Interesting however, is that five respondents (TM, PC1, PC2, T1, and T5) (see Table 6.46), rated the business impact of READ's training projects on organizational growth as being 'good' while the other three respondents (T2, T3 and T5) (see Table 6.46), rated the business impact of those projects as being "excellent".

The study shows that from the eight respondents who were interviewed at READ, all of them mentioned that there were notable changes in the last three years of organizational success in acquiring new projects. For example, Project coordinator 1 (PC1) said "*There are many notable examples of projects that were acquired by READ in the last three years. For example, the Anglo Gold Ashanti project, the National Lottery project and the Edcon project. I would rate the business impact of READ's training programmes on organizational growth as "Good".* (sic).

According to level 4 of the R01 model that has been used in this investigation, it is imperative to assess the impact of training programmes on organizational growth and sustainability (Brown & Seidner, 1998:106-107).

These findings concur with the views of Grade 4 educators who participated in this investigation as illustrated in Table 6.18.

Based on these findings, it may be concluded that READ's training programmes have impacted positively on organizational growth and success. Details are reflected in Table 6.46 below.

Table 6.45 Coding system explaining the business impact of READ's training programmes on organisational growth

Responses	Code
There are notable changes that resulted from the implementation of READ's training programmes	NPA
READ has acquired projects in the last three years of organizational success	RAP
I would rate the business impact of READ's training programmes on organizational growth as being "good"	RBG
I would rate the business impact of READ's training progress on organizational growth a being "excellent"	RBE

Table 6.46 Frequency explaining the business impact of READ's training programmes on organisational growth

Response	Codes	Frequency
There are notable changes that resulted from the implementation of READ's training programmes	NPA	TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T5
READ has aquired projects in the last three years of organizational success	RAP	TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, T5
I would rate the business impact of READ's training programmes on organizational growth as being "good"	RBG	TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T4
I would rate the business impact of READ's training programmes on organizational growth as being "excellent"	RBE	T2, T3, T5

When the respondents were asked about success stories that could be linked to READ's training programmes, all the respondents (TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, and T5) (see Table 6.48), indicated that there were many success stories that could be attributed to READ's training programmes. Surprisingly, three respondents (TM, T1 and T4) (see Table 6.48), mentioned that READ provided schools with the resources. Three respondents (PC2, T2 and T5) (see Table 6.48), mentioned that READ's training programmes had an impact on the development of literacy skills in general. Only two respondents (PC1 and T3) (see Table 6.48), mentioned that READ's training programmes

had an impact on educators' professional development. Intriguing however, is that two respondents (PC1 and T4) (see 6.48), mentioned that READ has already groomed successful business people in South Africa, while two other respondents (PC1 and T4) (see Table 6.48), mentioned that READ is the best NGO in South Africa. When the respondents were asked about the uniqueness of READ's training programmes, one respondent (PC2) (see Table 6.48), mentioned that READ was involved in the provision of non-formal education and the other respondent (T5) (see Table 6.48) mentioned that READ undertook continuous research on its training programmes.

The study shows that from the eight respondents who were interviewed at READ, all of them mentioned that there are many success stories that could be linked to READ's training programmes, for example, Project coordinator 1 (PC1) said *"READ has already touched the lives of many educators and learners. My children undergone training at READ and they are successful businessmen. READ has been there for 27 years and it is the best NGO in South Africa."* (sic).

According to Brown and Seidner (1998:106), it is vital to determine whether there are some success stories that could be linked to the organization's language programmes in schools. This is an important aspect of programme evaluation as it determines the merit and worth of organizations.

The above findings are corroborated by the findings of the quantitative study where Grade 4 educators showed a positive reaction towards READ's training programmes. These findings confirm the credibility of READ Educational Trust as the service provider. Any organization that attains a positive reaction or customer satisfaction has the potential to acquire many projects which implies economic growth and sustainability. Details of these findings are illustrated in Table 6.48 below.

Table 6.47 Coding system explaining success stories that could be linked to READ's training programmes

Responses	Code
READ provides schools with the resources	RPR
READ has an impact on the development of successful business people	RDB
READ has an impact on the development of literacy skills in general	RDL
READ is the best NGO in South Africa	RBN
READ undertakes continuous research on its training programmes	RRT
READ organizes motivational events	RME
READ is involved in the provision of non-formal education	RNE

Table 6.48 Frequency explaining success stories that could be linked to READ's training programmes

Response	Code	Frequency
READ provides schools with the resources	RPR	TM, T1, T4
READ has an impact on the development of successful business people	RDB	PC1, T3
READ has an impact on the development of literacy skills in general	RDL	PC1, T4
READ is the best NGO in South Afica	RBN	T5
READ undertakes continuous research on its training programmes	RRT	T1, T2
READ organizes motivational events	RME	PC2, T2, T5
READ is involved in the provision of non-formal education	RNE	PC2

When the respondents were asked about the theories that underpin READ's training programmes, seven respondents (PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, and T5) (see Table 6.50), indicated that the READ language programme is based on language teaching and learning theories of Vygotsky and Bernstein. However, one respondent (T5) (see Table 6.50), mentioned that they also followed language principles proposed by authors such as Krashen.

The study shows that from the eight respondents who were interviewed at READ, seven of them mentioned that READ's training programmes are based on language teaching and learning theories of Vygotsky and Bernstein. However, the training manager (TM)

indicated that READ's training programmes are based on the teaching and learning theories of Vygotsky, Bernstein and Kirkpatrick's training evaluation model.

Based on these findings, it may be argued that READ's training programmes are credible as they are based on learning theories that have been developed by well-renown scholars such as Vygotsky and Bernstein. Even more fascinating is that READ's training programmes are based on Kirkpartrick's training evaluation model. It is imperative to determine the basis as well as the nature of training programmes when conducting programme evaluation (READ Education Trust, 2006:10). Details of these findings are illustrated in Table 6.50 below.

Table 6.49 Coding system explaining theories of learning that underpin READ's training programmes

Response	Code
READ's training programmes are based on teaching and leaning theories of Vygotsky and Bemstein	TVB
READ's training programmes are based on teaching and learning theories of Vygotsky, Bernstein and Kirkpartrick	VBK
READ's training programmes are based on language principles proposed by Krashen	LPA

Table 6.50 Frequency explaining theories of learning that underpin READ's training programmes

Response	Code	Frequency
READ's training programmes are based on teaching and learning theories of Vygotsky and Bernstein	TVB	PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4,T5
READ's training programmes are based on teaching and learning theories of Vygotsky, Bernstein and Kirkpartrick	VBK	TM
READ's training programmes are based on language principles proposed by other authors such as Krashen	LPA	T5

When the respondents were asked about the challenges facing them as READ trainers and managers, all the respondents mentioned that they were faced with different challenges during the implementation of READ's training programmes.

When the respondents were asked whether top management was supportive of the implementation of READ's training programmes, all the respondents (TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, and T5) (see Table 6.52), mentioned that top management was supportive of the implementation of READ's training programmes.

When the respondents were asked whether the social milieu has an impact on the general implementation of READ's training programmes, five respondents (PC1, PC2, T1, T3 and T5) (see Table 6.52), mentioned that the social milieu has an impact on the general implementation of READ's training programmes. Amazing however, is that two respondents (T2 and T4) (see Table 6.52), mentioned that the social milieu does not have an impact on the implementation of the READ training programmes.

When the respondents where asked whether English as a medium of instruction was a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes, five respondents (TM, T1, T2, T3 and T4) (see Table 6.52), mentioned that English as a medium of instruction is not a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes. Interesting, however, is that three respondents (PC1, PC2 and T5) (see Table 6.52), mentioned that English as a medium of instruction is a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes. These respondents also indicated that the home language policy was a challenge. Only one respondent (PC2) (see Table 6.52) mentioned that lack of vehicles was a challenge to them as fieldworkers. Surprisingly, one respondent (T3) (see Table 6.52), mentioned that lack of funds was a challenge. According to Nieman and Monyai (2006:159), it is imperative to establish the challenges facing project staff when conducting programme evaluation.

This study shows that from the eight respondents who were interviewed at READ, all of them mentioned that they were faced with different challenges and that management was supportive of the implementation of READ's training programmes. The data in Table 6.52 also show that five of the respondents mentioned that the social milieu has an impact on the implementation of READ's training programmes. For example, Project co-ordinator 1 (PCI) said "*The social milieu affects the implementation of READ's training programmes, because learners in urban areas normally perform better than those in the rural areas even though they are provided with almost the same material.*" (sic).

The study has revealed that from the eight respondents who participated in the investigation, five of them mentioned that English as a medium of instruction is not a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes. This result is contrary to the findings from Grade 4 educators where the majority of the respondents indicated that English as a medium of instruction is a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes. Interesting though, is that three of the respondents indicated that English as a medium of instruction is a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes. Of note is that the majority of Grade 4 educators who participated in the qualitative study, mentioned that English is a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes.

In the light of the above findings, it may be concluded that English as a medium of instruction can, to a certain extent, be a barrier to the implementation of language programmes in schools. Details are reflected in Table 6.52 below.

Table 6.51 Coding system explaining challenges facing READ staff

Response	Code
Top management is supportive of the implementation of READ's training programmes	TSI
The social milieu has an impact on the implementation of READ's training programmes	SIR
The social milieu does not have an impact on the implementation of READ's training programmes	SNI
English is a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes	EBL
English is not a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes	ENB
The home language policy is a challenge	HPC
Lack of vehicles is a challenge Lack of funds is a challenge	LVC LFC

Table 6.52 Frequency explaining challenges facing READ staff

Response	Code	Frequency
Top management is supportive of the implementation of READ's training programmes	TSI	TM, PC1, PC2, T1, T2, T3, T4, T5
The social milieu has an impact on the implementation of READ's training programmes	SIR	PC1, PC2, T1, T3, T5
The social milieu does not have an impact on the implementation of READ's training programmes	SNI	T2, T4
English is a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes	EBL	PC1, PC2, T4

English is not a barrier to the implementation of READ's training programmes	ENB	TM, T1, T2, T3, T4
The home Language policy is a challenge	HPC	PC1, PC2, T5
Lack of vehicles is a challenge	LVC	PC2
Lack of funds is a challenge	LFC	T3

6.4 SUMMARY

In Chapter Six, the analysis and interpretation of the quantitative and qualitative results are provided. Aspects such as the reliability and validity of the questionnaire; the interpretation of data obtained on items assosciated with the impact of the READ programme on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies; statement of the appropriate hypotheses and analyzing the data by means of multivariate statistical tests, a discussion of the five factors identified in this study and a discussion of the differences between the factor means of the group for each of the factors that contribute to the impact of the READ programme on Grade 4 learners' writing competencies, were dealt with in this chapter. In addition to the analysis and interpretation of the qualitative research, a discussion and synthesis of the qualitative results was presented in the Sixth Chapter

The next chapter presents the summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations.