

# **Children with Physical and Sensory disabilities: Exploring the implementation of inclusive education legislation and policy**

**BY**

**Serika Rajmohan**

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Interdisciplinary Masters in Child Care and Protection Degree, in the College of Law and Management studies and the School of Law, University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard College Campus).

Date: November 2015

## DECLARATION

This research has not been previously accepted for any degree and is not being currently considered for any other degree at any other university.

I declare that this Dissertation contains my own work except where specifically acknowledged

Serika Rajmohan (212562025)

Signed.....

Date.....

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Above all, thank you God for all the blessings in my life. Thank you for always giving me the strength to be motivated through all the obstacles experienced.

Secondly, a special thank you to my husband for your patience and support throughout this process.

A special thank you to Mrs. Singh for being so accommodating in allowing me to take the time off when needed. It has really made this process less stressful.

Finally, without my supervisor Professor Carmel Matthias this would not be possible. You have been a motivating source throughout this entire process and I am eternally grateful for the time and effort you have taken in constantly correcting my work and being so patient.

## **ABSTRACT**

Research studies have shown that schools in South Africa face many challenges in implementing inclusive education (IE) for children with disabilities. The primary aim of this study was to explore the implementation of IE policies for children with physical and sensory disabilities in six public primary schools in the Pinetown district. A qualitative research approach was used in this study. Probability sampling in the form of simple random sampling was used. Semi-structured interviews were used to collect data from 6 principals at public primary schools in the Pinetown district. An ecosystem perspective was used as a framework to guide the study.

The major conclusion of this study was that public primary schools were not implementing IE legislation and policies. Schools accommodated children with limited physical and sensory disabilities provided that they were self-sufficient and did not rely on the teacher or other students to move around. Children with severe physical and sensory disabilities were not admitted in these schools either because parents did not approach mainstream schools or the past procedures of referral to special schools was still practiced. Mainstream schools continue to have barriers in implementing IE due to large class sizes, the lack of resources and infrastructure, the teachers' lack of training and lack of support from parents and the DoE.

The findings in this study are consistent with a number of other studies where similar challenges were experienced in implementing IE. Regardless of legislation and policies on IE, children with disabilities continue to be segregated on the basis that they are still not receiving an education together with their able bodied peers.

## **ACCRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

DoE	Department of Education
CRPD	United Nations Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities
IE	Inclusive education
UNCRC	United Nations Convention on the rights of the child
EWP6	Education White Paper Six
UN	United Nations
ACRWC	African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child
DPSA	Disabled People of South Africa
HR	Human Rights

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>ABSTRACT.....</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES.....</b>	<b>XI</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2 BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE FOR STUDY.....	2
1.3 RESEARCH PROBLEM.....	4
1.4 RESEARCH AIM.....	5
1.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES.....	6
1.6 RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	6
1.7 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	6
1.8 STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION.....	9
<b>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	10
2.2 DEFINITION OF DISABILITY.....	10
2.3 PREVALENCE OF DISABILITY.....	11
2.4 MEDICAL APPROACH & SOCIAL APPROACH.....	13
2.4.1 Medical Approach.....	13
2.4.2 Social Approach.....	14
2.4.3 Human Right Approach.....	15
2.4.4 Developmental Approach.....	16
2.5 INTERNATIONAL LAW.....	17
2.5.1 The Salamanca Statement and Framework for action on special needs education.....	17
2.5.2 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child 1989 (UNCRC).....	18
2.5.3 The African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child 1990	

(ACRWC).....	18
2.5.4 Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities 2006 (CRPD) .....	19
<b>2.6 NATIONAL LEGISLATION AND POLICY.....</b>	<b>20</b>
2.6.1 The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 108 of 1996 (1996 Constitution) .....	20
2.6.2 The National Educational Policy Act 27 of 1996.....	21
2.6.3 The Education White Paper Six - Building an inclusive Education and Training System (EWP6) .....	21
2.6.4 The South African Schools Act 1996.....	23
<b>2.7 DEFINITION OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>2.8 CHALLENGES FACED IN IMPLEMENTING INCLUSIVE EDUCATION...25</b>	
2.8.1. Support from the Parents.....	25
2.8.2. Support from the Community.....	27
2.8.3. Teachers' skills and training.....	27
2.8.4. Support from the Principal.....	31
2.8.5. Support from the District Based Support Team.....	32
2.8.6. Support from the Department of Education.....	33
2.8.7. Infrastructure and equipment.....	34
<b>2.9 CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>35</b>
 <b>CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....</b>	 <b>37</b>
3.1 INTRODUCTION.....	37
3.2 RESEARCH APPROACH.....	37
3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN.....	38
3.4 SELECTION OF SCHOOLS.....	38
3.5 PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY.....	38
3.6 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES.....	39
3.6.1 Semi-structured interviews.....	39
3.6.2 Observation.....	40

<b>3.7</b>	<b>METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>40</b>
3.7.1	Planning for recording data.....	41
3.7.2	Data collection and preliminary analysis.....	41
3.7.3	Managing data.....	42
3.7.4	Reading and writing memos.....	42
3.7.5	Generating categories and themes.....	42
3.7.6	Coding the data.....	43
3.7.7	Testing emergent understanding.....	43
3.7.8	Searching for alternative explanation.....	43
<b>3.8</b>	<b>VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY.....</b>	<b>43</b>
3.8.1	Credibility.....	44
3.8.2	Transferability.....	44
3.8.3	Dependability.....	44
3.8.4	Confirmability.....	45
<b>3.9</b>	<b>ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>3.10</b>	<b>LIMITATION OF THE STUDY.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>3.11</b>	<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>46</b>
 <b>CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS.....</b>		<b>47</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>SHORT PROFILE OF PARTICIPANTS AND DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHOOL CONTEXT.....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF PARTICIPANTS.....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>4.4</b>	<b>IMPLEMENTATION OF IE POLICY AND LEGISLATION.....</b>	<b>51</b>
4.4.1	Understanding of IE.....	52
4.4.1.1	Access to the EWP6.....	52
4.4.1.2	Interpretation of IE.....	53
4.4.1.3	Perceptions about implementation of IE.....	54
4.4.2	Admission.....	56
4.4.2.1	No applications.....	56



4.4.2.2	Referral to special school.....	57
4.4.2.3	Opinions on admitting children with severe physical or sensory disability.....	59
4.4.2.4	Opinions on admitting children with limited physical or sensory disability.....	61
4.4.3	Infrastructure and resources.....	63
4.4.3.1	Current school layout.....	64
4.4.3.2	No budget from the DoE.....	65
4.4.3.3	Large class sizes.....	67
4.4.4	Teacher training.....	69
4.4.4.1	Disruption of classes.....	70
4.4.4.2	Not enough workshops therefore limited knowledge.....	70
4.4.4.3	The psychology or emotion of the child.....	74
4.4.4.4	Sign language.....	75
4.4.4.5	Demotivation.....	76
4.4.5	Parent support.....	77
4.4.5.1	No support.....	78
4.4.5.2	Limited to positive support.....	79
4.5	RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PARTICIPANTS.....	80
4.5.1	Need for teacher training college.....	80
4.5.2	Accommodation for children with limited disabilities.....	81
4.5.3	Teacher volunteers and special classes within the school.....	82
4.5.4	Donations and sponsorships.....	82
4.6	CONCLUSION.....	83
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....		84
5.1	INTRODUCTION. ....	84
5.2	SUMMARY OF THE MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION.....	84
5.2.1	Factors that positively and negatively impact on the admission of pupils with physical and sensory disabilities.....	84

5.2.2	Experiences and challenges in implementing inclusive education policies.....	85
5.2.3	Steps taken at schools in furthering inclusive education.....	89
5.3	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	89
5.3.1	Policy directives with effective monitoring.....	90
5.3.2	School principals to be fully orientated to IE policy.....	90
5.3.3	Weighting system.....	90
5.3.4	Tertiary institutes to include IE modules.....	90
5.3.5	Ongoing teacher training.....	91
5.3.6	Public awareness.....	91
5.3.7	Budget allocation.....	91
5.3.8	Sponsorships, donations and fund raising.....	91
5.4	RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	92
5.5	CONCLUSION.....	92
	REFERENCES.....	93
	APPENDICES.....	100
	Appendix A: Informed consent.....	100
	Appendix B: Principal interview schedule.....	101
	Appendix C: Permission to conduct research from the DoE.....	103
	Appendix D: Ethical clearance letter.....	104

## List of Tables

Table 4.1	Gender and Years of experience as Principal.....	50
Table 4.2	Themes and subthemes.....	51

# CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education (IE) for children with disabilities is an extensive concept that cannot have a solitary meaning. Amongst other connotations it is “a dynamic approach of responding positively to pupils with diversity and seeing individual differences not as a problem but as an opportunity to enrich learning” (Mariga, 2014: 25). More importantly its philosophy aims to increase the participation of all disabled persons in society and at schools thereby decreasing any exclusionary or discriminatory practices (Booth, 2005: Mariga, 2014).

Children with disabilities are affected by poor access to education. The situation regarding access to education by children with disabilities is evident globally. Lansdown (2009: 1) estimated that there are “at least 90% of children with disabilities across the developing world have no access to education”. Closer to home, Donohue estimated that almost 70 per cent of school-going children with disabilities are not at school (Donohue, 2014). In the year 1995, five per cent of the South African population was estimated as being disabled (Office of the Deputy President, 1997). A more recent estimate according to Statistics South Africa using census 2011 data, showed that the disability rate in South Africa has increased to seven and a half per cent. Results from surveys show that children with disabilities are less inclined to go to school than their able-bodied peers (DSD, 2012). These statistics provide an indication of the scope of intervention required.

For children with disabilities access to public primary ordinary schools and meaningful education is dependent on various systems working together to make IE a reality. This study explores principals’ experiences and understanding in implementing IE in schools including their admission policy, barriers, and the support structures available together with recommendations to implement IE.

This chapter provides the context within which this study was undertaken, the background and rationale for the study, the research problem, aims and objectives, key research questions, theoretical framework and the structure of the dissertation.

## **1.2 BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY**

Internationally, the IE concept was initiated at the Salamanca World Conference in Spain (The Salamanca Statement, 1994). It set into motion a global movement to pursue the goals of making education available for all children (The Salamanca Statement, 1994). The 1989 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC, 1989) introduced specific human rights (HR) for children with disabilities (Article 23). Following this international instrument was the adoption of the regional African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child 1990 (ACRWC) promoting social integration of persons with disabilities (Article 13) and the right to education of every child (Article 11). Similar rights are enshrined in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Person with Disabilities (CRPD, 2007) which specifically addresses the right to IE (Article 7) and places an obligation on governments to provide reasonable accommodation, support and incorporation of sign language and braille in the education system (Article 24). South Africa has supported this macrosystem global movement of HR and inclusion of persons with disabilities by ratifying these international conventions.

Legislation in South Africa has aligned itself with the international movement on IE. In 1996, our supreme law The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 108 of 1996 (1996 Constitution) upheld the values of non-discrimination (Section 9) and made the right to basic education a fundamental right (Section 29(1)). The values of the 1996 Constitution are echoed in all subsequent legislation. The South African Schools Act (1996) makes provisions for all schools to be full service schools without unfairly discriminating in any way

(Section 5) and to make provision of relevant support and physical facilities (Section 12). Further laws in education (The Higher Education Act, 1997; The Further Education and Training Act, 1998; The Adult Basic Education and training Act, 2000) were promulgated to spread the movement of inclusion of children with disabilities.

Despite the promulgation of legislation, Swart in 2002 identified a number of IE implementation challenges. These included lack of: suitable infrastructure, teacher training, funding, IE officials, assistive devices, and overcrowding of schools. Similar challenges were confirmed in the DANIDA project (Department of Basic Education, 2003) which was a field work pilot study project outlining good practices on the way forward in promoting IE in South Africa. Years after the above studies these challenges still persist. Ngcobo's (2011: 360) findings showed that teaching is done in a "conservative way with no evidence of change in teaching methods". This is despite the fact that teachers were "urged to maintain flexibility in their teaching methods" (Department of Basic Education, 2005:35). Ngcobo (2011:361) also found "no evidence of curriculum differentiation" which is a key strategy in the achievement of IE. Ntombela's (2011) findings also confirmed the limited understanding and experience of teachers on the IE policy, highlighting the lack of training and skills.

The changes in the education system as envisaged by legislation and policy have the potential to allow children with mild to moderate disabilities,( children with disabilities that do not require extensive assistance for normal functioning) access to normal schools. This access to education also provides students with disabilities with an opportunity to reach their full potential, and not be stigmatized according to their disability but rather be acknowledged for their abilities and potential to be productive and contribute to society in their adult lives.

### **1.3 RESEARCH PROBLEM**

The Education White Paper 6: Building an inclusive Education and Training System (EWP6, 2001), the main policy document by the Department of Education, aimed that within the first five years all the necessary systems would be in place for the full-scale implementation of an IE system. However, the Parliamentary Liaison Office, 2012:2) noted that “[m]ore than a decade after the EWP6 was gazetted this goal had not been adequately achieved”. Despite some progress in making IE policy a reality, literature shows that many challenges still exist in implementing this policy (Heeralal, 2014; Kalenga, 2014; Donohue, 2014). The identified challenges include lack of building modification for wheelchair access, training and skills of teachers, curriculum differentiation, various support structures and funding (Ngcobo, 2011).

The introduction of EWP6 by Professor Kader Asmal emphasized the need for “persistence, commitment, support monitoring, evaluation and follow-up” (EWP6, 2001:4). It has been 13 years into the 20 year implementation trajectory set out in the EWP6. Further, the Hon. Ms Angie Motshekga declared 2013 the year of IE (Department of Basic Education, 2015) which emphasized its importance. She emphasized the need for study and research when she stated that “It is important to critically assess what has been achieved and to explore new and vigorous strategies to accelerate and strengthen the implementation of the policy towards 2021” (Department of Basic Education, 2015: 4). This decision gives a clear mandate to all systems within the education system to take responsibility for ensuring the constitutional right of learners with disabilities to receive support for an appropriate level of education. This statement provides justification for research studies to explore what has been achieved in the implementation of policies.

Persons with disabilities include, “those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual, or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others” (CRPD, 2007: 4). In this study I will focus on both physical and sensory

disabilities. Physical disabilities include “upper limb disability, lower limb disability, manual dexterity, and disability in co-ordination with different organs of the body” (Disabled World, 2015). Sensory disabilities can involve any of the five senses, but for educational purposes, it generally relates to hearing, vision or both hearing and vision (Virginia Department of Education, 2015).

Significant gaps in knowledge remain a problem and the underlying cause is the inadequacy of the efforts from government and non-government actors to fulfill the rights of children with disabilities (DSD, 2012). Due to inconsistent policy implementation many children are at risk of being deprived of their right to an IE as enshrined in our 1996 Constitution, international law and national legislation. The Schools Act (1996) vests the authority on the principal in playing a crucial role in the implementation of policy such as IE (Section 16A2). It further obligates the principal to manage staff, learning support material and other equipment (Section 16A (2) (iii)). The significance of “having a good leader in new policy implementation” has repeatedly been affirmed (Poon-McBrayer, 2013:1). In other words, principals exert a certain authority over teachers who in turn affect students in the class. “Teachers represent the primary resource for achieving the goal of IE” (Oswald, 2011: 391) they have a “critical role as agents of change in the creation of an inclusive society” (EWP6, 2001: 22) and therefore good leadership by the principal is of paramount importance. It is against these reasons and the profound changes towards an IE system that I sought to explore the extent of implementation of inclusive education at six public schools in the Pinetown district by interviewing their principals.

#### **1.4 RESEARCH AIM**

The primary aim of the study was to explore the implementation of inclusive education policies for children with physical and sensory disabilities in six public primary schools in the Pinetown district.



## **1.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

1. To explore the factors that positively and negatively impact on the admission of pupils with physical and sensory disabilities.
2. To explore the experiences and challenges in implementing inclusive education policies.
3. To explore steps taken at the schools in furthering inclusive education as advocated in policy documents.

## **1.6 RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. What factors positively and negatively impact on the admission of pupils with physical and sensory disabilities?
2. What are the experiences and challenges in implementing inclusive education policies?
3. What are the steps taken at these schools in furthering inclusive education as advocated in policy documents?

## **1.7 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

In this study I used an ecosystem theoretical framework. This theoretical framework was developed in 1979 by Urie Bronfenbrenner (Rosa & Tudge, 2013). The ecological perspective focuses on the “continual interactions and transactions between persons, families, groups and or communities and their environment” (Teater, 2014: 30). It is also referred to as a “person-in-environment concept” (Glitterman, 2008:51). “Bronfenbrenner viewed the environment as intrinsically connected to the individuals within it.” (as cited in Rosa & Tudge, 2013:246).

Bronfenbrenner’s approach uses a “series of concentric rings” to represent different system levels (Healy, 2014: 124) much like Russian dolls. The levels include the microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem and macrosystem (Healy, 2014). These subsystems are seen as a series of “nested structures” that are inclusive but also extends beyond the home, neighborhood, Department of

Education and other teams with which the school has interactions with (Berk, 2000: 27).

Firstly, Bronfenbrenner described “the microsystem as the most proximal setting, with particular physical characteristics” (as cited in Rosa & Tudge, 2013: 246). It is the most immediate and the most influential. He also argued that “the setting is one in which the activities and interpersonal roles and relations engaged in over time are the constructive elements” (as cited in Rosa & Tudge, 2013: 246). In this study, the school is identified as the microsystem.

Secondly, Bronfenbrenner explained the mesosystem as the relationships among two or more microsystems in which the institution is actively involved with (as cited in Rosa & Tudge, 2013). Put differently, the mesosystem is an arrangement of microsystems. It is shaped or extended every time an institution enters a new setting, and is reduced when the institution leaves the setting. Education of children with disabilities is a partnership between the parents and the teachers and the linkages between school and children’s home settings are critical for both the learners and the educators. The relationship between the parents and their providers such as the school contributes to the success of IE (Soodack, 2002). An example will be the interaction between the school and the child’s family or the social and cultural organizations that provide support. There is a positive impact when the microsystems work together and a negative impact if they work against each other.

Thirdly, the exosystem is the larger social system that the school does not directly function within but experiences its influence. An example could be the parent’s earnings. Should most of the parents belong to a low income bracket they cannot afford to send the child with disability to independent schools that cater specifically for their needs but are forced to use public schools. The school is not directly influenced by the parent’s income bracket but it is affected by the increased number of students enrolled in a class at the public school.

Finally, the macrosystem is described as the outermost level consisting of the overarching pattern of microsystems, mesosystems and exosystems characteristic of a given culture or subculture. “Bronfenbrenner stated that the influence of the macrosystem on the other ecological settings is reflected in how the lower systems (e.g. school) function” (as cited in Rosa & Tudge, 2013: 247). According to Bronfenbrenner the distinctive feature of the macrosystem is its underlying “belief system or ideology” (as cited in Rosa & Tudge, 2013: 247). For example, the EWP6 policy on IE has been formulated nationally as the main policy document on implementing IE in schools. However, it does not mean that every public ordinary school applies these policies in the same way. In Bronfenbrenner’s final phase of theory development (1986-2006) he developed the concept of a ‘chronosystem’ which represents “the importance of time” (as cited in Rosa & Tudge, 2013:256).

The usefulness of ecosystems theory enables one to see all manner of relationships and dynamics which are otherwise relatively invisible. It gives a “holistic perspective in determining which system requires intervention” (Teater, 2014:30). If there is a change in one system it can potentially cause change in the other system. I was guided by the ecosystems theory in focusing not only on the school but also on all the external factors that impacted on the implementation of IE policy at schools.

## **1.8 STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION**

The chapters included in the dissertation are as follows:-

### **Chapter 1: Introduction and theoretical framework**

This introductory chapter included the background and outline of the research problem, research aim, objectives, research questions and theoretical framework.

### **Chapter 2: Literature review**

In this chapter the prevalence and definition of disability is considered. In addition to that, international and national laws and policies concerning IE for children with disabilities is considered. Some of the major challenges in literature are also identified.

### **Chapter 3: Research methodology and methods**

In this chapter the use of a qualitative research design is explained to get a comprehensive understanding of the experiences of the participants. The research methodology is explained and includes techniques utilized to collect data, rigour, data analysis, limitations and ethical consideration.

### **Chapter 4: Analysis and discussion of findings**

The results are presented using themes and sub-themes guided by relevant literature and the theoretical framework. This chapter includes a description of the school context, experiences, strategies and recommendations of participants.

### **Chapter 5: Conclusion and recommendations**

In the final chapter findings of the study is discussed. From these findings recommendations are drawn.

## **CHAPTER 2:**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter provides a review of the literature on IE for children with disabilities. In order to grasp the concept of IE there is a need to understand the reason for the progression of our laws and the need for change in our education system. South Africa has changed discriminatory practices to make laws more in accordance with universally accepted norms by recognizing that each child is born with inherent HR. The chapter begins with the definition of disability. This is followed by a discussion of international law that has influenced South African legislation. National legislation that governs IE is also discussed. This chapter also looks at the role-players required to put IE practices into action. Challenges in the various microsystems working together will be considered from literature. One of the foremost challenges is defining disability.

#### **2.2 DEFINITION OF DISABILITY**

One of the fundamental challenges in bridging the gap between disabled and able bodied persons is that there is no specific definition for disability. The effort “to define disability in a way that accurately and realistically depicts the lived experience of persons with disabilities is a historical one, characteristic of power dynamics, prejudice and the social exclusion of those who do not belong” (The Presidency Republic of South Africa, 2014: 5). This challenge is best explained by Soudien and Baxen (2006: 154):

“...each definition is embedded within the broader constructs of how society works, who is in and who is out, and under what conditions decisions are made. How definitions work to frame, organise and create policies and the social practices that flow from them, is nowhere clearer than in the field of education. It is crucial, therefore, that these definitions be understood as emergent from particular histories and discursive formations.”

Globally, according to the World Health Organisation (2014), “disability is the interaction between individuals with a health condition (e.g. cerebral palsy, Down

syndrome and depression) and personal and environmental factors (e.g. negative attitudes, inaccessible transportation and public buildings, and limited social supports)". The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD, 2006) has a broad definition for disabilities and "includes those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual, or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others" (UN General Assembly, 2007: 4). However, in South Africa we do not have a dedicated definition or disability specific legislation (Office of the Deputy President, 1997). Currently, "the definition of disability varies across legislation and contexts, with too many national departments still documenting and implementing policies using impairment as the sole axis for defining disability" (The Presidency Republic of South Africa, 2014:26). This has the effect that in South Africa there is no agreement about what should be categorized as disability (Heap, Lorenzo and Thomas, 2009). Consequently the discussion below will show how, "the lack of a clear definition for disabilities has created one of the main challenges in obtaining accurate statistics" (United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2006:6) which helps government in decision making and policy formation.

### **2.3 PREVALENCE OF DISABILITY**

In South Africa there is a serious absence of dependable information on the nature and prevalence of disability. Apart from the clear definition of disability other factors contribute to the lack of information which included the traditional negative attitudes to persons with disabilities and that "in the past disability issues were viewed mainly within a health and welfare framework" which "led to a failure to integrate disability into mainstream statistical processes" (Office of the Deputy President, 1997: 1). It is of paramount importance that learners with disabilities are adequately accommodated for and accessing reliable information is a vital part of the transformation process of including children with disabilities in mainstream schools.

Governmental and non-governmental institutes provide different perspectives on the presence of disability in South Africa. As noted in Chapter One, an estimate in 1995 put the prevalence of disability at five per cent of the South African population (Office of the Deputy President, 1997). A more recent estimate according to Statistics South Africa using census 2011 data, the national disability prevalence rate has increased to seven and a half per cent in South Africa. The same survey showed that 11 per cent of people who are five years and more had sight impediments, 3.6 per cent had hearing impediments, and a smaller percentage of two per cent had problems communicating and walking. However Disabled People of South Africa (DPSA) disputed these figures released by Statistics South Africa. Olwethu Sipuka the national spokesperson for DPSA stated that, “this is a total fabrication of statistics because it doesn’t look at disability as a social issue” (Bothma, 2014). According to DPSA the prevalence of disability is almost double the amount (14 per cent) compared to Statistics South Africa figure of seven and a half per cent (Bothma, 2014).

Gaining correct statistics is a massive problem. If the statements made by the DPSA spokesperson are true then only a fraction of persons with disabilities are accounted for. Statistics South Africa relies on the participants of the survey to declare their disability. Should the majority of disabled persons not participate in the census then they will be unaccounted for. The government is then reliant on inaccurate statistics to inform its decision making and policy formation.

Despite no clear definition of disability and the unreliable statistical data there is a need to provide for children with disabilities in schools. Donohue (2014) estimated that almost 70 per cent of school-going children with disabilities are out of school. Besides the obvious need for disabled students to receive an education, it is important to receive this education in non-segregated settings. The next section discusses the different approaches in viewing disability.

## **2.4 MEDICAL, SOCIAL, HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH**

In this section the difference between the medical, social, human rights-based and developmental approaches will be discussed. This portrays the manner in which society views disability. It is important to distinguish between these approaches. In order to promote inclusivity people need to follow the social approach that is based on HR and development.

### **2.4.1 Medical approach**

In the past disability used to be viewed and understood in a medical and welfare framework. This meant people with disabilities were identified as ill and different from peers that were not disabled and the focus was “on an individual who needs fixing – either by therapy, medicine, surgery or special treatment” (Peters, 2004: 8). The “aim was usually to offer treatment, or create alternatives to begging or hiding away” (Office of the Deputy President, 1997: 11).

The medical approach towards disability usually meant that organisations for persons with disabilities were normally directed by persons without disabilities. The belief was that disabled people were “to be pitied or helped as part of the deserving poor” (Office of the Deputy President, 1997: 11). Disabled people were acknowledged as people in need of care and their dependency on non-disabled peers created by the medical model deprived them of power and separated them from the majority in society. This prevented them from receiving access to the basic rights.

Despite the shift in approach from the medical to the social model, teacher education programs are still dominated by the former, that children with disabilities have special needs requiring special material, “special teacher skills and special segregated settings” (Oswald, 2011: 391). “Just because a social model of disability now prevails in the way disability is documented, it does not mean that it is being understood and addressed at grassroots level, especially in



the delivery of services” (Howell, Chalklen & Alberts, 2006: 80). Ntombela’s (2011) findings showed that teachers were still using the initial medical model they were originally trained with as it was clear that their standards, ideas and practices of this model was embedded in how they think.

#### **2.4.2 Social approach**

Currently, the social model for disability is a result of it been seen as a HR concern. Central to the social approach is the HR movement. In South Africa IE “originated from a rights perspective that was informed by liberal, critical and progressively democratic thinking to be more democratic and inclusive.” (Nel *et al*, 2011: 75) The social approach to disability “focuses on the removal of barriers, the right to equal participation and the elimination of discrimination based on disability” (Office of the Deputy President, 1997: 12).

It is based on the premise that if the community do not accommodate for persons with disabilities; then it is the community that needs to change (Office of the Deputy President, 1997). The “one size fits all” mentality needs to be abandoned and teachers need to cater for individual students’ needs (Ngcobo, 2011: 363). This means the old way of teaching needs to be amended. Besides changes in thinking, changes are also required to the physical environment (Peters, 2004). Resources need to be made accessible to change current facilities and services need to be available to cater for a more diverse environment. Infrastructure such as school buildings need to be changed making it accessible for persons with wheelchairs. It is also important that resources are provided for students that require aides in learning. Ultimately, the aim must be for people with disabilities to play a complete role in society as with others.

The social model is “based on the belief that the circumstances of people with disabilities and the discrimination they face are socially created phenomenon and have little to do with the impairments of the disabled people” (Office of the Deputy President, 1997:12). The discrimination is essentially based on how

people think and behave. The social model requires a change in mindset in how we visualize disability. Separation and rejection of students that are disabled is considered an important area of injustice and a violation of HR within South African schools as discussed below.

### **2.4.3 Human rights (HR) approach**

Lansdown (2009:11) defines HR as “rights a person has because he or she is a human being”. It includes the essential requirements that people need to live in dignity. If those HR are violated then it is treating that person less than a human being. The UNCRC (1989) introduced specific rights for children with disabilities. Article 23 states that “no children shall be discriminated against on the basis of their disability to receive education that enables the fullest possible social integration and individual development” (UNCRC, 1989). A rights based approach to education is “characterised by accountability and transparency, and thus its outcomes must be measurable” (Craissati, 2007:46). It also means seeing children with disabilities as people with rights and not as objects. Lansdown (2009: 11) mentioned the four central features of HR which include: “universality and inalienability, indivisibility, interdependence and interrelatedness and equality and non-discrimination”.

**Universality and inalienability** – every person in the world has HR which cannot be discarded.

**Indivisibility** – HR are inseparable. The various basic rights are paramount to uphold the dignity of each person. Each right has the same status and one right cannot be more important than another right.

**Interdependence and interrelatedness** – the recognition of one right is often totally or partially dependent, upon the recognition of another right. “For example, the right to education for children with disabilities can only be fully achieved if other rights are also respected” such as the “right to non-discrimination and freedom from poverty” (Lansdown, 2009:11).

**Equality and non-discrimination** – every person is entitled to receive their basic HR without prejudice.

The HR approach recognises that children with disabilities are also entitled to the same rights as their able-bodied peers. The “goal of human rights-based approach to education is to assure every child a quality education that respects and promotes his or her right to dignity and optimum development” (Craissati, 2007:1). The social approach above supports the HR approach in the strong belief that people with disabilities should enjoy the same equal rights as anyone else in society.

#### **2.4.4 Developmental approach**

The developmental approach “is based largely on the White Paper for Reconstruction and Development (1994), which has as one of its goals, socio-economic development through poverty alleviation” (Framework for Social Welfare, 2013: 13). Elements of the developmental approach as explained in the framework for social welfare (2013) include: rights-based elements, harmonising social and economic policies, participation and democracy, collaborative partnership and bridging the micro-macro divide.

This approach states that in order to fully implement the HR approach all stakeholders from micro to macro levels must have social, political and economic goals for future development by promoting human rights. This means in all future plans it is required that each person’s needs are valued equally. It supports the social and HR approach in that it calls for society to ensure that its developmental services are sustainable. “A human rights and development approach to disability focuses on the removal of barriers to equal participation and the elimination of discrimination based on disability” (Office of the Deputy President, 1997:12). “Policy makers in South Africa envisaged the developmental approach to disability would facilitate sustainable, people-centred development and remove barriers to participation so as to improve society as a whole” (Gathiram, 2008:147). The developmental approach “places an emphasis on rights to social welfare as well as social investments that enhance people’s capacity to participate effectively in the productive economy” (Gathiram, 2008:

149) which is ultimately the goal for children with disabilities to receive their right to education and be a part of a productive future economy.

## **2.5 INTERNATIONAL LAW**

When a State ratifies conventions and treaties it is also obligated to execute it. It bears the duty in implementation of these laws and is required to ensure that these conventions and treaties are applied to everyone. South Africa is signatory to the following international laws and is thus obligated to promote its content.

### **2.5.1 The Salamanca Statement and Framework for action on special needs education (Salamanca Statement)**

IE commenced in earnest in many countries after the Salamanca Statement. It called on the “governments to adopt as a matter of law or policy the principle of inclusive education enrolling all children in regular schools, unless there are compelling reasons for doing otherwise” (Lansdown, 2009: 111). South Africa took the initiative in applying recommendations of the Salamanca Statement. One of the recommendations included encouraging students with disabilities to be admitted in regular schools. This was viewed as the most successful method of reducing discrimination (UNESCO, 1994). It is one of the first international reports that have influenced the movement towards inclusivity of children with disabilities. This framework further encourages schools that are inclusive to recognize and accommodate for the different needs of each student, providing for all learners in spite of any difficulty experienced (UNESCO, 1994).

### **2.5.2 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child 1989 (UNCRC)**

The UNCRC provides a benchmark against which other laws should be assessed. Its contribution in realising the rights of children with disabilities cannot be underestimated as “never before had a human rights instrument received near-universal ratification” with only Somalia and the United States of America not ratifying this treaty (Kaime, 2009:1). The UNCRC established rights

specifically for children with disabilities because these children are one of the most defenseless groups in society (United Nations, 2006).

It provides a framework that is comprehensive and binds principles which strengthen how children are treated around the world. Article 2 sets out the “right to non-discrimination and includes disability as a specific ground for protection against discrimination” (UNCRC, 1989:2). Article 3 emphasizes that the child’s best interest should be the main concern and should be the foundation on which programs and policies are formulated (UNCRC, 1989). It “should be taken into account in every service provided for children with disabilities and any other factor affecting them” (Office of the Deputy President, 1997:9). Article 23 “recognises that a mentally or physically disabled child should enjoy a full and decent life, in conditions which ensures dignity promotes self-reliance and facilitates the child’s active participation in the community” (UNCRC, 1989 :7).

The UNCRC goes further as it also establishes a body for monitoring the implementation by the Committee on the Rights of the Child. This committee signifies the importance of IE being the goal of teaching children with disabilities, and it also persuades government to start programs that promotes IE (Lansdown, 2009).

### **2.5.3 The African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child 1990 (ACRWC)**

The ACRWC is another international treaty that aims at securing the rights of the child at an international level. More particularly it contributes to furthering the rights of children in Africa and in ensuring that the “best interest of the child shall be the primary consideration” (Article 4(1)). Article 13, which refers specifically to the rights of children with disabilities, requires States to ensure the active participation of a child with disabilities in society and for some special measures of protection (Article 13(1)). Article 13(3) further acknowledges this child’s right to access public institutions or facilities. This could be interpreted as

obligatory for governments to provide infrastructure conducive to the mobility of children with disabilities such as providing ramps and elevators for wheelchair access. Even though Article 11 of the ACRWC refers to education, education is regrettably left out in Article 13 which concern children with disabilities. Children with disabilities have different needs in comparison with that of their able bodied peers. In Article 13 the right to education is not specifically mentioned. This has the effect that the fulfillment of rights for children with disabilities is undermined in the ACRWC. This is the difference between the UNCRC and the ACRWC as the UNCRC specifically refers to the right to education for children with disabilities in Article 23(3).

#### **2.5.4 Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities 2006 (CRPD)**

The promulgation of the CRPD came into effect as people with disabilities were continued to be seen “as objects of welfare rather than subjects of rights” (Lansdown, 2009: 19). This further added to the demands from the community of persons with disabilities to develop a new treaty to guarantee that persons with disabilities enjoyed their rights on the same basis as others. The CRPD in its entirety apply to all persons with disabilities. It also recognizes that children with disabilities should enjoy all HR equally (CRPD, 2006). Article 7 specifically obligates States to guarantee that children with disabilities should enjoy all HR equally with other children, and also that the main concern should always be the child’s best interest. Article 24 of the CRPD ensures that people with disabilities have equality rights and are not prejudiced. It goes further in obligating the State to provide education. More importantly, it recognises “inclusive education” as a discrete human right (CRPD, 2006: Art 24(1)). Ultimately, the most important aim of the CRPD was to create explicit new HR for people with disabilities. Part of testing the worth of any international HR treaty lies in determining whether the rights it guarantees can be fulfilled at the national level. The fact that the CRPD has been ratified by so many countries “is a hopeful sign but it is not a sufficient barometer for measuring commitment” (Ngwena, 2013:474).

## **2.6 NATIONAL LEGISLATION AND POLICY**

Legislation in South Africa developed in accordance with international laws and the universal movement of promoting HR. IE for children with disabilities addresses discrimination on the basis of disability where old laws were repealed or amended and made more in accordance with the 1996 Constitution.

### **2.6.1 The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 108 of 1996 (1996 Constitution)**

The 1996 Constitution is the highest law of South Africa. It repeals all discriminatory laws and promotes the movement towards protection of HR for all. All laws need to purport the values of the 1996 Constitution. Specifically promoting IE is section 9(3) stating that nobody should be prejudiced against based on disability and section 29(1) which makes it clear basic education is a right that everyone should enjoy. These sections are significant in protecting all children with or without disabilities. It places an obligation on Government to make basic education available to all children, access to schools without discrimination and to be committed to the principles as enshrined in the 1996 Constitution.

Despite these values being enshrined in our 1996 Constitution it is still evident that the right to access quality education for children with disabilities is being denied. This violation was brought to court in The Western Cape High Court in *Western Cape Forum for Intellectual Disability v Government of the Republic of South Africa* case. The Western Cape forum for intellectual disability is a disability organization that represents children with severe and profound intellectual disabilities. They lead an action against the Department of Basic Education as they failed to provide these children with accommodation in public schools. The States failure to provide quality education infringed on their constitutional right to: education, equality, dignity, and protection from neglect. The court concluded these four rights were violated. The right to equality and basic education was mainly applied in deciding the case. As a remedy in violating

the 1996 Constitution, the order of the court included that the State must make basic quality education available to children with these disabilities. This must be done by providing sufficient funds and resources. This included training being provided and employing of more educators together with transport being provided to schools. The order from court also included the State to report back in a year, outlining what steps it took to execute the order. This provision guaranteed that the court has a way of supervising whether the State complies with the order.

### **2.6.2 The National Educational Policy Act 27 of 1996**

The National Educational Policy Act is based on the Constitutional principles and also promotes the child's best interest. This act was put in place in order for each child to reach their full potential. This must be done by considering the rights and choices of the child with special needs when being admitted in school. Specifically the Act states "that no person is denied the opportunity to receive an education to the maximum of his or her ability as a result of physical disability" (National Education Policy Act, 1996: S4 (d)).

### **2.6.3 The Education White Paper Six - Building an inclusive Education and Training System (EWP6)**

The National Educational Policy Act was adopted as a policy document in the form of EWP6. It is the most important policy document that summarizes what an IE and training system is and it sets out the framework on how it intends to be created. It is "another post-apartheid landmark policy paper that cuts our ties with the past and recognizes the vital contribution that our people with disabilities are making and must continue to make as part of our flowering nation" (EWP6, 2001: 4). It provides a framework with funding strategies and steps to be taken in setting up an IE and training system nationally (EWP, 2001). EWP6 is in line with approaches used internationally where the focal point is to provide all students with quality education. It outlines a 20 year period to attain an IE and training system.



The fact that EWP6 supports steps to be taken for creating an IE and training system does not guarantee that the steps set out are followed in schools. Unfortunately policy documents, guidelines, norms and standards cannot pass as law and this reduces strict adherence to implementation. This fact is acknowledged in many countries as, “just because more than 80% of countries in the North and 50% in the South have written policies on IE, it does not automatically follow that these policies will be enacted” (Peters, 2004: 37). “To date, compulsory school attendance for children with disabilities has not effectively been monitored and enforced. What is being witnessed is policy evaporation of EWP6, resulting in a knock-on effect of underachievement of developmental objectives for persons with disabilities in South Africa” (The Presidency Republic of South Africa, 2014:28). Oswald (2011) is of similar view that IE is rather symbolic than a practical reality.

Policy does not exist without practice (Peters, 2004). In many schools IE practices do not exist as teachers have negative attitudes towards its implementation (Nel *et al*, 2011). Their perception reflects a reality in South Africa (Nel *et al*: 2011). Ntombela’s (2011) findings are consistent with Nel’s as it was clear the teacher’s experiences of EWP6 were very limited. Donohue (2014: 6) argues that the explanation for “any significant movement on inclusive policy is the apparent lack of clarity in the policy” and it is not clear whether this lack of clarity had led to, “inaction by the stakeholders involved”. He further stated “that clear policy mandates, together with enforcement of such mandates, will be the most effective means by which inclusive policy will be realized in South Africa” Donohue (2014: 6). It was suggested that some policies in South African are created for “political symbolism” instead of being implemented practically (Jansen, 2002: 199). Donohue (2014: 8) suggests that “vague policies often get passed but no one is held accountable for their implementation”. He further states that EWP6 lacks specifics and structure, and this adds to its vagueness. “South Africa’s IE policy is therefore characterized by both high conflict and ambiguity” (Donohue, 2014: 9).

A study in three schools in the Eastern Cape found the lack of access to EWP6 hampered the implementation of IE as none of the schools in the study was in possession of this policy document (Heeralal, 2014). This showed that in these schools IE had not yet been introduced let alone being implemented as the EWP6 is a framework for systematic changes towards IE and it is imperative that each school has a copy of the EWP6 and is familiar with the contents. Kalenga 2014: 328) reiterated that a “policy not well timed and supported could be a recipe for disaster”.

#### **2.6.4 The South African Schools Act 1996**

The South African Schools Act makes provision for a consistent system for the management of schools. It is another Act passed by parliament to promote IE. It does this by specifically compelling public schools “to admit learners and serve their educational needs without unfairly discriminating in any way” (South African Schools Act, 1996: S 5(1)). Another important support structure for IE is parent support and the Act encourages parent participation in schools by establishing student governing bodies. Further, section 12 compels the Minister of the executive council, who is part of the cabinet of the government, to provide relevant educational support and provide physical facilities which is one of the fundamental challenges in changing infrastructure and providing resources to make schools more adaptable for children with disabilities.

### **2.7 DEFINITION OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION**

It is imperative that the concept of IE is understood. It does not just mean having disabled students being taught together with their able bodied peers as it goes further, in changing the way society thinks.

UNESCO (2005:13), the principle UN agency on education, defines inclusion as follows:

*“Inclusion is seen as a process of addressing and responding to the diversity of needs of all learners through increasing participation in learning, cultures and communities, and reducing exclusion within and from education. It involves changes and modifications in content,*

*approaches, structures and strategies, with a common vision which covers all children of the appropriate age range and a conviction that is the responsibility of the regular system to educate all children. Inclusion is concerned with the identification and removal of barriers.”*

Our main policy document on IE the EWP6 (2001:6) defines IE and training system as:

*“Acknowledging that all children and youth can learn and need support.*

*Enabling education structures, systems and learning methodologies to meet the needs of all learners.*

*Acknowledging and respecting differences in learners, whether due to age, gender, ethnicity, language, class, disability, HIV or other infectious diseases.*

*Broader than formal schooling and acknowledging that learning also occurs in the home and community, and within formal and informal settings and structures.*

*Changing attitudes, behavior, teaching methods, curricula and environment to meet the needs of all learners.*

*Maximizing the participation of all learners in the culture and the curricula and environment to meet the needs of all learners.*

*Maximizing the participation of all learners in the culture and the curriculum of educational institutions and uncovering and minimizing barriers to learning”*

IE does not have a single meaning, it incorporates various principles that compels government, society, as well as the various support structures to adhere to. It outlines ways that people need to change to ensure children with disabilities are a part of an inclusive society and are not discriminated for the fact that they are different.

## **2.8 CHALLENGES FACED IN IMPLEMENTING INCLUSIVE EDUCATION**

Various challenges exist in implementing IE in South African schools. It is clear that just believing and supporting IE policies is not sufficient to guarantee that it will work practically. It requires co-operation, communication between the various mesosystems and strong leadership in schools involved in implementing a new system in education.

Any new policy cannot be fully integrated into a system without the proper support structures. It requires various stakeholders working in a team with one vision. International best practices have documented that support in the form of processes such as networking, collaborative partnerships; knowledge sharing at school and wider levels is the cornerstone of successful IE (Peters, 2004). Support from parents, teachers, principals, the DoE and other important stakeholders are imperative in making the IE policy a reality. When these subsystems work together it has a positive effect and a negative effect if they work against each other.

### **2.8.1 Support from the Parents**

Parents' positive role in all aspects of a child's life ensures the best interest of the child is always considered. Legislation and policy documents it have reiterated the need for parents to become involved as well as to support the child at school. Especially in promoting an IE system parents are motivated to support the child. The CRPD "at national level requires governments to ensure that sector plans and implementation frameworks involve parents actively in their children's education and enlist their support to strengthen the contribution of the school to children's education" (Lansdown, 2009: 112). The EWP6 also defines IE as being "broader than formal schooling and acknowledging that learning also occurs in the home and community and within formal and informal settings and structures" (EWP6, 2001: 6). Our national laws such as the South Africans Schools Act supports maximum parental involvement in their children's education and also encourages parents to represent on school governing bodies (Peters, 2004).

The needs of parents of disabled learners should be considered. This can be done by providing them with knowledge, counseling and the ability to help their children (EWP6, 2001). Parents should have all the information necessary to make proper choices about their children's education. In research done in three countries Lesotho, Zanzibar and Tanzania parents were skeptical about IE because most of them feared their children will be abused or laughed at and neglected (Mariga *et al*, 2014). They also felt that their children would not have the individual attention they have in special schools (Mariga *et al*, 2014). This type of thinking hinders the promotion of IE as it encourages parents to separate their disabled child from the rest of the children and therefore "parent education is an important strand in implementing IE" (Mariga *et al*, 2014:87). Another research that included 107 mainstream teachers pointed out that relationships with the parents' are one of the most stressful issues dealt with (Engelbrecht, 2001). This included, "limited contact with parents together with the parents' perceived lack of understanding of the learners' capabilities" (Engelbrecht, 2001: 81). The knowledge and wishes of the parent must carry the ultimate weight in any decision making process (National Department of Basic Education, 2014) and therefore it is of paramount importance that parents are informed enough to make the right decisions for their children.

The expenses incurred for education in South Africa is considered by parents. Many special schools charge fees and "it may not be economically feasible for parents to send their children with disabilities to school, particularly if they have other developing children of school-going age whose prospects of bringing in some sort of income are much better than those of their disabled child" (Donohue, 2014: 5). In some South African schools parents are so poor that they cannot even help with fundraising (Kalenga, 2014). Research in the DANIDA project highlighted reasons why parents were not available (Department of Basic Education, 2003). The evaluation revealed that parents were not available or able to support their own children in school because they had to

work or died as a result of HIV/AIDS or because they were not financially able to support the school and felt ashamed as a result; or because they were not treated as real partners in the life of the school, including school governing structures (Department of Basic Education, 2003). The DANIDA project also highlighted the importance of including parents in addressing learning barriers. The value of parent support should not be underestimated in promoting the IE policy. Besides other important stakeholders, parents are a significant part in achieving the IE system for children with disabilities.

### **2.8.2 Support from the Community**

The traditional African proverb remains true, “it takes a village to raise a child”. With the rampant rate of HIV/AIDS related deaths and illnesses as well as the poverty rate in many communities it is important to have members of the community being a significant part of a growing child’s life. Communities need to work together to eradicate discrimination of children with disabilities because they express “disregard and prejudice towards people with disabilities, then discriminatory practices will continue to be propagated” (Donohue, 2014:5). In a study in KZN, teachers held society’s negative perspective liable for learners with disabilities being stigmatized in public schools and regarded this as a valid reason for continuing the practice of these students attending special schools (Donohue, 2014). The value and importance of a “community-based approach” in the implementation of IE must not be underestimated (Department of Basic Education, 2003:166).

### **2.8.3 Teachers’ skills and training**

Before the social “model of disability was widely accepted, teachers in South Africa were trained to teach either general education or special education” (Donohue, 2014: 4). “This dual system of education with the dominating medical model used in the initial training” (Ntombela, 2011: 12) has resulted in teachers not being capable to teach in inclusive classrooms (Donohue, 2014). There is a need for “change in mindset of teachers as they are confronted with new

theories, assumptions, practices and attitudes” (Oswald, 2011:391). Classroom educators are the primary resource for achieving our goal of IE (Mariga *et al*, 2014; Ntombela, 2011) and this means that they are required to enhance their skills and knowledge (EWP6, 2001).

Teachers are disillusioned, some of them are of the opinion that they are called to “absorb learners with special needs and this has the effect of them likely resenting their work environments due to a sense of hopelessness” (Kalenga, 2014:328). Some teachers felt that IE was a lot of work and they will not meet the syllabus, they felt inclusion will lower their standards and the pass rate will be affected (Mariga *et al*, 2014). Teachers are still thinking in a conservative way, needing the child to “adjust and fit” in as opposed to adapting the environment to suit the child (Ngcobo, 2011:360). A new and greater challenge posed to teachers is the inability to manage the “diversity of disabilities” (Oswald, 2011:1; Swart *et al*, 2002) because of the variety of learning abilities and needs. Teachers find it difficult to manage the increasing number of students with behavior problems in mainstream classrooms (Prinsloo, 2001). South African teachers leaned more towards “disagreement with an inclusive school system” (Nel *et al*, 2011:88). Ntombela’s findings were similar as teachers still “supported separate provision for learners who experience barriers to learning” (Ntombela, 2011:12). Ntombela’s findings showed that teachers had limited experiences and understanding of what IE entails, resulting in teachers feeling inadequately prepared to implement this policy.

The DoE officials responsible for implementation of EWP6 “do not have the adequate skills” (Pasensie, 2012:3) and teachers feel they “lack the necessary knowledge and skill” but had no choice but to “keep up with the new trends in education” (Lessing & De Witt, 2007:65). In a review of 26 international studies the findings showed “that teachers are negative or undecided in their beliefs about inclusive education and do not rate themselves as knowledgeable about educating pupils with special needs; they do not feel capable or confident in

teaching pupils with special educational needs”; and teachers reject pupils with special needs compared to their abled bodied peers (de Boer, 2011: 33).

The CRPD requires governments at national level to guarantee that systems are in place to adapt teacher training syllabuses to include IE methodologies (Lansdown, 2009). IE methodologies in training include certain skills such as early identification, early interventions, curriculum differentiation, continuous professional development and sustainability. The general committee in the UNCRC suggests “that state parties establish systems of early identification and early interventions” (UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2006:16). The ability of recognizing the symptoms of disability at an early stage as well as making appropriate referrals for diagnoses and management is an important aspect of teacher training. This requires high awareness amongst teachers (UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2006).

EWP6 also defines IE as “changing attitudes, behavior, teaching methods, curricula and environment to meet the needs of all learners” (EWP6, 2001: 7). EWP6 stresses the call for curriculum differentiation as an important tool for tailoring the curriculum to meet the needs of individual learners; however it does not state how this is to be done. Teachers need adequate training to assist with transforming schools to become more inclusive, “it will take substantial amounts of time to achieve, far more than is currently allocated” (Ntombela, 2011:13). We cannot have a single curriculum to address all the learning needs of each student whether disabled or not. Each child has different capabilities and needs and this should be catered for. Dr Moses Simelane director of IE, DBE stated in his speech that a significant initiative has been professional development to institutionalize curriculum differentiation targeting all subject advisors and teachers in the system, and to date approximately 10000 subject advisors in all provinces has been orientated (Department of Basic Education, 2013).



Developing educators professionally is considered to be a vital part in enhancing the standard of education (Ntombela, 2011). Considering that the majority of teachers lack the skills to teach children that are disabled, training workshops and continuous professional development of the teachers will help them improve knowledge and skills lacking. Donohue suggests teachers would have positive attitudes towards inclusion “if along with training, they were to receive the appropriate service support for their learners with disabilities” (Donohue, 2014:5). Guidelines from the DoE also re-iterate the importance of teachers improving their skills and urge educators “to pursue studies for their professional development” (Department of Basic Education, 2005:5).

The lack of workshops and training of educators was a factor that hampered the implementation of IE (Heeralal, 2014) and was identified as one of the major challenges. Continuous professional development in the form of regular training workshops is seen as effective. The “school based approach to training where workshops were integrated into staff development training” was positively viewed (Department of Basic Education, 2003: 17); however the downfall was that training took place during school time where classes were disrupted. Educators have not been trained adequately as some could only remember attending a single workshop in 2009 where only one educator per school had been invited. This lack of training was confirmed in another school where teachers attended a workshop on the revised national curriculum statement with the part dealing with IE lasting just 30 min (Kalenga, 2014). Whilst some research shows that the DoE does not provide enough training for IE in schools, another research project showed one of the major challenges as the “non-attendance of some teachers at the workshops and some teachers leaving early” (Department of Basic Education, 2003:48). Therefore there needs to be commitment with positive attitudes from the both the DoE by providing adequate training to teachers and for teachers to make the effort to attend and improve their skills.

Sustained teacher training is a vital aspect of implementing IE, as is evidenced in research studies and pilot projects. Also “awareness of the new IE policy changes teacher’s attitudes positively” (Department of Basic Education, 2003: 45). “If the existing drivers of IE are not involved in the ongoing development of this implementation, there will be a problem with sustaining what has been developed” (Department of Basic Education, 2003:49).

Teacher training needs to be ongoing and pursue the objectives as set out in the EWP6. The Hon Angie Motshekga in her opening speech at the National workshop 2013 stated that workbooks have been adapted to Braille, large print and augmentative and alternative communication will assist hundreds of learners in special and ordinary schools and that there is a collaboration between stakeholders to ensure that “all teachers are fully skilled in Braille” (Department of Basic Education, 2013:5). She also stated that a revised strategy for screening, identification, assessment and support has been finalised and teachers and parents will receive the necessary support to ensure that learners can be included in local neighbourhood schools.

#### **2.8.4 Support from the Principal**

Principals are representatives of the DoE and are considered the frontrunners and overseers of implementation of new policies (Heeralal, 2014). Where school heads were negative this affects the attitudes of teachers as well (Mariga *et al*, 2014). A study done in three schools in Eastern Cape found that a lack of training and workshops for principals hampered implementation of IE (Heeralal, 2014) as principals stated that they had never attended any formal workshop where they were addressed on more subtle aspects of IE. Heeralal’s study revealed that although principals revealed an understanding of IE it appeared this understanding was limited. They should be responsible for providing guidance and recommendations on the way forward. A principal has acknowledged not wanting “these children” in their school as teachers are frustrated and students are failing (Kalenga, 2014). The DANIDA project also highlighted the negative

attitude of the principals (Department of Basic Education, 2003). The positive attitude of the principal is important. Kalenga was keen to point out that even if resources are made available in a school; “as long as leadership is not transformative, the school may not move towards increased effectiveness and improvement” therefore the role of the principal is crucial (Kalenga, 2014:329). The evaluation in the DANIDA project in all provinces revealed a “very clear need for good leadership to implement this policy” (Department of Basic Education, 2003:162).

### **2.8.5 Support from the District Based Support Team (DBST)**

The DBST was established with the aim to implement IE. The objective is to “change as many special schools into resource centers” (EWP6, 2001:29). The aim was that these centres would support students with disabilities in the surrounding schools. The “expertise of teachers in special schools will also be used to train and equip teachers in the surrounding schools to support all learners in their classrooms” (EWP6, 2001:30). The EWP6 maintains that support services within all education rest on strengthening DBST to evaluate programs, establish their effectiveness and suggest changes.

Teachers agree that “special schools have a vital role to play in education systems of their countries, and this response can be attributed to their expertise” (Nel *et al*, 2011: 86). In a research study in the Eastern Cape, of three schools only one school received support from the district level to provide a hearing aid for a learner, whereas another student was referred to a special school (Heeralal, 2014). Heeralal’s finding also suggests that a lack of support from the DBST is a crucial factor in the three schools under investigation. Heeralal’s findings were consistent with the Background Paper on Disability where it was found that the “role and effectiveness of the district based support teams in managing learning barriers requires attention” (The Presidency Republic of South Africa, 2014:28). One of the key structures in the IE framework is the DBST (EWP6, 2001) however, in Ngcobo (2011) research it was found that the DoE did not provide

training for teachers regarding the set up and operation of the DBST (Ngcobo, 2011).

### **2.8.6 Support from the DoE**

Teachers need support and encouragement to change attitudes and be reassured that the needs of students with disabilities are similar to those of all students. The principal as the head of the school and representative of the DoE needs support from them to be able to implement new strategies for IE. However, Donohue suggests that in order for important advancement in implementing IE “the DoE can no longer relegate these responsibilities to others such as the school principals and teachers” (Donohue, 2014:10). Donohue also argues that the lack of significant movement in inclusive policy is poor implementation as reflected in the “inadequate funding provided by the South African Department of Education to the provincial education departments together with the vague guidelines, ambiguous incentives and directives they provide to educators” (Donohue, 2014:3). In another school in SA a principal stated that they have received a document on IE but they had no support services and that these provisions are just on paper with no support from the DoE (Kalenga, 2014). “The case of Western Cape Forum for Intellectual Disability demonstrates State ambivalence towards inclusive education” (Ngwena, 2013:1).

Department officials fail to provide support (Ngcobo, 2011). Ntombela suggests that the DoE did not provide adequate support as they did not offer suitable professional development in disseminating information within the department. One of the principals was of the view that the DoE officials that conduct the workshops “do not seem like they know what they are talking about” (Kalenga, 2014:327). The DANIDA project showed evidence from other countries to suggest that the ‘broad-superficial’ approaches will be counterproductive and suggested that from the pilot projects that a ‘narrow-deep’ approach has the

potential to be very successful (Department of Basic Education, 2003). It was proposed therefore, that the DoE consider pursuing a 'narrow-deep' approach and build in the sharing of 'learning from good practices' and other strategies in the implementation of IE over the next 20 years (Department of Basic Education, 2003:168). It would seem that these recommendations were not taken as implementation is scattered and vague.

### **2.8.7 Infrastructure and equipment**

Legislation and policies show the importance of making infrastructure accessible and resources available to children with disabilities. Article 4 of the UNCRC states that government must do all that they can to fulfill the rights of the child. "Funding must also be ensured for other programs aimed at including children with disabilities into mainstream education by renovating schools to render them physically accessible to children with disabilities" (UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2006:6). The EWP6 also shows the importance of establishing an IE system by the creation of barrier-free physical environments (EWP6, 2001).

Peters (2004) suggests that providing sign language for the hearing impaired and Braille or texts with enlarged prints for visually impaired students, together with alternate assessment formats are all vital components for IE and should not be add-ons that are subject to availability. The consequence for the lack of resources was apparent at another primary school where a child that was partially sighted failed due to not having equipment to enlarge printed material (Kalenga, 2014).

The way the schools surroundings and infrastructure is constructed adds to freedom of movement for the child with disabilities. Donohue (2014: 10) suggests that "short term funding must be increased so that schools can make the infrastructure changes that are needed". He further states that the DoE "needs to hold itself accountable for the implementation of a policy that it created, especially since inclusive policies are of little meaning and use unless they are

implemented and enforced” (Donohue, 2014:11). Heeralal (2014) found that schools were not catering for inclusivity as there were no ramps for children with wheelchairs. Further, “A 2006 survey on accessibility of ordinary schools by the Department of Education indicated that 97 percent of the over 10 000 schools surveyed provided no physical access to learners, teachers or parents who use wheelchairs” (The Presidency Republic of South Africa, 2014: 29). In another study the principal highlighted the fact that no adjustments had been made in the last ten years in line with the IE policies, such as the building of ramps, due to of the lack of money (Kalenga, 2014).

Every child has a right to be accommodated in a school. This was brought before the equality court in *Lettie Hazel Oortman v St Thomas Aquinas Private School* in 2010, where the school was compelled to accept Chelsea Oortman and take legitimate steps to eliminate all barriers enabling her access with her wheelchair to all the classrooms and the toilet. In this case the court set a significant standard that challenged this school for not providing accommodation that is reasonable for the needs of a student with disability. “Physical access to school buildings is an essential pre-requisite” (Peters, 2004:40).

## **2.9 CONCLUSION**

The procrastination of IE in schools discriminates against children with disabilities by denying them an equal platform and the opportunity to be a part of a productive society together with their able bodied peers. “It is crucial that the education of a child with disabilities includes the strengthening of positive self-awareness, making sure that the child feels he or she is respected by others as a human being without any limitation of dignity” (United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2006:17). The inclusion of the child with disability shows this child has an individual uniqueness and is a part of the classroom and community. Education empowers and allows the child to achieve success to the maximum potential (UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2006). “We must stop seeing disabled people as objects of pity but as capable individuals who are

contributing immensely to the development of society” (Office of the Deputy President, 1997:1). The literature shows that South Africa and other countries have produced legislative frameworks aimed at promoting IE for children with disabilities. Whilst there is some evidence of progress in formulating policies, children with disabilities are still not adequately accommodated for in schools. It is the primary duty of those that teach and those that support the teacher to uphold the right of these students with disabilities.

## **CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter explains the research methodology used in this study. It includes the research paradigm, research design, sampling strategy, data collection methods, trustworthiness of data, data analysis techniques, ethical considerations and limitations of the study. I relied on information received from six principals from public primary schools in the Pinetown District.

### **3.2 RESEARCH APPROACH**

According to Babbie (2010) a paradigm is the approach the researcher selects to study a particular phenomenon and frame of reference used to organise observations and reasoning. A research paradigm is defined “as a model or pattern containing a set of legitimated assumptions and a design for collecting and interpreting data” (De Vos & Strydom, 2011: 40). The study aim was to explore the implementation of IE legislation and policy for children with physical and sensory disabilities using a qualitative paradigm.

Qualitative research helps the researcher obtain real, rich and deep data. This is in contrast to the quantitative paradigm where findings are “mainly the product of statistical summary and analysis” (Shaughnessy, 1994:22) or a set of “worked out formulas” (Fouche & Schurink, 2011:308). Rather, the qualitative nature of this study “is concerned with understanding rather than explanation of reality from the perspective of an insider as opposed to that of an outsider” (Fouche & Schurink, 2011:308). In this study it allowed the researcher to enter into the principals’ perspective (Patton, 2005:341). Therefore this qualitative research was in the form of observation and semi-structured interviews.



### **3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN**

Descriptive research “presents a picture of the specific details of a situation, social setting or relationship” (Kreuger & Neuman 2006:23). It describes a particular phenomenon like IE in schools. Therefore the researcher starts with a definite topic and carries out research to accurately describe it. According to Babbie (2010) description is further inclined to a more thorough assessment of a phenomenon and its significance, and thus leads to description that is thicker. In descriptive research, “a body of knowledge already exists for which we can produce additional knowledge” (Glicken, 2003:15). Babbie (2010) suggests the aim of descriptive research is to describe situations and accurately determine the real situation.

### **3.4 SELECTION OF SCHOOLS**

For description and exploration on the progress of policy implementation of IE for children with physical and sensory disabilities at schools I randomly selected six public primary schools that were within the Pinetown district to get an idea of progress. The schools in the Pinetown district were chosen because schools in this district range from ex model C to “no-fee” paying schools. I aimed to investigate if IE was uniformly implemented at all of these schools. The schools were randomly selected.

Probability sampling in the form of simple random sampling was used to select the schools. According to Shaughnessy (1994:120) simple random sampling is where “every element has an equal chance of being included”. A list of 29 public primary schools in the Pinetown district was obtained from the DoE website. Each school was allocated a number. Six schools were randomly sampled from the list.

### **3.5 PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY**

The target population was principals because of the management position they hold. The principals from the six schools randomly selected were invited to participate in a semi-structured interview. Three principals from the initial six

selected schools agreed to be interviewed. I then resampled using the same procedure and selected three principals from the remaining list. The latter three principals all agreed to be interviewed.

Pre-arrangements were made by calling the participants telephonically to find out if they would participate in the study. A further set of calls were made prior to the meetings with each of the participants. In addition, I scheduled interviews at times that were convenient for the participants.

### **3.6 DATA COLLECTION**

**Two methods of data collection were used: semi-structured interviews and observation**

#### **3.6.1 Semi-structured interviews:**

Qualitative data collection in the form of semi-structured interviews was personally conducted at the respective schools. Semi-structured interviews are defined as “those organised around areas of particular interest, while still allowing considerable flexibility in scope and depth” (Greeff, 2011:348). This type of interview uses an interview guide or schedule with open-ended questions that allowed me to elicit rich information. It provides greater flexibility in that the interviewer is open to investigate, explore or ask more questions on specific subject matter. The set of planned questions on my interview schedule did not warrant my strict compliance but rather served as a guideline (Appendix B). The interview schedule had themes to guide in obtaining the information. The advantages of an interview guide is that it makes sure “certain areas are covered in limited time in a more systematic and comprehensive way” (Patton, 2005:343). It is important that each “participant can express their own understanding in their own terms in qualitative interviewing and it enables the researcher to get an inside view of reality” (Auriacombe, 2007:443).

In this way it enabled me to ask questions freely during the interview and get in-depth understanding of concepts to obtain greater clarity. It also allowed me to

be more flexible as I was able to probe certain areas of interest during the interview which resulted in a better understanding and fuller picture of concepts (De Vos, 2011). Since qualitative data describes, interviews capture direct quotations about people's personal viewpoints and experiences. The average length of interviews was 50 minutes.

### **3.6.2 Observation**

In qualitative research there are two types of observation, this includes simple observation and participant observation. In this study simple observation was used where the researcher remains an outside observer (Babbie & Mouton, 2010). Babbie and Mouton (2010) further acknowledge that a key type of observable data is the physical location which includes observation of the settings and people's personal space. Cohen (2001) support observational data for two reasons, firstly, it provides a complete perspective of the problem under investigation and secondly, it gives the researcher a chance to collect information from situations as it happens. The observation of the school setting in relation to infrastructure adaptations and accessibility took place on the dates of the scheduled interviews. I documented observations upon commencement and after completion of the interview. Some aspects of the observations included the presence of ramps, railings, even terrain, structure and layout of the school. These observations were discussed during the interview.

### **3.7 METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS**

The data was analysed, this allows for interpretation of the information collected. Short notes were made at the time of the interview. This was supplemented by audio recordings of the interviews. These recordings were transcribed into computer files while the details were fresh in mind for close analysis. Data analysis included direct quotations which provides thick description and are a "basic source of raw data in qualitative inquiry, revealing respondents depth of emotion, the ways they have organized their words, their thoughts about what is happening, their experiences and their basic perception" (Patton, 2005:344). A

fieldwork journal was also kept to record problems and ideas that arose during each stage of the research. Data was coded and categorized into themes and sub-themes. Schurink, Fouche & De Vos (2011) indicate eight guidelines to help in the process of analysis of data. Data analysis in this study included the main steps for preparing, organizing and reducing data. This is discussed below.

### **3.7.1 Planning for recording data**

It is important that the researcher plans ahead about how the data will be collected, recorded and analysed. Therefore I prepared a list of things to do before embarking on data collection. For example I had to consider the convenient times principals will be available as their schedules are busy due to exam preparation as well as considering school holidays. Also under consideration was the recording device to use as well as having back up power so that the battery does not die. This reduces the stress in having to record all data clearly and not to miss information. According to Smith et al (as cited by De Vos, 2011:359) a recorder “allows a much fuller record than notes taken during the interview” as “it also means that the researcher can concentrate on how the interview is proceeding and where to go next”. All participants were comfortable with the interviews being recorded as they were assured of anonymity.

### **3.7.2 Data collection and preliminary analysis**

As recommended by Schurink, Fouche and De Vos (2011:405), this step comprises a twofold approach. One is when the researcher collects information at the research site and the other is when the researcher is away from the research site. De Vos (2011) suggests that in this process the researcher should ensure that immediately after the interviews, the voice recordings are labeled and note taking is undertaken. These guidelines were followed by the researcher to ensure the information obtained is kept intact. Also to safeguard against fallible memory, the responses were recorded and transcribed a day after the interviews. My preliminary analysis involved repeated reading of the interview transcripts

and notes from the field and with continually “developing themes and highlights found within” (Greeff, 2011:359).

### **3.7.3 Managing data**

The data managing stage is demanding and time-consuming. After each interview, the researcher transcribed the recordings into computer files to ensure that the information obtained from the participants were not lost. Another advantage, it is done whilst the researcher’s memory is still fresh and can remember and have a better understanding of all communication. This exercise took approximately two hours for each interview as the recordings had to be listened to several times to ensure that the researcher did not miss any information.

I also made sure that the master copies of the information were kept in a safe place so that should information get destroyed there would be a backup (De Vos, 2011). Accordingly recordings along with hard-copy print outs were kept in a secure place, and the computer files were copied to separate computer systems.

### **3.7.4 Reading and writing memos**

I read the transcripts “in their entirety several times in order to get immersed in the details, trying to get a sense of the interview as a whole before breaking it into parts” (De Vos, 2011:409). This was helpful as it allowed the researcher to have a strong understanding of the information collected.

### **3.7.5 Generating categories and themes**

The generating of categories “represents the heart of qualitative data analysis” (De Vos, 2011:410). In this process of analysis the researcher categorized the data into themes. “Identifying themes, recurring ideas or language and patterns of belief that link people and settings together is the most intellectually challenging phase of data analysis” (Schurink, Fouche and De Vos, 2011:410). The researcher noted any repeated issues in the participants’ responses and

thereby identified broader themes that emerged from what the participants said. Afterwards, all the responses were grouped into these themes. Having done that the researcher noted patterns of similar responses. This then allowed the researcher to come up with subthemes to analyse the data.

### **3.7.6 Coding the data**

According to De Vos (2011) the primary task of coding is to recognise and label relevant categories or themes of data. “Codes may take several forms: abbreviations of key words, coloured dots, numbers - the choice is up to the researcher” (Schurink, Fouche and De Vos, 2011:411). The researcher accordingly formulated tables that divided the information into sections and themes that emerged from the responses.

### **3.7.7 Testing emergent understanding**

Once the information had been categorized into themes and subthemes, the researcher began to examine whether the themes were in line with the context of the research and whether or not they were relevant to include in the analysis. This allowed the researcher to focus on the quality and key issues rather than on less meaningful information. “Part of this phase is evaluating the data for their usefulness and centrality” (De Vos, 2011:415).

### **3.7.8 Searching for alternative explanation**

After all this was done, the researcher searched for alternative explanation of the data presented by going back to the literature review to search for similarities in previous national and international research. This enabled the researcher to provide explanations for information presented by the participant.

## **3.8 RIGOUR**

According to Salkind (2006) in qualitative research validity refers to truthfulness, correctness, genuineness and soundness and reliability refers to consistency,

stability, and trustworthiness. Lincoln and Guba (as cited by De Vos, 2011) states that there are four ways to ensure trustworthiness of qualitative findings

### **3.8.1 Credibility**

Schurink, Fouche & De Vos (2011: 420) supports that the objective of credibility is to show that the inquiry was carried out in a way that guaranteed the participant had been correctly “identified and described”. The researcher chose to interview principals of the schools due to their position and knowledge in school policies and procedures. Here the researcher asked if there was a match between principals’ views and the researcher’s reconstruction and representation of these participants. The researcher also obtained authorization from the participants through verbal and written consent. In addition semi-structured interviews were used by the researcher to collect the data. This promoted credibility because the participants answered questions on themes addressed and were also able to state their experiences while engaging in discussion. According to Babbie & Mouton (2001) audio recordings provides a good record.

### **3.8.2 Transferability**

“The researcher asks whether the findings of the research can be transferred from a specific situation or case to another” (Schurink, Fouche and De Vos, 2011: 420). De Vos (2011) indicated the weakness of qualitative approach was the generalization to other populations and settings. Babbie & Mouton (2010) suggests that the researcher provides comprehensive details of the data in perspective with a detailed report which allows the reader to judge the transferability. The researcher ensured that thick descriptions from the participants’ responses were given throughout the analysis process.

### **3.8.3 Dependability**

The researcher asks “whether the research process is logical, well documented and audited” (De Vos, 2011:420). Babbie and Mouton (2010) suggests that it is another way to measure trustworthiness and that all methods used to undertake

the study were clearly stated. My supervisor was responsible for examining the data, findings, interpretations and recommendations in order to confirm that the researcher's analysis was supported by data.

#### **3.8.4 Confirmability**

Babbie and Mouton (2010) emphasise that the findings are a result of the focal point of the inquiry and not of the researcher's prejudice. According to Lincoln and Guba (as cited by De Vos, 2011:421) it is the need to ask whether the findings can be corroborated and confirmed by another. The researcher asked the questions whether the findings were in conformity with other research findings and not the researcher's personal view.

### **3.9 ETHICAL CONSIDERATION**

Ethical consideration was adhered to at all times to avoid harmful consequences to the participants. Prior to the interviews, informed consent letters (Appendix A) were presented to the principals setting out the research purpose and guaranteeing confidentiality and anonymity. This letter also provided the participants with an opportunity to withdraw from the study and decline answering questions that they were uncomfortable with. The researcher was clear that participation in the interview was completely voluntary and participants were not obligated to take part in the interview. This resulted in the need for the researcher to resample after the first selection as many principals did not wish to be a part of the study. A gatekeeper's letter (Appendix C) was obtained from the Department of Education prior to approaching any of the schools. Ethical clearance was also granted by the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Protocol Reference Number: HSS/0993/015M – Appendix D). Informed consent forms signed before any interviews commenced. When permission from the participants was obtained, the researcher audio-recorded the interviews, which were later transcribed into computer files.



### **3.10 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

Three participants refused to participate in this research study. Reasons given were their high workloads, insufficient time, union protests and work schedules adding to the fact that the interview was also voluntary. This resulted in a need to resample. In addition to this, although anonymity was ensured at all times, there was a possibility that the principals' were cautious due to being recorded. This may have resulted in limited freedom in being blunt and truthful with responses.

### **3.11 CONCLUSION**

This chapter provides insight into the research methodology used. It shows that the research done was qualitative in nature. The sampling comprised principals from public primary schools. The researcher collected data through semi-structured interviews and observation. The interviews were audio recorded with the participants' authorization. Participants were properly consulted and consented to participate in the study.

## **CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

### **4.1 INTRODUCTION**

The aim of this study was to explore the implementation of inclusive education policy and legislation at six public primary schools in the Pinetown District. The study comprised six participants who were principals at the respective schools. This chapter includes an analysis and discussion of the broad thematic areas which emerged from the responses to the questions in the semi-structured interview guide. This chapter firstly provides a short profile of the participants and a description of their school contexts from the observation of the researcher. Secondly, the themes and subthemes from the data are provided. To preserve anonymity, privacy and confidentiality complete profiles of the participants are not provided.

### **4.2 SHORT PROFILE OF PARTICIPANTS AND DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHOOL CONTEXT**

As noted in the introduction six principals were interviewed. In the discussion below, after a brief description of the participants I provide my observations of the school environment.

#### **Participant A**

Participant A served as principal for two years at this primary school but was the deputy principal at the same school for 8 years. She has previous experience teaching at a school for deaf children. On entering the school I had to walk up a slight incline before reaching the pedestrian gate. Entry was obtained via pressing the intercom. Upon entry I walked up three steps to gain access to the administration block. No alternate entry was available. Access to the administration block is restrictive as it does not cater for anyone in a wheelchair. There are no hand railings anywhere in the school. This school has two floors which can be accessed via the stairs only. The entire school area is concrete

and tarred. The playgrounds can be accessed either by stairs or a tarred ramp which leads to a grass field. The toilets are all standard with no adaptation for anyone with a disability. This was an ex model C school and charges a school fee of approximately R10 000 per year.

### **Participant B**

Participant B was appointed as principal of this school since February 2015 but she was the previous acting principal.

I had to drive across a small bridge to arrive at the school. Crossing this bridge was the only means to gain entry to the school. This bridge is used by both vehicles and pedestrians daily. It was narrow and did not have any barriers on the sides. The area around the school was sandy. I was met by some students that were not wearing shoes. Some students were carrying water in drums into their classroom.

I met the principal in the administration area where two steps needed to be climbed to gain entry. This is restrictive for someone that is unable to use stairs. This school has three single storey blocks separated from each other. Access to these classrooms is gained either by climbing up one big step or through a make shift pathway. There were no railings anywhere to be seen. The toilets were not adapted to cater for students with disabilities. This was a no fee paying school.

### **Participant C**

Participant C was appointed as principal at this school eighteen months ago but was acting principal a few years prior to being appointed. There are two points of entry to the school, one pedestrian gate and the other for vehicle access. The pedestrian gate is restrictive as stairs need to be used. The gate for vehicles has a ramp. The entire bottom level of the school is wheelchair friendly to an extent. Other than being flat which makes movement much easier, the pathways are narrow and there are no existing rails. There are two levels to this school and the entire top level is inaccessible to someone in a wheelchair. The toilets are

not adapted for someone with a disability. The playgrounds surface area is uneven, covered by grass and sand. It can only be accessed via steps. This was an ex model c school and charges a fee of approximately R10 000 per year.

### **Participant D**

Participant D was appointed as principal at this school in February 2013 but was previously acting principal since October 2011. This school is situated on top of a steep hill and can only be accessed if a child with disability is dropped off inside the school yard as the driveway is steep with no railings. The corridors are very narrow and can only comfortably cater for two small children walking side by side. This school is made up of three blocks with three storeys on each block. The different blocks are staggered in levels and separated by stairs. A child with a wheelchair will only be limited to the first block which is basically the administration area and the toilets. The toilets are not adapted for anybody with a disability. This school charges a fee of approximately R750 per year.

### **Participant E**

Participant E has been principal at this school for the past 4 years. He was the acting principal for a few years prior to being appointed. This school has four blocks with two levels. I walked up two flights of stairs to gain access to the administration block and then had to open two sets of gates to access the principal's office. There are no ramps or railings and this school is totally inaccessible for someone in a wheelchair. The toilets are not adapted for children with disabilities. This school charges a fee of approximately R5000 per year.

### **Participant F**

Participant F has been principal at this school for the past 2 years but was the acting principal for three years prior to that. This is a small school with fewer than ten classrooms situated in a horseshoe type shape. The toilets are close to all classes but are not adapted for children with disabilities. There are no hand

railings. The play area is just an open field. The library is a Wendy house structure with a narrow entrance. Someone with a wheelchair will not be able to enter. This was a no fee paying school.

### 4.3 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF PARTICIPANTS

This section provides demographic information about the participants, including the gender and years of experience as principal.

**Table 4.1 Gender and Years of experience as Principal**

<b>1. Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
Male	2
Female	4
Total	6
<b>2. Years of experience as principal</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
0 - 2 Years	4
4 - 8 Years	2
Total	6

As can be seen in the table above the majority of participants in this study were female. Although the years of experience as principals ranged from 2-4 years, many of them had served as either deputy principals, acting principals or teachers. Research studies have shown that teachers' gender does not influence receiving training on IE (Lessing, 2007), however years of experience does impact on teachers' attitudes towards IE. According to Lessings (2007) teachers' perception towards receiving training on IE is not influenced by the position they hold, the gender, age and qualification. De Boer *et al* (2011) study showed that the years of experience was found to be a variable related to teacher's attitudes towards IE. The study revealed that teachers with fewer years of experience held positive attitudes as opposed to teachers with more years of experience that tend to have negative attitudes to IE. These findings are

similar to Gal's (2010) study that indicated older teachers with a number of years experience had negative attitudes towards IE. However they were of the belief that the needs of children with disabilities could only be addressed in classes that are smaller. Although the studies above refer to the gender and years of experience of teachers, it does correspond to the participants as they held longer terms in the position of teachers than that of principals.

#### 4.4 IMPLEMENTATION OF IE POLICY AND LEGISLATION

Participants were interviewed to gain knowledge of implementation of IE at respective schools. They were asked several questions to gain a holistic picture on the implementation of IE. Their responses to the questions are incorporated in themes and subthemes identified in table 4.2 below.

**Table 4.2 Themes and subthemes**

Themes	Subthemes
* <b>Understanding of IE</b>	Access to EWP6 Interpretation of IE Perceptions about implementation of IE
* <b>Admission</b>	No applications Referral to special school Opinions on admitting children with severe physical or sensory disability Opinions on admitting children with limited physical or sensory disability
* <b>Infrastructure/resources</b>	Current school layout No budget from the DoE Large class size

*	<b>Teacher training</b>	Disruption of classes Insufficient workshops The psychology or emotion of the child Sign language Demotivation
*	<b>Parent support</b>	No support Limited and positive support

#### 4.4.1 Understanding of IE

It is imperative that all educational staff have a common goal in understanding and implementing IE policies at schools. The following subthemes emerged which includes access to EWP6 and perceptions about implementation of IE. This is discussed below.

##### 4.4.1.1 Access to the EWP6

The EWP6 was the first policy document that introduced the government's new policy for "a single, undivided education system for all learners" (Donohue, 2014:2). The EWP6 sets out the implementation framework of IE and forms part of the macrosystem. The EWP6 is emulated in systems that are lower, in this instance it influences how schools function. Heeralal (2014) emphasized that besides it being imperative for each school to have a copy of the EWP6; it needs to be studied in depth. The responses of participants were as follows:

*"It comes to us (EWP6). Whatever circulars there are about inclusivity it doesn't only go to special needs schools, it comes to us so it's in our interest to go read them. And I like reading about it. I keep informed."*

*"If it is in the government gazette then we have a copy of it (EWP6). It's filed."*

*"It's (EWP6) in my cupboard"*

*“Yes we receive them (EWP6), teachers have access to them”*

From the responses received it can be perceived that although the EWP6 was cascaded to schools there is no obligation on staff members to read and understand the contents. Peters (2004) pointed out that in many countries where IE policies have been enacted does not mean they are adhered to. Heeralal (2014) confirmed that besides the schools having copies of the EWP6 the details of this policy document were not known and this was the common practice at schools.

#### **4.4.1.2 Interpretation of IE**

To implement a policy it needs to be interpreted correctly and utilized for the purpose it was intended. Participants provided their understanding of IE. They responded as follows:

*“They like to mainstream all of them [disabled students]”*

*“Every child needs to be accepted in the school even if he is disabled... the child must not be discriminated against because of disability.”*

*“It’s where everybody can go to what is considered a normal school and interact with children of varying disabilities.”*

*“I think the vision is to try and accommodate these learners who have certain challenges whether it’s sensory or physical disabilities challenges. They might have to try and include them as much as possible in the mainstream school which might be closer to their home which might be convenient. But also in terms of the child’s development in a school socializing with other children and exposed to everything else that these “normal children” are exposed to.”*

*“Inclusive education, basically in context should be where learners of all different ability levels are catered for.”*

*“I would think it’s being able to offer education to all that need it.”*

It is apparent from responses above that most participants understanding of IE is relatively narrow. Their understanding corresponds to the EWP6 definition of



mainstreaming rather than the meaning of inclusion. The EWP6 differentiates between mainstreaming and inclusion. Mainstreaming focuses on “giving some learners extra support so they can fit in” or be a part of a “normal” class whereas “inclusion is about supporting all learners, educators and the system as a whole” where all learning needs are met (EWP6, 2001:16). With inclusion the focus is on teaching and development of good teaching strategies as opposed to mainstreaming where focus is on the learner “fitting in” (EWP6, 2001: 17). It is clear from the responses above that this differentiation is not understood. Lansdown (2009:112) stresses that “simply placing excluded children within a mainstream setting does not in itself achieve inclusion.” The participants still viewed it as simply meaning children with disabilities attending schools with their able bodied peers; the focus was still on the learner. Heeralal’s (2014) study also verified that principals’ understanding of IE was limited. The definition of IE goes further in changing how people think. It is about “changing attitudes, behavior, teaching methodologies, curricula and the environment to meet the needs of all learners” (EWP6, 2001, 16). It means that schools should be adapted to accommodate for the children’s needs, rather than having children adapt to the school (Lansdown, 2009).

The principals’ perceptions about implementation of IE will be discussed below.

#### **4.4.1.3 Perceptions about implementation of IE**

Abenyega (2007) and de Boer (2011) suggest that the attitude of teachers towards IE is a significant factor in successful implementation of IE. The participants’ perception about implementation of IE includes the responses below:

*“Never, that will never happen I can tell you categorically it will never happen. It really means, for one it’s a whole paradigm shift. Secondly it’s going to be a whole new ball game completely. Teachers will have to be trained; schools have to have facilities. Toilets have to be changed; the department does not have that kind of money. I can’t imagine it happening.”*

*“You know I do know that our government has tried to follow what has been happening overseas with regards to the development in the way we do education in South Africa but the problem is like its chalk and cheese.”*

*“Children who are building their own long drop toilets some classes don’t have roofs and here they want to talk about white paper six where you have to have 15 children in a class.”*

*“You got to look how well it is working overseas. In England we see these video clips where you got a class of about 12 and there are about 4 children with disabilities and each one has got a helper. And you think well it would be very nice. I don’t know, we got a long way to go before we have that.”*

*“Reality is you have to be in a situation to know. We can have fancy, glorious manuals, meetings, workshops but in practical situation... they don’t work”*

*“I turn 55 in three and a half years’ time and I’m going to take early retirement, there are just too many challenges and no support.”*

The above responses indicate that the majority of participants have negative perceptions about the implementation of IE. These perceptions are confirmed in de Boer *et al* (2011) research where teachers held predominantly negative beliefs towards IE. Ntombela (2011) suggested that the limited experience and understanding of EWP6 resulted in the negative attitudes. This coincides with Oswald’s (2011) finding that knowledge of legislation on IE resulted in more positive attitudes. From the above responses another contributing factor to principals’ negative attitudes can also be attributed to challenges they already experience such as large class sizes and maintenance of the school.

The negative attitudes that participants hold is concerning as Kalenga (2014), Department of Basic Education (2003) and Mukhopadhyay (2013) pointed out the crucial role which principals play in leadership of schools. At a microsystemic level if principals are pessimistic, it will impact on the staff and policy implementation in the school. One participant further elaborated on her views on the EWP6 as follows:

*“I have been teaching for 24 years. I’ve been to curriculum 2005, CAPS now the revised CAPS that is coming up next year. And 9 times out of 10 unfortunately it has been a political tool. When they distance politics from education then maybe we will get somewhere. I think that the EWP6 is a political tool but it does have some very good qualities but you know that we still have schools after 20 years of democracy which don’t have toilets..”*

Jansen (2002) suggested a number of policies in South African were created for their political representation rather than being practical which often resulted in unclear policies being passed with nobody being accountable for the implementation. Donohue (2014) supports this view and believes that “clear policy mandates, together with enforcement of such mandates, will be the most effective means by which inclusive education is realized in South Africa” (Donohue, 2014:7). It is unclear who the onus is on to implement IE due to uncertain directives and IE not being mandatory.

#### **4.4.2 Admission**

The subthemes which emerged under this theme were: no applications and referral to special schools. Further subthemes related to the participants’ opinions about admission of children with severe physical and sensory disabilities and those with limited physical and sensory disabilities. These latter two subthemes are discussed separately to indicate how schools differentiate and accommodate varying degrees of disabilities. The subtheme of no applications is discussed first.

##### **4.4.2.1 No applications**

In reference to the admission of children with severe physical and sensory disabilities the responses were as follows:

*“We never had that request I am here for the last 8 years and we have not had a request for it.”*

*“There haven’t been many of them that have actually applied. I think parents with children who have got limited scope don’t actually bring them to schools like ours. Because they can see from the outset it’s going to be challenging.”*

*“It seems like from earlier on from much younger the parent already gets the child into a special school. In our school as such it’s not an issue that we are dealing with often. We hardly ever have applications of that sort. So it’s not something we are dealing with on a daily basis.”*

*“We haven’t had that situation, but my attitude is that if we can help a child then we have to do it. Given though we are not wheelchair friendly and don’t have the perfect situation we won’t say no to that child”*

From the participants’ responses above it is clear that these mainstream schools did not receive applications for admittance of children with severe physical and sensory disabilities. The reasons provided were that parents prefer special schools and realize that mainstream schools would be challenging for the child with disabilities. Human Rights Watch (2015) suggested this could be due to parents’ not receiving information about the best type of education for their child and parents’ deficient understanding of the child’s capabilities. Donohue (2014: 6) was of a different view and said parents’ found special schools to “be safer due to the intolerant attitudes of other children and school staff” in mainstream schools. In addition, he stated that parents assumed their children with disabilities children cannot learn or will disrupt other learners. Referral to special schools is discussed in the next subtheme.

#### **4.4.2.2 Referral to special schools**

Two participants responded as follows:

*“If we get a case like that [admitting a disabled child] we will refer them to a special school that will cater for them.”*

*“Because we are not capacitated to provide for learners with barriers we normally recommend they go to specialized schools. So we recommend to parents that they get psychological assessment and that they approach these specialized schools. We had two children in the last two years, with our*

*recommendation together with the support systems, who have been admitted to [a special school].”*

It is apparent from the above responses that the admission procedures for children with disabilities at these mainstream schools remains unchanged since IE was introduced. Participants prefer children with disabilities to attend special schools as mainstream schools cannot cater for their needs. The past practice of learners being assessed and diagnosed by specialists who recommend interventions that are technical, for example placing students in special schools has not been transformed to contribute to building an inclusive system. Ntombela's (2011: 13) findings are similar to the participants' views in this study where teachers see the untypical learner deserving “to be taught separately from the rest of the learner population without looking at how their teaching and classroom organization could be causing barriers to learning”. “Such practices contradict the government's broader aim of achieving inclusive education by ensuring children with disabilities can attend nearby mainstream schools, while being guaranteed adequate support through reasonable accommodation” (Human Rights Watch, 2015:35).

The researcher probed on the procedure which is followed in referring to special schools. Some of the responses were as follows:

*“We got a very small department for psychological services here. They supposed to look after five or six wards and they've got two psychologists but they cannot even assess the children because they don't have the time. So even with that which is the basic requirement that we would need from the department even that doesn't happen. So here I know we have out of our school fees paid for one or two children to be assessed so that we can find out how we can help them.”*

*“If we want to refer a child who is not performing well we call them up. But it takes time.”*

The participant further commented that this

*“...Can even take months.”*

In relation to what happens after the assessment is completed the participant stated that:

*“With the assessment they just tell us that the child has a problem of hearing but after sometime they help with asking parents to take them to be more assessed. After assessment they keep them here. There is no other school. And we work with them.”*

In the above case, the child was kept in the same school and went through the grades without any teaching adaptations because there were no other schools in the area. Human Rights Watch (2015) found that the majority of the students with disabilities interviewed at mainstream schools were on a list waiting to be referred to special schools due to the current schools inability to cater for their needs.

The next subtheme is on opinions on admitting children with severe physical and sensory disability.

#### **4.4.2.3 Opinions on admitting children with severe physical or sensory disabilities**

The participants gave their views on admitting a child with severe physical or sensory disabilities.

*“We don’t accept them because this school doesn’t cater for that kind of child. Staff as well are not trained and equipped for that child. “*

*“There are enough schools in the area that will cater for them” “I don’t think any of our schools are geared for them”*

*“I guess that’s what special schools are there for to cater for all of that.”*

*“They have the facilities so my personal view is there are facilities there are schools for them to cater for them and they will be better of being there.”*

*“Special schools are needed”*

*“As much as it seems like you accommodate them, the ideal situation is for them to go to a specialized school.”*

These responses correspond with Nel *et al* (2011) and Agbenyega's (2007) findings where South African teachers leaned more significantly towards disagreements with an inclusive school system. This is another example where the opinion of the principal or teacher, who is at the microsystem level, could work against the implementation of IE at the school. The above statements were made despite the National Disability Strategy condemning the separation of people with disabilities from society (EWP6, 2001).

One participant noted the school was not equipped to cater for a child in a wheelchair but was willing to admit this child anyway.

*"We do accept them. It is difficult the way the school is structured (for a child that uses a) wheelchair it is going to be difficult for him or her in a normal situation like this. Although we cannot say, we cannot accept you."*

Another participant outlined the danger of admitting a child with special needs without having the proper resources.

*"We had a child who was mentally retarded and we kept him here right until grade 7. He is now at home and just walks around the community. He doesn't talk at all. We approached a special school and the speech therapist and principal said there's nothing they can do for him. If he went there when he was younger they could have helped."*

Lansdown (2009) acknowledged the problems children with disabilities face in accessing their educational rights. He stated that "many children do not receive early identification and assessment of their needs and therefore fail to obtain the support and help they need. Children are thereby denied the opportunity to achieve their full potential" (Lansdown, 2009: 106). Human Rights Watch (2015) also found that many children are deprived of an education in mainstream schools due to their disability. One participant drew a clear distinction between admitting a child with severe physical disabilities and severe sensory disabilities. In the former case such a child will be admitted as opposed to the latter case the child will be refused admittance. In regards to the latter case the participant said

*“We will not help that child because no one can help that child.  
We don’t have this case.”*

It seemed that a child in a wheelchair was given greater preference to being admitted in this school than a visually impaired child. Mukhopadhyay (2013) verified this finding where the categories desired the least were visual and hearing impairments as the study showed that learners with mobility impairments were preferred because the demands on the teachers were not as serious. Abenyega’s (2007: 53) findings confirmed “teachers believed that regular schools are not places for students with disabilities, particularly students with sensory impairments.”

The next subtheme is opinions on admitting children with limited physical or sensory disability.

#### **4.4.2.4 Opinions on admitting children with limited physical or sensory disability**

Since the majority of participants indicated they did not receive applications and would not admit a child with severe disabilities, I probed to determine if they would admit a child with limited physical or sensory disabilities. This allowed the researcher to get a sense of the extent of accommodation for varying degrees of disabilities. Most participants were more positive towards admitting children with very limited disability only, but had few cases in their schools. The responses were as follows:

*“We just had this one child who had very very bad eyesight”*

*“So far they needed glasses we make sure they are in front of the classroom.”*

*“We do have but although it is difficult to teach them in a normal situation. “*

*“We have got a couple of children like a little girl who has a tiny hand with few fingers who is bubbly as anything and bounces around and that doesn’t limit her at all. ....this young lady who has moved to high school, she had a club foot and she just*



*carried on with the rest of the kids. Obviously if she was tired we allowed her to walk a bit slower, but we haven't had that many children come through."*

*"Yes that kind of child [with limited disability] will be admitted because that child will be able to manage is quite independent can move around on his or her own, doesn't need assistance of other learners or an adult that kind of child will be admitted."*

*"That doesn't pose a major challenge. Depends how serious it is as well. Lots of children are wearing glasses that is a minor challenge for them, not serious. Normally if a child comes in and we talk to them and they are able to respond to us and you find that a child can manage then we don't exclude such child."*

*"Maybe to a limited extent in a normal school like ours can accommodate certain students"*

From the above responses it is evident that a child with very limited rather than extensive physical or sensory disabilities would be accepted in these mainstream schools. These findings confirm Mukhopadhyay's (2013) study where participants would rather include students with limited disability as opposed to students with severe disability in a mainstream classroom. Limited disability was dependent on the child being self-sufficient and not reliant on the teacher to move around. Small adjustments would be made to accommodate this child. In another study, school staff did not do anything to help a partially sighted student as they did not have equipment to enlarge the prints resulting in the child failing (Kalenga, 2014). Kalenga (2014) also found that staff were totally unsupportive of learners with special needs.

One participant stated that the school required higher school fees from children with special needs, who are accommodated in a remedial class.

*"The final thing is that we look at the finances. Obviously that class [remedial class] the school fees are little higher and they need specific equipment. Yes fees are different. Then we negotiate with them and see what they can pay. Obviously we cannot advertise that, but we do deal with them in an individual level."*

This can be seen as further discrimination of children with special needs as they were prejudiced by paying higher fees due to their special needs. Human Rights Watch (2015) also found discrimination between students with and without disabilities as the former were paying fees for school that the latter were not.

Another participant stated that

*“The parents can’t afford to pay for his transport to go to the special school and he is not capable of travelling alone in a taxi. “*

In this particular example the school is within walking distance of the student’s home. If this student attended a special school, he would be required to take public transport. The participant stated that parents cannot afford to pay transport costs. Human Rights Watch (2015) also found that children attending special schools were discriminated against by paying burdensome transport costs when special schools were further away from their communities than mainstream schools. The CRPD recognizes that children with disabilities are often disregarded because parents cannot take care of the needs of the child (Lansdown, 2009).

The next theme is infrastructure and resources.

#### **4.4.3 Infrastructure and resources**

The schools infrastructure needs to be adapted to accommodate students with disabilities. The researcher asked questions to determine the adaptation of the buildings for accommodation of children with disabilities, as government must undertake “all reasonable measures to ensure that the physical facilities at public schools are accessible to disabled persons” (Schools Act, S12(5)). The responses are categorised into three subthemes: the current school layout, no budget from the DoE and large class sizes.

The first subtheme is the current school layout.

#### 4.4.3.1 Current school layout

Some of the responses were as follows:

*“We don’t have the facilities for them. Kids are moving around all the time. Every class needs to be wheelchair friendly which we are not. Even the toilets are not sorted out.”*

*“It’s very difficult to admit a child who is in a wheel chair because there is no way that they could actually get around in the school. They would have to be limited to this ground level and that’s it. Unfortunately this school was never designed to accommodate people with disabilities.”*

*“You see that’s it as well the fields don’t cope, the toilets don’t cope. You have to buy additional chairs, additional desks and that kind of stuff. It’s a bit of a nightmare situation.”*

*“I think the kind of learner that we will accept is actually determined mainly by the school layout itself. It’s extremely difficult in this building here as it is a 3 storey building. So it’s not feasible and practical. This school is not wheelchair friendly. The way in which the school is situated especially this school most of the terrain is not one level.”*

*“We wouldn’t be able to. The only block that could more or less on ground level is the admin block. In order to get to the classrooms you got to climb stairs. “*

*“We are not wheelchair friendly. Everything is so basic”*

*“Four to four and half years ago we were considered a dysfunctional school. We had maggots in our toilets, broken windows; we couldn’t open our windows because the septic tank was oozing and the smell of feces.”*

It is clear from the responses above that these schools are not adapted to be inclusive. The reasons given were that they experienced other challenges and becoming inclusive was not a priority since there was no urgent need to accommodate children with disabilities. One participant said

*“Nothing has been adapted... again I think as well because there isn’t a pressing need in this school. We haven’t forwarded such a request to the department because we haven’t been getting a lot of this type of applications.”*

It appears that no changes were to take place in the near future as there were no requests to bring IE in these schools. This verifies a survey done by the DoE that indicated 97 per cent of over 10 000 schools do not provide wheelchair access to learners with special needs (The Presidency Republic of South Africa, 2014).

Two participants affirmed that they have taken limited steps to accommodate the physically disabled.

*“We have about three parents who use wheelchairs we organized ramps around the school so that when they do come for meetings they are not disadvantaged”*

*“We have a ramp, toilet facilities and washbasins etc for physically disabled learners. “*

Although the schools provided these facilities, it was limited as wheelchair access was only restricted to lower levels. The higher levels and many areas of the ground cannot be accessed. The EWP6 sets out the framework for implementing IE however it is not binding and nobody is held accountable for policies not being implemented.

The next subtheme is no budget from the DoE.

#### **4.4.3.2 No budget from the DoE**

The DoE has a direct impact on the resources and infrastructure changes and assistance from DoE is interconnected to how the microsystem works. The support from the DoE either contributes to the success or failure of IE implementation. Most participants stated that the budget they receive from DoE was insufficient. They said

*“They pay us it’s about R120 or R150 per child per year. That doesn’t even cover the toilet paper they need for the year. That’s textbooks, paint and paper and all of that kind of stuff. A little bit goes towards maintaining the school and the cleaning of the school. They believe that if they are paying for 21 teachers and*

*one grounds man and one secretary and R160 per child per year. You are on your own. That's the reality of the situation."*

*"Very minimal, their budget is always an issue with the department of education and we understand this. They are still trying to address all the backlogs that has existed over the years and accumulated so even, for example, we want to get the painting of our roofs done there is no budget for it. We have to get funds and sponsorships and get it done ourselves. We get very little funding from the department of education."*

*"Well look the department of education has work shopped us to initially introduce this whole concept of inclusive education and how best we can go about trying to incorporate this into our normal mainstream school but most of the needs at school can only be addressed by budget. So even if this school here had to be totally redesigned to be totally inclusive it's going to take a lot of money to build ramps to retrain and reskill teachers, to lower the class numbers or to have just specially set up classes just for these children at a normal school to be able to do that it's going to take a lot of infrastructure and personnel development also."*

*"Our funding from the department of education is R126000 for the year, that doesn't even pay the electricity bill. The worse thing is running a school without funding."*

*"You can't approach the department for funding, anything is they don't have the money. We are a no fee paying school so they will say to us if you ask for school fees then we will charge the principal. I cannot understand how you can make a public announcement that it is a no fee paying school but you don't give them funding to sustain a school."*

It appears that these public primary schools received a once of budget to maintain and run the school. This budget was insufficient to cater for all the resources needed let alone make improvements to help with inclusion. Donohue (2014) asserts that to move forward with IE, the DoE can no longer transfer responsibilities to other stakeholders and the lack of significant movement in IE is due to inadequate funding by the DoE. This is the situation despite the need for funding to be provided for "programmes aimed at including children with disabilities into mainstream education, *inter alia* by renovating schools to render them physically accessible to children with disabilities" (United Nations

Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2006:6). Human Rights Watch found that “the budget for special schools in the 2014-2015 academic year was 12 times larger than the budget for inclusive education” (Human Rights Watch, 2015:76). This action surely contradicts government’s IE program by encouraging segregation.

The next subtheme is large class sizes.

#### **4.4.3.3 Large class sizes**

Large class size refers to the excessive number of students per class which were common in all the participant schools. One of the requirements in successful implementation of IE is schools having smaller class sizes like special schools. This enables teachers to cope with the children’s varying capabilities and needs. At the microsystem level the school is the most proximal setting in which a person can interact. Large class sizes influence the learning experience. Smaller numbers of students per class is ideal to allow teachers more time to focus their attention on individual student needs. The numbers of students per class were as follows:

*“We don’t go over 31. For some of the classes they are sitting at about 28 in a class but most are sitting at 30.”*

*“It depends on the classes others have 40 other have Grade 2 have 60.”*

*“Our class sizes are too large. Our average is 43. And I think that children that have these challenges will need that individual time and attention from the teacher that they are not going to get in a class of 43.”*

*“We have a teacher with 40 students to one teacher. The teacher does not have time for an individual case” “If you have 40 students how are you going to cope?”*

*“We have 45 per class how do you deal with that if you have a child with a hearing disability, they are going to struggle , because the teacher is going to be talking to 48 and 45 learners and that child needs specialized are one and one “*

*“Our challenge now with normal children is not the ideal situation. We have 45 – 48 in a class which should only be accommodating 20.”*

Mukhopadhyay’s (2013:78) study had similar findings were due to large class sizes “teachers could not give adequate attention to all learners”. In research done by Human Rights Watch (2015:60) where teachers had more than 40 students in a class including children with disabilities, the teachers resorted to “the classic model of rote learning and teaching at the front of a classroom, with their backs to the children which is incompatible with children with moderate to high level of needs and support”.

Another disadvantage with mainstream schools is that it differs from special schools where the weighting system was introduced by government to accommodate the range of disabilities in a classroom (Human Rights Watch, 2015). The Campaign to Promote the Right to Education of Children with Disabilities (2011) gives the following example to explain the weighting system: in special schools a weight is attached to a specific disability, so for example a child with a sensory impairment carries a weight of 5. If the ratio of teacher to student is 1:30 and the classroom had one student with a sensory impairment then the classroom size would be 25. Each disability is given a specific weight. This weighting system determines a maximum student-to-teacher ratio and is accordingly weighted to the disability type. Mainstream schools do not benefit from this weighting system (Human Rights Watch, 2015). This means that these public schools did not receive any directive to regulate the student-to-teacher ratio to cater for students with special needs.

The participants also commented that due to space constraints it would be very difficult to have a student with assistive devices in a classroom as classes were already crowded. The responses were as follows:

*“It’s the actual physical space because the classes are crowded. Where can we fit a wheelchair in that space? It’s not viable for us”*

*“There is no way that you could have a child who is in a wheel chair or a child who is blind or a child who is deaf in a normal class room situation that we are experiencing now because firstly, they would not be able to move around and secondly they would not be able to be taught because it’s just not a feasible option and unless the department changes a lot of additional policies IE is actually not going to happen.”*

*“There are 55 children in the class, in a normal size classroom which is only supposed to fit 28. If you look at the health and safety regulation each child is supposed to have one square meter and the teacher is supposed to have seven square meters. They got 55 children in their class so clearly they are breaking that rule firstly and then if you going to add to that equation children with disabilities there is no way.”*

From the participants’ responses it was clear that physical space was a challenge. This is similar to Agbenyega’s (2007) study where classes were found to be overcrowded. This environment was not conducive for a child with special needs.

The theme of teacher training is discussed below.

#### **4.4.4 Teacher training**

Teachers are part of the microsystem and if they work together with other microsystems then there might be positive results. “Teacher education is the key to the effective implementation of inclusive education as its success is largely dependent on the attitudes and skills of teachers” (Mariga *et al*, 2014: 90). The participants were asked about training provided for and the preparedness of teachers in implementing IE. The responses are categorised into the following subthemes: disruption of classes, lack of workshops, the psychology or emotion of the child, sign language, and demotivation.

The first subtheme is disruption of classes.



#### **4.4.4.1 Disruption of classes**

One of the reasons provided for the lack of training of teachers is not having available time. This was a major concern for one of the participants who stated that:

*“There is no way you can let five teachers at a time go for a whole day workshop because basically that would disrupt learning and that won’t happen. Obviously there are limitations like I say with extra mural with regards to having meeting in school time. They are here to teach so the children have to come first. So, for example, you have three teachers absent who are genuinely sick I mean my staff doesn’t take time off willy nilly.”*

This is a direct link to the limited number of teachers per school and the large class sizes as well as a lack of budget to employ more teachers. There is a shortage of teachers at these schools which makes it impossible to attend training and leave students unattended. Mukhopadhyay’s (2013) study also found that one of the major barriers in providing training included insufficient time for teachers to attend.

Besides teachers not having an opportunity to attend training the other reason for their limited knowledge was that not enough workshops were provided. This will be elaborated in the next subtheme.

#### **4.4.4.2 Not enough workshops therefore limited knowledge**

Some participants agreed that teachers were not capable of teaching children with disabilities because they did not have adequate knowledge due to insufficient workshops and training. They said

*“The teachers have never been work shopped. “*

*“....staff will have to be retrained and developed and trained to deal with these children.”*

*“Except for the two that attended with me when we attended that initial one, nobody else.”*

*“They [the teachers] would support these kids, but they are limited in the knowledge of these cases, the time also.”*

One of the principals agreed that teachers did attend workshops however these were not sufficient in preparing teachers.

*“Not prepared, we have to have trained professional people handling. The teachers know about it but can’t practice anything.”*

This corresponds with a number of non-governmental organisations that told Human Rights Watch that “teachers are not sufficiently qualified and equipped to teach children with disabilities, particularly in mainstream and full-service schools” (Human Rights Watch, 2015:54). Abenyega (2007) supports this view. In this study the participants attended workshops in their capacity as principals. They said

*“I attended mandatory workshop just for few hours in one day.”*

*“Attended compulsory workshop. It lasted a day. You will find that in this term there is one workshop maybe in another term there is another workshop.”*

*“We have been to a couple of workshops that have been done by the department. They are not for everybody they are just for managers and one or two heads of department and things like that and then with the training they are done by people who read the books. They don’t actually interact there are very few of them that can actually speak English properly and its boring for the teachers.”*

*“Yes we had a workshop conducted by the department of education where they called us and they briefed us on the aspect on trying to make our schools as inclusive as possible and they also realised that not every school could be fully inclusive because of the layout of the school.”*

*“I think this particular one (workshop) if I recall was over three days but it did not start in the morning. Because they try not to take us away from school too long. If I recall correctly this one was over three days but was about 3 hours each day.”*

*“Normally the workshops by the Department are mandatory so somebody needs to be there from our school.”*

*“We have been notified and told at a meeting that IE is to be implemented. However there are no parameters that we can work with. There is no formal introduction. Presently we are still referring cases to the Department of education psychologist.”*

*“I myself as management (principal) can’t advise them (teachers on IE procedure)”*

This corresponds to Ntombela’s (2011) research findings were the general response from teachers interviewed maintained that workshops were attended once off by one or two staff lasting a few hours with no follow up sessions. The participants also noted that the workshops they attended were not sufficient and did not give clear directives or parameters to work with. Donohue (2014:3) argues that the primary reason for the slow movement on IE policy is “the apparent lack of clarity in the policy, as well as issues pertaining to the poor implementation of this policy.” Both Kalenga (2014) and Donohue (2014) found that workshops which were provided were not sufficient.

In order for IE ideals to be realized in schools, “teachers should be prepared to accept ownership for students with varied abilities and needs, as well as to ensure their participation and success” (Oswald, 2011:399). This requires specific skills such as curriculum differentiation.

Curriculum differentiation is an important concept to be implemented in schools to cater for children of varying needs in one classroom. The EWP6 argues that “with respect to teachers, there should be attitudinal change, as well as changes to behavior, teaching methods, curricula and the environment” (Oswald, 2011:390). When asked about the extent of curriculum differentiation practiced at the schools, they responded

*“I guess that’s what special schools are there for, to cater for all of that.”*

*“No I won’t lie we use the same curriculum but its better if you know if the child has a problem because you will teach them according to the problem but we do not change the curriculum”*

*“We do follow the curriculum quite closely and obviously if there are some children that are battling with a specific concept we do actually revise so we do stop and do a lot of group teaching, take them out and go over it with them. “*

*“Main challenges we have is the language barrier and obviously if we have children that have physical and sensory disabilities also that will be a different barrier that teachers will have to deal with because between 85 and 90 percent of our learners are isiZulu speaking background although the school itself is an English medium school. That’s a barrier in our school. It’s an English medium school. The teachers are teaching in English and the children are coming from an isiZulu background. It’s something the child has to deal with slowly and slowly develop efficiency in English and the teacher has to go much slower to cater for these children that are slow in grasping simply because of this language barrier. So to try and bring about this differentiation to cater for the different levels of children in the class....(it’s another challenge).”*

These responses are similar to the findings of Ngcobo (2011) and Mukhopadhyay (2013) where no evidence of curriculum differentiation was evident despite DoE emphasizing in the Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for teacher education and development in South Africa (2011-2015) “that skills and knowledge on curriculum differentiation should become a key feature of all teacher development programmes” (DSD, 2012:80). Human Rights Watch interviewed parents in a recent research study and “most parents interviewed were not aware of an individual education plan or their children following any specific curriculum adapted to their needs” (Human Rights Watch, 2015:63). One of Human rights Watch (2015: 3) key findings showed that “children with disabilities in many public schools receive low quality education in poor learning environments” and “they continue to be significantly affected by a lack of teacher training about inclusive education”. Oswald and Swart (2011) found that it was a challenge for teachers to manage the diversity of disabilities. Ngcobo (2011) and Kalenga (2014) both agreed that teachers taught learners

with disabilities like other children in promoting a universal method. Implementation of IE will only be successful “if teachers are adequately prepared and equipped by means of initial training and they realize the importance of improving their practice by means of continuous professional development” (Lessing , 2007: 89).

The next subtheme is the psychology or emotion of the child.

#### **4.4.4.3 The psychology or emotion of the child**

Understanding the mental or emotional aspect of having children with disabilities in mainstream schools should not be underestimated. The participants elaborated how the integration of students with disabilities and without disabilities can have an adverse affect on the emotion of the child. Teachers need to identify these emotional problems and deal with them accordingly. They said

*“I have taught at a deaf school so I know it’s a problem for them themselves, also this labeling thing that happens they feel uncomfortable kids will give them a hard time. Kids are horrible let me tell you how horrible they can be and I mean a child just do some silly thing they will be all over them. Like I have a problem here because there’s one fellow he is from Nigeria. He is really really black and you know the problems that the kids give him he actually has to go to the psychologist”*

*“They have this disability to deal with then they have to deal with other people who are picking on them all the time. Look although it may seem like a little thing but you know that it is a problem.”*

*“Even if the child is here he or she will find that, no I don’t belong here because of the structure of the school.”*

*“But the problem is the library is upstairs. The computer rooms are over there. It would make life very challenging for the little person and think it would damage their self esteem because they would get tired very quickly going up and down stairs.”*

*“Obviously, if it is not within our scope (to teach children with disabilities) then it’s not fair to the child because obviously you want the learning environment to be as comfortable as possible.”*

Other factors were:

*“Psychological factor it’s a stigma” We don’t want to do more damage to the child that is already having a barrier.”*

*“Children used to laugh because he used to drool constantly. This child was a constant joke in the school and the children used to laugh at him. They would hit him and runaway.”*

All these responses showed that inclusion for children with disabilities is a complex exercise. Besides catering for physical factors like resources, teachers require thorough preparation on the emotion and psychology of the child. This requires professional training to identify these problems when faced. Other researchers found that although teachers acknowledged their lack of skills in teaching children with disabilities they had no choice but to keep up with the developments in education and the new teaching methods (Lessing, 2007). De Boer *et al* (2011) confirmed that teachers are neither confident nor competent in catering for student’s needs.

The next subtheme is sign language as a method of communication.

#### **4.4.4.4 Sign language**

None of the teachers were qualified in sign language despite the CRPD requiring governments to take “appropriate measures to employ teachers, including teachers with disabilities who are qualified in sign language and / or Braille, and to train professionals and staff who work at all levels of education “(CRPD, art 24(4)). When asked if the participants have knowledge in sign language they responded as follows:

*“We would need to bring in personnel that do sign language and there is no way that the department could cater for that.”*

*“We would have to speak to professionals to see what we need to do. Because a lot of our teachers are trained in remediation but they are not trained in sign language. So we would have to get a professional to tell us how we can help the child and obviously do our best.”*

*“None of the staff that I’m aware of no.”*

*“No, no specialized personnel.”*

The majority of the responses were negative despite the Hon Angie Motshekga stating that there is collaboration between stakeholders to ensure all teachers are fully skilled in Braille (Department of Basic Education, 2013) and despite “President Jacob Zuma’s official announcement that sign language would become an official language in South Africa’s schools. Children who are deaf or hard of hearing face barriers learning sign language, and the lack of teachers who can teach sign language to an adequate standard” (Human Rights Watch, 2015: 47). Mukhopadhyay (2013) was concerned that knowledge and skills in sign language and Braille reading was lacking. Peters (2004) also indicated that sign language and Braille reading are integral components and should not be subject to availability.

The next subtheme is demotivation of teachers.

#### **4.4.4.5 Demotivation**

Another challenge was demotivated teachers. Some of the responses were as follows:

*“We in KZN got the largest number of school children in the country but there’s a lot of problems. It’s not a quick fix by any stretch of the imagination. And you just have to go to into Bergville, Limpopo, Dundee and have a look at those schools there and visit some of those schools there and you will see how lacking they are and then you wonder why teachers are not motivated to go the extra mile.”*

*“Some of the teachers in the outlying area are so happy to come to a workshop and they will take the whole day off. They arrive at the workshop late but they did not go to school that day. So those children do they get a teacher, no, they get told do not come to school today. “*

*“Our challenge is also absenteeism where we have one or two teachers that will be constantly sick and stay away. Most teachers are dedicated there are one or two generally with a bad attitude. They see it as a paycheck.”*

*“Teachers are highly stressed there’s so much the department expects from us. We try our best”*

“The main resource in making inclusive schools a reality is teachers” (Mariga *et al*, 2014:100). Human Rights Watch (2015:61) noted “part of the problem is the lack of incentive to teach children with disabilities” and this “discourages teachers who must now spend extra class time focusing on children with disabilities”.

One participant said

*“Now at the moment people who haven’t even seen the inside of the classroom in the last 20 years have decided on policy for teachers. If I want to know about grade 4 teachers I go to the grade 4 teachers and I spend time in their classroom. They are not doing that. They are just deciding on these policies and they sound wonderful and these people are brilliant but at the end of the day when you get down to the grassroots level it is not going to work which is disturbing.”*

Research found that teachers in South African were unhappy that they were not consulted when the IE policy was planned (Oswald, 2011). They also felt that IE policy was imposed on them (Abenyega, 2007).

The next theme discussed below is parent support.

#### **4.4.5 Parent support**

In order for IE policy to be successfully implemented it needs to be holistic, that means all important stakeholders are required to be a part of the execution phase. Parent involvement and support which forms part of the mesosystem are important factors in making this possible. Education of children with disabilities is a partnership between parents and teachers. Linkages between the school and children’s home settings are critical for both the learners and the educators. “They have the most direct impact on their day-to-day lives, and their parents’



attitudes and understanding would be the most effective means of ending social exclusion” (Lansdown, 2009:53). The researcher identified the degree of support from parents at these schools ranging from no support to limited support and positive support. These subthemes will be discussed below.

#### **4.4.5.1 No support**

The researcher asked the participants what support is received from the parents. The responses were as follows:

*“You hardly get support from the parents. But we get a handful. This is more like a dumping ground.”*

*“It’s so difficult you even call the parent, the parent will not come. It’s difficult when you call a class meeting you see the parents are not available.”*

*“Because of parental lack of knowledge, because of resources, finances, transport, most of parents do not take up the recommendation. They just leave them in mainstream education and they are just going through mainstream education without benefitting.”*

*“Parents are not equipped to handle them”*

*“Some parents will tell you that [special schools] are for “insane people” it’s a barrier for parents too. There is a need to get through to parents and counsel parents.”*

*“There has been in some instance a little boy in grade 3 who has been assessed and in his report it says he has to go to a special school because his learning difficulties are huge and these parents are driving us up the wall. They are not working with us. They are divorced and fighting with each other and the kids are in the middle. Every day he cannot retain one thing from one day to the next. It’s heartbreaking because he is such a lovely child and without he parents there is nothing you can do.”*

*“We don’t have support from parents. The school is like a crèche. It’s like I lay the egg and walk away. That’s the attitude of lots of parents, most of them”*

The majority of participants stated that they did not receive any support from parents. Some responses highlighted and suggested that having children with special needs were a barrier for parents as well. They further said that parents sent children to school and expected teachers to accommodate all their needs. Parental involvement is crucial and was a missing gap in many of the schools. This finding is similar to a research study comprising 107 mainstream teachers which included, “limited contact with parents together with the parent’s perceived lack of understanding of the learners’ capabilities” (Engelbrecht, 2001: 81). In another research study in some South African schools parents were so poor that they could not even help with fundraising (Kalenga, 2014). The EWP6 also defines IE as being broader than formal schooling and begins at home. The next subtheme is limited to positive support from parents.

#### **4.4.5.2 Limited to positive support**

One participant experienced limited support from a parent whose child had no disabilities and responded as follows:

*“I would say to a limited extent. We have a fully functional governing body, parents are involved. They support us with fundraising, when we invite them to come to school to meet with teachers and check their children’s work and so forth. We get a reasonable turnout but if you have a parent meeting for the purpose of budget to present the New Year budget and determine school fees you will be lucky if you get 30 parents. And our school enrollment is 1000. They support certain things and other things they just don’t have interest in it I suppose. In terms of parental support from home, teachers often complain.”*

Another participant experienced positive support from parents of children with disabilities and said

*“With regards to the other little people with minor disabilities the parents have been very accommodating and work with us and I mean the little girl who had the club foot her mum was amazing. The little boy we used the microphone his mum was incredible. And I find that if you show that you are actually going to work*

*with the parents they come on board so well. You just got to give that initial assessment or whatever the initial step.”*

Parents are supportive in limited cases. One participant suggested that if teachers created an open line of communication with parents it helps with the mutual working relationship for the betterment of the child. The relationship between the parents and the school contributes to the success of IE (Soodack, 2002).

Due to the participants' vast knowledge and experience teaching it is important to seek their advice. Some of their recommendations will be discussed below.

#### **4.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PARTICIPANTS**

Participants in this study offered recommendations regarding what should be implemented. The following are some of the recommendations which included: the need for teacher training colleges, accommodation for children with limited disabilities, teacher volunteers with special classes within the school and importance of donations and sponsorships to supplement the budget allocated to mainstream schools.

##### **4.5.1 Need for teacher training college**

Participants suggested the need for teacher training colleges. One participant said, for example:

*“To be practical they actually need to bring teacher training colleges back because yes University Bachelor Ed is brilliant but these teachers get PGCE (Post Graduate Certificate in Education) and they get thrown in the classroom and it's nothing of what they are being taught absolutely nothing. It takes 3 years to get a teacher to a point to where they are fully trained to deal with the reality of a classroom. ....maybe you don't have the right temperament to be a teacher and also with IE you need to find the people who are going to be patient with these children because you want them to get a good vibe about their own learning. You don't need somebody that is going to be screaming and shouting at them because they are too slow or because they haven't grasped the concept or the teacher can't explain it to*

*them so you are looking for a very special kind of person. It's hard to find good teachers let alone teachers who have the feel for children in need."*

The concern over teacher preparation programmes at the university was expressed in the study done by Mukhopadhyay (2013). The UNCRC (2006: 8) also emphasized the need for training programmes that are targeted "on the rights of children with disabilities as a prerequisite for qualification". In the Human Rights Watch (2015) study education experts were also concerned about the limited programs at universities that provided IE training. Forlin (2011) also mentioned the importance of teachers being prepared to teach in inclusive classrooms as tertiary facilities should ensure that the curriculum sufficiently covers information to cater for diverse needs of the student.

#### **4.5.2 Accommodation for children with limited disabilities**

The majority of participants recommended that children with limited disabilities should be accommodated as far as possible in mainstream schools. They elaborated on methods they have used which have been successful. For example, for children with limited sight, two participants said they make sure this child is sitting in the front of the classroom.

Another participant said for example:

*"Very very bad eyesight so he had to sit right in front and he had to use a magnifying glass. And where the kids had A4 page I used to roll out all his papers on an A3. The font was bigger. We made specific provisions. "*

Mukhopadhyay (2013: 78) agreed that an ideal teaching practice "employed instructional adaptations and strategies such as large fonts for learners with visual impairments".

When a child was diagnosed as being hard of hearing, one participant said for example

*“His teacher wore a microphone on her so he could hear and she did that and she had to face him so he could lip read.”*

Schools were accommodating to an extent when it was within their scope to provide for a child with limited disabilities only.

#### **4.5.3 Teacher volunteers and special classes within the school**

One participant recommended that each school have one class per grade that is earmarked for inclusion and she said for example:

*“I think for it to work you will need one person to volunteer to have those children and that person will have to be trained on sign language or whatever Braille or..”*

Further suggestion was to reduce one class size in a grade. For example if you had four classes in grade one, then one class will be reduced. She further suggested that

*“It would be in the ground level if you had children with major disabilities so that is the only way I would see EWP6 work in a normal school.”*

However, the perceived disadvantage of this option would be that the other three classes would include more students so as to cater for one smaller class. In making the above suggestions participants were obviously mindful of the reality of current school conditions.

#### **4.5.4 Donations and sponsorships**

Participants pointed out the importance of donations and sponsorships. One participant said for example:

*“We receive very limited funds from the department. Also, so we rely a lot on fundraising, donating sponsorships.”*

Another participant elaborated as follows:

*“So within 4½ years we have raised more than R800 000 worth of sponsorships. We have really turned this school around. And you know we are so blessed here that it’s almost every day someone stops to offer us some sort of sponsorship.”*

*“So lots that goes beyond the call of duty. As I said this is a kind of school that you need to have a heart for what you are doing. “*

However every school is different as this was an example of a very community orientated school. Also the principal had to multitask from managing the school and her duties to being the school’s spokesperson during her personal time in attempts to raise more funds. It is noted that not all principals have the time and opportunity to represent their school in that way.

#### **4.6 CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, as noted from the participants responses there were several challenges that impacted on the implementation of the IE policy and legislation at the schools. These included the very understanding of IE, large class sizes, the inadequate infrastructure and resources, lack of teacher training and parental support.

This chapter also provided the participants recommendations in making schools inclusive, considering the reality of challenges already experienced. Amongst the recommendations these included the need for teacher training colleges, methods to accommodate children with limited disabilities, teacher volunteers with one special class within the school and lastly and the importance of sponsorship and donations.

## **CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

In this chapter a summary of the main findings will be provided, the conclusions and recommendations drawn from chapter 4. The main aim of the study was to explore the implementation of IE policies for children with physical and sensory disabilities in six public primary schools in the Pinetown district. The objectives of the study included exploring the factors that positively and negatively impact on the admission of pupils with physical and sensory disabilities, the experiences and challenges in implementing IE policies and steps taken at the schools in furthering IE as advocated in policy documents. The study was qualitative in nature. Data collection included semi-structured interviews and observation. Six participants were interviewed in this study. Emerging themes and subthemes from the transcribed interviews were analyzed in chapter four.

### **5.2 SUMMARY OF THE MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

The main findings and conclusions are as follows:

#### **5.2.1 Factors that positively and negatively impact on the admission of pupils with physical and sensory disabilities**

The research confirmed that IE legislation and policies at schools are not being implemented. It further highlighted challenges experienced in the implementation of inclusion for the purposes it was intended. There were several factors that both positively and negatively impacted on the admission of students with physical and sensory disabilities. A positive factor was the admission of children with limited physical or sensory disabilities. The negative factors included not being approached for admission, referral to special schools and non-admission of children with severe physical and sensory disabilities.

The negative factors far outweigh the positive. Most participants indicated that the schools were not approached for admission of children with severe physical and sensory disabilities. It may be hypothesized that many parents may be unaware of the rights to education for their children with disabilities in mainstream schools and therefore they only apply to special schools. A further practice adopted in the mainstream schools is the referral of learners to special schools when they are approached. The research data suggests that the practice of learners being assessed by specialists who diagnose and place learners in programs is still being practiced. For example, one school had two children with disabilities in the last two years and on the principal's recommendation these children were admitted to special schools. The conclusion drawn from these findings is that children with severe physical and sensory disabilities are not admitted into mainstream schools but are rather referred to special schools.

### **5.2.2 Experiences and challenges in implementing inclusive education policies**

The schools experienced a number of challenges in implementing IE policies. These included large class sizes, lack of infrastructure and resources, inadequate teacher training, insufficient parent and DoE support. On the basis of the findings these factors were the main reason for policy non-compliance. All six participants agreed that large class sizes were a challenge in implementing IE as it does not allow teachers to focus on individual children's needs. For example, each class averages about forty students per class and the principals' acknowledged that teachers do not have time for individual attention. Large class sizes also contribute to lack of physical space in the classroom. For instance one participant stated that classes are already crowded and they cannot fit a wheelchair in the class as movement will be restricted. On these grounds it can be concluded that large classes are not conducive for IE.



The physical infrastructure at all schools were not adequately adapted to cater for students with disabilities. The layout of the schools have not been changed or adapted since the DoE introduced the EWP6 in 2001. For example, there were no railings in any of the schools. All the participants confirmed that the schools with two or more levels cannot be accessed by wheelchairs. One participant stated that ramps were built for the bottom floor only to allow parents with disabilities access during meetings. No other adaptations to the buildings were made at any of the schools to make them inclusive. The main argument that can justify the reason for not making these buildings accessible is that the participants had no compelling reason to pursue the need to adapt as there has not been any request or need to do so. All participants experienced other challenges, such as insufficient staff and resources. The conclusion drawn from the findings is that changing the building infrastructure and making the schools inclusive is not a priority.

The DoE, being a department of the South African government, oversees education and policy implementation in South Africa. One participant stated that he never approached the DoE for help in adapting the school as there was never a need to as parents rarely approached mainstream schools to admit their children with severe disabilities. The findings also show that the DoE does not have a budget to help with anything else besides the annual set allocation for each school which is insufficient for the maintenance of the school. For example, one participant stated that the budget allocated to her school does not even cover the electricity bill for the year.

This study further found that teachers were not trained to teach children with disabilities. Training for an inclusive class should include managing the psychology or emotion of the child and learning sign language. There should also be curriculum differentiation and other support that teachers require. The research findings showed that not enough workshops were provided for teachers. For example, besides the one school where only two teachers attended a workshop none of the other teachers attended training on IE. The

reasons provided were insufficient time as classes would be disrupted and no training was offered.

An important aspect of teacher training should include the psychology and emotion of the child with disabilities. The data gathered in this study suggests that children with disabilities not only have physical barriers but also physiological and emotional barriers as well. For example, one participant stated that other learners in the school would laugh at a boy that had a mental disability and who constantly drooled. They would hit him and run away.

Learning sign language is imperative. All six participants confirmed that sign language is nonexistent at the schools despite it being a major communication tool for children with sensory disabilities. Together with learning sign language, another major concept in an inclusive class is curriculum differentiation. All six participants stated that all children were taught in the same way with no individual learning plan to cater for individual needs. The large class sizes contributed to the curriculum being standard for all children as it was near impossible to give each child individual attention. All the challenges which teachers experience contribute to their demotivation. One participant stated that the ever changing curriculum and political imperatives are major contributing factors together with no support to teach children with disabilities.

The findings suggest that in most cases the participants did not receive support from parents. One participant stated that having a disabled child is a barrier not only for the child but for the parent as well. Parents need help in coping with the needs of their children. One participant agreed that positive support was received from two parents which contributed to the successful education of children with limited disabilities. She stated that teachers just need to open that line of communication to help with a mutual working relationship for the betterment of the child.

All the participants indicated that they receive DoE policy documents. These policy documents and circulars are sent via the government gazette and are very accessible. However, there is no means of knowing if these documents are even read or practiced. For example, when asked if the EWP6 is available at schools, one participant stated that if it's in the government gazette then we have it. There does not seem to be any enforcement of the policies on IE. It can be concluded that the lack of mandatory enforcement of implementing IE policies results in IE not being a priority at these schools.

Implementing IE will bring along more challenges that the principals are not ready to cope with. They are aware of the reality of the schools situation and are pessimistic on IE implementation in the near future. Findings show that they prefer to refer learners with disabilities to special schools because they feel that these schools are better equipped to help children with special needs and children with disabilities are referred to special schools regardless of severity of disability. Principals were also not clear on the directives to implement IE at their schools because of the lack of workshops, lack of guidelines regarding admission procedures in relation to severity of disability and parameters to work with.

The conclusions drawn from these findings are that participants are faced with a number of obstacles in implementing IE at their schools. Firstly, the admission policy and procedure at these schools has not changed. Secondly the large class sizes make it near impossible to cater for individual learning needs. Thirdly, the building and infrastructure has not been sufficiently adapted to accommodate students with special needs. Fourthly, teacher training on IE was non-existent to cope with all the aspects needed for successful education of children with disabilities. Fifthly, parental support is inadequate. Sixthly, the DoE is faced with other major challenges and making schools inclusive does not seem to be the priority. And lastly, the principals prefer special schools where children can receive specialized education. Due to the current challenges they experience they are not keen to implement IE that would bring about new challenges.

### **5.2.3 Steps taken at schools in furthering inclusive education**

The accommodation of children with limited disabilities was noteworthy. The findings indicate that only children who did not have to rely on the teacher or other students to move around were admitted. For example one participant reiterated that children needed to be self sufficient to be admitted at that school. Small adjustments were made to accommodate limited disabilities. For instance, children that are partially sighted are made to sit in front of the class and worksheets and paperwork are all enlarged. Children with hearing problems for example, are accommodated by a teacher used a microphone to speak to the child, faces the child when talking so he could lip read and children with limited physical disabilities are accommodated by receiving extra time to walk to classes or complete tasks. These are some of the techniques used in the mainstream schools to adapt for children with limited disabilities only.

One school experienced great success in getting the local community involved in fundraising. This participant basically runs this school on donations and sponsorships alone. In spite of this taking much of the principal's time to procure sponsorships she has successfully turned her school around with providing facilities for the children. This would not have been possible had it not been for the fund raising efforts by the principal.

Other than these practices nothing has been done to help with implementing IE. The findings show that there is no pressing need to implement IE at these schools. There have not been any significant changes to school practices and procedures in the last 14 years since the DoE issued EWP6 in 2001.

### **5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS**

To be effective IE requires all stakeholders at the macro, meso and micro levels to work in unison for the implementation of this policy. The recommendations at the various levels are discussed below.

### **5.3.1 Policy directives with effective monitoring**

IE policies and procedures should have clear directives for all stakeholders to understand and practice. Even though policy documents are cascaded down to the micro level there are no monitoring facilities to enforce directives. There should be effective monitoring of legislation and policy implementation at the schools and repercussions for non-compliance. However, repercussions for non-compliance must be subject to adequate resources and other support being provided.

### **5.3.2 School principals to be fully orientated to IE policy**

The principals are the head of each school and it is clear for any policy to be implemented it needs to be understood by the person governing the school and this understanding to be cascaded to the staff below. It is important that principals attend regular compulsory workshops that monitor IE implementation. The workshops should provide clear directives on gradual implementation of IE policies. Clear mandates along with support should be provided for.

### **5.3.3 Weighting system**

Mainstream schools should also benefit from the weighting system that special schools receive. This will ensure that classes are kept at a manageable size to cater for all students needs and specific disabilities are accounted and accommodated for.

### **5.3.4 Tertiary institutes to include IE modules**

Not enough training is done at tertiary level to prepare future teachers on IE in schools. The Bachelor of Education degree is not sufficient to prepare future teachers to teach inclusive classes. IE should be incorporated in tertiary institutes to prepare future teachers to teach children with disabilities.

### **5.3.5 Ongoing teacher training**

It is apparent that teachers already in the system with years of experience still lack skills required in teaching children with disabilities. It is recommended that teachers attend regular training on IE techniques and methods to adapt teaching strategies for an inclusive class. This training should be mandatory with available support structures to assist when challenges are experienced. Teachers and training staff should share success stories on methods that work at their school to be able to learn from one another.

### **5.3.6 Public awareness**

The public includes communities, parents and all persons that are affected by IE. They should have information readily available on IE. Many people are unaware of the right to education their disabled child is entitled to at mainstream schools. Schools and government bodies should be more proactive in advocating for the rights of children with disabilities. This should be done at community level in the surrounds of each school so that information is easily accessible with clear lines of communication.

### **5.3.7 Budget allocation**

The major challenge experienced in all of the schools is the lack of funding received from the DoE to make necessary changes in transforming schools to be more inclusive. Government needs to ensure the budget allocation when making policies. There is a need for funding to be allocated to mainstream schools in making them inclusive instead of allocating a greater portion to special schools. This practice does not promote what IE policy was intended for. It just further promotes segregation of disabled students from their able bodied peers.

### **5.3.8 Sponsorships, donations and fund raising**

Incentives should be given to schools and the fund raising committees that go the extra mile to raise funds as insufficient budget allocation is a problem at all schools.

#### **5.4 RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

Since the sample of this study was small, with six participants, it is recommended that it should be followed by an expanded study with a larger sample size of principals from schools across the country. This will help in comparing what could be done differently in implementing IE in schools.

It is also recommended that further research be undertaken in exploring the views and knowledge of parents of children with disabilities.

#### **5.5 CONCLUSION**

This chapter has summarized the main conclusions and recommendations derived from the participants interviewed. The study has shown that, due to a number of challenges, schools are not implementing IE policies. This compromises the rights of children with disabilities to an inclusive education. They are still referred to special schools with no significant change in the practice and procedures in public primary schools implementing IE.

## REFERENCES

- Agbenyega, J. (2007). Examining Teachers' Concerns and Attitudes to Inclusive Education in Ghana. *International Journal of whole schooling*, 3(1), 41-56.
- Auriacombe, C., & Mouton, J. (2007). Qualitative field research. *Journal of Public Administration: Special issue*, 42(6), 441-457
- Babbie, E. & Mouton, J. 2010. *The practice of social research*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Bothma, B (2014, September 9), Over 2.8 million people in South Africa live with disability, retrieved from [www.enca.com/self-declaration-keyaccurate-disability-figures](http://www.enca.com/self-declaration-keyaccurate-disability-figures)
- Booth, T., 2005. *Keeping the future alive: putting inclusive values into action*. Forum 47 (2), 151–158.
- Campaign to Promote the Right to Education of Children with Disabilities, 2011, “Factsheet 6: Systemic barriers to inclusive education” retrieved from <http://www.included.org.za/R2ecwdsite/docs/Factsheet%206.pdf> accessed [20 November 2015].
- Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (2001). *Research Methods in Education 5th Edition* Routledge Falmer, New York.
- Craissati, D., Devi Banerjee, U., King, L., Lansdown, G., & Smith, A. (2007). *A human rights based approach to education for all*. United Nations Children's Fund. retrieved from <http://eprints.ulster.ac.uk/7097/> accessed [30 November 2015]
- de Boer, A., Pijl, S. J., & Minnaert, A. (2011). Regular primary schoolteachers' attitudes towards inclusive education: a review of the literature. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 15(3), 331-353.
- De Vos, A. S., & Strydom, H. (2011). Scientific theory and professional research. In De Vos, A. S., & Strydom, H. Fouche, CB and Delpport, CSL (2011). *Research at Grass Roots. 4th Edition*. Van Schaik, Pretoria.
- De Vos, A. S., & Strydom, H. Fouche, CB and Delpport, CSL (2011). *Research at Grass Roots. 4th Edition*. Van Schaik, Pretoria.
- Denscombe, M. (2010). *The Good Research Guide: For Small-Scale Social Research Projects: For small-scale social research projects*. McGraw-Hill International.



Department of Basic Education. (2014) Draft Policy on Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support, 2014.

Department of Basic Education, Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa, 2011-2025.

Department of Basic Education. (2013), *Inclusive Education Conference Report* at [www.thutong.doe.gov.za/ResourceDownload.aspx?id=47915](http://www.thutong.doe.gov.za/ResourceDownload.aspx?id=47915) accessed [1 June 2014].

Department of Basic Education. (2003), *Final Report of the Department of Education/DANIDA Pilot Project in Inclusive Education* at <http://www.thutong.doe.gov.za/inclusiveeducation//Policy//DANIDAProject/tabid/3318/Default.aspx> accessed [28 February 2015]

Department of Basic Education. (2005), *Conceptual and Operational Guidelines for Full-Service Schools*, at <http://www.thutong.doe.gov.za/inclusiveeducation/Policy/Guidelines/tabid/3262/Default.aspx> accessed [28 February 2015]

Department of Basic Education. (2008), *National Strategy on Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support* at [www.thutong.doe.gov.za/resourcedownload.aspx?id=35979](http://www.thutong.doe.gov.za/resourcedownload.aspx?id=35979) accessed [20 June 2014]

Department of Education (2001) White Paper 6: *Building an inclusive Education and Training System* (Pretoria, Government Printer).

Department of Education – Framework and management Plan for the first phase of implementation of Inclusive education 2005 – 2009, Department of Education available at [www.thutong.doe.gov.za](http://www.thutong.doe.gov.za) accessed on [01 June 2014].

Disabled World at Disability: Definition, Types & Models  
<http://www.disabled-world.com/disability/types/> accessed [28 February 2015].

Donohue, D., & Bornman, J. (2014). The challenges of realising inclusive education in South Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, 34(2), 01-14.

DSD, DWCPD and UNICEF. 2012. *Children with disabilities in South Africa: A situation Analysis: 2001-2011*. Pretoria: Department of Social Development / Department of Women, Children and People with disabilities/ UNICEF.

Engelbrecht, P., Forlin, C., Eloff, I., & Swart, E. (2001). Developing a support programme for teachers involved with inclusion in South Africa. *International Journal of Special Education*, 16(1), 80-89.

Forlin, C., Earle, C., Loreman, T., & Sharma, U. (2011). The sentiments, attitudes, and concerns about inclusive education revised (SACIE-R) scale for measuring pre-service teachers' perceptions about inclusion. *Exceptionality Education International*, 21(2 & 3), 50-65.

Fouche, C. B. and Schurinck, W. (2011). Qualitative research designs. In De Vos, A. S., & Strydom, H. Fouche, CB and Delpont, CSL (2011). *Research at Grass Roots. 4th Edition. Van Schaik, Pretoria.*

Framework for Social Welfare (2013), Department of Social Development at [http://www.dsd.gov.za/index2.php?option=com\\_docman&task=doc\\_view&gid=515&Itemid=39](http://www.dsd.gov.za/index2.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=515&Itemid=39) [accessed 24 June 2015]

Gal, E., Schreur, N., & Engel-Yeger, B. (2010). Inclusion of Children with Disabilities: Teachers' Attitudes and Requirements for Environmental Accommodations. *International Journal of Special Education*, 25(2), 89-99.

Greeff, M. (2011). Information collection: interviewing. In De Vos, A. S., & Strydom, H. Fouche, CB and Delpont, CSL (2011). *Research at Grass Roots. 4th Edition. Van Schaik, Pretoria.*

Grinnell, R.M &Unrau, Y.A. (2008). Social work research and evaluation: foundations of evidence-based practice, New York: Oxford University Press.

Gitterman, A., & Germain, C. B. (2008). Ecological framework. *Encyclopedia of social work*, 20, 97-102.

Glicken, M. D. (2003). *Social research: A simple guide*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Healy, K. (2014). *Social work theories in context: Creating frameworks for practice*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Heap, M., Lorenzo, T., & Thomas, J. (2009). 'We've moved away from disability as a health issue, it's a human rights issue': reflecting on 10 years of the right to equality in South Africa. *Disability & Society*, 24(7), 857-868.

Heeralal, P. J. H., & Jama, P. P. (2014). Implementation of Inclusive Education in Three Schools of Mthatha District in the Eastern Cape Province, South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(20).

Howell, C., Chalklen, S. & Alberts, T. (2006). "A History of the Disability Rights Movement in South Africa." In: Watermeyer, B. et al. (Eds). *Disability and Social Change: A South African Agenda*. Cape Town. HSRC Press.

Human Rights Watch, "*Complicit in Exclusion*": *South Africa's Failure to Guarantee an Inclusive Education for Children with Disabilities*, August 2015, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/55d594994.html> [accessed 26 September 2015]

Jansen, J. D. (2002). Political symbolism as policy craft: Explaining non-reform in South African education after apartheid. *Journal of Education Policy*, 17(2), 199-215.

Kaime, T. (2009). *The African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child: A socio-legal perspective* retrieved from <http://eprints.soas.ac.uk/7758/> accessed on [30 November 2015].

Kalenga, R. C., & Chikoko, V. (2014). The State of Inclusion in One South African Primary School: Evidence from the School Principal. *J Soc Sci*, 38(3), 321-331.

Lansdown, G. (2009). *See Me, Hear Me: A guide to using the UN convention on the rights of persons with disabilities to promote the rights of children*. Save the Children.

Lessing, A., & De Witt, M. (2007). The value of continuous professional development: teachers' perceptions. *South African journal of education*, 27(1), 53-67.

Lettie Hazel Oortman v St Thomas Aquinas Private School Case No 1/2010 Equality Court, Witbank

Lomofsky, L., & Lazarus, S. (2001). South Africa: First steps in the development of an inclusive education system. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 31(3), 303-317.

Mariga, L., McConkey, R. and Myeza, H. (2014) *Inclusive Education in Low-Income Countries: A resource book for teacher educators, parent trainers and community development workers*. Cape Town: Atlas Alliance and Disability Innovations Africa.

Mavuso, M. F. (2014). Strategies for Facilitating Learning Support Processes. What can Teachers do Support Learners with Specific Learning Difficulties? *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(2), 455.

National Department of Basic Education. (2014), Draft Policy on Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support at

[www.education.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket...tabid=628&mid...](http://www.education.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket...tabid=628&mid...) Accessed [14 June 2014]

National Education Policy Act 27 of 1996

Nel, N., Müller, H., Hugo, A., Helldin, R., Bäckmann, Ö., Dwyer, H., & Skarlind, A. (2011). A comparative perspective on teacher attitude-constructs that impact on inclusive education in South Africa and Sweden. *South African Journal of Education*, 31(1), 74-90.

Neuman, W.L. (2006). *Social research methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.

Ngcobo, J., & Muthukrishna, N. (2011). The geographies of inclusion of students with disabilities in an ordinary school. *South African Journal of Education*, 31(3), 357-368.

Ngwena, C. G. (2013). Human right to inclusive education: exploring a double discourse of inclusive education using South Africa as a case study.

Ntombela, S. (2011). The progress of inclusive education in South Africa: Teachers' experiences in a selected district, KwaZulu-Natal. *Improving Schools*, 14(1), 5-14.

Office of the Deputy President, (November 1997). *Integrated National Disability Strategy White Paper*, [www.info.gov.za/whitepapers/1997/disability/html](http://www.info.gov.za/whitepapers/1997/disability/html) [accessed 15 March 2015].

Organization of African Unity (OAU), *African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child*, 11 July 1990, CAB/LEG/24.9/49 (1990), available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b38c18.html> [accessed 12 March 2015]

Oswald, M., & Swart, E. (2011). Addressing South African pre-service teachers' sentiments, attitudes and concerns regarding inclusive education. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 58(4), 389-403.

Pasensie, K. at [www.cplo.org.za/?wpdmdl=2&&ind=34](http://www.cplo.org.za/?wpdmdl=2&&ind=34), December 2012, Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference, Parliamentary liaison Office, Briefing paper 314, accessed on [28 February 2015].

Patton, M. Q. (2005). *Qualitative research*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Peters, S. J. (2004). *Inclusive education: An EFA strategy for all children* (pp. 7-8). World Bank, Human Development Network.

Poon-McBrayer, K. F., & Wong, P. M. (2013). Inclusive education services for children and youth with disabilities: Values, roles and challenges of school leaders. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 35(9), 1520-1525.

Prinsloo E, (2001). Working towards inclusive education in South African classrooms. *South African Journal of Education*, 21(4), 344-348

Rosa, E. M., & Tudge, J. (2013). Urie Bronfenbrenner's theory of human development: its evolution from ecology to bioecology. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 5(4), 243-258.

Rubin, A. and Babbie, E. (2005). *Research methods for social work*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Australia: Thompson Brookes/Cole

Schurink, W., Fouche CB. & De Vos AS. (2011). Qualitative data analysis and interpretation. In De Vos, A. S., & Strydom, H. Fouche, CB and Delpoit, CSL (2011). *Research at Grass Roots. 4th Edition. Van Schaik, Pretoria.*

Shaughnessy, JJ, & Zechmeister. E. B., (1994). *Research methods in psychology* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Soudien & Baxen (2006). Disability and Schooling in South Africa. In: Watermeyer, B. et al. (Eds). *Disability and Social Change: A South African Agenda*. Cape Town. HSRC Press

Strydom, H & Delpoit, CSL. (2011). Sampling and pilot study in qualitative research. In De Vos, A. S., & Strydom, H. Fouche, CB and Delpoit, CSL (2011). *Research at Grass Roots. 4th Edition. Van Schaik, Pretoria.*

Swart, R. E., Engelbrecht, P., Eloff, I., & Pettipher, O. R. (2002). Implementing inclusive education in South Africa: teachers' attitudes and experiences. *ACTA ACADEMICA-UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE*, 34(1), 175-189.

Teater, B. (2014). *An introduction to applying social work theories and methods*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 108 of 1996

The Presidency Republic of South Africa, (2014) The Twenty Year Review SA, 1994 – 2014, Disability at <http://www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za/publications/20%20Years%20Review/Pages/Synthesized-Reports.aspx> [accessed 23 June 2015]

The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special needs education: World conference on special needs education: Access and Equality. Salamanca, Spain 7-10 June 1994.

The South African Schools Act 84 of 1996

UN General Assembly, *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: resolution / adopted by the General Assembly, 24 January 2007, A/RES/61/106*, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/45f973632.html> [accessed 12 March 2015]

UN General Assembly, *Convention on the Rights of the Child*, 20 November 1989, United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1577, p. 3, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b38f0.html> [accessed 12 March 2015]

Unesco. (1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for action on special needs education: adopted by the World Conference on Special Needs Education; Access and Quality. Salamanca, Spain, 7-10 June 1994*. Unesco.

United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child. General Comment No. 9 (2006). The rights of children with disabilities [www1.umn.edu/humanrts/crc/comment9.html](http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/crc/comment9.html) accessed [15 March 2015).

Virginia Department of Education  
[http://www.doe.virginia.gov/special\\_ed/disabilities/sensory\\_disabilities/](http://www.doe.virginia.gov/special_ed/disabilities/sensory_disabilities/) accessed [28 February 2015].

Walton, E., Nel, N., Hugo, A., & Muller, H. (2009). The extent and practice of inclusion in independent schools in South Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, 29(1), 105-126.

Western Cape Forum for intellectual Disability v Government of the Republic of South Africa and Another (2011 (5) SA 87 (WCC)) [2010] ZAWCHC 544; 18678/2007 (11 November 2010)

World Health Organisation (WHO) 2014. Media centre: Disability and health. Available at <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs352/en/>. Accessed 20 March 2015.

**INFORMED CONSENT FORM**

<b>APPENDIX A</b>
-------------------

**Research Topic:** Children with Physical and Sensory disabilities: Exploring the implementation of inclusive education legislation and policy

**Student's Name** : Serika Rajmohan  
**Student number** : 212562025  
**Degree** : Interdisciplinary Masters in Child Care and Protection (Law and Social Work)

**Responsible institution for this research project** : University of KwaZulu-Natal School of Applied Human Science  
TELEPHONE: 031 260 7922  
[matthiasc@kzn.ac.za](mailto:matthiasc@kzn.ac.za)

I \_\_\_\_\_ [full names of the participant] hereby confirm that I understand the contents of this document as well as the nature of the research project, and I consent to participating in the research project.

I understand that I am at liberty to withdraw from the project at any time, should I so desire.

I give consent to the interview being audio-recorded      Yes/No (Circle the appropriate response)

I confirm that the following themes which are contained in the above Information Sheet were clearly explained to me in English (which I clearly understand)

- Identifying Particulars of the researcher
- Purpose of the Research and Procedure
- The use of an audio-recorder
- Potential Benefits of the Research
- Potential Risks and Discomforts
- Rights of the Participants of this research
- Payment for Participation(s)

.....  
Signature of the participant

.....  
Date

.....  
Signature of the Researcher (Serika Rajmohan)

# Semi-structured interview schedule

Children with Physical disabilities: Exploring the implementation of inclusive education legislation and policy

Name of school \_\_\_\_\_

How long have you been a principal at this school?

## Admission Policies at the School:

What is the admission policy for learners with Physical Disabilities?

What is the admission policy for learners with Sensory Disabilities?

How many learners with physical disabilities have been accepted in the last 5 years?

How many learners with sensory disabilities have been accepted in the last 5 years?

## Principal's Understanding of inclusive education:

- legislation
- policies

**What barriers has the school faced with in achieving full implementation of IE? Probe for:**

**Infrastructure / environment**

**Physical disabilities**

- Have there been adaptations to the school to cater for students with physical disabilities? (ramps/ rails/ elevators/ toilets)
- Extra time for completion of tasks
- Playgrounds
- toilets

## **Sensory disabilities**

- Work in Braille and sign language?
- Sign language teachers
- Adaptation of the curriculum

**Teachers are paramount in promoting IE, how have they been prepared to implement this policy?**

**Probe for:**

- Skills development , continuous professional development



- Training, voluntary or compulsory
- Curriculum differentiation
- Staff to children ratio
- Resources

**What are the support structures available? Probe for support from:**

- Department of education
- Parents
- School management teams
- Student governing bodies
- Teachers
- Special schools that phased conversions provide professional support and integrated into district based support teams?

Other?



education

Department:  
Education  
**PROVINCE OF KWAZULU-NATAL**

Enquiries: Nomangisi Ngubane

Tel: 033 392 1004

Ref.:2/4/8/440

Miss S Rajmohan  
Flat 17 Elrod  
206 Percy Osborne Road  
Morningside  
DURBAN  
4000

Dear Miss Rajmohan

#### PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN THE KZN DoE INSTITUTIONS

Your application to conduct research entitled: **“CHILDREN WITH PHYSICAL AND SENSORY DISABILITIES: EXPLORING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION LEGISLATION AND POLICY”**, in the KwaZulu-Natal Department of Education Institutions has been approved. The conditions of the approval are as follows:

1. The researcher will make all the arrangements concerning the research and interviews.
2. The researcher must ensure that Educator and learning programmes are not interrupted.
3. Interviews are not conducted during the time of writing examinations in schools.
4. Learners, Educators, Schools and Institutions are not identifiable in any way from the results of the research.
5. A copy of this letter is submitted to District Managers, Principals and Heads of Institutions where the intended research and interviews are to be conducted.
6. The period of investigation is limited to the period from 15 June 2015 to 31 July 2016.
7. Your research and interviews will be limited to the schools you have proposed and approved by the Head of Department. Please note that Principals, Educators, Departmental Officials and Learners are under no obligation to participate or assist you in your investigation.
8. Should you wish to extend the period of your survey at the school(s), please contact Mr. Alwar at the contact numbers below.
9. Upon completion of the research, a brief summary of the findings, recommendations or a full report / dissertation / thesis must be submitted to the research office of the Department. Please address it to The Director-Resources Planning, Private Bag X9137, Pietermaritzburg, 3200.
10. Please note that your research and interviews will be limited to schools and institutions in KwaZulu-Natal Department of Education.

(See list attached)

**Nkosinathi S.P. Sishi, PhD**  
**Head of Department: Education**  
**Date: 09 June 2015**

KWAZULU-NATAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

POSTAL: Private Bag X 9137, Pietermaritzburg, 3200, KwaZulu-Natal, Republic of South Africa ...dedicated to service and performance  
PHYSICAL: 247 Burger Street, Anton Lembede House, Pietermaritzburg, 3201. Tel. 033 392 1004 Fax: 033 392 4003  
EMAIL ADDRESS: [kehologile.connie@kzndoe.gov.za](mailto:kehologile.connie@kzndoe.gov.za) / [Nomangisi.Ngubane@kzndoe.gov.za](mailto:Nomangisi.Ngubane@kzndoe.gov.za) ; CALL CENTRE: 0860 596 363;  
WEBSITE: [WWW.kzneducation.gov.za](http://WWW.kzneducation.gov.za)



APPENDIX D

21 August 2015

Mrs Serika Rajmohan (212562025)
School of Law
Howard College Campus

Dear Mrs Rajmohan,

Protocol reference number: HSS/0993/01566

Project title: Children with Physical and sensory disabilities: Exploring the implementation of inclusive education legislation and policy

Full Approval – Expedited Application

In response to your application received on 07 July 2015, The Humanities & Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee has considered the above mentioned application and the protocol have been granted FULL APPROVAL.

Any alteration/s to the approved research protocol i.e. Questionnaire/Interview Schedule, Informed Consent Form, Title of the Project, Location of the Study, Research Approach and Methods must be reviewed and approved through the amendment/modification prior to its implementation. In case you have further queries, please quote the above reference number.

PLEASE NOTE: Research data should be securely stored in the discipline/department for a period of 5 years.

The ethical clearance certificate is only valid for a period of 3 years from the date of issue. Thereafter Recertification must be applied for on an annual basis.

Take this opportunity of wishing you everything of the best with your study.

Yours faithfully

Professor Umthi Bob (University Dean of Research)
On behalf of Dr Shenika Singh (Chair)

/s/

- Cc Supervisor: Professor Carmel Mathias
Cc Academic Leader Research: Dr Shannon Bosch
Cc School Administrator: Mr Pradeep Ramjeevak

Humanities & Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee
Dr Bhupenk Singh (Chair)
University Campus, Goven Mbeki Building
Postal Address: Private Bag 154001 Durban 4001
Telephone: +27 (0) 31 261 8962/8953/4557 Facsimile: +27 (0) 31 283 4609 Email: vinob@ukn.ac.za / shenika@ukn.ac.za / h.s.s.research@ukn.ac.za
Website: www.ukn.ac.za

1993 - 2010
17 YEARS OF ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

- Faculty of Commerce, Edgewood, Howard College, Medical School, Pietermaritzburg, Westville