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ABSTRACT

The role of a school principal is complex and multidimensional, and is pivotal to the success of an educational institution. It is widely recognised by researchers that the effectiveness of a principal depends on his or her ability to be a strategic thinker, create and share knowledge, build relationships, be flexible, embrace a sense of efficacy and nurture the development of organisational capacity.

Through a self-reflexive, autoethnographic methodology I examine my ‘self’ as the person in the principal’s office within the unique socio-cultural context of a rural school for the Deaf. Through a process of narrative inquiry and reflective analysis, I explore the first steps in my leadership journey, my engagement with instructional leadership in all its complexity, and my quest for quality outcomes for Deaf learners. This autoethnography raised multiple levels of consciousness about my identity, my lived experiences as a school leader and the school as an institution.

Through the interrogation of my leadership enactments key themes have emerged that have implications for the professional development of school leaders. I came to understand that my identity as a leader evolves continuously and that my leadership practices are negotiated and renegotiated in context. Thus, my identity as a leader is situated and produced simultaneously in many different contexts, events, and by different agents for diverse purposes.

My study highlights that leadership is not merely the act of an individual but is embedded in a complex, unpredictable, non-linear interplay of various interacting influences. Leaders are social actors who need to be able to examine critically their own subjectivities, subject positions and the discourses that shape their actions. Leadership is the site for continuous, ongoing processes of learning, and organisations have the potential to be dynamic, interactive and adaptive systems, reinforcing the notion of the enabling leader. Therefore, leadership development programmes should enable leaders to understand that their actions and practice are socially and culturally situated, and that schools are complex dynamic, adaptive systems.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

'I can’t believe that', said Alice.

'Can’t you?’ said the queen in a pitying tone. 'Try again, draw a long breath and shut your eyes.'

Alice laughed, 'There’s no use trying,’ she said, 'one can’t believe impossible things.’

'I daresay you haven’t had much practice’, said the queen, ‘when I was your age, I always did it for half an hour a day. Why sometimes I believed as many as six impossible things before breakfast.’

(Lewis Carroll, Through the Looking Glass)

My doctoral study has enabled me to realise that this extract is the axis on which my principalship of a school for the Deaf spins. Through the use of autoethnography as a reflexive research method, I came to know that my belief in ‘impossible things’ for the Deaf underpinned my leadership enactments and performances over the past ten years. Indeed, I did believe in ‘impossible things’ and sometimes more than six impossible things in a year.

This doctoral journey has forced me to engage in deep introspection, reflection and analysis of my leadership philosophy and practices. I was able to examine my multiple intersecting identities and roles, including that of principal, instructional leader, administrator, teacher and researcher. It allowed me to examine the nodal moments of accomplishment, resistance, tension and contradiction, and the uneasy dilemmas that were produced and reproduced on my leadership journey.

By nature I am an impatient, passionate, goal-orientated and task-driven person. I am what one would label a ‘Type A’ personality profile. Tirado (2012) describes these personalities as competitive, strong, achievement orientated, having a sense of urgency, engaged in frequent multi-tasking and constantly stressed. Therefore as a ‘Type A’ personality, engaging in self-reflexiveness and introspection were foreign to me.

1 See section 2.5.2.2 for an explanation of the usage of the word “D/deaf” throughout this thesis.
In the early stages of my research, I was drawn to the metaphor of the looking glass from Lewis Carroll’s *Through the Looking Glass*, the sequel to *Alice in Wonderland*. I interpreted the looking glass as an extended metaphor for times when the world turns strange, or when various often unpredictable forces turn events around. Autoethnography as a research method became the looking glass that reflected my principalship and its enactments within a particular sociocultural environment. It also was this looking glass that allowed me to reflect on what others experienced and identified as my leadership behaviours. My own reflections and the reflections of others on me, resulted in a very painful, invigorating, infuriating, exhilarating, fearful, confusing and lonely time for me. My glorified view of myself as an exceptional principal came crashing down with the force of an avalanche as I started to live, relive, tell and retell my stories of the past ten years at the Hilltop School for the Deaf (pseudonym). I wondered at some of the decisions I had made and was not sure if my passionate belief in impossible things for the Deaf was foolhardy or brave. During focus-group interviews I often listened in complete disbelief to what was said about me in relation to my expectations not only of myself but others as well. Reeling backwards through the looking glass was more difficult than I had imagined.

“That is the effect of living backwards,” the queen said kindly. ‘It always makes one a little giddy at first.’ (Lewis Carroll, *Through the Looking Glass*)

In this opening chapter, I explain the rationale for my study, its aims and how I came to use autoethnography as method. I discuss a literature review I undertook that helped me further shape my study, then state my research questions, and finally I outline the structure of this thesis.

1.2 The rationale for my study

1.2.1 Experiencing leadership at a school for the Deaf

My teaching career started in 1984 when I graduated with a Junior Secondary Diploma in Education specialising in Music. The only reason that I opted to do a teaching diploma was a financial one. I was the second child in a single-parent home. The bursary offered to me to study for a teaching diploma was the deciding factor as to what career I would pursue and where I would study. However, as soon as I started teaching I immediately enrolled for a Bachelor of Arts degree majoring in English and Psychology. My appointment to a pre-vocational school that caters for learners with learning disabilities motivated me to enrol for the Diploma in Specialised Education. I completed the diploma with distinction and then pursued an honours degree
specialising in Psychology. Thus, my educational background, together with ten years of experience working in a specialised environment, made me realise that perhaps I could be more involved in effecting change in the area of Special Needs Education in a management capacity. Being the non-conformist that I am, I decided to apply for a post level 3 management position at a special school, despite the fact that I was a post level 1 teacher. I applied to the Hilltop School for the Deaf for the position of deputy principal.

In brief, the school was established by the late Archbishop Dennis Hurley, a revered leader in South Africa who dedicated his life unstintingly to the promotion of freedom, social justice and peace in South Africa during and following the liberation struggle. The story of how the school began is indeed a moving one. On a visit by Archbishop Hurley to a rural area called Thintwa, in the province of KwaZulu-Natal, a little eleven-year-old African boy from the community came up to Hurley and touched his robe in an attempt to get his attention. The Archbishop tried to communicate with the boy but did not obtain a response from him. After enquiring from community members present about the boy, the Archbishop established that the boy was Deaf and that there was no available schooling for black African Deaf children in 1983 in the province. There was one school designated for white Deaf children in the then apartheid era. This incident spurred Hurley to establish a school for the Deaf in KwaZulu-Natal for Black children. The name given to the school was symbolic (here it is referred to using the pseudonym “Hilltop”), and, translated from isiZulu, means ‘to be touched’. The school motto is ‘Sitinthwe Ngumoyo Sezwa’, which means ‘to be touched by the spirit we hear’. This has significant meaning, especially for the Deaf.

My appointment to this school as deputy principal came as a surprise to me. Not only was I applying for a post for which I was not eligible in terms of post levels, but I also had no experience in teaching the Deaf. I was further surprised when I discovered that the school had a staff of over 80, with the majority being black African. Furthermore, most of the staff members were much older than I was. The road ahead seemed daunting and complex to me. In addition, I had no senior management experience; did not speak isiZulu, did not know Sign Language, was a young Indian female and had to supervise all the male workers (i.e. drivers, groundsmen, maintenance staff, and security staff). When I took up the position, I realised that the core responsibilities assigned to me were not academic but involved the management of the school hostel, its kitchen, the catering services and the related staff. I had no experience whatsoever in these areas of work related to a residential school. However, despite my misgivings, I was able to make many successful and effective changes, which, on reflection, I am sure impressed key
stakeholders in the school community. I was appointed as principal of the school the very next year.

My new role as principal was intimidating in that it encompassed a broader range of responsibilities. I was the final accounting officer of the school, a mammoth task indeed. Financial management and expertise were necessary requirements and I felt extremely inadequate because of my limited experience and exposure to this area of my work. In addition to this, the social dynamics of the school at that time were very complicated since we were really a very diverse group that represented a wide spectrum of ages, races, ethnicities, language groups, and geographical and social backgrounds.

A further complexity was that my appointment coincided with the release of the South African government’s new policy on inclusive education, *Education White Paper 6: Special Needs Education, Building an inclusive education and training system* (Department of Education, 2001). This new philosophy and policy had major curriculum implications since the school, up until this point, had followed its own watered-down curriculum that placed very few expectations on the Deaf child because of the belief that Deaf children could not achieve academically. This was further complicated by the fact that language as a barrier to learning needed to be addressed. One such barrier experienced at the school was that teachers had no formal training in Sign Language yet were teaching the Deaf through the medium of Sign Language. The debates around the exclusive use of Sign Language in the context of Deaf culture, and Sign Language versus the auditory approach to language development for the Deaf, were key issues in policy debates in South Africa at this time. The most appropriate literacy curriculum and forms of early childhood intervention for Deaf learners were also in the foreground of debates. These issues will be engaged with in depth in Chapters 4 and 5.

Further issues that I had to give priority to in creating a more inclusive school were as follows: inadequate teacher development, lack of parental involvement, the poor socio-economic status of families of the learners, insufficient funding to support change, and insufficient hostel staff. These factors intersected and played out at the school in multiple and complex ways. The fact that the school had to operate according to a Catholic ethos, since it was built on Catholic property, added to the complexities.

As I have stated, the school represented a diverse socio-cultural context. I had to deal with issues that arose from the fact that both the staff and the learners brought various ethnicities, cultures, religions, languages, histories, and habits of mind to the socio-cultural context of the school.
These complexities were further intensified by the presence of a strong Deaf culture that was vehement in its promotion of Sign Language as the first language for the Deaf. I very soon realised that this diversity would create a distinctive institutional culture, and that the culture of an institution is a collective phenomenon. I knew that the different sets of values, beliefs, norms, ideologies, standards for behaviour, learned ways of coping with experience, and shared expectations would intersect in complex ways and thus have a complex impact on how individuals and groups would interact with each other and work to achieve institutional goals. Morgan (1997) explains this succinctly:

Shared values, shared beliefs, shared meaning, shared understanding, and shared sense-making are all different ways of describing culture. These patterns of understanding also provide a basis for making one’s own behaviour sensible and meaningful (p. 138).

In other words, beliefs, values and ideology influence how members of an organisation behave and how they view the behaviour of other members. Morgan (1997) also reminds us that there may be diverse and competing beliefs, norms and value systems that create a “mosaic of organizational realities” (p. 137).

Thus, in those first few weeks, I had a strong sense that my leadership would be intertwined in this institutional culture and cultural formation, as argued by Schein (1992). I also was aware that the institutional culture can be a powerful tool for building and creating an effective organisation. Developing a shared set of beliefs and values can enable cooperation, communication or commitment.

I knew that I had to be open to continual learning. Many scholars have argued that leadership is culturally contingent (for example, Crothers, 2011; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman & Gupta, 2004), suggesting that the meanings of many leader behaviours and characteristics may vary according to contextual influences. I felt that I would need additional skills to lead within a diverse community. I was very aware that internationally, researchers and scholars have argued that the role of the school principal is pivotal to the development of an inclusive and effective educational institution (for example, Barbour, Clifford, Corrigan-Halpern, Garcia, Maday-Karageorge, Meyer, Townsend & Stewart, 2010; Harmony, 2006; Rice, 2010; Toremen, Ekinci & Karakus, 2006).

I was aware that I had a huge responsibility. I grappled with the following questions virtually day and night: How can I develop the level of critical consciousness needed to lead ethically in this
diverse context? Would I be responsive to the unique demands of the context? How do I as a school leader create an inclusive, socially just school culture and ethos? What does it mean to protect the social rights of all? How would I deal with the many exclusions that may exist in the complex socio-cultural context?

I was very aware at the time that the subject positions I took in this socio-cultural unit would require much reflection on my part. I knew I had to be vigilant about how my history, biases, interests, values, preconceived ideas, experiences and characteristics would affect my leadership enactments in this context. Recently, there have been many theoretical articles and empirical studies on the links between reflective practice, leadership and organisational cultures (Brown, 2010; Jack Lam, 2001; Polizzi & Frick, 2012; Seel, 2006). Scholars contend that reflective practice leads to an increase in leaders’ self-knowledge and a deeper understanding of how values, beliefs and ideologies circulating within the institution, including their own, influence their actions and leadership.

There is compelling evidence in research over the past two decades on effective schools that shows that good principals influence a variety of school outcomes, such as student achievement, motivation of quality teachers, well-articulated school vision and goals, effective allocation of resources, and the development of organisational structures to support instruction and learning (Fataar, 2009; Oduro & Macbeath, 2003; Mncube, 2009; Rice, 2010; Van der Merwe & Parsotam, 2011). My experience over the years as a teacher and a principal has shown me that the principal’s role is complex and multidimensional, and that the effectiveness of a principal depends on his or her ability to be a strategic thinker, create and share knowledge, build relationships, be flexible and embrace a sense of efficacy. Fullan and Ballew (2001) extend this by highlighting components such as a sense of moral purpose, the ability to establish coherence in the face of uncertainty and ambiguity, and the ability to understand change. In my own work as a school principal, I found that I had the need to protect the school’s autonomy in order to ensure continued high performance and innovation, which entailed accountability and the constant monitoring of organisational performance.

From my first few months in a leadership position, I began to reflect on my leadership practices, the socio-cultural context of my school and my Self. When I made the decision to embark on doctoral studies I knew without doubt that my focus would be on the school principal as a leader and the complexity of his or her embeddedness in a particular socio-cultural context.
1.2.2 Being drawn to the study of the Self

While I was studying for my Master’s degree in the discipline of educational leadership, I often had discussions with my supervisor, Professor Muthukrishna, about the complexities of my role as a leader. I would cite and describe critical incidents and stories as they occurred. She showed great interest in the interactive dynamics that arose within my school and its unique socio-cultural context. She often drew my attention to the contextual nature of leadership. In our discussions we often explored alternative lenses and different ways of understanding the dynamic relationship between me as leader and my institutional context. Professor Muthukrishna had extensive experience in the field of special education and had been involved in policy development in South Africa since 1994. We would often critique emerging special education policy and practice in the context of my school. She encouraged me to register for my doctorate and suggested that I read about autoethnography, which was a relatively new research methodology in South Africa at the time.

She gave me a copy of an autoethnographic study by Grossi (2006) and suggested that I read *The Ethnographic I* by Carolyn Ellis (Ellis, 2003). She expressed her firm belief that my lived experience as a principal in a particular Deaf school and its unique socio-cultural context had the potential to be a rich autoethnographic study. Reading the thesis, the book and many other articles on self-study and autoethnography excited me, and the idea of studying the Self as a scientific investigation fascinated me. I knew that my personal experience as the researcher would become the focus of inquiry, and would illuminate my socio-cultural context. However, I have to admit that the thought of exploring my Self as a cultural being was also somewhat intimidating. My readings suggested to me that an autoethnography depicts deeply personalised accounts, and that it is the task of the researcher to facilitate an understanding of the Self as embedded in the culture or subculture studied (Ellis & Bochner, 2000; Sparkes, 2000). Ellis and Bochner (2000) explain that an autoethnography is characterised by “confessional tales” (p. 740). I was not sure whether I was ready for such introspection.

At the time, I envisaged that a doctoral study would enable me to understand the intersection of personal and professional life, and the multiple facets of my identity as a leader in a unique socio-cultural context. I was keen to explore the following reflexive questions: Who am I? How do I negotiate my different identities? What are the subject positions I take as the person in the principal’s office in my socio-cultural contexts? Why do I enact the principalship the way I do? What contextual factors influence these enactments? I wanted to make sense of and critique my leadership practices. Furthermore, an autoethnographic study would engage me in theorising my
leadership practices. Ellis (2009) argues that “those who seek out autoethnography are those who want to better understand themselves and the world in which they live and who desire to change it for the better” (p. 374).

Autoethnography is a qualitative research approach. Sparkes (2000) emphasises that autoethnographies “draw upon the experiences of the researcher/author for the purposes of extending sociological understanding” (p. 21). They merge autobiography and ethnography, and highlight the researcher and his or her own reflexivity as viable data sources in a given study (Cahnmann-Taylor, 2008).

A strong influencing factor that informed my choice of methodology was that texts are usually written in the first person and feature dialogue, emotion and self-consciousness as relational and institutional stories affected by history, social structure and culture (Ellis & Bochner, 2000). This clearly indicated to me that taking an autoethnographic stance would enable me to write in a clear, engaging manner that would be easily accessible to a variety of readers. My intention became similar to that of Sparkes (2000), who asserted, “I attempt to take you as the reader into the intimacies of my world. I hope to do this in such a way that you are stimulated to reflect upon your own life in relation to mine (p. 467). In the same vein, Belenky (in Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger & Tarule, 1986) states that one can learn to use the self as an instrument of understanding to arrive at passionate knowing.

1.3 Locating my study in current scholarship

1.3.1 Introduction

As I read about autoethnography, I felt that I needed to have more insight into scholarship that focused on the person in the principal’s office. I was aware of Harry Wolcott’s (1973) acclaimed ethnographic study, The man in the principal’s office: An ethnography. At the time, much of the literature I accessed examined leadership characteristics and leadership styles within schooling contexts of countries of the North (for example, Bristow, Ireson & Coleman, 2007; Harmony, 2006; Leithwood, Day, Sammons, Harris & Hopkins, 2006; Schmitz & Brown, 2006; Silins & Mulford, 2002; Toremen et al., 2006). I wanted to gain more insight into literature emanating from Africa on leadership and the school principal.
Influenced by my critical friends in a PhD cohort programme at the university, I decided to launch on a deep critique of studies emanating from Africa that focused on the principal as a leader. South Africa shares many of the contextual influences of other countries in Africa. These include poverty, the HIV/AIDS pandemic, low levels of academic achievement and violence, as well as the consequences of colonisation. My interest was in establishing what empirical studies had been conducted in the previous 10 years on principalship in schools. I envisaged that this literature review would help me locate my study in current scholarship, and provide a further rationale for the focus of my study.

The review I undertook drew on all published, peer-reviewed, English-language empirical studies that had been undertaken in the previous 10 years (2001–2010). I later revised this time frame to include studies undertaken in 2012. A total of 22 studies were identified, most of them from the previous six years. The literature review is presented in a paper titled, *Researching the principalship in the African context: A critical literature review* (Naidoo, 2012) (see Appendix 1). I am hoping to have the paper published in a peer-reviewed journal.

The review indicated that research in the previous ten years focused broadly on five key issues: the lack of professional development for school principals; the complexities of school-based shared management; the marginalisation of women in leadership posts, and critical competencies needed by principals for the achievement of effective schools. Only one study examined the identity of the school principal.

Furthermore, the studies show that professional development for school principals in the particular contexts is informed by debates on transformational leadership styles that are collaborative in nature. In addition one is able to see that recent research in Africa, in particular South Africa, is placing the lens on the critical role of the school principal in the creation of effectively functioning schools. In the sections below, I examine how this literature review speaks to the two research questions: How can current research on the principalship in the African context be characterised? What are the areas for future research on the issue?

### 1.3.2 Methodological issues

Nine (9) of the 22 studies were perception studies that explored perceptions of participants about issues. My critique suggests that there is a need to rethink the value of perception studies for debates in the field of educational leadership. Questions that should be raised are: Do
perceptions reflect or obscure reality? Are an individual’s perceptions selective? Do they perceive what they want to? Do expectations influence perceptions? What are the cognitive and motivational biases embedded in a person’s perceptions? To what extent do these distort perceptions? Do people recognise and interrogate their own biases embedded in their perceptions? None of the researchers in the nine ‘perception’ studies adopted this critical sociological stance in their analysis and interpretation of the findings.

Most studies (14 of the 22) used a conceptual framework to make meaning of the data yielded. Generally, the conceptual framework was framed around the notion of leadership and management, for example, educational leadership, invitational leadership, democratic leadership, instructional leadership, transformational leadership, or Ubuntu leadership. These studies generally examine leadership from a competencies lens, and often fail to engage with the leadership enactments in their complex, contextual embeddedness. Oduro & Macbeath (2003) draw attention to the fact that generic models of competencies should not be seen as universally applicable as they do not factor in cultural and contextual influences on school contexts and leadership enactments.

It was interesting that only one of the studies explored in some depth the leadership of the school principal with a lens divorced from a narrow focus on debates within the discipline of leadership and management studies. Fataar (2009) used a combination of post-structuralist and feminist theory in powerful ways to understand three school principals in township schools.

In Fataar’s ethnographic study, he employed the conceptual framework of teacher identity and subjectivity, Judith Butler’s performativity theory (Butler, 1990), and the notion of space as a social construction (for example, Lefebvre, 1991). Through his analysis Fataar was able to capture the reflexive adaptations of the school principal and a nuanced picture of the social relations and power dynamics of leadership in township schools. None of the studies examined the identity and subjectivity of the school principal. Although a number of studies pointed to socio-economic factors that intersect with the leadership of a school in the African context, (such as poverty and underdevelopment, teenage pregnancy, inadequate resources and infrastructure, and the HIV/AIDS pandemic), it is only Fataar’s (2009) study that examined how situational and social challenges, in and out of the school environment, shape the multiple and often contradictory subject positions principals take up in their professional lives.
1.3.3 Implications for future research

In this section, I will discuss some key areas for future researchers to explore, as illuminated by the review.

One question to be posed is: what are other critical topics and issues that need to be examined in research that focuses on the leadership of the school principal or head teacher? A key neglected issue is emotionality. There is a growing body of research internationally that explores the emotionality of teachers and the interplay among teacher emotions, context and identity (for example, Darby, 2008; Carnine, Holt & Jones, 2006; Kelchtermans, 2005; Marshall, Dombrowski, Garner & Smith, 2010; Reio, 2005). Drawing from his narrative-biographical work with teachers, Kelchtermans (2005) argues that research on teachers’ lives cannot limit itself to questions of technical efficacy, increasing efficiency and effectiveness, but has to include the more messy issues of emotionality. I would argue that this most certainly applies to research on principalship. The intersection of the technical, moral, ethical, political and emotional dimensions of the principal’s work is a dynamic and complex reality that research needs to illuminate. For example, Kelchtermans (2005) explains that teachers often have to make value choices and such choices inherently involve risk taking as decisions and commitments may be questioned or overturned. Reio (2005) argues that “risk taking, emotions, and professional vulnerability significantly contribute to teachers’ identity formation” (p. 986). Darby (2008) contends that meeting the needs and demands of a range of stakeholders, such as parents, learners, colleagues and education administrators, evokes teachers’ emotions. Studies have explored teacher emotionality as a lens to make sense of the impact of educational reform and change on teacher identity (for example, Hargreaves, 2005a; Zembylas, 2005). Zembylas (2002), in synthesising research on teacher emotionality, argues that scholars have questioned the dichotomy between emotion and rationality. Emotions are no longer viewed as irrational but “as sites of social and political resistance and transformation of oppressions” (p. 98). Boler (1999), a feminist theorist, argues that we need to understand emotions as historically situated and socially constructed, as dynamic in their relationship to power, culture and context, rather than merely as psychological and individual phenomena.

Only one study in the literature review presented in this paper focused on the affective dimension of the leadership role of the principal (Van der Merwe & Parsotam, 2011). In view of the above informative debates, I argue that the emotionality of the school principal is a promising new direction for research in the African context.
A second area that should be targeted for future research is the identity and subjectivities of the school principal. Much of identity research internationally in the field of education focuses on the classroom teacher (Gill & Pryor, 2006; Husu, 2007). The perspective in recent literature is on examining the shifting, multiple, and fluid nature of identity in the different contexts that reflect teacher lives. Furthermore, as in the study by Fataar (2009), the argument has been that teacher identity is formed within social and political contexts, through the ways in which they navigate and negotiate their workplace spatialities, and in the ways those spaces enable and limit their meaning making (Husu, 2007).

The leadership of the school principal in the context of social justice issues is dealt with in a limited way in the studies reviewed. Most studies describe the schooling contexts and exclusionary factors such as poverty, HIV/AIDS; teenage pregnancy, crime and violence. An important topic of relevance to African contexts is leadership, emotions, and personal and professional identity. However, very few of the studies examined in depth the adaptations principals engage in, the reflexive stances with which they approach students, families and community members, and the beliefs that they hold around complex issues of diversity and social justice.

The most common research method used was the qualitative case study located in an interpretivist paradigm. Thirteen (13) of the 22 studies employed a qualitative case study approach. Data generation involved mainly semi-structured interviews, observation and document analysis. The data collected were analysed for emerging themes in an interpretative manner. The studies were generally small-scale and ranged in their degree of in-depth analysis. A few were merely descriptive and lacked adequate theorisation, and the qualitative data included seemed rather thin. I also had concerns about whether the selective use of data in fact represented multiple realities.

The aim in these studies was to understand the bounded reality and gain insight into the experiential knowledge or practical knowledge of the case rather than engage in any kind of generalisation. However, the studies are useful in that they allow for a cross-case analysis where the findings of multiple cases are compared and combined (Stake, 2005). There are concerns in certain studies around the issue of triangulation, in particular whether the studies accessed a diversity of views, and gained insight into the multiple realities in which the participants lived (for example, Botha, 2006; Lumby & Azaola, 2011; Mncube, 2009). In these studies it was evident that the researcher/s failed to use multiple data sources.
From the analysis of the studies in this review, it is clear that there is a need for future researchers in the African context to explore other research paradigms and innovative research methodologies from the social sciences, for example, biographical research (such as life histories), self-study research, participatory research methodologies, narrative inquiry, ethnography, feminist research methodologies, visual methodologies, and action research. Such research methodologies can result in more nuanced, contextually rich analyses.

On reflecting on the critical literature review that I undertook, I envisaged that my proposed study would contribute to the current scholarship emanating from the African continent, and contribute to some of the questions that are neglected in research.

1.4 My research aims and critical questions

My aim was to open my living textbook and to recollect and share my life experiences as a school principal. More importantly, my aim was to understand and theorise the Self and my life lived as a leader within a highly complex socio-cultural context. Through my autoethnography and its reflexive stance, I hoped to unveil and analyse the many layers of my identity as a leader and the interacting contextual influences that shape my enactments. From my experience, I had come to view leadership as not merely the act of an individual but rather as embedded in a complex, unpredictable, non-linear interplay of various interacting influences. My aim was to interrogate and illuminate this dynamic interplay using autoethnography.

I believed, firstly, that my study had the potential to generate knowledge that would inform change and transformation in my practice as a school leader in a particular context. Secondly, I hoped that my personal story would provide an opportunity to explore the multiple identities and subject positions I take as I enact my leadership practices. Thirdly, an interrogation of my reflexive practice of leadership within a socio-cultural context would be a worthy contribution to the already existing knowledge base in the discipline of leadership and management studies. My view was that my study would foreground the dynamic, emergent, interactive and contextual nature of leadership that is often neglected in research in the discipline of leadership and management. I also hoped that my study would generate new questions for other researchers and scholars in the field of education. Furthermore, I felt that the study would explore the particular complexities of educational leadership in a school for the Deaf, thereby contributing to the fields of disability studies and education for the Deaf. Such a study would evoke a response from
school principals, educators, school governing bodies, academics, learners, parents, and the larger Deaf community. Lastly, my view was that my research had the potential to make a contribution to studies in research methodology in the social sciences through its use of autoethnography as a form of enquiry.

The following were my specific research questions:

What are my leadership practices, and how are they enacted and experienced within the dynamic socio-cultural context in which I work and live? Why are they experienced in particular ways?

How can an autoethnographic exploration enable a deep understanding of Self and my principalship within the dynamic socio-cultural context in which I work and live?

1.5 Structure of the thesis

The following is a brief account of the structure of my thesis.

Chapter One: Introduction and rationale for my study.

Chapter Two: Discussion of my research methodology, autoethnography and my theoretical framework.

Chapters Three, Four and Five: The narratives of my lived experience as an educational leader and social actor at Hilltop School for the Deaf.

Chapter Six: My integrating chapter — drawing together the threads.

Chapter Seven: My concluding reflections.

1.6 Concluding thoughts

The notion of impossible things and the metaphor of the looking glass run throughout my thesis. These two themes are extracted from Lewis Carroll’s Through the Looking Glass a sequel to Alice in Wonderland. In Through the Looking Glass, Carroll uses the looking glass (the Victorian name for a mirror) as a metaphor for reflection, reversal, dilemma, contradiction and opposition.
When Alice passes through the looking glass she finds herself among situations, objects and people who look familiar and use the same words as her, but who live everything backwards.

For Alice the looking glass serves as a portal to another world, for as she gazes into the looking glass she is transported into that world. Her reflection in the mirror serves the role of reversing things and everything is turned upside down. In this way the mirror serves as a means of questioning her own sense of reality.

For me in this research, the looking glass (mirror) serves a similar purpose (Fig. 1). It is a tool for reflexivity and in my case the mirror is a self-reflexive device. This became particularly relevant for me since reflexivity is pivotal to my chosen methodological framework. Autoethnography becomes the looking glass that serves as a portal to my world of leadership in the context of education for the Deaf over the past 10 years. It provides a means of questioning my own sense of social reality and identity.

![Figure 1. Autoethnography: The Looking Glass and the Self](image)

Given that mirror images are reflections and reproductions, I have found that I have been forced to hold every aspect of myself as a leader up before a mirror and have subsequently learned to question everything. I posed these questions: What is the image of ‘self’ through the looking
glass? What do I see to be the relationship between Self and social structure? Do I see an image of Self as others see me? Do I see a passive Self? Do I see an active, creative Self? Do I question the ‘Self’ through the looking glass?

In Carroll’s story, impossibility is an important aspect of the looking glass world. Thus the realm of impossibility becomes vital in my narrative because it is through the reflexive stances of myself and others that I am able to see past by own biases and the biases of others in relation not only to my own leadership potential but the potential of Deaf persons as well. My narrative presented in chapters 3, 4 and 5, hinges on my belief in impossible things, as illustrated in *Through the Looking Glass*. In this story the White Queen imparts something immensely valuable to Alice. She teaches Alice that, with practice, believing in impossible things becomes possible. My gaze into the looking glass made me discover that I possessed the capacity to believe in impossible things.

In the next chapter I discuss autoethnography as my methodology of choice, my theoretical framework and my research design.
CHAPTER TWO

FINDING THE METHODOLOGY

Alice came to a fork in the road. ‘Which road do I take?’ she asked.

‘Where do you want to go?’ responded the Cheshire cat.

‘I don’t know,’ answered Alice.

‘Then,’ said the cat, ‘it doesn’t matter.’

(Lewis Carroll, *Through the Looking Glass*).

2.1 Introduction

Through my study of international literature, I have come to realise that the traditional role of the school principal has changed drastically over the past few years (Bush, Kiggundu & Moorosi, 2011; Grant, 2007; Taylor, 2011; Townley, 2009). In South Africa, the South African Schools Act (Act No. 84 of 1996) (RSA, 1996b) proposed a radically new approach to leading and managing schools. Internationally researchers and scholars have foregrounded that the role of the principal is pivotal to any educational institution (Barbour et al., 2010; Harmony, 2006; Rice, 2010; Toremene et al., 2006). In addition, research indicates that in the field of education there is a leadership deficit internationally, which has brought leadership development under scrutiny and focus (Prosser, 2007; Christie, 2010; Rice, 2010; Grant, 2008).

Certain critical issues have been highlighted in debates, in particular the emotive nature of leadership, the values-driven element, and the need for research to explore the self. Schneider (2008) suggests that there is a need to focus on the development of leadership through greater self-awareness. Cummings, MacGregor, Davey, Lee, Wong, Lo, Muisse & Stafford (2010), maintain that there is no single model for leadership and that leadership is indeed very values and emotion driven. Beatty (2000) further argues that what is missing from leadership development debates is a focus on the emotions of leaders and, in particular, the voices of the leaders themselves. DeLong (2010) reiterates this when she explains that in her experience she found that leadership needs to be based on caring, emotional intimacy and listening, and must be values-driven. She argues that this focus is often neglected in leadership research and development.
My experience over the years has shown me that the principal’s role is complex and multidimensional and that the effectiveness of a principal depends on his or her level of experience, ability to be a strategic thinker, flexibility, accountability, ability to create and share knowledge, and build relationships and embrace a sense of efficacy, as well as on his or her emotional maturity.

In the context of the above debates, I have chosen as the focus of my study my personal narrative of the self as the school principal in a unique socio-cultural context: a school for the Deaf. After exploring various research methodologies in the social sciences, I decided on autoethnography as my methodology of choice largely because of its reflexive nature — the fact that the researcher’s self is the subject of investigation, and the focus on the self is as a cultural being in interaction with others (Ellis, 2003; Reed-Danahay, 1997). I was drawn to the narrative nature of writing an autoethnography, as I knew that there would be a particular plot, a unique context, events, situations, multiple characters and actors, and dramatic tensions in the telling of my life as lived as a school principal.

The research questions I eventually formulated after much reflexive engagement were:

> What are my leadership practices, and how are they enacted and experienced within the dynamic socio-cultural context in which I work and live? Why are they experienced and enacted in particular ways?

> How can an autoethnographic exploration enable a deep understanding of me as a person in the principal’s office and my principalship at the school for the Deaf?

### 2.2 Research methodology

‘You don’t choose autoethnography, it chooses you’ (Ellis, 2003, p. 26).

Autoethnography is a relatively new ethnographic method and its reliability and validity have come under much scrutiny and focus. Stemming from the field of anthropology, autoethnography shares a storytelling feature with other genres of self-narratives but transcends mere narration of self to engage in cultural analysis and interpretation. Chang (2008) succinctly summarises the method as auto meaning ‘self’, ethno meaning ‘people’ or ‘culture’, and ‘graphy’ meaning ‘writing’ or ‘describing’. Thus, simply put, autoethnography means “writing about the personal and its relationship to culture” (p. 31).
As I have stated, I was drawn to this method because of these three essential characteristics alluded to above. I wanted to tell a story about my experiences as a principal within a particular sociocultural environment.

2.2.1 Autoethnography: a self-study?

In the early stages of the conceptualisation of my study, I was very keen to pursue the research tradition referred to as *self-study*, which is a look at the self. Hamilton and Pinnegar (1998) define it as “the study of one’s self, one’s actions, one’s ideas as well as the ‘not self’” (p. 236). Self-study is related to the idea of studying the self in a specific activity, usually in an educational practice (Khau & Pithouse, 2008; Loughran & Russell, 2002; Pithouse, Mitchell & Moletsane, 2009).

Autoethnography, on the other hand, is an emerging genre, with evocative or emotional autoethnography being in the mainstream. Scholars argue for the need to change the world by writing from the heart. Autoethnography is described as a highly personalised account in which the author draws on his or her own experience to extend understanding of a particular discipline or culture (Chang, 2008; Ellis, 2003; Holt, 2003). Evocative autoethnography, in particular, involves considerable narrative skills that may be expressed in prose, poetry and performances. Ellis and Bochner (2000) assert that autoethnography is a rather personal style of research characterised by ‘confessional tales’ that do not figure in more conventional styles of academic writing. Ellis’s (2000, p. xix) description of autoethnography provides a clear summing up when she explains that it is

research, writing, story and method that connect the autobiographical and personal to the cultural, social and political. Its forms feature concrete action, emotion, embodiment, self-consciousness and introspection that is portrayed in dialogue, scenes, characterization and plot. Thus it claims the conventions of literary writing.

It is argued that autoethnography can, however, have different meanings for different people (Ellis, 2003; Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011). Some describe it as personalised research; others describe it as a study of the self within a larger socio-cultural context and emphasise that when researchers do autoethnography, they retrospectively and selectively write about epiphanies that stem from, or are made possible by, being part of a culture or by possessing a particular cultural identity.
Duarte (2007) explains further that autoethnographic writing begins with a descriptive narrative of events and activities that unfold within a particular culture. It then develops into a reflective analysis of these events and activities to generate new insights and to enhance the researcher's sensitivity towards the knowledge that he or she gained in the process. Hence, autoethnography allows a researcher to return to a story that has already happened and to rearrange elements of the story in order for them to make sense. It is contended that the autoethnographic method enables the researcher to journey back in time to recollect lived past experiences that shaped his or her life and destiny, and to share these experiences with an audience (Autrey, 2003; Eisner, 1997).

In a South African study, Grossi (2006) used autoethnography very effectively to examine her life as a teacher in a career that spanned a period of 41 years. Her study is a reflective analysis of her life and the multiple intersecting paths on which she journeyed. Through her successful use of this methodology she argues that more teachers should tell their stories, especially teachers with different cultural identities. She recommends that autoethnography as a method be incorporated into pre-service training for educators. Hendry (2008) used autoethnography effectively to chronicle his own experiences as a principal in the United States of America. He provides a highly personalised account of the complexities, interpretations and reflections of a principal who moved from one elementary school to another elementary school. This illustrates to me that autoethnography has the potential to research the shifting aspects of self, and creates ways to write about experiences in a broader social context.

At some stage early in my research, I was confronted with the pertinent question of whether autoethnography was indeed a self-study. Hamilton, Smith & Worthington (2008) describe self-study as a look at the self in action and outline three specific characteristics: self; practice and context. They further point out five essential elements that must be prevalent: autoethnography must be self-initiated, focus on the self, be reflexive, be improvement-based and be qualitative in nature.

These characteristics are prevalent in autoethnography primarily because there is a focus on ‘I’, there is a ‘context’, it is ‘reflexive’ and it is a ‘qualitative study’. However, I was inclined to agree with scholars who argue that the most clearly distinguishable characteristic of autoethnography is that it has an easily identifiable cultural component. It is this essential cultural component that distinguishes self-study and autoethnography (Chang 2008; Ellis, 2003; Hamilton et al., 2008). Proponents of autoethnography emphasise that autoethnography can be used effectively to write about the personal and its relationship to culture. They postulate that autoethnography refers to
stories that feature the self or include the researcher as a character, but the distinguishing characteristic is that it must have an easily identifiable cultural component. In addition, autoethnography must combine cultural analysis and interpretation with narrative details (Ellis, 2003; Ellis & Bochner, 2000). Chang (2008) advocates that the “stories of autoethnographers be reflected upon, analysed and interpreted within the broader sociocultural context” (p. 4).

My interaction with literature has led me to understand that in a self-study the ‘I’ is an ‘actioned’ one, but in autoethnography it is a cultural ‘I’. Hence, in self-study one studies the self in action, and in autoethnography one studies the self within a larger sociocultural context. A study will not be classified as autoethnography if there is no cultural component.

It is against these arguments that autoethnography became my preferred methodological choice because I viewed autoethnography as a self-study with a strong sociocultural component. Ellis et al. (2011) propose that an autoethnographer must use personal experience to illustrate facets of cultural experience, and in so doing make the characteristics of a culture familiar for insiders and outsiders. I therefore chose to use autoethnography to examine my lived experience as a principal within the unique socio-cultural context of Hilltop School for the Deaf. Furthermore, I was drawn to this method as it not only situates the self within the context of a culture, subculture or group, but it also enables one to study one’s experiences and the experiences of others within the group.

Most crucial to my research interest is the fact that this method has enabled me to write reflexively, and be explicit about my social position and its location in time and space (Richardson, 2000). Duarte (2007) and Ellis (2003) argue that writing reflexively requires that the researcher’s whole being (intellectual, emotional and spiritual) be present in the research process and that reflexive ethnographers use all their senses, use the ‘self’ to learn about the other, and “use their experiences in the world of others to reflect critically on their own” (Ellis, 2003, p. 48). McIlveen (2008) emphasises that autoethnography is a method that enables the researcher and practitioner to operationalise the notion of critical consciousness. It is this reflexivity that entails an awareness of reciprocal influences between the researchers, their settings and research participants. More importantly, it involves self-conscious introspection with the objective of gaining an understanding of both self and others through examining actions, beliefs and perceptions (Anderson, 2006).

It is also emphasised that autoethnography is a reflexive means by which the researcher-practitioner consciously embeds himself or herself amidst theory and practice and by giving an
explicit autobiographic account, exposes a phenomenon under investigation or intervention (McIlveen, 2008). Toney (2011) argues that an important issue is that “unlike ethnography where the researcher becomes a disembodied, sometimes omniscient, overseer of the experiences of the researched, autoethnography is first-person and researcher embodied” (p. 2).

My reading of literature points out that there are other emerging visions of what autoethnography can be. Atkinson, Coffey & Delamont (2003) and Anderson (2006) critically examine new forms of inquiry and practice to assess their potential value for improving and expanding the analytic ethnographic craft. A point of contestation within autoethnography is the fact that it embraces subjectivity and has an emotional dimension. In order to counter this criticism, scholars place emphasis on the analytical dimension (Anderson 2006; Atkinson et al., 2003). Anderson (2006) introduces a new version of autoethnography, which he calls analytic autoethnography. From the analytical perspective Anderson maintains that subjectivity and the emotional dimension can be counteracted. This analytical goal can enable the theorisation of experiences that will subsequently eliminate subjectivity. Anderson (2006) proposes strategies in support of analytical autoethnography. These include inter alia, analysing data reflexively, the researcher declaring the ‘self’ in the research, and extending conversation with others beyond the self.

The literature suggests that performative and political autoethnography are part of the emerging ideas in this genre (Spry, 2001; Denzin, 2006). Performance autoethnography is a form of moral discourse and a defining feature of autoethnographic performance is interpreting culture through self-reflections and cultural refractions of identity. Scholars argue that autoethnography is not an innocent research practice but is performative, pedagogical and political. Analytical autoethnography, however, has the advantage of making one acutely conscious of how one witnesses one’s own reality constructions (Spry, 2001; Denzin, 2006).

I therefore embraced all these emerging variations so that I could use academic rigour to engage in a thorough self-examination in my cultural context, by combining cultural analysis and interpretation with narrative details (Chang, 2008). Through my autoethnographic study I relived and traversed my journey as a school principal from the day I took on the role. Autoethnography has thus enabled me to theorise my life.
2.2.2 Self within a socio-cultural context

Researchers have emphasised that autoethnography illuminates the socio-cultural context and the self within that context. In the following discussion, I explore research on culture and organisational cultures. Chang (2008) postulates that “the concept of culture fundamentally affects how we conduct a cultural study” (p. 15). She maintains that it shapes our research questions, our data sources and our writing, as well as the way we analyse and interpret our data: therefore, an understanding of culture and organisational culture becomes imperative in an autoethnographic study, primarily because of the pervasive imperative cultural element in autoethnography.

The term ‘culture’ is arguably the most elusive term in the generally rather fluid vocabulary of the social sciences. The concepts of ‘culture’ and ‘organisational culture’ become difficult to capture and define because they are constructed in relative terms, and these concepts have an abstract quality. Scholars further argue that the conceptualisations are difficult because it is not easy to reduce patterns of purposeful actions and thoughts into definitions (Conquergood, 1989; Bate, 2002). These patterns are in essence holistic, qualitative elements that manifest in our complicated collective lives. It is further emphasised that a performance paradigm of culture prevents the compartmentalisation of culture into variables to be isolated, measured, and manipulated. Fataar (2008) points out that “culture is never a given, but rather alive with the unpredictability associated with social actors making decisions such as whether to perform a familiar narrative or to disrupt it” (p. 7).

Despite this difficulty some attempts have been made from various perspectives to define and clarify the concepts of culture and organisational culture. According to the South African Concise Oxford Dictionary, ‘culture’ is a broad term that makes reference to the customs, institutions and achievements of a particular nation, people and group (South African Concise Oxford Dictionary, 2002, p. 282). Schein (1992) attempts firstly to clarify a possible meaning for the term before attempting a definition. He proposes that culture implies “rituals, climate, values and behaviours bound together into a coherent whole. This patterning or integration is the essence of what we mean by culture” (p. 10). Based on this clarification, Schein (1992) defines culture as

a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be
considered valid and therefore to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to these problems (p. 12).

Hofstede (1980) defines culture as “the collective mental programming of the people in an environment” (p. 43). Parekh (2000) defines it as the views or beliefs that human beings form regarding the meanings we attach to human life. According to Kidd (2002), culture plays an influential role in the behaviour of people, since it is the way of life for a group of people. Bate (2002) concurs with this view and emphasises that culture refers to a particular group of people. He points out that from this perspective various multicultural countries can be viewed as having a number of cultural groups. In South Africa, for example, the concept of culture is often associated with the notion of ethnic origin. Chao, Wei, Good & Flores (2011) argue that a culture is a “configuration of learned behaviours and results of behaviour whose component elements are shared and transmitted by members of a particular society” (p. 3). This, according to him, is applicable to an organisation as the employees of an organisation are influenced by the organisational culture and are bound together by working towards the same organisational goals.

From these definitions one can deduce that culture is a socially learned way of living. It is the conventional behaviour of a society that encompasses beliefs, customs, knowledge and practices. This learned behaviour embraces and influences human behaviour, all avenues of social life and thoughts. It can also be argued that every society has some underlying cultural profile that results in people behaving in an identifiable way because of exposure to a particular culture, and people organise their lives by conforming to cultural patterns, values, plans and goals. I believe that these assumptions have implications for leadership in that a leader’s culture can be explored and explained from various perspectives and levels in terms of socialisation, type of education, social environment and general life experiences. In addition, a leader’s understanding of culture will equip him or her to handle cultural tensions as they arise in the workplace. Culture in any organisation is an observable, powerful force. It is made up of its members’ shared values, beliefs, symbols and behaviours. Culture guides individual decisions and actions at the unconscious level and as a result can have a potent effect on the wellbeing of an organisation (Petersen, 2008). In its very broadest definition organisational culture can be viewed as purposeful thought, feeling, action and meaning that moulds and depicts life within an organisation (Parekh, 2000; Kidd, 2002). Brown (1998) emphasises that organisational culture refers to the pattern of beliefs, values and learned ways of coping with experience that have developed during the course of an organisation’s history, which get manifested in its material arrangements and in the behaviours of its members. It is the organisational culture that
distinguishes one organisation from another, and it is the organisational culture that gives an organisation its personality based on its value systems (Petersen, 2008).

These definitions and perspectives point out that in organisations there are cultures that affect the behaviour of people and these cultures are created by invisible concepts like values. Organisational culture is therefore characterised as the framework of shared values, beliefs and assumptions. The organisation can be viewed as the outer shell within which the cultural values and beliefs contribute to the elements that motivate employees to achieve the goals of the organisation. However, there can be more than one culture prevalent in an organisation (Payne, 2008).

Payne (2008) shows that conflicting and converging cultures are present in many layers. She distinguishes between ethnic cultures, socio-economic cultures and the culture of bureaucracy. Deblois, Corriveau, Guilbert et al. (2004) assert that political culture can also interact with all other cultures in ways that will affect the intellectual material and moral resources available to learners in any particular school at any given point in time. For example, whether or not children will learn about evolution will depend upon the political will in a country shaped along political, religious and cultural lines. Payne (2008) further argues that all these interacting cultures converge upon schools and how they are mediated will have consequences for the school as an organisation. Honey (2010) postulates that people have to surpass all these cultures to develop a set of values, beliefs and stories that will go beyond all other influences and tensions, and will focus everyone more closely on the common goal, which is the task of learning.

The notion of organisational culture is of particular relevance to my study. For leaders it becomes imperative to consider the non-material forces in organisations, such as cultures and values (Wheatley 1999, in Crowther, 2010, p. 5). I believe that the ways in which organisational culture is conceptualised by a leader are critical to the kind of leadership that will prevail. Research indicates a correlation between strong organisational cultures and strong effective leadership (Sarros, Gray & Densten, 2002; Brenton & Driskill, 2005). Schein (1992) emphasises that while culture is a systemic phenomenon, the primary architects within an organisation are the leaders or people at the very top. An understanding of culture in the workplace becomes a significant factor of leadership, as confirmed by studies conducted by Sarros et al. (2002), who reveal that culture is more responsive to the leadership dimension than leadership is to culture.

Wilson (2007) suggests that there are two pervasive models of culture in schools that have an impact on leadership. He describes the functionalist model, in which culture is seen as the main
ingredient that binds an organisation through a sense of interdependency of shared values and agreed norms. These norms and values are drawn from wider societal values, but more importantly from the values rooted in the history and tradition of the organisation itself. Hence, the emphasis is on the organisation’s capacity for self-production through a closed system of relations in which the external environment is regarded as an extension of the organisation’s own sense of identity, interests and concerns. Within this model, leaders can audit their organisational culture and be proactive in strengthening cherished norms and traditions. The second model he describes is the dynamic-unbounded perspective. This model is different from the functionalist model in that it emphasises the ever changing nature of organisational culture. Organisational culture is understood in terms of heterogeneity and diversity, and organisations are characterised by loosely coupled systems. In this model the leader must be open to changes and alert to new ways of emphasising and strengthening the cultural values of an organisation.

A further explanation of how culture operates at different levels in an organisation is that of Schein (1992). He proposes a model of culture that is structured into three levels. Level one comprises of artefacts (observable action). This level includes observable features of the organisation, for example office layout. The second level comprises of basic assumptions (espoused values). On this level exists the organisation’s judgements about what is good and bad. The third level deals with basic assumptions (values in use). This level has the deepest and most comprehensive explanation of reality and our views of fundamental truths about people and the world. Schein (1992) proposes that it is this layer that actually drives an organisation’s behaviour. He does, however, emphasise that these levels do not necessarily operate at a conscious level, but that an understanding of these levels can better equip a leader to deal with the cultural values within an organisation.

One difficulty of examining and understanding these levels of culture is that except for the first level (artefacts — observable action), which is easily observable, levels two and three are not so easily discernible. These levels are usually inferred by patterns of behaviour. A criticism of this model is that a leader’s hidden values (which operate at the deepest level of basic assumptions — values in use) may sometimes conflict with or override the organisation’s basic assumptions — espoused values. The implication is that leaders may unwittingly undermine the espoused values of an organisation. Such behaviours may have a powerful impact on the effectiveness of an organisation (Argyris, 1994).
From my reflections as a school leader and my study of the literature, I have come to understand the concept of organisational culture as the identity of an institution. To me, the culture of an organisation plays a critical role in the organisation’s everyday operations. Organisational culture is complex, heterogeneous, diverse, fluid and changing. Furthermore, an organisational culture is socially constructed, and is affected by the history of the institution, its members’ shared meanings and basic assumptions, and the multiple contextual influences. It is a collective experience. The norms, values, beliefs and goals are constructed and reconstructed, produced and reproduced, learned and relearned and play out at different levels and in many rich layers.

I believe that a leader who understands the notion of organisational culture from this perspective is better prepared to work towards an organisational vision and an organisational identity that is open, dynamic and responsive to change.

### 2.2.3 Autoethnography and/as narrative inquiry

Autoethnography is a self-narrative (Chang, 2008). A focus on the meanings that people construct around their experiences provides a lens into the complexity of human lives through narrative (Josselson, 2006). My study links autoethnography and narrative inquiry as research traditions, and my view is that both these research traditions involve subjective personal introspection, experience and story as meaning-making enterprises. Narrative inquiry is a form of qualitative research that involves the gathering of narratives, which may be written, oral and/or visual. Chase (2005) argues that ‘narrative’ can be assigned to any text or discourse. He further emphasises that it might be text that is used within the context of a mode of inquiry in qualitative research, for example self-study or autoethnography. Pinnegar and Daynes (2006) suggest that narrative can be both a method and the phenomenon of the study. In my study I use narrative as a method.

Andrews, Squire & Tambokou (2008) explain that narrative is based on the argument that as human beings, we come to understand and give meaning to our lives through story. In the gathering and telling of ‘stories’, we are gathering knowledge from the past. My self-stories of concrete action, subject positions, emotions, embodiment, personal experiences, social locations, interpretations and introspection have in many ways comprised a plot, dramatic tension, dialogue, scenes and the emergence of characters. According to Josselson (2006), researchers involved with narrative inquiry engage in far more than the uncritical presenting of stories. They
move beyond the story itself to explore the ways in which a story is constructed, in what context, from what subject positions, for whom and why, as well as the socio-cultural discourses embedded in them. Connelly & Clandinin (2006) explain that narrative inquiry involves the study of experience as a story in which the researcher delves “inward and outward, backward and forward” (p. 50) into the past, present, and future of experience. Many scholars have provided ways for analysis and understanding of stories lived and told (Connelly & Clandinin, 2006; Chang, 2008; Whitehead, 2008). Creswell, Hanson, Clark Plano et al. (2007) explain that “the procedure for implementing this research is made up of focusing on studying one or more individuals, gathering data through the collection of their stories, reporting individual experiences and chronologically ordering the meaning of these experiences” (p. 240).

In summary, my study merges two research traditions: autoethnography and narrative inquiry. This makes it possible for me to gain a deeper understanding of myself as the person in the principal’s office within a particular socio-cultural context. At the outset of my research I envisioned that autoethnography would be the most fitting method to use in attempting to understand myself through my study. I found that it would be beneficial for me to use both autoethnography and narrative inquiry as methodological vehicles to arrive at a better understanding of my storied life as principal of a school for the Deaf. In a similar vein, Meyer (2011) called her work self-study, autoethnography and narrative inquiry.

2.3 The issue of trustworthiness in autoethnography

Trustworthiness when using autoethnography as a method became the focus of attention and fell under the spotlight in my discussions with the cohort group that I belonged to. My readings of literature confirmed that in autoethnography, validity can be problematic.

Feldman (2003) emphasises that validity and reliability are two concepts of critical importance in understanding issues of measurement in research. He postulates that when researchers engage in reflective processes that focus on themselves, they cannot be sure of the accuracy of what they see.

In addition, the use of self as the only data source has brought the validity of autoethnography into question. Because of the excessive focus on self in isolation from others, autoethnography has been critiqued as being too self-indulgent and narcissistic to the extent that Pathak (2010) questions whether autoethnography is ‘research’ or ‘I search’ (Ellis, 2003; Palmer, 2008; Holt,
This raises the concern that autoethnography has the potential to lack self-criticality. This can result in writing that is not useful to the researcher and others. To counteract this argument, scholars who promote autoethnography emphasise that a study that discounts the role of the researcher in the process is not providing a holistic view regarding the culture studied. They emphasise that they do not apologise for the personal nature of this inquiry, asserting that autoethnography has a therapeutic effect on authors and readers (Bochner & Ellis, 2002; Manning, 2009). Manning (2009) challenges the critique of autoethnography as self-indulgent by maintaining that she continues to explore the balance between writing about ‘self’ and ‘other’ and reframes a focus on self as “being essential and enlightening for one’s own understanding of ethical research practice” (p. 5). In my own study, I hope to use the self as an instrument of understanding to arrive at passionate knowing (Belenky et al., 1986).

A further point of contention regarding the validity of autoethnography is that autoethnographers use biased data, and are referred to as ‘navel gazers’ because they do not hypothesise, analyse and theorise. These processes are believed to be essential requirements of scholarship. Detractors see an overemphasis on narration rather than analysis and interpretation of the self in autoethnography, which does not sit comfortably with the traditional criteria used to judge qualitative inquiries (Sparkes, 2000; Anderson, 2006; Madison, 2006). In this regard Feldman (2003) suggests that one way to ensure validity is to go beyond mere representation of one’s findings and demonstrate how one constructed one’s representations. He suggests key ways to ensure validity in self-study. These include the researcher providing a clear and detailed description of how data is collected, and making explicit what counts as data in one’s work. It is also imperative to give clear and detailed descriptions of how the representation from one’s data was constructed. This would add to the validity of the representation if readers had some knowledge or insight into the way the researcher transformed data into an artistic representation. Finally, Feldman argues for the need to extend triangulation beyond multiple sources of data to include explorations of multiple ways of representing the same self-study. Because one dataset can lead to a variety of representations, it is important to show why one has been chosen over another. However, multiple representations that support and challenge one another can add to the reasons to believe and trust the self-study and can serve as analysis and interpretation.

The question of objectivity in autoethnographic research raises further issues of validity and trustworthiness. It can be argued that when we engage in reflective processes that focus on ourselves, we cannot be sure of the accuracy of what we see.
However, it is argued that as a result of subjectivity it becomes vital for us to make sure that we are not blinded or fooled in the way we construct our stories. It becomes imperative to provide reasons for why others should trust our findings (Chang, 2008; Anderson, 2006; Spry, 2001). Ellis and Bochner (2000), however, emphasise that there is no pretence of objectivity in autoethnography as the researcher’s own experience becomes the object of investigation as he or she becomes fully committed and immersed in the contexts and groups he or she studies.

Closely associated with the issue of subjectivity and objectivity is the credibility of the narrator. In this instance the exclusive reliance on personal memory and recall as a data source has its own complexities that lead one to question whether the narrator could really have had the experiences described against the available factual evidence, and whether the narrator really believes that the experience he or she describes had really happened. For autoethnographers, validity means that a work seeks verisimilitude. It should evoke in readers the perception that the feelings described are lifelike, believable, possible and plausible (Ellis et al., 2011; Bochner, 2002).

Having considered the pitfalls of and counterarguments against the validity of autoethnography, I investigated ways to ensure the validity of my own research. I drew on Richardson’s (2000) observations on how poststructuralist theories offer support to qualitative writers, firstly by directing us to “understand ourselves reflexively as persons writing from particular positions at specific times”, and secondly by freeing us “from trying to write a single text in which everything is said to everyone” (p. 518). Manning (2009) posits that knowing that one is writing from a particular position/s at a particular time can be both constraining and liberating.

In this regard, it can be argued that reflexivity not only provides insight into emotions and reactions that are not available by observation alone, but it can provide the reader with the necessary information for assessing validity. It is contended that the reader would be able to see the viewpoint of the research context (Manning, 2009; Richardson, 2000).

Positionality is essentially the practice of a researcher delineating his or her position in relation to the study with the implication that this position may influence aspects of the study, for example types of information collected, the authenticity of the data collected or the way in which the data is interpreted. However, it is argued that our positionality is not fixed but relational. It is a “constantly moving context that constitutes our reality and the place from which values are interpreted and constructed” (Robertson, 2002, p. 9).
I am aware of the position from which I am writing, i.e. that of a school principal. What concerns me most about my position is that the position of principal puts me in a different location from others, within a hierarchy where the members of staff feel obliged in some ways to be deferential to the title. Staff members were unable to answer discussion questions honestly, because of repercussions that they imagined were possible because of my position of power. This position of power, in addition, made me feel ‘othered’ in that I was always viewed from the other side and, at times I felt that my position put me in an irreconcilable position of difference. Nonetheless this raised questions of how I could play with different positionalities to build trust and get honest answers. I had to negotiate power relations constantly and grappled with this in my writing.

Some of the ways in which I tried to overcome this tension included having discussions out of working hours in more casual settings, using a neutral researcher to conduct interviews in order to counteract the power relations involved in a school, and conducting some discussions in isiZulu, which is the mother tongue of a majority of the staff at Hilltop School. The use of mother-tongue communication facilitated a more relaxed and conducive environment, and gave participants the ability to express themselves easily. These conversations had to be translated and transcribed for me. Despite many attempts to deal with my position of power and difference, I was not able to neutralise my position and I believe that this had an influence on the reflections of others on my leadership behaviours.

However, reflecting on my positionality and the way others constructed my identity helped me to engage more fully in reflexivity. Thus, reflexivity provided me with insights into ideas and emotions I had about myself and how others viewed me, which would not have been available from observation alone. In addition, by recognising that my position as principal affects the research process, I used this knowledge to resist the urge to proclaim my knowledge as powerful. This, according to Richardson (2000), can be a liberating experience. In this way, I argue for the usefulness of positionality. It is emphasised that positionality can be useful if one’s position is reflected upon and articulated in terms of its influence on the fieldwork (Robertson, 2002; Manning, 2009; Richardson, 2000).

Furthermore, with regard to power and position, Richardson (2000) emphasises that language is how social organisation and power are defined and contested, and is the place where our sense of self and subjectivity are constructed. Thus, I saw language not only as a means of reflecting on social reality but also as a means for creating it. In my research I engaged thoroughly with reflexive editing (Petersen, 2008) through the process of being honest and present in my writing.
Through reflexive editing I ensured that my research was conducted in a disciplined, systematic and rigorous manner.

The use of ‘critical friends’ in autoethnography adds validity and has the potential to counterbalance self-indulgence with resonance (Samaras, 2011). Schunck and Russell (2005) explain that the notion of the critical friend is central to self-study, and contend that critical friends serve as a sounding board, raise challenging questions, support the reframing of events and issues, and become an important part of the professional learning experience. McNiff, Lomax and Whitehead (1996) assert that “the critical friend, regardless of status or role, is expected to help the researcher achieve a critical perspective even though this may challenge the normal assumptions underlying the researcher’s work” (p. 85). Costa and Kallick (1993) explain that “a critical friend, as the name suggests, is a trusted person who asks provocative questions, provides data to be examined through another lens, and offers critique of a person’s work as a friend” (p. 50). My critical friends comprised of peers in my PhD cohort group in the School of Education, my supervisor, and a senior lecturer/researcher at the university who has an interest in self-study methodology.

Interactions with my critical friends certainly provoked and challenged my thinking and made me reflect more deeply on my values, assumptions and practices as a leader. This process was filled with tensions on the one hand, and yet was supportive and trusting. I was challenged to question, critique and recreate my thoughts embedded in my narratives. I felt that my construction of my narratives was constantly put under scrutiny, and I was supported in the process of reframing events. I was forced to delve deeper into the motivations for my actions and the events that shaped my practices, and I constantly had to self-question the interpretations and meanings I was making of my lived experiences. I had to look more deeply inwards and also look outwards beyond the self. I was drawn to the silences in my narrative and the underlying motivations for them. Overall, I trusted my critical friends and knew that their critique was underpinned by their commitment to support me in producing a scholarly piece of research.

2.4 Theoretical framing

2.4.1 The question of a research paradigm: My dilemma

As a researcher, I knew that I had to make reflective decisions regarding the paradigm in which my study would be located, and my ontological and epistemological positions. My decision
would reflect how I view the world, how I view social reality, what assumptions I make regarding knowledge, and what I believe is the best way to research the issue/s under study. I also knew that how I design my study, generate my data, and analyse and make sense of my data would be a reflection on my axiological, ontological and epistemological assumptions. These are some of the paradigmatic questions I put to myself at various stages of my study:

What is my position about how I might discover knowledge about the world?
Can I acquire knowledge objectively or can it never be objective?
What are the particular ways of being?
What shapes who we are, the ways we view the world, and the ways we perceive our roles in society?
What will be my relationship to that which I will research?
What is the role of values in research? Is research value-free and unbiased? Or is research value-laden and biased?

As I read the literature pertaining to my research, I challenged the idea of a detached researcher who could be separated from the object/s of inquiry. I rejected the search for ‘the truth’, and saw human action as influenced by time, space, place and human agency. In other words, I came to understand that all knowledge and action are contextual, situated and contingent. I also came to concede that reality is subjective and multiple.

In the initial stages of my study, I was comfortable with autoethnography and its narrative approach, which have their roots in interpretivism, a postmodern paradigm in which regimes of truth are questioned. As explained above, Ellis & Bochner (2000) argue that in autoethnography and its narrative approach the researcher is intrinsic to the research, and there is an intense reflexive interrogation of the researcher’s own position, values, beliefs and socio-cultural background. The ontological, axiological and epistemological assumptions that underlie interpretivist research are that there are multiple realities, that there is a close relationship between the researcher and that which is being researched, and that research is value-laden and inherently biased (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Ellingson & Ellis, 2008).

Autoethnographers reject the idea of social research as an objective and neutral endeavour, and embrace researcher subjectivity rather than suppress it. The interpretivist orientation to autoethnography is aligned to social constructionism, which holds that our personal reality is a social construction, with, according to Young and Collin (2004), varying emphases upon internal influences, external factors, and personal agency. Through a social-constructionist lens we can examine how our social reality shapes what we do, how we think about our identity, and how we...
respond to the expectations of others. Further, in terms of axiology, the researcher is open, explicit and transparent in respect of his or her values and personal concerns (McIlveen, 2008).

However, in my later reading I found that “autoethnography can align with either the constructivism-interpretivism or critical-ideological paradigms” (McIlveen, 2008, p. 15), and that “the critical-ideological researcher would likely extend the social constructionist stance to further emphasise the role of discourse and power relations in shaping a personal reality” (McIlveen, 2008, p. 15). In other words, the autoethnographer may write his or her subjective personal narratives, but within this process there would be an awareness of the discursive nature of social reality and its “oppressive or liberating influences” (McIlveen, 2008, p. 15).

I have to confess that from the beginning of my study I wanted to do more than just understand myself as the person in the principal’s office in a particular socio-cultural context. I wanted my research to be transformative in nature and influence social change in the context of my school setting. Further, I believed that autoethnography as a self-reflexive methodology had the potential to produce emancipatory knowledge and empower the researched subject, in this case me, the person in the principal’s office.

I will explain how my epistemological and ontological stances shifted even further and began to be located in the poststructuralist paradigm. This shift occurred when I studied the literature on teacher identity, and when I began to engage with various conceptualisations of the notion of identity.

2.4.2 Identity formation

2.4.2.1 Introduction

Autoethnography is a self-narrative that critiques the situatedness of self and others in social context (Spry, 2001). As I attempted an autoethnographic exploration to enable a deep understanding of me as a person in the principal’s office in what I believed was a unique socio-cultural context, and seek answers to who I am, how I negotiate my many selves and how I come to know, I was compelled to look at the notion of ‘identity’ since it is strongly linked to these questions.

Meynert (2007) argues that “identity is an important aspect of the human quest for understanding the self” (p. 4). Krause (2006) suggests that identity is inseparable from a person’s
narrative or life story. Clark (2007) suggests that one should think of identity in terms of giving an account of one’s self. Watson (2006) argues that identities are collections of stories about persons. Connelly and Clandinin (1999) further maintain that stories lived out in practice tell of who you are and who you are becoming. I believe this can apply to me as a principal, and to the ways in which I integrate a range of influences and position myself and others in the confronting of tensions and contradictions in my principalship.

I wish to state here that in my masters research I had done an in-depth study of traditional leadership theories or models that have been debated by scholars over the past three decades or so, for example, transformational leadership; transactional leadership, distributed leadership. In the early stages of my review of literature for my PhD study, I revisited these models with a critical lens. I began to realise that traditional theories have limitations, are in many ways incomplete, and do not help one to fully understand leadership within the complexities of the modern world (Brown, 2011). For example, traditional leadership models suggest that change is generated by the leader as the individual who occupies the hierarchical role and by the direction or path he or she charts out. Further, leadership is a controlled, predictable strategic endeavour that sets rationally conceived goals, and fixed boundaries and parameters. So the leaders role is to motivate members of the institution toward task objectives and lead them, in an almost linear manner, to align with and commit to organizational goals.

In contrast, my interest in my PhD research was to explore leadership as embedded in context and “socially constructed in and from a context” in complex and often unpredictable ways (Osborn, Hunt & Jauch, 2002, p. 798). In addition, I wanted to research leadership as an emergent, interactive dynamic within complex systems, processes and interactions.

I thus turned to identity theory in my self-study which sought to raise questions about who is the person in the principal’s office. What follows now is a brief discussion of various approaches to theorising the nature of ‘identity’ I have studied. However, in chapter 6 it will become evident that I looked even further to another more recent theoretical model to explain my complex leadership enactments illuminated by my self-study.

2.4.2.2 Discourses that define the concept of ‘identity’

In my readings, I attempted to examine discourses around the notion of ‘identity’. Identity revolves around the question of epistemology, that is, who we are. In my initial study of the literature, I found the concept of identity to be a difficult and complicated concept to grasp.
Eventually I found that structuring my emerging understandings according to three different paradigmatic stances (modern, postmodern and poststructuralist) served as a scaffold for me. I realised that discourses often intersect in conceptualising the concept of identity. Stalwick (2007) argues that there is a strong link between identity and discourse. In other words, who a person is, is constantly shaped by the assumptions embedded in discourses. Thus, discourses and their embedded meanings are central to identity formation. Furthermore, one cannot construct reality without foregrounding the self and intersecting it in unique ways with others with whom one interacts. We constantly negotiate our identities within larger social-cultural contexts. I believe that identity is an important factor in one’s pursuit to make sense of the self. In modernist conceptions identity is seen as essentialised, stable, static and coherent. For example, Erik Erikson (1968) defined identity as a person’s own continuity and coherence in time. Erikson’s view of identity is that it is a uniform, ahistorical, and stage-driven process of achievement that has to be maintained. The modernist account views identity as a rigid concept that results in the construction of cultural homogeneity. Identity is seen as a fixed set of characteristics with clearly defined boundaries that may undergo change in a linear manner throughout life (Meynert, 2007).

Postmodernist discourses of identity, on the other hand, challenge the position of the self-determining subject of modern discourses and the overemphasis on human reason and will. In postmodern conceptualisations, identity is multilayered, non-unitary, fragmented and plural. The postmodern notion of identity is one that decentres the individual (Dumitrescu, 2001). For example, Freudian and critical theories in their analyses decentred the subject by regarding it as divided in nature (Freud, 1965). Freud’s theory of the unconscious differentiates the self into the ego, id and superego, and into the conscious and unconscious. Thus, the conceptualisation of the subject as centred by a single, fully self-conscious, rational, self-defining identity is challenged (Freud, 1965). Critical theorists hold the view that identity is socially constructed and shaped by power and power relations (Arnowitz & Giroux, 1991). Thus, identity from a postmodern perspective is multifaceted, plural, changing, uncertain and contradictory, rather than singular, stable and depicting certainty (Meynert, 2007). Postmodernist discourses resist the notion of the self-determining subject of modern discourses and the overemphasis on rationality and will.

My initial study of literature revealed that the poststructuralist perspective also rejects the idea of a coherent self. Poststructuralist theorists maintain that identity is not fixed or made up of an essential core but is fluid, contingent, multilayered and constituted in discourse. Identity is constituted and reconstituted relationally, and its boundaries are constantly remapped and renegotiated (Foucault, 1979; Lather, 1991; Laclau & Mouffe, 1985). Theorists argue that people
live within multiple representations of class, race, gender, language and social relations. In poststructuralist theory, the notion of the identity of an individual is situated and produced simultaneously in many different contexts, events, and by different agents for many different purposes (Meynert, 2007).

Furthermore, individuals constitute their sense of ‘self’ or ‘I’ as they are positioned in discourse. Giddens (1984) explains that the ‘I’ develops out of, and is related to the positioning of the agent in social encounters. He argues that subjects constitute their sense of ‘self’ as they are positioned in dialogical engagement with an ‘other’, and dismisses notions of ‘I’ as a core, private self. In itself, ‘I’ has no meaning; it only acquires meaning when positioned in discourse.

I was drawn to explore poststructuralist positions on the concept of ‘identity’. The poststructuralist idea that the subject occupies conflicting subject positions interested me. The argument made is that self-identity is constituted and reconstituted relationally and its boundaries are mapped and remapped and renegotiated (Hall, 1992). I was also interested in the notion of subjectivity, and the idea of “subjectivity as a site of disunity and conflict” produced through varied and multiple discourses (Weedon, 1987, p. 21).

A poststructuralist analysis focuses on the discourses and practices through which our subjectivities are produced and constituted, and these are often in conflict with one another. The analysis would make visible the tensions and instabilities in each person’s subjectivity, and would produce multiple layers of contradictory meanings that are inscribed in their bodies and in their conscious and unconscious minds (Davies, 1993; Letts, 2006). I felt these conceptions had a great deal of relevance for my research on the self as the person in the principal’s office. However, I experienced the literature as complex and profound. Below is my analysis of key ideas gleaned from the literature that I felt would help me make sense of my narrative.

2.4.2.3 A poststructuralist perspective on identity

As mentioned in the previous section, poststructuralists reject the idea that identity can be seen as a fixed, essential core. Instead they contend that existing variables start to shape our lives at birth and influence the way we continue to perform our lives. Lather (1991) maintains that identity is informed by the interaction between existing structural and biographical variables and factors that are external to the individual, thus making identity continuously transient and changeable in character. Poststructuralists therefore view identity as highly ambiguous, multiple
and potentially contradictory. Attempts to overcome or deny ambiguity by trying to define an entirely clear coherent and consistent self may further reinforce, rather than resolve, the very ambiguity and insecurity identity strategies are intended to overcome (Collison, 2006).

2.4.2.3.1 The notion of ‘subjectivity’

Venn (2006) strongly emphasises that when one explains a ‘lived’ life one must include both identity and subjectivity. He argues that subjectivity is a crucial factor to understanding identity. Venn further emphasises that identity is not an autonomous concept. Woodward (1997) maintains that subjectivity involves personal thoughts and emotions that influence the different cultural positions we hold. This constitutes the sense of self which results in ‘this is who I am’. Hall (2004) further argues that the concept of ‘subjectivity’ emphasises the making of the subject, which includes the taking up of subject positions. This foregrounds a reflexive dimension.

Subjectivities are produced and constituted through discourses (Letts, 2006). Foucault (1977) argued that discourse is the key concept of the relationship between power and knowledge, and a critical object of social analysis. Discourses are systems of thought, or knowledge claims, which take on an existence independent of the particular subject. As human subjects we constantly turn to and access pre-existing discourses as resources for social interactions with others (Stoddard, 2007). As teachers, we may think of a discourse of social rights as we negotiate our way through schooling contexts and the goal of achieving quality education for all learners. Stoddard (2007) explains that an individual’s sense of self or subjectivity, and the subject positions taken, are constructed and shaped through his or her engagement with a range of intersecting discourses.

One of the key theoretical contributions of Foucault is his rethinking of the notion of power and his analysis of the relationship between power and knowledge. Power not only operates at a macro social level but also at the local level within a range of diverse sites. Power not only functions oppressively and as a mechanism of control in social institutions, but also produces sites of resistance. Foucault also emphasises that power is relational, flows in multiple directions, and operates as a network (Foucault, 1978). It is relational in that it operates in relationships with others. A further important point he makes is that discourse operates in a somewhat open, fluid and negotiated way.

According to Foucault, power is as an everyday, socialised and embodied phenomenon and the term ‘power/knowledge’ constitutes a particular form of knowledge and understanding. For
example, one can analyse the cultural production of knowledge and the reproduction of
gendered and racialised networks of social power (Foucault, 1980; 2000).

Thus, the production and circulation of discourses are mechanisms of social power (Stoddard, 2007). Foucault shows how we concede to multiple intersecting networks of power because we adopt the ideological discourses that permeate civil society produced by institutions such as the media and the school, for example. Further, the production of discourse may also contest, constrain and resist the exercise of power (Foucault 2000). A discourse may gain dominance over others depending on the extent to which it is strengthened and promoted by individuals and institutions.

Foucault (1972) advocates that as individuals, we take positions of agency and identity by locating ourselves in a position within a particular discourse. In this way we become subjects of the discourse by subjecting ourselves to its dominant meanings, power and regulation.

Poststructuralism highlights the complexity and fragmentation of power, and the microstructures of power (Stoddard, 2007). In educational contexts, I would argue that power has the potential to create, entrench and sustain objects of discourse to form and produce networks of leaders, teachers, scholars, policy makers and other stakeholders that would influence the nature of policy and practices.

Foucault developed the concept of the ‘discursive field’ as part of his attempt to understand the relationship between language, social institutions, subjectivity and power. Discursive fields, such as education, the school or the family, contain a range of competing and contradictory discourses with varying degrees of power to give meaning to and organise social institutions and processes. For example, schools as institutions are made possible by a wide range of discursive practices that include policies, strategies, educational debates about what comprises an effective school, and normative social behaviour. Discursive practices are rule-governed structures that both compel individuals to behave in a particular way and sanction particular ways of behaving.

Thus, investigating an individual’s subjectivity through the lens of poststructuralism enables a researcher to interrogate the discourses that are produced and reproduced in everyday social reality and the discursive practices that constitute individuals. Discourses determine various subject positions, which can be produced within and subject to particular discourses. Stoddard (2007) explains that power is discursive, and circulates throughout lived experiences in multiple directions. It is not possible to completely resist and overcome power; rather, our research
should produce the kind of reflexivity that encourages us to monitor and manage relations of power and their harmful influences better.

Poststructuralists have added emotions as a dimension integral to subjectivity (Holstein & Gubrium, 2000; Zembylas, 2003a). These theorists maintain that emotions play a critical role in subject formation since emotions connect an individual’s thoughts, judgements and beliefs, and give meaning to experiences. Zembylas (2003a) argues that the multiplicity of emotions that are likely to be experienced in any one event is complex. He further adds that it is important to observe and note the way in which an integrated personality evolves out of socially constructed emotions within a context that is shaped by and shapes the tensions of power relations. To summarise, Weedon (1987) conceptualises discourses as ways of constituting knowledge, together with the social practices, forms of subjectivity and power relations which inhere in such knowledges and relations between them. Discourses are more than ways of thinking and producing meaning. They constitute the ‘nature’ of the body, unconscious and conscious mind and emotional life of the subjects they seek to govern (p. 108).

Foucault (in Ball, 1990) argues that the “the body is directly involved in a political field; power-relations have an immediate hold on it; they invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs” (p. 25). Stoddard (2007) explains that according to Foucault the body is socially constructed, and is a site where networks of discourse and power inscribe themselves, a critical space for relations of productive power and discourse/power regimes. The body is also a site for contested meanings.

As a principal I am aware that I am constituted and produced as a subject through a range of intersecting discourses and discursive practices. As explained, subjectivities are complex, changing and contradictory. This study therefore attempted to examine contradictions as areas of tensions and struggle in my own identity formation as a principal and leader. I hoped in my study to explore questions such as:

*What are the complex ways in which power and discourse are produced in the socio-cultural context where I serve as a leader?*

*How do ideological discourses define and shape who I am as a leader and the limits and possibilities of social action and future visions in the particular socio-cultural context in which I work?*
2.4.2.3.2 The duality of structure and agency

Agency and structure are viewed as two major forces that shape identity and society, and are therefore embedded in identity formation. It is critical to establish the extent to which the identity of the individual is determined by social structure and the extent to which identity is self-determined and independent of social structure. Explained further, it is the extent to which a person’s identity is determined by various structures of power and the extent to which a person uses free will or independence in his own identity formation.

Structure refers to positions within discourses that are imposed on individuals, resulting in the restriction of the agentic influence of their actions, social and cultural structures (Taylor, 1989). Giddens (1991) defines structure as the rules (routines) and resources (material, authoritative) organised as properties of social systems, and agency as the capacity to make a difference to the world, that is, to exercise some sort of power, reliant on knowledgeable, competent human actors. Giddens (1992) further asserts strongly that structure is not to be equated with constraint but is always constraining and enabling. Agency refers to a person’s free will. If there is free will then a person is thought to have agency or to be an agent of his or her own actions.

There are many contrasting viewpoints on the duality of structure and agency. The psychological/developmental perspective is that identity formation is self-determined. It is argued that this identity formation occurs as one adapts or develops in response to the various circumstances in one’s life. Taylor (1989) describes the individual as having an agentive identity and as a self-interpreting subject. Giddens (1991) proposes that identity is a person’s own reflexive understanding and interpretation of his or her biographical narratives. According to Giddens, the ‘self’ constitutes the multilayered identities, which connect to the different roles we occupy at various times in our lives.

Giddens (1991) further posits that agency and structure are intertwined in a structuration process, creating a sense of equilibrium in the co-joined influences of personal agency and exterior structures. He explains that in the conceptualisation of identity, behaviour and identity are determined primarily on how individuals receive and process environmental information and use this to construct individualisation.

Poststructuralists not only challenge identity formation as an individual phenomenon, they also challenge it as a social phenomenon (Foucault, 1984). Poststructuralists describe identity
formation as a continuing process of becoming and emphasise the impossibility of an origin of the self, meaning there is no fixed self. They further argue that rather than identity being reflected in discourse, identity is constituted in discourse in an active, continuous and dynamic process. In this view the self is defined by its position in social practices.

For the purposes of my study I explore identity formation as a combination of both agency and structure. I examine the extent to which I exercised agency as a school leader and to what extent I have allowed the structures embedded in the socio-cultural context of the school to shape and co-construct my identity. Key questions I knew I would explore in my study are:

- **To what extent are my agency, my actions and my existence as a school leader influenced by the cultural, social and historical context in which I am located?**
- **To what extent do my actions as a leader structure my social world and to what extent I am structured by it?**
- **How do my agentic orientations play out, become reconstructed, change and transform in the variety of temporal-relational contexts of actions in which I lead, and what influences them?**
- **How do social structural conditions shape, enable and constrain my actions and agency as a leader, and influence the meanings I give to them?**

**Summary**

In constructing our identities and defining ourselves within the larger social framework, I came to believe that writing our narratives serves as a powerful space to reflect, make meanings, and negotiate ways of being. At this point in my research, I was filled with excitement in telling and retelling my story.

**2.5 Research design**

**2.5.1 Introduction**

Palmer (2008) points out that autoethnography is a social science inquiry method. Therefore, it uses personal experience as primary data, interprets self as a cultural being in relation to others.
and explores the relationship between self and others (in its cultural context) through the systemic investigative process of data collection and interpretation.

My study adopts autoethnography as a method, as the aim of my study was to open my living textbook and to recollect, share and theorise my life experiences as the school principal of Hilltop School for the Deaf. More importantly, my aim was to make meanings of my past experiences as a leader and reach a deeper understanding of myself within a highly complex socio-cultural context.

The autoethnographic method was suited to my research aims in that the ‘auto’ enabled an analysis of my own identity constructions in the context of a school for the Deaf (ethno). The data and research design emerged as I described and interrogated my nodal experiences as leader within this context. Research tools included my narrative, co-constructed narratives, reflexive journals, minutes of meetings and interviews. Texts served as catalysts to refresh my memory that enabled me to tell the story of my experiences within the context of a particular socio-cultural context. The analysis of my story was done through the lens of identity theory from a poststructuralist perspective. Reflexive analysis was used for chronicling my experiences as the person in the principal’s office.

2.5.2 The research context

Hilltop School (Fig. 2) has a highly complex, diverse socio-cultural environment with a huge range of talents, outlooks, cultures, backgrounds, languages, races and abilities. The school is situated in a picturesque valley in KwaZulu-Natal (Fig. 3).
It is a rural public boarding school on the property of the Catholic Church. The school has an enrolment of 320 learners (2013) who come from all over the province. An academic programme is offered from Grade 0 to Grade 12, and this programme aligns with the National Curriculum Policy and Assessment Statement (for example, Department of Basic Education, 2010), which is mandated for all mainstream schools nationally. Learner admissions start at age three since the school prioritises early intervention, in particular the early development of Sign Language. Learners continue with the academic programme and exit school after completing
Grade 12 with a National Senior Certificate. Learners who are unable to cope with the academic programme are offered a skills programme and exit with a National Qualification Certificate from an accredited College for the Deaf. The school is affiliated to the college and a satellite college is administered at the school.

The school serves the poorest of the poor in that most of the learners are from impoverished socio-economic backgrounds. This is evidenced in the inability of parents to pay the minimum school fees and to provide the basic requirements of learners, such as school uniforms and stationery. The school is largely dependent on sponsorships and fundraising to ensure access to quality education.

The staff component comprises 106 staff members in total, which includes teachers, support staff, administrative staff and hostel staff. The race groups comprise African, White, and Indian people. There is diversity in terms of language, with staff using English, isiZulu and Sign Language as means of communication. The staff members belong to various religious groupings, including Catholicism, Christianity, Hindu and Islam. The members of staff live in both rural and urban areas, with socio-economic backgrounds ranging from the lower socio-economic categories to middle class.

Our main role players at the school are the Roman Catholic Church, the provincial Department of Education, charitable organisations, non-government organisations (NGOs) and advocacy organisations for the Deaf. The school views parents as key role players. However, parental involvement in the education of the learners is minimal. One of the reasons is that parents do not live in close proximity to the school. As the school is a large residential school it serves learners from deep rural communities that are located up to 300 kilometres away. There are only eight schools for the Deaf in the province, the majority situated in urban or peri-urban areas. Thus, financial difficulties limit parents’ visits and involvement in the school. The school, however, works hard to meet the goal of working with parents as partners. Sign Language classes for parents are offered on a monthly basis. Early intervention programmes for Deaf children are available for parents with Deaf babies. Unfortunately these support initiatives are poorly

---

I acknowledge that the term ‘race’ and its categories ‘African’, ‘Coloured’, ‘Indian’ and ‘White’ are social constructions that served particular political agendas in the apartheid era. The fact that I use these terms in my thesis does not suggest that I accept the racist assumptions and beliefs underlying them. The terms are used to reflect the complex and differential manner in which apartheid had an impact (and continues to do so) on the lives of people in South Africa and various social institutions in the country.
attended. Many staff members perceive this as a lack of interest and tend to construct parents in a negative light. From a social-rights perspective, there have been questions raised by educationists about whether these large residential special schools are an ideal model for a more developing context such as South Africa, as such institutions place barriers upon and alienate parents and children from many of the communities they serve. From an early age children experience long periods of separation from parents, extended families and communities.

In the sections below I discuss briefly three dominant elements of diversity that shape the research context and bring out the complexity of diversity at Hilltop School: the Catholic ethos, culture and language.

### 2.5.2.1 Catholic/Christian ethos

The school was founded through the vision and guidance of the Catholic mission by His Grace Archbishop Dennis Hurley in 1981. The founding principal, staff and school governors were all people of the Catholic faith who promoted and maintained a strong Catholic culture. Prior to the first democratic elections in South Africa in 1994, which ended apartheid, schools were racially divided and Catholic schools were classified as independent schools. These independent schools were classified as such since they did not depend on government funding. As a result they determined their own policy of admission and religious practices. In keeping with the Catholic mission, Hilltop School was an independent school that served only the poor and marginalised and promoted a strong Catholic ethos. Funding was received from the Catholic Church.

The end of apartheid saw a search for a suitable new non-racial education system in South Africa. Numerous draft policies and commissions culminated in the South African Schools Act of 1996 (RSA, 1996b), which made provision for two types of schools, public and independent schools. Public schools can either be on state or private property. Independent schools in South Africa were given an opportunity to relinquish their financial obligations to the state while still maintaining ownership of the property. Hilltop School is built on the property of the Roman Catholic Church. The Church exercised the option of handing over the administration of the school to the Department of Education because of financial difficulties. A Deed of Agreement signed between the Catholic Church and the Department of Education in 2001, formalised the classification of Hilltop School as a public school on private property.
The Deed of Agreement ensures that the Catholic ethos of the school remains intact. The basic purpose of the agreement is to ensure that

the religious organisation and the governing body are committed to working as partners to ensure that the school offers education of excellence with a distinctive Catholic character from which all members of the school community, especially the learners, can benefit (CIE, 2004).

The distinctive Catholic character as stipulated in the agreement has three salient elements: the school must have a distinctive religious character, the school should be a real centre of care and the education must be valued-based. What makes a Catholic school different from other schools? According to the Catholic Institute of Education (CIE) it is the ethos that gives a Catholic school its distinctive character. The CIE explains this ethos in its Governance Handbook (2012):

When the school talks about ethos it is talking about all the things that make the school Catholic, that is the spirit of the school. Being a Catholic school is about more than just excellence in education. A Catholic school promotes and teaches the values of Jesus Christ as upheld by the Catholic Church, through its Religious Education programme. At the heart of Catholic values is the love of God and love of the neighbour. Catholic values hold that each person’s dignity is recognised and that children, the poor and marginalised deserve special care because they are the most vulnerable. Children of all faiths attend Catholic schools and are welcomed but they must recognise and accept that the school has a Catholic character (CIE, 2012, p. 19).

According to the CIE (2012, p. 21), a Catholic school must demonstrate its ethos by respecting the dignity of each person, building liturgy into its daily activities, being in harmony with the Catholic Church, reaching out to the vulnerable and marginalised, having a component of critical reflection and delivering a quality religious education.
Mullins (1983) reiterates that in order to establish a distinctive Catholic culture, the school community must have a value-based education programme, strive to offer excellent holistic education, demonstrate planned care and concern for all members of the school community, cater for the vulnerable, remain open to all regardless of status, race or religion and must promote and develop learners so that they can take their place as responsible citizens serving both the Catholic and wider community.

The Deed of Agreement emphasises that the religious character of the school must be maintained through religious observances and religious instruction: “In this way the uniqueness of Catholic education is preserved as religious education becomes a living reality at the heart of the school community” (CIE, 2004).

At Hilltop School, every attempt is made to honour the Deed of Agreement by promoting and maintaining a Catholic ethos (Figs 4 and 5). To this end religious education that is designed by the CIE is incorporated into the school curriculum. Catechism is also offered to all interested learners outside the school academic programme. In addition, pastoral care for both staff and learners is provided by trained pastoral counsellors who are trained by the Catholic Schools Office. Religious and pastoral care committees form an integral part of caring for the poor, vulnerable and marginalised, as well as ensuring that religious education and religious
observances are conducted within the required standards as set out in the Deed of Agreement. HIV/AIDS counselling and bereavement care are cornerstones of the pastoral care for both learners and staff.

**TOUCH OF LOVE**

By Christine Marot

It seemed rather appropriate that I should arrive at **School for the Deaf on Valentine’s Day**; a day on which the world celebrates love. Overlooking the Valley of a Thousand Hills in Inchanga, KwaZulu-Natal, the school welcomes visitors with neatly mown lawns, colourful flowerbeds and staff who clearly love what they do.

As I had expected, the classrooms were a lot quieter than those of hearing children, but there were frequent outbreaks of laughter and later the sound of music coming from the hall, where entertainment had been planned for the day. Children and teachers were colourfully dressed in red and white, but I was assured that they look much smarter in school uniform.

A strong Catholic ethos permeates the school which has a full boarding establishment and caters for more than 300 profoundly deaf learners from Grade 0 to Grade 12. A number of teachers are deaf, but weekly sign language classes are proving of great benefit in broadening the “vocabulary” of the 98-strong staff complement.

The children attending the school come from “the poorest of the poor” communities throughout KwaZulu-Natal, says Principal Lingan distraught Nadoo, who is of the firm conviction that her school provides “the best education for the deaf in KwaZulu-Natal”. Nadoo joined the school in 2000 as deputy and was promoted to principal the following year. With a wealth of experience in special education, she is well prepared to face the daily challenges associated with educating children who cannot hear.

The school provides the best education for the deaf in KwaZulu-Natal.

Highbury Preparatory School, a private establishment in Hillcrest, took on the role of caretaker of three years ago. Since then the school buildings have been painted, two dormitories have been renovated and the children have received donations of food and socks. "At Christmas time every child receives a present," says the principal, who gratefully welcomes every donation.

**Figure 5.** An extract published in a Catholic magazine encapsulating the ethos of our school.
Many dilemmas and complexities are experienced as we promote a strong Catholic culture at the school. Firstly, despite Hilltop being a Catholic school, most of the learners and staff are not Catholic. Learners and staff represent a diversity of religions: various other Christian denominations, Hinduism, Islam and Zulu traditional religion. Such religious diversity raises complex issues against the backdrop of promoting a Catholic culture. Many staff members are not always accepting of the exclusive promotion of the Catholic faith. However, since staff members are advised before employment at the school that the school has a Catholic ethos, many comply with this ethos. The need for secure employment takes precedence. The tensions that underlie the issue of religion will be returned to as my narrative unfolds in the ensuing chapters.

2.5.2.2 Deaf culture and its complexities

The majority of the school population at Hilltop School are Deaf learners and a significant number of Deaf staff (Fig. 6). Deaf staff members are employed both as teachers and support staff. Many are employed as teacher aids, hostel staff, kitchen staff and maintenance staff. The Deaf staff members exert a strong influence on all aspects of the school life and ensure that the rights of the Deaf are always promoted and protected.

Figure 6. Learners being taught in Sign Language.
Literature on Deaf culture and Deaf identity is very limited internationally, and has been difficult to access; hence, many of the key sources I use would be considered dated. There is a very small emerging body of research in South Africa (for example, Ram & Muthukrishna, 2011; Akach, 2010; Aarons & Akach, 2002). I provide some perspectives on Deaf culture and Deaf identity by drawing on the research I was able to access.

Deaf culture can be described as a distinctive culture that is underpinned by a social, communal and creative presence that is strongly linked to language (Ladd, 2003a). However, critics have pointed out that Deaf culture can be complex and difficult to define, and the meanings and constructions of Deaf culture are not fixed. All Deaf people are deaf by virtue of the physical and physiological description of not being able to hear. This conceptualisation cannot be denied since it is this understanding that attributes meaning to deafness (Heap & Morgans, 2006; Haualand & Allen, 2009; Arroyo, 2011). However, there are the Deaf who identify themselves as Deaf as a consequence of their linguistic or cultural allegiance, and there are those who identify themselves as deaf because of their physiological loss. Pickersgill (1998) emphasises that Deaf people are members of a minority group and are identified as this minority specifically through their Sign Language and Deaf culture. A critical issue is that to the majority of Deaf people, deafness is not a deficit but a cultural identity (Heap & Morgans, 2006; Haualand & Allen, 2009). Deaf people consider themselves to be a minority culture that has the foundational physiological condition of deafness and elect to set themselves apart from the dominant hearing culture (Ladd, 2003a). This forms the foundation for the construction of deafness as a cultural phenomenon and not a physical impairment.

Sign Language is central to and deeply rooted in Deaf culture. Sign Language exists as a mother-tongue for Deaf cultures internationally. In South Africa, South African Sign Language (SASL) is the recognised language for the Deaf. However, the perception that all Deaf people subscribe to the norms and values of the Deaf culture has been questioned. There are Deaf people who choose not to separate themselves from the hearing culture. They choose the oral form of communication and exclude themselves from Sign Language and hence Deaf culture. There are also those who are happy to vacillate between both cultures and live in both worlds.

The Deaf cultural community is defined prominently by the way in which the ‘D’ in Deaf is used. Internationally there is a broad acceptance among deaf people that ‘Deaf’ (with a capital letter ‘D’) is linked to a unique social identity with strong allegiance to a specific social group and to supporting the use of Sign Language. The writing of “deaf” (with a small letter ‘d’) is used by most academics and medical professionals to imply a definition based on medical descriptions of
deafness as measured against the ‘norm’ of hearing. The ‘lower case’ deaf community relies on oral styles of communication such as lip reading or speaking, rather than on Sign Language (Bat-Chava, 2000; Ladd, 2003a). Throughout this dissertation the word deaf will be used with a capital ‘D’, and D/deaf will be used specifically in the context described above.

Scholars argue that there is always a potential for conflict in terms of language and cultural allegiance since the Deaf do not live exclusively within their own culture. Despite the fact that many are in residential schools, one cannot deny that the presence of hearing people in their everyday environment influences their lives.

2.5.2.2.1 The role of the school in the transmission of Deaf culture

It is my contention that Deaf culture does not originate in the context of families and homes, but instead it originates in schools for the Deaf. Hilltop School, like most other schools for the Deaf, is residential in nature. Deaf learners begin their schooling at a very early age, usually at around three years old. It is in the school context that the Deaf are socialised into the behaviour patterns, values, norms and communication modes of the Deaf (Leigh, 2009; Ladd, 2003a). Bat-Chava (2000) emphasises that Deaf culture is unique in that unlike hearing cultures that transmit traditions from adults to children, the traditions of Deaf culture are transmitted from learner to learner, or from Deaf adult to Deaf learner/child as they co-exist mutually in classrooms and residential schools. These learners may vary in terms of their age, gender, race, social class, and religious and political affiliations, but show spontaneous and natural unanimity in their allegiance to the practices of Deaf culture (Ram & Muthukrishna, 2011). In my own experience, I have witnessed younger learners depending on older learners for support and companionship during their pre-school years. I have witnessed older learners unintentionally enabling and encouraging younger learners to learn the language, customs and values of Deaf culture.

In addition, for Deaf children life in the school dormitory is a very important aspect of their schooling. Ladd (2003a) maintains that it is in the context of life in the dormitories that learners are away from the structured control of the classroom and are introduced to the social life of Deaf people. Leigh (2009) points out that this may be understood as a peer-promoted culture and is an important part of the dynamics of Deaf culture. At Hilltop School, hostel life has a great impact on the environment of the school.
2.5.2.2 The role of mentorship for the Deaf

Internationally documented statistics reveal that more than 90% of D/deaf children are born to families with little or no experiences of deafness (Aarons & Akach, 2002; Heap & Morgans, 2006; Akach, 2010). Therefore, Patkin (2011) advocates that role modelling and mentorship are an integral part of the dynamics of Deaf culture. Like everyone else, the Deaf need inspiration and motivation to believe that they can succeed, especially if they are born to hearing parents whom they often view as different from themselves. He emphasises that it is important for young Deaf people to have Deaf role models who have been through similar life experiences, since many parents of Deaf children not only have limited experiences with deafness, but also lack an understanding of early childhood education and especially the importance of language acquisition.

Research by Foster & MacLeod (2004) further illustrates the integral role of mentorship in Deaf culture. They conducted a study of D/deaf graduates from the Rochester Institute in New York who became supervisors in primary hearing settings. Results of the study indicated that having a Deaf mentor was a primary and persistent element in their career success. Participants reported that having a Deaf mentor enabled them to break through barriers to career success in spite of experiencing various limitations to their skills and abilities. Research findings from the University of Utah, U.S.A also demonstrated that children (from birth to five years) who were part of a three-year mentorship programme gained significantly from having Deaf mentors. Diagnostic tests conducted on a six-month basis demonstrated that children with Deaf mentors showed greater gains in receptive and expressive language and performed better on other linguistic tests (including English grammar tests) than those children without mentors (Watkins, Pittman and Walden, 1998).

Thus mentorship can be viewed as being integral to the learning context of Hilltop School.

2.5.2.3 Zulu culture: a complicated issue at Hilltop School

At Hilltop School the majority of the members of staff are from the Zulu ethnic group. The learners are all Deaf and belong to the Zulu ethnic group. Although learners consider their dominant culture to be Deaf culture, they also incorporate Zulu culture. As a result, the general socio-cultural context of the school is also largely influenced and shaped by Zulu culture as a secondary culture.
Zulu people are considered to be an ethnic group in South Africa. The Zulus are one of the largest ethnic groups in the country and are descendants of the Nguni tribe who migrated south from central to East Africa to settle in the South African province of KwaZulu-Natal. Since the inception of apartheid legislation and policies in South Africa, people have been categorised and officially classified in terms of their ‘race’. Four major race groups were identified: Whites, Indians, Coloureds and Black. Over the past fifty years the labels of these categories have changed. For example, Indians were referred to as Asians and Africans were referred to as Native, Bantu or Africans. Africans were further categorised into cultural and ethnic groups such as Venda, Xhosa and Zulu. The main reason for the differentiation was essentially to fulfil one of the primary objectives of apartheid: to relegate the African population of South Africa to ‘homelands’, with each homeland being designated for a particular ethnic African group. The racial classification of South Africans influenced every aspect of their lives: where they lived, where they attended school, who they interacted with, what they had access to and their social relations (May, 2004; Hall & Carter, 2006; Leach, Behrens & LeFleur, 2002).

One of the most prominent aspects of the school culture is language. Hall and Carter (2006) point out that culture and language are part of the same system of meaning and that language is an integral part of any culture. Hence, as discussed earlier in this chapter, Sign Language is the language of the Deaf but English is the business and written language of the school. isiZulu, which is the third language, is used mostly by staff and parents for communication. Learners use Sign Language as their mother tongue and English as their first additional language, despite the fact that they all belong to the Zulu ethnic group.

Since the majority of staff are Zulu, isiZulu is a spoken language at the school. At meetings and in the classrooms, Sign Language and English are used. isiZulu is often the language of choice at all social events, for example religious services, staff parties and other social functions. In addition, a large number of the non-academic staff have a limited understanding of English and use isiZulu as their main form of communication. As a result, there is a dependence not only on Sign Language interpreters but also interpreters for English-speaking staff, who are a minority.
Zulu songs and dance, which are an integral part of Zulu culture, feature prominently at all school functions (Figs 7 and 8) and it is through these forms of expression that Zulu values and norms are passed on to the learners from an early age.

Figure 7. Learners in Zulu attire.

Figure 8. Modelling our cultural traditions, norms and values.
Hostel staff also play an influential role in the transmission of Zulu traditions and values. The fact that all hostel staff who play a paternal role are from the Zulu ethnic group reinforces the Zulu culture at the school. It is in this way that Zulu culture becomes an integral part of the lives of learners from an early age. However, I have observed that although Deaf and Zulu culture are acquired simultaneously, Deaf culture remains the dominant culture for learners at Hilltop School.

Concluding thoughts

It is clear that the very complex and diverse context of my study has had a direct impact on my understanding of my leadership, and how I experience it. It takes effort and commitment from the leadership and management of the school to manage diversity. My readings have illuminated for me some of the issues related to the issue of diversity and school leadership. Research internationally and in South Africa has demonstrated that schools that serve highly diverse populations have many inherent conflicting cultures, each of which has an impact on the general socio-cultural context (Aleman, 2009; Brown, 2010; Chao, Wei, Good & Flores, 2011; Arnold, 2005; Petersen, 2008). According to complexity leadership theories, leaders must work with complexity and not try to reduce it (Olmedo, 2012). Brown (2010) emphasises that a school that accepts diversity and recognises the contributions of all the people in it is healthier and more productive than a school that does not. Schools that treat the diversity of their people as a strength are better able to adapt to the changes taking place in the rest of society, achieve their goals and objectives, and provide a richer learning and working environment for all its members (Olmedo, 2012; Lim, 2009).

The complexities and tensions that arise out of this diverse environment are elaborated on in my narrative.

2.5.3 Data-generation methods

The main source of my data was my narrative, which formed the basis of my study. It spans the period from the time I was appointed as deputy principal to the present, and includes my interview for the post of deputy principal. I explored significant nodal points in my life and depended primarily on personal memory as I tried to chronicle the past. Inventorying and self-visualising were techniques that I used to evoke my memory.
There is a growing body of research in South Africa in the area of visual research methodologies, and many of the scholars use memory work as a methodological tool (for example, Mitchell, Strong-Wilson, Pithouse & Allnutt, 2011; Hemson, 2012; Masinga, 2012; Pattman, 2012; Pithouse-Morgan, Mitchell & Pillay, 2012). Discussions of memory work have also emerged from the feminist epistemological critique of the traditional positioning of the scientific researcher as an objective and distanced observer of the social world and object of study (Jansson, Wendt & Ase, 2008). The method was intended to promote research practices that relate to women as subjects and not as objects, where closeness, experience and subjectivity are valued as opposed to objectivity, control and distance. Epistemologically, memory work rests on the position that social reality is established and reproduced by individuals in the lived practices of everyday life. This aligns very well with the ontological and epistemological position I took in my study.

The primary objective of memory work is self-knowledge (Schratz & Walker, 1995). Onyx and Small (2001) explain that “subjectively significant events, events which are remembered, and the way they are subsequently constructed play an important part in the construction of self” (p. 774). Hamerton (2001) explains that memory-work “enables people to make explicit the ways in which experiences and identities are constructed within particular socio-cultural settings” (p. 414). In the recall of my memories I discovered that I engaged in a dialogue with my memories, talked to them, challenged them, and responded to them. In remembering and reflecting on events, actions, situations, critical incidents and episodes, I found I was reflecting on my identity as a school leader and its formation in a particular socio-cultural context.

Berg (2008) explains that “memory work invites us into a room where reflections on knowledge production can inspire new ideas” (p. 224). I looked forward to this potential of memory work at the start of my study.

My research was in a sense collaborative memory work with the aim of reflecting on my subjectivity in collaboration with critical co-researchers and critical friends in particular social spaces of the school at which I am a leader. Schratz & Walker (1995) explain that collaborative memory work involves “ways of thinking about the self, and changing the self, that are socially rather than individually located” (p. 61).

During this recollection and writing, it was easy to recall vividly my story at times but at other times it was difficult and complex. However, I was aware that the aim of memory work is not necessarily to produce authentic knowledge, but rather to engage in present-day interpretations.
of past events and experiences (Berg, 2008). Berg argues that recounting experience is never authentic, in the sense that it would be innocent, clear-cut, or straightforward. Recounting experience is complex and is about “impossible encounters and connections, about possibilities of making a difference in terms of knowledges and better politics” (Scott 1992, p. 218).

As I recalled and often relived nodal moments, I was strangely surprised by the emotions that they awakened in me. Berg (2008) explains that memory work can stir complex emotions such as uneasiness, regret, pain, guilt and shame. There were many times when I felt that what I had challenged or accomplished was unbelievable in the sense that my own courage/foolishness, perseverance and resilience seemed unrecognisable by me. I was often confronted with the dilemma of whether I was merely foolish and fearless, or determined and driven. Writing my story, therefore, became a very emotional experience for me and it often evoked fears within me. I often stopped to wonder what my predicament would have been had events and goals turned out differently.

In addition I was unprepared for the conflicting emotions and ‘roller coaster’ feelings that I frequently experienced when I was reflexive in terms of my leadership enactments. Confronting some of my actions made me feel regret and sometimes shame as I faced the possibility that my own fears and insecurities had propelled me to achieve certain goals at the expense of the feelings of staff. My own agenda seemed to have taken precedence over all others. This made me feel uncomfortable in retrospect. At times I felt sad when I realised that I had negated the feelings of others and I questioned whether my actions were self-serving.

My insecurities came to the fore as I confronted the reflections of others on my leadership behaviours. I recall feeling intense anxiety whenever I heard or read the reflections or co-narratives of other members of staff. I often found that the judgements and scrutiny of others, which included my PhD cohort group members, staff members, critical friends and my supervisor, filled me with trepidation and dread. The vulnerability that I experienced when my own memories were up for interrogation at cohort meetings was hard to manage.

Focus group sessions with participants often evoked difficult and uncomfortable emotions in me. This collective interrogation of memories was difficult and created tensions and frustration within me (Berg, 2008). Cornforth, White, Milligan & Claiborne (2009) emphasise that subjecting the rewriting of your memories to interrogation disrupts the coherence of the stable subject from whom evidence is collected. It was in these moments of my research journey that I experienced regret for choosing autoethnography as my methodology, and felt demotivated.
In addition, chronicling my story became a challenge as many developments, changes and innovations at the school were happening concurrently. To assist in this regard I depended on log book entries, school magazines, minutes of meetings (especially staff and SGB meetings) and journal entries, as well as information from various members of staff who were involved in particular projects. Often this proved difficult as many staff members did not keep timeous records and confused me even further with their own recollections. My deputy principal often came to my rescue as she had always filed her documents meticulously for the past six years, and had paid attention to details such as dates. Using all this information, I constructed a timeline to assist my narrative development.

At the time that I decided to use autoethnography as my method of study, I started a reflexive journal and made a concerted effort to write every day. This proved to be an invaluable source of data as I wrote my story, particularly when I recalled emotional events that had shaped me. However, writing every day became a struggle. My aim was to make regular reflective notes at the end of each day. However, at times I found that I could not meet this commitment after an emotionally draining day at the school. In addition, as I wrote accounts of nodal moments in my journal, I realised that I was tapping into the emotions generated by embodied memories. However, observing, writing and thinking about my own feelings, assumptions and actions provided invaluable sources of data.

Using co-constructed narratives was a technique that I used to obtain additional data. According to Grossi (2006), the goal of a co-constructed narrative is to represent the experiences of partners. The two storytellers (researcher and partner) become co-authors. I used the two deputy principals and a Level One teacher to co-narrate with me. In this regard it was surprising to note that often the stories they told were very different from my version. I also had difficulty with one of my co-narrators, who was always happy to talk and discuss events but was not at ease with writing. He often remarked that he ‘hated writing’ and it was not his strength. Hence, he agreed to co-narrate on condition that his contribution would be oral and that I was to be the scribe. However, he refused to allow our conversations to be audio-taped. This became a limitation in my study as I was never certain about whether I had accurately captured everything that he had narrated. I did have the advantage of revisiting issues with him at various points.

Data was also produced through semi-structured interviews. These were face-to-face interviews with selected educators and key stakeholders involved in the school. My positionality as principal of the school created tensions. In my initial discussions of the study with them, I could sense that some of the staff I had planned to interview felt that if they were negative and honest, they
would be victimised. They felt obliged to narrate only positive achievements and accounts. Thus, the process was complicated as I was both the subject of the research as well as the researcher, and the person in the principal’s office. To overcome this I engaged a neutral researcher to conduct the interviews. I also took the stance with them that I wanted their honest lived experiences of me as the school leader, and that their rich authentic perspectives would enhance my study.

My other sources of data included newspaper articles and magazines that featured the school, certificates of accomplishments, congratulatory letters, and photographs, as well as video recordings of special events.

### 2.5.4 Data analysis

Smith and Sparkes (2006) postulate that narrative analysis should include stories as data. The aim is to try to understand human experience and/or social phenomena through the form and content of stories that are treated as textual units. The analysis focuses on the sequence of elements of the story, on why some elements are evaluated differently from others, how the past shapes constructions of the present, how the present shapes constructions of the past, and how both shape constructions of the future (Squire, 2008). Key scholars in the field of data analysis are Connelly and Clandinin (2006), who propose a three-dimensional research framework that can be used to analyse narrative data. This framework places *temporality* (past, present and future), *sociality* (social and personal) and *place* (situation) on each of the three axes.

Other scholars such as Mishler (1991) and Riessman (1993) place emphasis on temporality, time and place, plot, scene and the voice of the researcher as situated in multiple contexts. Polkinghorne (1988) suggests that people tend to organise their temporal experiences, and that patterns or themes (sets of patterns) may be identified that people use to unite the events of their lives. Similarly, various metaphors may be identified through which subjects organize their stories (as in in the studies by Grossi, 2006; Hendry, 2005; Harrison, 2009; and DeLong, 2000).

In my study, the examination of nodal moments of my life in my narrative allowed me to construct patterns of experience in order to enable the reader to see me and my socio-cultural context more clearly (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001).
I used certain analytical and interpretative strategies suggested by Chang (2008). These included the following strategies: searching for recurring topics, themes and patterns; looking for cultural themes; identifying exceptional occurrences; analysing inclusion and omission; connecting the present with the past; analysing relationships between self and others; comparing oneself with other people’s cases; contextualising broadly; comparing with social science constructs and ideas; and framing with theories.

As I reviewed my reflections and those of others, I marked segments of the data with themes, for example, *no consultation with staff, disregard of staff relations, task focused*. I then grouped all the themes together into a larger category, for example *leadership styles, diversity, social rights*. I rearranged these categories in a way that allowed for comparison between issues in the same category. This categorisation enabled me to understand the data in context, through trying to identify relationships among the different elements of the data. As suggested by Chang (2008), I used a method called ‘zooming in and zooming out’ to pay attention to small details in the data (zooming in) and at times I had to ‘zoom out’ so that I could get a broad context or a ‘bird’s eye’ view of the data. In this way I was able to see how my own story was related to others and how the past “left traces in the present” (Chang, 2008, p. 129).

Using theories as a framework for data analysis and interpretation was another strategy that I employed. Theories are considered to be explaining tools (Creswell, 1998). In my own narrative I used identity theory as a lens through which to analyse my data. Using this theory I placed under scrutiny my various subject positions that I held/hold, and examined the discourses and discursive practices that produced, constructed and reconstructed my identity. I looked at moments of accommodation/challenge and resistance indicative of identity work (McCormick, 2008).

Chang, Hernandez and Ngunjiri (2010) emphasise that fundamental to autoethnography is the connectivity between self and others. To this end I searched for similarities between myself and others as well as differences between myself and others. Similar others, for example principals of other Deaf schools, made me ask pertinent questions such as, what binds us together? What is the relationship between myself and these others? Similar others and different others helped me to see myself more clearly by comparing our sets of values, beliefs and identities.

In addition, analysis of the interviews and journals of those who formed part of my group of ‘critical friends’ formed an integral part of my data analysis. Over and above narrative analysis, document analysis was used, which includes articles, poetry, photographs, diaries, newspaper
articles, and school policies to enhance the narrative, as well as co-constructed narratives. All these techniques assisted me in creating a coherent story and in making cultural sense of my data.

2.6 Summary

In this chapter I have explained my selection of autoethnography as the method of research to explore my research questions. I further discussed the suitability of autoethnography in the context of self-study as a method, highlighting its limitations and benefits.

Identity theory from a poststructuralist perspective was explained as a lens for analysis. This theory has facilitated a thorough interrogation of my identity formation and has enabled me to depict myself as having multiple selves, with inherent paradoxes, contradictions and ambiguities. My research design, data-generation methods and data analysis were also explained.

The next chapter is the beginning of my narrative, which discusses my nodal experiences as the person in the principal’s office, reflecting on my initial understanding of leadership during my first years at Hilltop School for the Deaf. What I have included in my autoethnography are slices of my life as a leader. It would be impossible to tell the whole story in the context of this thesis. Consequently I have made a choice to share a few snippets of my enactments as a leader.
CHAPTER 3

THROUGH THE LOOKING GLASS: Navigating My Initial Years at Hilltop School for the Deaf

'I can't go back to yesterday because I was a different person then. How puzzling all these changes are! I'm never sure what I'm going to be from one minute to another.'

(Lewis Carroll, Through the Looking Glass)

3.1. Introduction

In the next four chapters I narrate my leadership journey as the principal of Hilltop School for the Deaf. As outlined in Chapter One, the looking glass provides the tool for me to reflexively go back to my leadership over the past ten years, examine, re-examine, interpret and re-interpret my leadership practices, and make sense of my identity as the person in the principal’s office. Like Alice, my initial reaction when facing obstacles was “That’s impossible”, but as I tell and retell my story I realise that I am similar to the White Queen who believes in accomplishing the ‘impossible’. Thus the following four chapters are in many ways my story of what I believe to be my engagement and absorption with the ‘impossible’ within a unique and diverse socio-cultural school community.

In this chapter I trace my development from teacher to deputy principal to principal within a two-year period. I examine the language barriers I faced, the change initiatives I proposed and the changes I enacted during those two years. The quote above is indicative of the many ways in which my identity was constituted and reconstituted within this particular environment in the context of the various transformative initiatives. Poststructuralist identity theorists have argued that identity is produced and reproduced relationally, and its boundaries are continually recharted and renegotiated (Foucault, 1979; Lather, 1991). As I look into the mirror, it simultaneously resembles me and then never resembles me again. The process of going back not only reflects who I was, but also illustrates that change is a continuous and often contradictory process; hence, I am not the same person that I was even a minute ago.
3.2. My first impossible thing: being appointed deputy principal

My encounter with impossible things began in 1999 when I applied for the post of deputy principal at Hilltop School for the Deaf. I knew that I did not fulfil the criteria for such a high-level management post. I was just a teacher at a prevocational special school at the time with no management experience in the traditional sense. But I had a yearning for change. I felt I was trapped in a ‘stuck’ school that could not implement change or build a professional learning community (Rosenholtz, 1989). I dreamed of being in a management position and being involved with innovation, visionary planning and policy making. I admit that coupled with this yearning was a deep sense of trepidation.

The impetus came in September 1999 when my husband, also a teacher, made the decision to apply for promotion. While I was assisting my husband with his application, I began to take a deeper look at myself, my future career and what I hoped to achieve in life. These reflections seemed to have served as a major catalyst for me. I recalled a model for change that remained with me from my psychology studies at university. Beckhard (1969) proposed three conditions necessary for one to recognise a need for change. These are dissatisfaction in the present situation, a vision of what is possible or could be possible in the future and clear, visible first steps to reach the vision. As I re-lived and reflected on Beckhard’s ideas, I felt an awakening, a new dawning.

I was ready to take the first step to effect change in my career. Scott and Jaffe (2004) argue that change can be unexpected and sudden or it can be carefully planned. They maintain that unplanned change is usually accompanied by fear and anxiety. Ash (2007) emphasises that resistance to change is normal and cites old habits, no control, insecurity and being worn out as some possible reasons for resistance. Fisher’s (2012) process of personal change points out that personal change involves anxiety, unhappiness, fear, threat, guilt and depression. Fisher maintains that one firstly has to recognise these emotions and then find ways of dealing with them. Hajek (2010) contends that there are a variety of reasons why people fear change. He proposes that lack of knowledge and not perceiving a need for change are the main reasons why one remains complacent about the possibilities for change. In retrospect, I can see that these theoretical understandings in literature did indeed underpin my need for change. At this time I did not have this theoretical knowledge about personal change but knew for certain that I wanted a change in my career and was acutely aware of my fears and anxieties. Despite the tensions and my doubts and fears I decided to apply for a promotion post. Having made the decision, I was clear about the post for which I would aim. Being a post Level 1 teacher implied
that my next step of progression would be a Level 2 post, which is a management position with the title of head of department (HOD). The chief role of an HOD is to manage the curriculum within a particular phase of the school, for example, from Grade 1 to Grade 4. Although this was my next step of progression, I felt certain that this was not the route I wanted to follow. I was definitely not aiming for such a position because I did not want to be restricted to curriculum issues only. My thinking at the time was that the curriculum is influenced by a network of other factors.

Instead, I decided to apply for a post Level 3 position, which is the post of deputy principal at a school. The reason for my decision was that I aspired to be involved in the organisational and administrative functioning of the school as an institution. This included critical decision making and policy development at school level. Clear in my decision, and with the full knowledge that I was not eligible for such a post, I applied to the Hilltop School for the Deaf for the position of deputy principal. In the weeks that followed I agonised over my action. I had sleepless nights, constantly turning over in my mind a multitude of questions: Did I have the capabilities to take on a leadership role? Would my inexperience and lack of qualifications in Deaf education have a negative impact on my leadership role? Did I have the knowledge and skills to build a professional community? Did I have the mind-set to manage the complexities of institutional change? How would staff react if I was promoted from post Level 1 to post Level 3? Would I be able to deal with resistance? Did I have the personality characteristics of a good leadership, such as openness and flexibility? On reflection, I can see that my thinking at the time was rather linear and deterministic.

I was indeed surprised, a few weeks later, when I was requested to make myself available for an interview for the post. I was amazed to learn that I had been short-listed but I had certain questions: Why did they short-list me? Why did they think I was eligible? However, I was elated, and my fears and doubts just dissipated. I was going to do this! I would give this my best shot! I had a renewed sense of confidence in myself.

I recall my interview experience quite vividly. With very little clarity in terms of physical directions to the school, I set out optimistically and in high spirits. Upon arrival at the school I was surprised not only by the huge buildings but also that it was a residential school. The reception from the staff at the school was very warm. I recall a particular member of staff who welcomed me by stating that he was certain I would be the next deputy principal at the school and that he would see me the following year. Oddly, this unnerved me as I could not decide whether he was patronising me, was teasing me or was just being friendly. Although I could not
ascertain his motive, his words stuck with me and became rather prophetic. I was successful in the interview and became deputy principal the following year (2000).

During my interview, I was strangely calm. On recollection I remember walking into the room and being surprised to find a large interview panel. There were approximately fifteen people around the table, the majority of whom were white men. In addition I registered surprise to see that the principal was a relatively young Black African woman. My great surprise and astonishment, however, was seeing Archbishop Dennis Hurley (Fig. 9), who was not only the chairperson of the interview panel but also the chairperson of the board of management at the school.

![Figure 9. Archbishop Dennis Hurley with Pope John Paul II.](image)

On 19 March 1947, Denis Eugene Hurley OMI was consecrated bishop, at the age of thirty-one he became the youngest in the world. In 1951, he became the first Archbishop of Durban. As a pastor, an anti-apartheid activist, an ecumenist and a liturgist, Archbishop Hurley has left a deep mark on the Church and the society of his times. He is also known as a man of great compassion, which was clear from his establishment of and support for the Hilltop School for the Deaf. His reputation has gone far beyond the boundaries of South Africa, particularly after the Second Vatican Council in which he participated actively and which he regarded as the greatest experience of his life. It was largely due to his influence that the Southern African Catholic Bishops ‘Conference, which elected him several times as president (Kearney, 2008).
Archbishop Dennis Hurley was a very significant South African leader who was known for his undying commitment to the values of social justice, freedom and peace. I had always admired the Archbishop for his active stand against apartheid in South Africa during my university years. This was the first time that I saw him in such close proximity, and I was in awe of him. The interview took on a new dimension for me as I wanted to impress Archbishop Hurley. When I recall that moment, I can admit that I became consumed with a determination to make a good impression. More than anything else I wanted to be part of Archbishop Hurley’s team. I wished for the ‘impossible things’!

During the interview I found the questions to be very demanding and at times perplexing. The panel focused on specific skills and responsibilities that are required at a senior management level. The following are some of the questions that stand out: How would you fulfil the vision of the school? How would you motivate and discipline staff at the school? What would you do to ensure that the school forms a partnership with the community? How would you supplement the resources of the school?

I found the first question very unnerving as I had no idea of how to conceptualise a vision for a school about which I knew so little. However, I responded from my own lived experience as a teacher. I stressed that a key component of a school’s vision should be to access equitable and quality education for the Deaf learners so that the Deaf could become independent, productive and contributing members of society. I then outlined the principles and strategies related to how I would achieve this. A key principle I articulated was that I would avoid the binary categorisation of learners as ‘special’ as opposed to ‘mainstream’. In the democratic South Africa at the time, key debates in education foregrounded the social rights of all learners, irrespective of diversity.

The discourse of the labelling and categorisation of learners was contested in education policy debates. I was aware that discourses that focused on perceived deficits from a medical orientation often led to low expectations for learners who are categorised with different ‘special’ needs. I was aware of the urgent need to interrogate constructions of ‘special’ children in the education sector as a homogeneous group who could not achieve academically, as that type of thinking often results in a ‘watered down’ curriculum. My premise was that all children can learn and achieve to their highest potential, and they therefore had the right to equitable, quality education — an imperative enshrined in our Constitution. One of my critical friends made the comment that it seems as if I was influenced by the discourses of social rights, social justice, and
equity and quality education for all that were prevalent at that early stage of policy development in the new South Africa. On reflection, I tend to agree that the subject positions I took at the time were rights-based, in line with post-apartheid debates, and that this may have emerged in my interview. Stoddard (2007) argues that an individual’s sense of self or subjectivity, and the subject positions he or she takes, are shaped through a range of intersecting discourses.

As I have explained, I had no previous experience in a management position and had limited theoretical knowledge and insights about leadership and management. During the interview I had to depend on my own past lived experiences as a teacher and on my engagement with school management to respond to the questions. I also drew on my experience as a teacher leader at my school and on my leadership position that I held in my church. For example, I was the head of the curriculum, sport and extra-curricular committees. I was the staff representative on the school management committee and on the SGB. I was also the coordinator of the leadership programme for learners at the school. In addition, I was the music and worship leader in my church. I recall now that at the interview I interrogated my leadership practices as a teacher and church leader, and the principles that were embedded in them. This informed my responses and the arguments I presented at the interview. Figure 10 shows an article that encapsulates my leadership in the church, and Appendix 3 contains the curriculum vitae I submitted with my application that summarises my teacher leadership.
Profile on ...

MAVIS NAIDOO
- John Hornby

The day that Mavis Naidoo was born, is the same day that the word “Dynamic” became part of the English language.

Born to be a leader, ready to face any challenge, Mavis took charge of the Praise and Worship Group at a time when St. Augustine’s seemed ready to implode upon itself.

Showing great skill, courage and tenacity, Mavis transformed the music group and has raised the whole group to new heights. The Taize services and our Carol Services, Easter and Christmas Services delighted all who attended and took part in these services.

The image of a dynamo is one of someone who comes in like a whirlwind and re-arranges everything. However, there is another side to Mavis that those privileged to work closely with her are allowed to see. This is the compassionate, loving, caring Christian lady who hates conflict.

A lady who opens her heart to those around her.

In the music group there is a family within a family. A group of people who love one another, who work together, loving each other, and sharing their love of Jesus. Mavis engendered this, showing the loving side of a beautiful human being.

Yes, Mavis does speak her mind, and no she will not back down when she believes she is right. If you want someone sincere, someone positive, someone who puts words into action, then Mavis Naidoo is the dynamic leader we all need.

Figure 10. Article in church chronicle.

---

3 Mavis is my unofficial middle name
After the interview I had coffee at a nearby cafe in a magnificent setting overlooking a picturesque valley with the most breath-taking views, located near the school (Fig. 11).

Figure 11. The picturesque valley located near the school.

It was in this setting that I allowed myself to be transported to a world of belief in impossible things. I imagined myself as the deputy principal of Hilltop School for the Deaf: action initiator, risk taker, a visionary leader! I thought to myself, what endless possibilities could lie before me? Was this the beginning of my dream about impossible things? I felt inspired. I awoke from my day dream and set off for home.

As I immersed myself in this autoethnographic study I constantly searched for answers to the source of my belief in impossible things. What started my belief in impossible things? What made me want to believe that I could be promoted despite the odds being stacked against me? What inspired my renewed confidence in myself and my wish to be promoted? As I engaged with literature during this study, searching for answers to these questions, I learned that inspiration and beliefs are linked. Brunton (1998) argues that intuition comes from a person’s mind and it is a stepping stone to inspiration, which in turn leads to beliefs. Brunton contends that inspiration can be experienced in different types of human activity, for example in any decision that involves family, career or personal growth.
My further reading exposed me to Edgerton’s (2007) theory of inspiration. Edgerton portrays ‘inspiration’ as a metaphor or an adjective that is used to describe the kind of greatness that can be achieved just by using the power of the mind. He views inspiration as an enigma, a projection, a paragon, a priori and essentially subjective. He maintains that this greatness can be achieved in a conscious way, emanating from a person’s own mind.

According to Edgerton (2007), inspiration does not come from repeated practice but is “breathed in from somewhere, sub-consciously, to the heart”. Dodd (2006) supports this view and maintains that the power of belief is based on inspiration. He emphasises that belief based on inspiration is the key to authority and personal power.

As I read this theory of inspiration I wondered if intuition and inspiration were the source of my indulgence in the belief in impossible things? Was I inspired to believe? If so, what inspired me? What made me feel a new awakening? Was this my first step to believing in impossible things both for myself and Deaf learners? Was this belief going to be the key to my leadership practices if I was appointed to the post? I engaged with these questions in different ways as I wrote my narrative and wondered about the belief in impossible things in Through the Looking Glass.

The results of the deputy principal promotion posts were announced in January 2000 by the provincial Department of Education (Fig. 12). We received the joyous news on the same day that my husband was promoted to Head of Department at his school. A week after the announcements I received a telephone call from the principal of Hilltop School congratulating me and requesting me to report for duty in a few days. I was astounded — the achievement of my first ‘impossible thing’!

My initial thoughts shifted to my interview. How had I been perceived and constructed by the panel? What influenced the decision to appoint me? Why had I been selected despite what I had perceived to be the odds against me? How had I convinced the panel to choose me? What capabilities had they seen in me? Had all the panel members been supportive of the decision? How had the school principal voted? My interview with the former principal in the course of this study revealed the following:
Figure 12. Letter of appointment as deputy principal.
Mavis: How did you feel when you heard the news that I was appointed as your deputy?

Principal C: I was disappointed. I was expecting the previous acting deputy principal to be appointed. But she was appointed to another school. I had worked with her for many years. Because you came from another school I saw you as an outsider and I had no idea what to expect from you. And I was worried that you were an Indian.

Mavis: Why did my being Indian worry you?

Principal C: From my experiences with Indians at other Deaf schools I understood them to feel that they knew more than anyone else and they like giving instructions and telling people what to do. So I had the expectation that you were going to come and behave like a queen expecting everyone to do what you tell them.

(Principal, August 2012)

Subsequent discussions with other members of staff confirmed that many staff members were disappointed with my appointment as the new deputy principal. It was revealed that they would have preferred someone from within the school. They considered me an outsider and my race was an issue for many. Two teachers had this to say:

We had never worked with an Indian before. So we were worried that you will think that you were better than us, and you will expect us to be like you. We also know Indians to make us work hard and treat Black people badly. So we were really worried when we heard that you were coming to our school.

(Teacher, Nelisiwe, August 2012)

When I saw a young Indian lady on the first day I was really worried. You did not look like you will be able to manage a senior management position. I believed that you would have a problem with our culture and you will bring Indian culture into the school. I also did not think that as an Indian you will survive. You also looked very young and inexperienced.

(Member of school management, Sithole, August 2012)

I realise now that my social identity categories of race (being Indian) and age would have affected the attitudes of certain staff members towards me in those early days. It is interesting that my gender did not seem to matter to those I interviewed. On reflection I understand that ‘race’ would have been an issue given the legacy of the apartheid past in South Africa. Four legislated identity categories were entrenched by the apartheid government: Indian, White, “Coloured” and
African. These categories, which I consider to be social constructions with a particular ideological base, still feature in existing South African legislation and policy, mainly in relation to measures of redress, and continue to have ongoing implications for and effects on the lives of citizens in the post-apartheid era. Even today, the emerging vision of an overarching South African ‘rainbow nation’ and peaceful coexistence in the post-apartheid era has not disrupted ethno-racial consciousness and stereotypes.

At home in South Africa I have sometimes said in big meetings where you have black and white together, ‘Raise your hands’. Then I have said, ‘Move your hands’ and I have said ‘Look at your hands — different colours represent different people. You are the rainbow nation of God.’

(Archbishop Desmond Tutu – December 1999)

It is interesting that I was naively and totally oblivious of these constructions of me and my identity. From the above interview excerpts, using a Foucauldian analysis, one can see the cultural production of knowledge and how networks of social power can be produced, and that power is constituted through particular forms of knowledge and understandings that circulate and become entrenched, for example forms of knowledge about a particular race (Foucault, 1980). It seems likely that the principal’s decision on the panel did not favour me as the candidate for the post. It seemed that she accessed pre-existing, historically located discourses or knowledge claims as resources to guide her dialogic engagement in the panel interview situation. The question to ask in relation to this is, can dominant discourses be contested, resisted and disrupted? My narrative will illuminate this question.

My first day at Hilltop School will be etched in my memory forever. The best way to describe it would be like a five-storey roller coaster ride. I was nervous, anxious, excited and fearful all at once. I was a tight bundle of nerves with no self-confidence. I questioned whether I could deliver what was required of me. My desire to aim for ‘impossible things’ dissipated as I focused on what the reactions of the members of staff would be when they became aware that I was a post Level 1 educator with no management experience. Would this affect their confidence in my management and leadership capabilities?

When I arrived at the school it seemed structurally larger than it had been on my previous visit (see Fig. 13).
In a metaphorical sense the large buildings represented the enormity and complexity of the feelings that I was experiencing on that day, in a sense adding to my apprehension and the sense of foreboding as I faced the unknown.

3.3 Early encounters with school leadership: the first two years

As I recall the first two years, 2000 and 2001, I marvel at the fact that I survived, given the subject positions I took in a very unique, complex socio-cultural context. Questions that are foremost in my mind are: Was it sheer madness? Was it strong determination? Was it my strength of character and my agency? Was it my incessant belief in ‘impossible things’ that drove me? Could I have done things differently?

My current deputy principal attributes my survival to my ability to be goal-focused in spite of the odds stacked against me. He stated in an interview:

> What made you survive was that you were oblivious and naïve to the dangers that you were facing. This in my opinion made you fearless. You had set your mind on making changes to make the learners’ lives better. Everyone could see that you wanted to make changes and regulate things at the school, but you were unaware that you were up against some very shrewd people. You were just focused and wanted to get going with your plans.
I saw you as a person looking across the river and being focused on getting to the other side. But you were not looking at the river that you had to cross. It was full of dangers with big crocodiles and water snakes. Therefore I think that because you were naïve to the rough, rude environment at the school you did not take note of it. As a result it was not an obstacle to you. In this way you remained goal-driven. This ensured your survival. I will like to add that you did not care what feathers you ruffled as long as the learners benefited and their lives changed. Ultimately I think this is what got you staff support.

(Deputy Principal, September, 2012)

My critical friends encouraged me to think more deeply about the deputy principal’s interpretations above. Drawing from my study of identity theory articulated in Chapter 2, I question the deputy principal’s underlying assumptions about my identity and the subject positions I took: Is there a coherent, autonomous self? Is identity not informed by the interaction between existing structural and biographical influences and factors that are external to the individual? Are my subject positions not situated and produced by context, events, different agents and for many diverse purposes?

I was soon to learn about the ‘contingent’ and ‘discursive’ nature of identity and subjectivity, that identity is constituted and reconstituted socially and relationally, and that its boundaries are mapped, remapped and renegotiated, as argued by Hall (1992).

3.3.1 The second impossible thing: contesting language as a barrier

One of the first obstacles that I faced at the school was the language barrier. On arrival at the school on the first day, I was shown the staff register of names by the principal as a means of orientating me to the different staff structures at the school. Two things surprised me: I saw a large staff component (there were more than eighty names); and I noticed that the majority were Zulu names, indicating that most of the staff members belonged to the largest ethnic group in the province, the Zulu people, who are part of the Nguni sub-group. I did not recognise any of the Zulu names and had no clue as to how to pronounce them. I had come from a historically Indian school, and this was my first contextual trial.

Within the first week I experienced marginalisation that had its roots in language difference. I had accompanied the principal to a meeting with hostel staff. These staff members were caregivers of the learners outside school hours in their hostels. The entire meeting was conducted in isiZulu. As I sat in the meeting in silence I felt frustrated, close to tears, bewildered
and intimidated. I felt a lack of belonging, acceptance and recognition. Was this kind of exclusion and marginalisation intentional? Was it just harmless oversight? Did I not belong in this context? Am I the ‘Other’?

Almost in answer to my silent questions, the pencil case of a colleague got my attention. Inscribed on it was “The will of God won’t lead you where His grace can’t keep you.” I felt comforted almost immediately. Having had a strong Christian upbringing and being a devout Christian, these words had an immediate impact on me. My Christian identity came to the fore and I interpreted the inscription and the involvement of Archbishop Hurley in the school as a sign from God. The inscription confirmed for me that my being at Hilltop School was indeed by Divine appointment. I was there through the plan of God. It was this belief that encouraged me to realise that the Grace of God would sustain me to survive in my new environment. I remain convinced that my Christian identity strengthened and shaped many of the subject positions I was to take in the months that followed.

My third experience of language as a barrier occurred during the first few weeks in a school management meeting. The business language of the school is English. Despite the fact that all academic management meetings were conducted in English, management staff, all of whom were isiZulu first-language speakers, often reverted to isiZulu. On many occasions I found that I was the only person in the meeting who could not follow the discussion in its entirety. I often missed the innuendos and underlying meanings in dialogues and debates, and as a consequence all sorts of negative thoughts would run through my mind: Was this a way to constrain my ‘power’ and authority as deputy principal? Was this a strategy to exclude me? Should I accept the situation passively or should I act to address the issue?

After much thought and a few sleepless nights, I resolved to act to address the situation and to make my voice heard. Firstly, I took the staff register home and familiarised myself with the names of members of staff. I requested a member of staff to assist me with pronunciation. I practised doggedly. Through sheer determination, after two weeks I was familiar with most of the names and was pronouncing them correctly. In the interactions that followed, my observation was that my effort pleased staff members, who often complimented me on my pronunciation of names or corrected me in a supportive manner.

With regard to the language spoken in non-academic staff meetings, I discovered that most hostel staff were able to communicate in English but felt more comfortable using isiZulu. I resolved the problem by using an interpreter at meetings. The issue of communication at
management meetings was a little more complex to resolve. After the first two management meetings, I expressed my concern to the principal. She reassured me that she would address the matter at the next management meeting. When she raised the issue with members of the team, it was received with mixed reactions. One member of the management team alluded to the fact that the previous deputy principal had been English-speaking and had raised no objections to management members communicating in isiZulu. I was insistent, however, that the use of isiZulu hindered my participation at meetings. On reflection, I could see that in the face of structural barriers my agency came to the fore. I questioned these social processes that were playing out, where they were located historically, and the underlying discourses that informed the ways of thinking?

I took the position that I would not allow myself to be complicit and subjected to the dominant discourse of exclusion and marginalisation on the basis of language, its meanings, power and regulation. I chose to resist. I saw this kind of exclusion as a violation of my social rights as a member of the management team. St Pierre (2000) explains that

resistance to domination is practiced by self-contained, autonomous individuals in response to an oppressive force from the outside, a force that challenges both the natural and political liberty of the individual (p. 489).

My thinking was that resistance counters the infringement of an individual’s social rights. The result was that a decision was taken that English would be the sole medium of communication in management meetings. Further determined to overcome the language barrier to effective leadership, I enrolled for an introductory isiZulu course at the University of KwaZulu-Natal. This proved to be most beneficial to me as I soon began to acquire a basic knowledge of isiZulu.

SASL was the medium of instruction for learners at Hilltop School. I knew that in many schools for the Deaf one of the key barriers to learning for learners is the language of instruction. Often teachers are not proficient in Sign Language, as articulated by learners in a study in KwaZulu-Natal (Muthukrishna, 2006). To me, this was about the right to equitable and quality education for all learners, an imperative enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (RSA, 1996b). At the outset I was committed to becoming proficient in Sign Language. To this end I enrolled for a Sign Language course at the Sign Language Academy in KwaZulu-Natal and attended all ‘in house’ Sign Language training conducted at Hilltop School for staff. I realised that I had to be able to communicate with learners, and affirm their language and culture in every
way possible. As I write my story now I believe that I am a fluent Sign Language user. I still, however, have great difficulty with communicating in isiZulu.

3.3.2 The third impossible thing: implementing change

In the early stages of my leadership as deputy principal I found myself thrown into a new arena, where I had to initiate, engage with and manage changes. At the time I had no theoretical knowledge of change as a process and the complexities intrinsic to change in organisations.

I have since learned and come to understand that the critical variables of change management are to plan, initiate, realise, control and stabilise the change process. Literature on change management indicates that managing change effectively requires an understanding of these variables. Since change is a process, it cannot be implemented in haste without adequate time being allocated for implementation (Fullan & Ballew, 2001). It therefore becomes imperative for the initiator of change to take into cognisance these critical variables and ensure that change is effected in an organised and systematic manner (Hajek, 2010; Galloway, 2007). Through my own experience I am inclined to agree with Ash (2009), who argues that change is often an emotion-laden process that usually evokes tensions and feelings of uncertainty in an organisation. As a result of this emotional component change can either promote unity and harmony or disrupt it. However, it is contended that change that is well planned with an implementation strategy decreases the risks of disrupting harmony and unity in an organisation (Pryor, 2008; Hajek, 2010; Fullan & Ballew, 2001). I wish that I had been exposed to these scholarly insights when I began my leadership journey all those years ago. Perhaps I would have approached change in a different way. I view my change enactments—both the struggles and achievements—as another impossible thing I embarked on.

3.3.2.1 Towards accountability in the school hostel

When I arrived at the school on the first day, the principal requested that I use the first few weeks to adjust to the new setting. I discovered that I had no academic workload as she had allocated these responsibilities to the other management team members. This unsettled me, and I requested from the principal the reasons for her decision. She indicated that she wanted to allow
me some time to adapt to the school, and that she planned to tailor the responsibilities she finally allocated to me to the skills and capabilities she would observe I possessed.

After the first week I felt ill at ease as I watched other members of management undertaking duties that I understood to be the workload of the deputy principal. A particular member of management would come into my office, remove files, make telephone calls and give instructions to staff members. I have to admit that I experienced these actions and activities as intrusive. I wished that the principal had discussed with me my induction into the school context in an open and democratic way. I needed to have a voice in decisions that affected my position as deputy principal.

I faced many emotionally charged sleepless nights pondering the developments. I made the decision that I needed to discuss my concerns with the principal. I called an urgent meeting with the principal and at the meeting I requested that I have access to my job description, which outlined my roles and responsibilities as deputy principal (see Appendix 4). I studied the document, and was filled with excitement. I was energised, and knew immediately that I wanted to begin engaging with the various management responsibilities indicated in the official document. I urged the principal to allow me to assume the full range of my responsibilities as soon as possible. She registered surprise at my request but hastened to explain that good intentions underpinned her decisions. She genuinely believed that she had to take on a pastoral role and protect me in a new and challenging environment, and allow me time to adjust. The principal eventually conceded to my request, cautioning me that if I wanted to “jump into the deep end” it was my choice. I thanked her for wanting to protect me and assured her that I would need her support.

The principal’s reflections in my interview with her provide insight into the critical incident above through her lens.

*Former principal, August, 2012*
Once I took on my official responsibilities, I decided to formulate a plan of action. I assessed the main areas of school management for which I was responsible, and decided to focus on three: the hostel kitchen, school hostels and maintenance of grounds and buildings. My first impression was that in these facets of the organisation there were very few structures in place to enable and monitor efficiency. I felt that the productivity of staff was questionable. My initial strategy was to observe and make as few changes as possible as I was concerned about the impact rapid change may have on the institution. However, I was determined to improve the operating efficiency of the sectors of the institution under my management.

The hostel kitchen became my priority when I discovered that there was a constant shortage of food supplies. As a result I was often called from meetings and my administrative work was disrupted in order to address crises that arose in the kitchen on an ad hoc basis. My observations in the hostel kitchen revealed that there was no order in the operational functioning of the kitchen. Cleanliness and hygiene were questionable, and there was evidence of theft. There was a constant shortage of food despite efforts to ensure that purchases of goods were based on need and learner numbers.

Member of staff accused one another of pilfering resources. A deep concern was that on an almost daily basis the learners did not have adequate sustenance. To me, this kind of deprivation was an issue of social rights and had to be addressed as a matter of urgency. The view of many staff members was that the school’s management had failed to address the poor management of the school kitchen over the past few years. I also discovered that there were certain staff members who enjoyed special privileges in the kitchen, which included having breakfast in the hostel kitchen, having meals prepared to take home, and tea being made at any time of day and delivered to offices and classrooms (usually during teaching time). Resources intended for learners were utilised for certain favoured staff members, with the result that the school faced food shortages constantly.

I wondered about the underlying power relations that were being played out at this micro-level, and why particular social dynamics and processes had become so entrenched and normalised. I reflect here on Foucault’s conceptualisation of power and power relations. Foucault (1980; 1984) conceptualised power as a strategy that involves multiple relations or techniques that individuals invest in and transmit. Techniques of power, Foucault contended, are intended to regulate and control subjects. In this micro setting, I believe particular forms of knowledge and rules of formation came into existence. These rules determined the social processes that become
possible. Rules of regulation enable particular truths to be told but also constrain what truth is to be circulated (Foucault, 1984).

Interviews with two founding staff members indicated that the management of the hostel kitchen had always been a contentious issue at the school. They reported that theft in the kitchen dated back to 1981. The person who managed the kitchen was found guilty of theft in 1982 and was dismissed. The management of the hostel kitchen was then handed over to the academic staff. Rules and regulations were put in place but theft persisted and even increased. It was common practice for some staff members to have their private meals cooked at school and taken home. The kitchen was a thoroughfare for all members of staff and rules were often not adhered to. There were no monitoring and accountability mechanisms in place.

My own observations and discussions with staff members confirmed the lack of operating structures and mechanisms of accountability in the hostel kitchen. I discussed by initial findings and my apprehensions with the principal. She admitted that poor management of the kitchen was an ongoing issue and that an intervention to address the ills had to be prioritised. She further added that she had failed to deal with the issues of theft, disorderly management and hygiene in the kitchen, but cautioned me to tread carefully in effecting change. I was assured of her support in any endeavour I embarked on to address the matter.

With this reassurance and in spite of the principal’s advice, I threw caution to the wind. I committed to address the issue as a matter of urgency. My goal was rapid, effective change guided by the principles of social justice, moral accountability and ethics, and I called a meeting of all staff who had responsibilities in the kitchen. My approach was to begin by raising my concerns regarding the management of the kitchen. At the meeting the members of staff made a limited contribution to the discussion. Certain members indicated that they had no concerns with the status quo, the implication being that there was no crisis. I made it clear to the staff that I found it morally very difficult to work with the current flawed system of management of the kitchen, and that there was an urgent need for review and change.

After the meeting, I drew up my own plan of action to address the situation. My plan was firstly to address the lack of hygiene in the kitchen and then design operational policies that would improve efficiency in the kitchen. On reflection, I have to concede that this was not a democratic process. It is very likely that the staff would have felt threatened. I regret that I did not have access to professional development or research insights on change management, as I may have pursued an alternative course of action had I had this knowledge. My experience
points to the need for ongoing professional development and support for school leaders as they deal with complex issues that arise in an institution. I have learnt that people resist change because of the uncertainty of change and the discomfort that is inevitable (Scott & Jaffe, 2004). Ash (2009) points out that it is common for employees to resist change initiatives because people are creatures of habit and are generally satisfied with the status quo. In my assessment of the events at the time, I tend to agree with Pryor (2008), who argues that people enjoy the status quo because different staff members have a stake in the status quo. Galloway (2007) argues further that people resist change for two reasons: firstly, because they have negative experiences of previous organisational change efforts, and secondly, because of the uncertainty created by the announcement of impending change, and the course it takes. However, Ash (2009) maintains that some discomfort is inevitable but explains that transition is the psychological process people undergo to come to terms with the new situation.

Thus, at the time I was oblivious to the reasons why people resist change but I felt that I needed to support staff to understand that improved efficiency in the kitchen was the key goal. Almost intuitively, I knew that change had to be seen as a collaborative enterprise. The first strategic move I initiated was to clean the kitchen and pantry, which were in an unacceptable state in terms of hygiene. Because this entailed additional work for the kitchen staff, some were reluctant to engage in the process. I ignored those who chose not to participate, and engaged additional help from the school maintenance staff. I also put on an apron and physically engaged in the various tasks.

Soon all the kitchen staff joined in this common project. My observations at the time suggested that there were feelings of embarrassment amongst them. Within three days the pantry and kitchen were spotlessly clean and freshly painted. Non-perishable food was categorised, labelled and stored in a systematic manner, depending on daily requirements. A new duty roster for staff was drawn up, which entailed the rotating of duties related to cleaning, cooking and the serving of meals. This roster was drawn up by the staff in the kitchen. In consultation with staff members, we drew up job descriptions in line with Department of Education guidelines. Conceptualising job descriptions became an effective tool for monitoring work commitments and accountability. In section 3.4 I critically reflect on this whole process and the leadership stances I took.

The management of the school hostel was another huge responsibility assigned to me. A year before my appointment, the Department of Education absolved itself from all administrative responsibilities in respect of school hostels in the province. Thus, individual schools had to
formulate their own management policies and guidelines for the management of the hostels in residential schools. To my amazement, at Hilltop School no such policies and guidelines existed. Further, the withdrawal of the Department of Education from financial responsibility for the maintenance of hostels had serious implications, as schools had to maintain hostel buildings and grounds from their own financial resources. For Hilltop School this meant that parents had to contribute financially towards the hostel. Prior to this, a minimum hostel fee had been charged, and only approximately 2% of the parents were able to meet the minimum fee.

The majority of Hilltop learners come from very poor socio-economic communities, where single parents and child-headed families are the norm. At least one third of parents are too poor to afford transport costs, let alone hostel fees. Thus the poor socio-economic status of parents directly affects the financial management of the hostels. When I arrived at Hilltop, because of a lack of funds the maintenance of the hostels had been compromised and the structure of the buildings and the quality of the facilities had deteriorated. Sponsorships and funding were limited, and financial difficulties in the administration of the hostels increased.

I was overwhelmed by the enormity of the task of managing the staff, the daily operations of the school hostels, and the hostel kitchens. There was no system in place and activities were conducted on an ad hoc basis. With time I introduced new systems, which included hostel rules (Fig. 16), a code of conduct for learners (Fig. 15), meal rosters and a menu for learners (Fig. 17). I made the decision to follow a democratic process in formulating policies and initiating change. I believed that increasing the ‘voice’ of the community of staff members involved would lead to higher levels of organisational commitment, improve implementation success, and also upgrade skills and abilities through participation.

However, this proved time consuming as all hostel staff, members of school management and learners were consulted and involved in the processes. For easy facilitation, a core committee comprising of teachers, school management, hostel staff, learners and parents was established.
This committee formulated draft policies to effect the changes envisaged in the hostel. The draft policies were then presented for input at various meetings held separately for parents, staff and learners. Finally, all policies were ratified and accepted at a specially convened SGB meeting that was fully representative of all stakeholders of the school: teaching staff, non-teaching staff, learners, parents, the Church and Deaf organisations (Fig. 14). Studies have shown that organisational democracy, although very appealing, is complex and time consuming, particularly the task of involving very heterogeneous members in the processes of participative decision-making, prosocial work behaviours, solidarity at work and governance (Fenwick, 2005; Koivisto, 2013).
CODE OF CONDUCT-LEARNERS [HOSTEL]

LEVEL 1
- Rude to housekeeping supervisors
- Rude to other learners.
- Refuse to do duties in the dormitories.
- Refuse to wake up in the hostel.
  [Several warnings given: 2 times]

PROCEDURE :
- Each housekeeping supervisor to have disciplinary book to record incidents in the hostel.
- Housekeeping supervisor- record in her/his book. Warning 1st time given and recorded. 2nd time recorded for detention and report to hostel superintendent.
- Detention on weekend. Hostel staff to be on duty. Rooster drawn.
- Detention co-ordinator: Hostel staff

LEVEL 2
- Attempt to hit an adult
- Fighting- other learners and adult
- Boy/girl relationships
- Refuse to go to school
- Tearing other learner’s books/clothes.

PROCEDURE :
- Housekeeping report to hostel superintendent and superintendent report to Deputy in charge.
- Deputy determines the seriousness of the offence and if there is a need for parent to be called. Parent will be called to school and warning given to the parent to sign should he/she commit same offence. Hostel accommodation will be withdrawn. [day scholar option]
- Detention depending on the seriousness of the offence.

LEVEL 3
- Use of drugs and alcohol
- Leaving hostel without permission.
- Theft [serious & evidence found]
- Vandalism
- Damage to other per person’s property
- Gambling
- Forging documents or signatures (permission slips)
- Possessing or distributing, pornographic, racist or sexist materials.
- Possessing dangerous weapons.
- Hitting an adult without adult hitting him/her back

Figure 15. Page 1 of the code of conduct for learners.
RULES FOR THE HOSTEL

1. No alcohol to be kept or consumed in the hostel.
2. No visitors in the hostels. All visitors to be attended to in the staffroom. Please try and keep visitors to a minimum and for emergencies only since learners need to be attended to.
3. Do not sell any food or anything else to the learners.
4. No corporal punishment under any circumstances.
5. Learners are not allowed to wash clothes or clean the rooms of the hostel supervisors.
6. WAKE UP TIMES – JUNIORS – 05H00, SENIORS – 05H30.
7. Learners are not to be awoken very early to clean hostels during weekdays. Learners will make their beds in the morning and may help with the cleaning of showrooms, etc.
8. Learners are not allowed to wash the clothes or clean the rooms of the hostel supervisors.
9. Please adhere to dinner times and TV times; SUN-THURS: 21H00, FRID-SATURDAY: 23H00.
10. Grade 10 and Grade 11 learners study time on Saturday – 15H00 – 16H00.
11. Learners are not to be taken on walks outside school with hostel supervisors.
12. Learners can only be granted leave if they have a signed leave form by office.
13. No leave will be granted to hostel supervisor without the permission from the principal.
14. Learners must not be left unattended. Do not lock learners in the dormitory and attend to your personal matters.
15. No visitors are allowed to sleep in the dormitories.
16. Internal arrangements regarding time away must be done with the approval of the hostel superintendent.
17. No food to be taken out of the dining hall.
18. Prior arrangement for outside matches during weekdays to be made with the office and the office to inform the hostel superintendent on duty.
19. No fraternization with learners.
20. Do not accept money from parents or learners.

NAME: ___________________________ PRINCIPAL: ___________________________

SIGNATURE: _______________________ WITNESS: _________________________

DATE: ____________________________

Figure 16. Rules for the hostel.
Despite the fact that the process of drawing up policies was a consultative one, implementation became a mammoth task as some hostel staff resisted the changes when they discovered that the changes required additional work and accountability. Frequent staff meetings, monitoring and constant feedback became necessary and long work hours as well as extensive visits outside school hours became routine for me. This had a negative effect on my personal and family life as my time was completely consumed by work. At first some staff seemed disgruntled by my presence outside school hours, and in retrospect I can see why they could have interpreted my visits as surveillance and control. I often observed that staff seemed unhappy but were not vocal to me about their dissatisfaction. Despite this I was driven to achieve change and I persisted with my vision of creating comfortable, health-promoting living conditions for the learners. To me, it was an issue of the learners’ social rights and social justice.

Figures 18 and 19 illustrate two examples of the monitoring mechanisms that were designed: clearly defined rules for the hostel superintendents, and a weekend checklist for the hostel and hostel kitchen.
HOSTEL SUPERINTENDANTS DUTIES

- DISCIPLINE IN THE HOSTEL (BOYS)
- IMPLEMENTS/MAINTAINS POLICIES.
- DINING HALL DISCIPLINE AND SET UP (LUNCH)
- CO-ORDINATES HOMEWORK IN THE HOSTEL-LIAISE WITH SCHOOL.
- UNIFORM CLOTHING OF LEARNERS.
- DISTRIBUTING OF CLEANING MATERIAL-HOSTEL.
- DIRECTLY IN CHARGE OF ALL HOSTEL SUPERVISORS./CHAIR MEETINGS ONCE A MONTH.
- MAINTENANCE OF FURNITURE & EQUIPMENTS IN HOSTEL SUPERVISORS’ COTTAGE.
- ALL ADMINISTRATIVE WORK WITH REGARDS TO THE HOSTEL.
- CONTROL OF HOSTEL SUPERVISORS REPORT BOOK.
- ESTABLISHING THE NEEDS FOR LINEN/CURTAINS ETC. IN THE HOSTEL.
- CONTROLLING OF UTENSILS IN THE DINING HALL.
- DRAWING UP OF HOSTEL SUPERVISORS’ ROOSTER.
- IN CHARGE OF LODGERS ACCOMODATION.
- SUMMARY REGISTER HOSTEL.

Figure 18. Clearly defined rules for the hostel superintendents.
3.3.2.2 Engaging with the maintenance staff: What were the rules of the game?

One of my core responsibilities as deputy principal was the supervision of the ‘groundsmen’ or the school maintenance team. This team was responsible for the maintenance of the school’s buildings and grounds, and comprised six black African men, all of whom were older than me. As I reflect on this facet of my work, I realise that I entered this arena in a completely naive and uninformed manner, totally unaware of the inherent complexities.

My very first engagement with the groundsmen was tense indeed. We began with introductions and a discussion on operational functions and responsibilities. When I introduced myself as their new supervisor, I observed surprise registered on their faces. Some even looked astonished and rolled their eyes in disbelief. One remarked in a very sarcastic manner, “You can’t be the new supervisor, now can you?” I could sense an air of distrust, suspicion and even anger emanating from the limited verbal responses, body language and facial expressions. This reaction to me will be forever etched in my mind. I was consumed by an inexplicable anxiety and vulnerability.

In reflecting on this difficult space in my life, I am moved to think of Alice in *Through the Looking Glass*. I can see I resembled Alice, who had little control over the trajectory of her life, and whose choices and actions were shaped by unexpected forces. At the beginning of the game, Alice is a
pawn with limited knowledge of the world around her, and limited power to influence outcomes. Most importantly, she did not fully understand the rules of the game. But an unseen hand guides her along her journey, constructing different spaces and encounters that drive her toward her goal.

I felt my self-confidence dissipate completely, and there was an uneasy silence from the men. They made a minimal contribution to the discussion regarding their work schedules and routines — information that was crucial to my work. After the meeting, I decided to discuss my experience with a member of the school management team who was black African and male. He listened intently, and explained that my age, gender and race were factors that worked against me and were forces that would influence my engagements with the men. He elaborated that, given the history of apartheid in South Africa, African people in South Africa viewed Indians as ‘slave drivers’ who were condescending, and who held the misconception that they were more endowed intellectually and in other spheres than African people. Indian women in particular are viewed as having no respect for African men. He added that being supervised by a younger person was not acceptable since African tradition dictated that an elder should not have to be accountable to anyone younger, as age is often associated with wisdom. He advised me to understand their reaction to me and adjust my leadership strategies by taking into account these contextual issues — a difficult task indeed!

One incident that epitomises the tension and conflict I experienced between traditional Zulu culture and organisational culture was when I tried to change their system of working. My evaluation of their work methods after a few weeks revealed routines that resulted in poor outcomes and minimal productivity. Their work practices entailed six groundsmen working together in one area of the school grounds at the same time. I observed that as a result of this system, only one area of the school grounds looked well maintained at any given time. My observations also revealed that this work system created poor work habits as staff frequently engaged in personal conversations during their working hours. In order to improve work productivity I suggested a new system of work.

I made the decision to engage the men in discussions with the hope that we could collaboratively appraise the situation and explore alternate work routines and strategies. At the meeting I noted a sense of indifference and a lack of responsiveness. No ideas were forthcoming from the groundsmen. A few indicated that they saw no shortcomings or drawbacks in the current system and that there was therefore no urgency for change.
Others mentioned that they could not think of alternative ways of working. At this point, I decided that I should voice my thoughts and ideas on the issue. My concern hinged on the fact that the present ‘group system’ was not effective since my observations revealed that production, and quality of work were compromised.

Based on the principle of equity and quality outcomes I proposed that the school grounds be divided into six sections and each person be responsible for a particular section (Fig. 20). In order to ensure equity of workload I suggested that the sections be rotated quarterly. Everyone nodded in agreement but I could see that they were not enthusiastic about the new proposal. Despite several requests for input, alternatives and suggestions, there was minimal input. At the end of the meeting we all agreed to a three-month trial of the new system. A meeting was to be held to draw up a roster for duty loads to ensure equity of workloads and efficiency of the new system.

On the following day, much to my surprise, I was summoned to a meeting by the principal. I discovered that the groundsmen had sought their labour union’s intervention on the matter. They cited a violation of their traditional customs and culture as cause for their grievance. This was to be my first meeting with labour union representatives, and I felt deep anxiety and trepidation. On my way to the meeting I lost my balance and fell, bruising my elbows and knees. I was grateful that no one had witnessed my fall and went into the meeting feeling very dishevelled. In the meeting the principal, union representatives and the groundsmen were present.

The key accusation put forward by union representatives was that my leadership practices indicated that I did not understand and respect the Zulu culture. Various arguments were made to support this construction of me. Firstly, I had proposed a division of labour. It was pointed out that working in a group was integral to Zulu culture. Working together provided them with the opportunity to sing and converse, and this invigorated workers and even enhanced their energy levels. It was further insinuated that my strategy to divide the workers into different sections was an attempt to ‘divide and rule’, a political strategy that was used by the apartheid government to entrench power and control. The intensity of the accusations levelled against me stunned me! I was completely shaken, silenced and felt extremely vulnerable. I was being constructed as a racist Indian! My approach was likened to apartheid era tactics! Was I wielding power and control?
Figure 20. Job description and management plan for groundsmen.
At this point my principal intervened and stated that she wanted to place the dialogue in perspective. She argued strongly that the groundsmen were using culture to resist change and in the final analysis did not want to be accountable for their work. She made it quite clear that she believed there was a need for efficiency, accountability and high-quality work outcomes at the school. She therefore supported me and my change initiatives to the fullest. She made a very convincing argument that one cannot use the notion of culture to argue against the need for a strong work ethic, quality and accountability, as these values are embedded across all cultures.

The union representatives retracted immediately and accepted the arguments of the principal. My strategy for the next three months would be implemented, and re-evaluated at the end of this period. The meeting closed soon after.

I pounded over the event over the next days. Was my principal’s voice heard because she was a black African woman? Was it the intersection of race, gender and my newly assumed leadership status that played out? I did feel that my ‘self’ and my agency were placed under surveillance and judged, and that techniques of power were used by union members to try to control and regulate me and the subject positions I took.

In the months that followed, I constantly relived and interrogated the experience. Looking back now, I see it as a pivotal moment for me as a leader at the school. The support of my principal amidst complex power dynamics represented her endorsement of my emerging management and leadership practices. I valued her as an ally as she was highly respected and admired by most members of staff. I did self-question. I knew I had to understand the deep underlying structures that had led to this critical incident. Why did they resist so fiercely? Was I to be blamed? Could I have followed a different path in my interactions with the groundsmen? Why did I come across as someone who was wielding power and control? According to Foucault (1984), resistance emerges out of power.

> Once inside the forest, Alice forgets who she is. The same cannot, however, be said about the name “human” and what it signifies. Could the forest itself be questioning Alice’s title and form? Without any clear connection between what she is and what she is called, Alice has no means of working through the problem logically. The induced forgetfulness of the forest brings this question to bear, and Alice must find a way to pass through the forest in order to remember her name and keep her identity intact. Once she does make it through, she recovers her memory fully, as does the fawn she runs into while in the forest. (Holt, 2003)
I interviewed one of the groundsmen who was present at the labour union meeting alluded to in the above discussion. This confirms how strongly the complex intersection of Zulu traditional norms and beliefs, my identities of race, gender and age played out at the time. The interview was conducted in isiZulu, ten years after the incident.

_In the beginning it was very hard to work with Mrs Naidoo. We thought she was too young. We had our own way of doing things and she had a different way. She did not understand our ways and traditions. It was very hard to talk to her directly since she was a female and we are not used to working under and being told what to do by a young woman. And she was an Indian! Sometimes we listened because we did not want her to think that we didn’t want to listen to her and we also did not want her to be angry. Sometimes we could see she got angry. Sometimes we could see she was frustrated. It was very unusual for us to work under a female. But we had to work because work is work. We all expected her to treat us badly. That is what Indians do. But she was very kind to us and always asked about our families and problems. She also did not understand that we needed to work together. She was unhappy when we explained our cultural need to work together. In the end we did what she said and now we are all used to her because work is work and she helps the school and all of us a lot._

_(Groundsman, February, 2012)_

Although the principal’s intervention resolved the issue to some extent, I feared that the issues would re-surface in the course of my work.

One of my critical friends questioned me about my understanding of the notion of culture at the time. My thinking was that a people’s culture included the characteristics of a particular group of people defined by values, norms, beliefs, language, religion and social habits. Beliefs and practices held by specific groups have been passed down from their ancestors through their grandparents, parents and the community and society. Organisational culture included the habits and accepted norms that underpin how people work and what is acceptable in workplaces. In my naïve thinking at the time, I believed that the norms and values of the organisation should take priority, although people’s cultures should be respected and affirmed in any organisation.

I faced a serious dilemma: how does a leader address the tension between the collective norms, values and expectations within the culture of an organisation, and the norms and values of a particular culture of individuals and groups within the organisation? I had no answers at the time. However, I came to understand the importance of skilled leadership in understanding and dealing with issues of diversity in an institution. I felt frustrated that I did not have access to professional development in the area of diversity management.
I continued with my role with a degree of trepidation and caution, guided by my intuition. I was convinced that it was crucial for a leader to have the expertise and research insights on how to deal with diversity in an organisation, particularly in a multiracial society.

3.3.2.3 From there on: The fund raiser, the public relations officer

My narrative above reveals that I traversed intricate, often conflicting spaces, and journeyed between despair, hope, risk, disappointment and opportunity. Despite this, I continued to navigate my dream of impossible things.

My dreams were often beyond the budget of the school. I realised that I had to explore ways to augment the inadequate finances at the school, but discovered that these dreams were not shared by other members of the management team. I received no support but was instead criticised for creating additional work for others. Many expressed the view that improving finances was beyond the scope of their role functions and job descriptions. Realising that I could not persuade them to work outside their official duties, I embarked on a solo journey to raise funds and improve the infrastructure of the school. Hence, on my own initiative I took on the additional role of fundraiser and public relations officer for the school. I wrote letters to potential sponsors, made applications to financial trusts and sought sponsorships from businesses within and outside the province of KwaZulu-Natal. I gave presentations about the school and its achievements to major business corporations, and was relentless in my drive to access funds. At the end of my first year, I had raised approximately R600 000 for improvements and renovations to the school and hostels.

Figures 21, 22 and 23 illustrate donations received through sponsorships, as well as some of the outcomes.
Our Ref: AAC 7723/1 A1117 8 December 2000

Mrs L Naidoo
School for the Deaf
Private Bag X1018
HILLCREST
3650

Dear Mrs Naidoo,

Thank you for your application for assistance to repair the instability of one of your hostel buildings.

Your application was reviewed recently and we are pleased to advise that a grant of R102 000 has been approved as per the quotations submitted by Mr D Yetton. Payment of the grant becomes available immediately, and we have pleasure in enclosing a cheque for R102 000 in full payment of the grant. Kindly acknowledge receipt thereof at your earliest convenience.

Kindly note that the grant is subject to the provision of a report that the repairs to the building have been carried out and photographs of the repairs that were done. Some photographs of the school would also be appreciated. In addition, a copy of your audited financial statements and annual report should be submitted as soon as they become available.

We wish you well with your project and look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely,

JENNY HEINZEL
Special Advisor

Anglo American Chairman’s Fund
Anglo American Chairman’s Fund Educational Trust
12th Floor 41 Fox Street Johannesburg 2001 PO Box 61593 Marshalltown 2107
Tel 011 497 8150 Fax 011 834 1492

Figure 21. Confirmation of sponsorship from Anglo American Chairman’s Fund.
19 February 2001

Mr. L. Naidoo
Deputy Principal
School for the Deaf
P.O. Box 35103
NORTHWAY 4065

Dear Mr. Naidoo

GRANT FROM FNB FUND

Further to our letter of 16 January 2001 and my visit to your school on Tuesday, 13 February 2001, we are pleased to advise you that a once-off grant of R114,000 from the FNB Fund has been agreed upon as a contribution towards the paving of the road from your gate to the main buildings of your school. A cheque in full settlement of the grant is enclosed.

The FirstRand Foundation is the structured instrument for Corporate Social Investment by the group and its major associates. There are four funds each with its own particular focus and policy running parallel and operating in complementary ways. The FNB Fund is one of the participating company funds and the grant is being administered in its name. It should therefore be acknowledged as such.

Kindly provide us with a receipt for the funds and note that it is a condition of the grant that a reflective report on the project, including original photographs is submitted in due course. The report should provide an overview of the activities, particularly those funded by the FNB Fund, which have been undertaken during the year, focus on their outcomes in terms of their impact on those involved, and highlight any difficulties experienced and any lessons learnt by the project which may influence future developments. Copies of the Project's audited financial statements are required at year-end.

We look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely,

MARIANNE MacROBERT
SPECIAL ADVISOR: FNB FUND

C.C. Vicki Treheaven
FNB: Communications

Figure 22. Confirmation of grant from FNB fund.
Figure 23. Opening of new sponsored classrooms.

After a few months, I could tell that my ingenuity and resourcefulness was being noticed and appreciated.

Everyone could see that you were a hardworking person and that you were strong and committed and was prepared to work long hours. I used to think that you are killing yourself working so hard. You worked long hours, weekends and during school holidays, I think that in many ways you did the job of five people. People admired you for that.

(Deputy principal, August, 2012)

Within a very short space of time, the transformation of the kitchen and hostels was visible to staff and learners in the school as a whole. The stakeholders of the school, which included the SGB, the Church, parents, staff and learners, were pleased with the improvements that I had introduced in my first year. Figures 24 and 25 demonstrate their satisfaction.
Dear Mrs Naidoo

Thank you very much for your overwhelming hospitality. You and your school leave me speechless. You have achieved so much with so little in such a short time. The buildings, gardens and general ambiance of the school has improved tremendously since your appointment to this school.

You and your staff are a fine example to your pupils through your exemplary management. You are truly an angel of mercy.

Thank you for allowing me to be “taught” by the spirit. I am proud to be a part of such a school.

God bless you all.

With all my love

Lawrence Mthethwa
SGB Chairperson

09 September 2000

Figure 24. Letter of thanks.
Despite these affirmations from stakeholders, I felt compelled to ask questions every time I gazed into the looking glass. Why was I so driven? How can I make sense of my agency? How did I navigate my multiple identities — wife, mother, colleague, fundraiser, leader? Why did I take such risks? What were the enabling mechanisms in this particular situated context?
In addition, the questions posed by my critical friends often challenged me even further to reflect in all honesty on my leadership. These pertinent questions served as a catalyst for deep reflection, interrogation and analysis of Self and my leadership practices: Did you truly involve others? Did you decide to go it alone after the initial disillusionment? Why? If not, was it you trying to prove yourself as leader? Did you alone want to get the glory/credit? Was all this going to be sustainable?

3.4 Reflections on my institutional change initiatives: What have I learned, what do I see?

_Do not follow where the path may lead._

_Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail._

(Muriel Strode)

Now looking back at the Looking Glass world after emerging from it (through my autoethnography), I continue to have questions to explore for the purposes of my own development as a leader.

Did I have a clear vision? I believe I did. At that time, my vision was confined to my responsibilities assigned to me as the deputy principal. My vision was to create a team of staff members in each sector I administered who worked together effectively as a cohesive whole and who were productive. I wanted to create a collaborative, supportive environment. I aimed to establish clear accountability across the different sectors and create a culture of high, efficient performance. Most critically, the health and welfare of learners and the creation of a safe, nurturing environment became my central priority to ensure optimal academic and social development. My vision was that my staff and I would grow to share common values, support a common mission, share trust, respect one another, and work as a supportive team so we could take risks together as we engaged in transformation. I wanted to build a cohesive culture. The values that underpinned my vision were to respect the social rights of learners, conduct ourselves ethically and with integrity; and work together in an honest, accountable and trustworthy manner.

I now reflect on the dynamics of being in a leadership position and the complexity of effecting institutional change as I experienced it during those early years of my leadership. My reflections suggest that, like Alice, I entered into the realm of the impossible, where time, events and rules
can run backwards and forwards. I admit that I was naïve and did not fully understand the logic of the Looking Glass world. This is evident in the comments of the current deputy principal, who shared his recollections of that time:

You wanted the mission completed no matter what. You had a vision. I could see that you were not interested in making friends but wanted the job done. You came into an environment where the management was not caring of what was happening. Staff were accustomed to doing their own thing. There was no distinction between teachers and hostel staff, and teachers were always in the kitchen making food or in the hostels and not being in their classrooms. This was accepted practice at the school. However, you were focused and nothing deterred you or distracted you from your goal. We could all see that you had a strong vision. You did not even notice when people were angry. Everyone could see that you had a vision.

(Deputy principal, August, 2012)

You came into the school and made lots of changes very quickly within a short time. You were like a bulldozer. You tried to regulate things but you were making enemies, and although you were making changes systematically and in an orderly fashion, you were stepping on people and ‘trampling toes’. I often wondered ‘Oh my gosh, she is never going to survive, she is biting more than she can chew. She is up against very deceitful and cunning people….she does not have a clue about this’. I believe that you didn’t see the dangers in the environment. If people were not happy they were going to gang up against you as well. By not noticing these people you just kept focused and went on working.

(Deputy principal, August, 2012)

I always felt that you had no idea of the difficulties you were facing. You was just focused on getting going, not looking at the road that you were travelling on but just on the road ahead. None of us felt brave enough to get involved because we did not think that you will succeed or survive for more than a few months.

(Member of management, Zwane, July, 2012)

I often reflect on my interactions with the groundsmen and union members, and my attempt to effect change. Were those staff members who constructed themselves as targets of oppression, in turn agents in my own oppression? This question foregrounds the intricacies of power relations that can play out in an institution, and how power circulates in an institution. According to Foucault (1995; 1997a) institutions such as the asylum, prison or school are spaces where power can be exercised, as well as ‘laboratories’ to observe and gain knowledge about subjects in these spaces. In other words, spaces where power is exercised are also spaces where knowledge
is produced. Foucault’s ideas on the notion of disciplinary power offers possibilities to make sense of social organisations and explore issues of surveillance, judgement, power relations, and production of knowledge, as well as resistance to power. In another vein, Harper (1997) suggests that organisations need to interrogate inequalities and examine the complex issues of power and powerlessness with the aim of exposing ways in which social structures place limits on some individuals and create advantages for others, in often contradictory and shifting ways. These social processes are contextual and situated in nature.

Through my autoethnography, as I reflect on events and my subject positions, I now begin to question the traditional leadership models and traditional models of change to which I was exposed in my studies. I now see them as rather reductionist and linear in nature. Internationally, scholars have isolated key characteristics of leadership that have focused on the leader as an individual. These traditional models suggest that there are key characteristics for successful leadership that can predict and create conditions to achieve particular future outcomes, for example a clear vision, a common mission, clear goals, shared decision making and a collaborative spirit (for example, Geisjel, Sleeger, Leithwood & Jantzi, 2003; Scott & Jaffe, 2004; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Leithwood & Poplin, 1992; Van der Westhuizen, 2000; Rayner & Gunter, 2005; Parsons & Jessup, 2011). The dominant debate in leadership theory has been on how leaders with this core set of basic leadership practices can influence others toward desired objectives within frameworks of formal, most often hierarchical, organisational structures. I believe this thinking influenced my practices and stances, and is very evident in my early years in a leadership position as shared in this chapter.

3.5 My fourth impossible thing!

I achieved my fourth impossible thing when I was promoted to principal within one year and three months of being deputy principal. I did not anticipate such a quick career change.

The principal was promoted to the position of Senior Education Manager in the provincial Department of Education, and was required to take up her new position within a week. With the encouragement of the Senior Education Manager and the School Governing Body (SGB), I accepted the position of acting principal. It seemed like déjà vu as I felt that I was once again thrown into the ‘deep end’. After I accepted the position, I was consumed by fear, trepidation and anxiety at the thought of the enormous responsibility before me. And yet, almost
simultaneously, I was excited and energised that this was an opportunity to explore endless possibilities for the Deaf and Deaf education!

During my term as deputy principal, I often questioned the academic programme at the school and whether we were offering quality education for the Deaf as promised in the Constitution (RSA, 1996c) and in the policy formulated and legislation enacted since 1994 when the democratic government came into power: the National Educational Policy Act (RSA, 1996a), the South African Schools Act (RSA, 1996b), Curriculum 2005, and Tirisano 2000. My vision was for an equitable, quality education for our learners. Hilltop School for the Deaf was going to be the best school in the province.

I took over the reins feeling insecure as I soon learned from some members of staff that a small number of them had expressed their dissatisfaction over my appointment as acting principal. Old fears had surfaced, with some expressing concern that I was going to continue being a ‘slave driver’. One member of management expressed her concern and disapproval over my appointment directly to me. Her concern was based on my limited management experience and a fear that I would implement even more changes. Her open disapproval concerned me as I knew that since she was a senior member of staff, with extensive experience in Deaf education, she could play an influential role with other staff members.

Despite this, my inspiration was those words I had seen during one of the first difficult meetings: “The will of God won’t lead you where His grace can’t keep you”. I recall the speech that I delivered at my very first staff meeting as acting principal, reproduced as follows:

2 March, 2001

May I take this opportunity of extending a warm welcome to all of you, and hope that you are well rested and ready to begin a new term. A new term which heralds change and challenge for all of us.

The confirmation of my appointment to the position of acting principal by the Department of Education has been finalised. The appointment of Mr Mazibuko as acting deputy has also been finalised by the Department of Education. I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating him on his appointment and believe that he is very worthy of the position. I also believe that he will be a tremendous asset to me and the institution.

I must admit that I accepted my position with a sense of trepidation and excitement. Trepidation because it is a huge challenge, and excitement because I believe that I can perform this function to the
best of my ability together with you – my team. I firmly believe that I have the abilities and capabilities to meet that challenge. Since we make up the core of the institution, together we can continue to progress and achieve new heights. In doing this we will take this institution into a position that we will be proud of.

It is my objective to make this institution a viable, successful and happy environment for management, staff and most especially our learners. I trust that I have your support in achieving these objectives.

It has come to my attention that certain members of staff are not entirely pleased with my appointment. Understandably change of any sort can be met with uncertainty. However, you have my commitment that my sole objective is the institution and the well-being of all in it.

I must emphasise that any dissatisfaction with my appointment will not impact on my objective. If any member of staff has a problem that may interfere or jeopardise the interests of the institution, then the proper lines of communication must be adhered to. No discussions outside this formal forum will be entertained. Personal opinion on my appointment and idle gossip will not be taken kindly as well.

Any problems encountered must have substance and ideally solutions.

Having said that, I need to emphasise the importance of every member of staff at this institution. Without your expertise and professionalism, my job would be that much more difficult.

I hope that all present with support my endeavour to improve the lives of our learners and that it becomes the goal of all staff.

A full staff meeting will be held on Friday.

At this point I would like to remind you that we have only 36 days in the term and it is imperative that productive work begins from today.

Are there any questions?

I thank you for your time.

I cannot recognise myself in this speech. The confidence was false, and fear, insecurity and uncertainty almost overwhelmed me. My vulnerability was masked by the formal and controlling tone I adopted, which could be read as an autocratic and arrogant stance. Looking back, I think
the subject position I took stemmed from the fact that in reality I felt extremely insecure and vulnerable.

This was the beginning of my leadership as the principal of Hilltop School for the Deaf.

3.6. Concluding thoughts

‘Leadership and learning are indispensible to each other’.

J. F. Kennedy (President of USA, 1917–1963)

So what have I learned about how to secure and sustain positive change in a school as an organisation? What did I learn about myself as a leader and about what the notion of leadership entails? What did I learn about the school as an organisation?

The Looking Glass provides a lens for me to view my leadership and the notion of leadership. I wish to share six new understandings from my narrative thus far.

My first is that leadership is an emergent phenomenon. Meyer, Connell and Klein (2005) explain that leadership events produce a new leadership identity, and that this identity formation occurs over time as events, experiences and people together define ‘who we are’ and what we do through our interactions. This argument seems to hold true for my early years as a leader.

My second key insight is that a leader’s agency can be enabled and constrained depending on the interplay of various contextual factors. This suggests that universal, decontextualised leadership development programmes are bound to be unsuccessful.

My third insight is that leadership involves human interaction and therefore has a strong emotional dimension. Examining a leader’s emotions can provide insight into the historical, social and political context in which leadership is taught and embedded.

My fourth key insight is that the discourse needs to change from a focus on individual leaders and their core practices to leadership as an organisational phenomenon. I have learned that the school is a complex system and that a new leader has to expect disequilibrium and nonlinearity in the emergence of his or her leadership capacities.
My fifth insight is that I have come to believe that dealing with diversity is central to change initiatives, particularly in multicultural, diverse school contexts and communities. From my experience, managing diversity has to be seen as a social characteristic and as a policy initiative in organisations and institutions.

A final key awareness I have is that change is contextual and is contingent on the dynamics of the socio-cultural context.

In Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 I share other impossible dreams I had as the person in the principal’s office, and how I navigated and negotiated them in the particular socio-cultural context of Hilltop School. In the next chapter I discuss my dream of raising the bar in literacy and language achievement at Hilltop School.
CHAPTER FOUR

MY DREAM – RAISING THE BAR IN LITERACY AND LANGUAGE ACHIEVEMENT

Door: ‘Why it’s impassible!’?

Alice: ‘Why, don’t you mean impossible?’

Door: ‘I mean impassible (chuckles). Nothing is impossible’

(Lewis Carroll, Through the Looking Glass)

4.1 Introduction

The Looking Glass world in Lewis Carroll’s book is a world where the impossible becomes possible. The story throughout raises the question of what is impossible, beginning at the moment when Alice exasperately states that “one can’t believe impossible things,” to which the Queen replies, “I daresay you haven’t had much practice.” The quote above concerning the exchange between Alice and the Door serves as a reiteration of the theme, what is impossible? There is a pun on the word “impassible”, and Alice is once again reminded that “nothing is impossible!” It is at this moment in the book that the Door conveys something immensely valuable to Alice. Things may be ‘impassable’ but are never impossible. Things are only seen as impossible if one does not have the power to believe.

When challenged with the issues of Deaf education, like Alice I too have been inclined to respond, “That’s impossible!” Initially, I saw the struggle of language and literacy learning and teaching in my early years of leadership at Hilltop as complex, and the prospect of effecting change as impossible. However, just like the Queen in the previous chapter, I grew to believe in accomplishing the impossible.

Could my belief in impossible things trouble the entrenched patterns of thought held by many of my staff that the Deaf cannot achieve high levels of language and literacy, that is, reading and writing? I pondered many questions: What would it take to raise the bar in learner achievement in reading and writing, a crucial life skill? What leadership capabilities were necessary for me to accomplish the ‘impossible’ in a complex socio-cultural context? How can I engage with the intricate interface of raising the quality of teaching and learning on the one hand, and the
professional development of my staff on the other, in the area of literacy, teaching and learning? Would I be able to resolve this impossible thing before breakfast like Alice had in the story?

As indicated in my previous chapters, the notion of leadership in educational institutions has become increasingly complex and elaborate over the past few decades. In my previous studies I engaged in considerable depth with the work of international scholars within educational leadership. I was excited by the various models of leadership I was studying, including transactional leadership (Bass, 2005; Lai, 2011), transformational leadership (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005) as well as distributed leadership (Scribner, Sawyer, Watson & Myers, 2007). As I reflect on these models, I note that most of the focus is on generic management issues such as the organisational conditions of an institution; ensuring the sustained capacity of an organisation to adapt and improve; strategic planning in the organisation driven by a strong vision, and the articulation of a sound mission and school climate. This is without doubt an important focus. I realise, however, that these models hold a critical limitation in the lack of attention given to key outcomes and the ultimate goal of education: student learning. This concern was expressed by Hopkins (2003), who argued that transformational leadership targets the wrong variables and fails to direct attention to teaching and learning, as well as the outcomes of the student.

Another problem raised is that the decentralisation of responsibility in local management of schools has shifted the focus of the leadership in schools worldwide. Principals have become budget managers, administrators of systems and the leaders of their colleagues (Hopkins, 2003; Bush, 2007). Their preoccupation with administrative matters leaves very little time for intellectual leadership, which is vital for the growth of the academic and intellectual component of the school. Principals tend to shift questions, instructions and professional development to others as their own knowledge becomes outdated.

When considering my own experiences as a teacher, I cannot recall the school principal providing any kind of intellectual leadership that had an impact on my development as a teacher or a curriculum developer. Leithwood, Louis, Anderson and Wahlstrom (2004) argue that not only is intellectual leadership imperative, but next to teaching, it is the second most important school-related factor that affects how the student learns. Significant scholarship considerations have recently emerged on what is considered the most suitable leadership capabilities and practices to enhance academic achievement (e.g. Bush et al., 2011; Bergeson, 2007; Bush, 2007). This is how the concept of ‘instructional leadership’ came into focus.
Instructional leadership focuses on the behaviour of teachers as they engage in activities that affect the academic growth of students and the level of student achievement. Managing instructional programmes in the school is therefore regarded as essential in leadership behaviour. This means that the principal is directly involved in developing strategies for successful teaching and learning as well as creating conditions that support the implementation of staff development and planning (Lunenburg, 2010; Enuewe & Egwunyenge, 2008). Waters and Grubb (2004) argue that the basics of instructional leadership include, most importantly, setting a clear vision, supporting and developing a talented teaching core and building a solid organisational structure to ensure high-quality academic outcomes. Studies internationally have shown that there is a strong link between instructional leadership and the performance of the student (Brewster & Klump, 2005; Walter, 2003; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Lunenburg, 2010).

Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) explain that an instructional leadership model aims to refocus the attention of the principal away from administrative duties and towards issues of teaching and learning, and student outcomes. Three main categories of practice are identified within this model: defining the school’s mission, managing the instructional programme and promoting a positive school learning climate. These main categories focus on controlling the development of specific academic goals, supervising and evaluating instruction, co-ordinating the curriculum, monitoring learner progress, protecting instructional time, promoting professional development, maintaining high visibility and providing incentives for teaching and learning. There are several common acts that exceptional instructional leaders engage in: shifting the focus to teaching and learning, building collaborative structures, using data to inform and improve learning and teaching, providing support and aligning the curriculum, instruction and assessment (Lunenburg, 2010).

When I entered my principalship at Hilltop School, I had no knowledge of the growing body of scholarship on instructional leadership. I soon came to realise that I had once more been thrown into an area of engagement that I then saw as impossible to achieve for the Deaf. Looking back now, I realise that particular contextual influences, events and the inherent tensions and dilemmas in my school played a role in influencing my changing professional identities and the diverse subject positions I took at different times. As a leader, your life is rarely predetermined. I believe that my personal ‘agency’ is cultivated from my day-to-day experiences, imperatives and social relations. Moral and ethical demands, socio-political influences and my interrogation of the multiple dynamics in my particular socio-cultural context played a role in fostering and
cultivating my agency. I believe that my leadership enactments in my unique socio-cultural context illuminate the complex interplay between structure and agency.

In this chapter and the next I reflect on my enactments as an instructional leader and on how I was compelled to take complex subject positions with the aim of creating a synergy between a focus on teaching and learning on the one hand, and building support and capacity building on the other. When I think about the choices and decisions I made, I know that my agency was underpinned by a social-rights agenda. I wanted my learners to have equal access to the quality education that is promised to them in all South African policy documents as their social right as a South African citizen.

In this chapter I share and examine my instructional leadership stances with respect to the language and literacy curriculum taught at the school. In order to contextualise my performances as an instructional leader, I have had to engage with literature that has enabled me to understand reflexively the politics of language and communication for the Deaf, particularly the ongoing debates on issues of policy and methodology related to oral speech, manualism, bilingual-bicultural and the different paradigms that underpin them (see Appendix 2 for a detailed background on these issues).

This autoethnographic study is primarily what began my intense examination of international research on the politics and methodologies of teaching language and communication for the Deaf. I found that the issue of the most appropriate language curriculum for the Deaf and the issue of the language of teaching and learning in schooling contexts had been a hot debate worldwide for many decades (e.g. Mathews, 2011; Ladd, 2003a; Moores; 2001; Ram & Muthukrishna, 2011). I grew to realise that the debates are rooted in the different constructions of deafness and the particular discourses influencing them (Botha, 2006; Lane, 2005; Solario, 2004). Solario (2004) argues that deafness is a social construction that is open to many interpretations. What I found to be important was that those social constructions and the underlying ideologies hold the power to label, define, control and marginalise particular groups of learners.

I came to realise that hearing people, including professionals, demonstrated divergent orientations to deafness. There are some whose ideas originate from a medical orientation and thus they seek to pursue a cure for deafness, believing deafness to be a personal tragedy. Deafness is considered to be a barrier to the hearing world. This orientation is in line with the discourse of disablement (Solario, 2004). In this case, Deaf individuals are treated as inferior to
their hearing peers (Andrews, Leigh, & Weiner, 2004). On the other hand, there are others who view deafness as a part of a cultural minority who possess a unique language and cultural identity. From this perspective, deafness is a consequence of the deprivation of functional language (Ladd, 2003a; Akach, 2011).

The scholarship dedicated to this field enabled me to interrogate and deconstruct the challenging discourses within Deaf education. I immersed myself in examining the politics within the debates on language for the Deaf and their impact on Deaf education. Through this autoethnographic study, I grew to realise the importance of my engagement in critical ideological debates within Deaf education. I came to recognise the crucial importance of these understandings to my leadership as a school principal. I studied literature in the field of Deaf education and gained exposure to the debates in the various forums in which I participated and in informal debates between my peers and the staff at the school (Figs 26, 27 and 28).

Figure 26. Debating language issues for Deaf education.
Figure 27. A strategic workshop conducted by Dr Martin from Gallaudet University.

Figure 28. South African National Association for Special Education conference.
As a result, my interrogation of the literature and my immersion in critical debates on Deaf education served as an analytical tool for my reflections on my performances as an instructional leader. In the sections below, I shift my focus to the issue of language at Hilltop School. I share my leadership performances in relation to this facet of the school as well as to the lives of the learners within the school. My successes, struggles and tensions in my change endeavours are illuminated.

4.2 Troubling language policy and curriculum practices at Hilltop School: Where did it all begin?

One issue that concerned me when I entered into education for the Deaf was that globally Deaf children were leaving school with relatively poor academic results, particularly when it came to literacy. This continues to be a growing concern in Deaf education internationally (for example, Allen, DeLuca & Napoli, 2007; Traxler, 2000; Marschark, Lang & Albertini, 2002; Humphries, Kushalnagar, Mathur, et al., 2012; George, Muigai & Nyakwara, 2013). I have always believed that high academic achievement for Deaf learners is a human-rights issue. All children should be allowed the right to achieve to the best of their potential.

When I entered Hilltop School, however, I had very little knowledge of the language policy and curriculum practices for the Deaf. My restricted understanding resulted in the thinking that since the learners were Deaf, Sign Language was the obvious language of communication. I reasoned that they would learn at a similar pace to their hearing peers since the only difference was the language of communication.

I can still recall the day clearly when the question of language became my focus. At this critical point in my life as the principal of Hilltop School my priority became change and innovation in respect of the language curriculum. I was newly appointed as principal, and sitting alone late one afternoon in my office I was somewhat startled by the sound of the learners conversing with one another. Although the speech was not very comprehensible, it was clear enough to be understood by me. I peered out of my window to observe a group of Grade 5 learners verbally communicating with each another in English with the support of signs (Fig. 29).
The next day, I shared this critical incident and my new awareness with the speech therapist. I eagerly questioned her: Are there any learners in the school who can communicate orally? Is there diversity amongst learners in respect of degree of hearing loss? Are the diverse needs, capabilities and competencies of learners taken into account when constructing the language curriculum?

I found that I was thrust headlong into the politics of the language issue. I wanted to know more, and because I had very limited knowledge on this topic and was enthusiastic to learn more, I took it upon myself over the next few weeks to engage in intense discussions with the speech therapist, audiologist, teachers and management staff. My central discovery was that the school did not have a sound, theoretically driven language policy. Although the Constitution (RSA, 1996c) and the South African Schools Act (RSA, 1996b) provide legal and legislative frameworks for the use of Sign Language as a medium of instruction in schools for the Deaf, the National Department of Education has not articulated a language policy for Schools for the Deaf in South Africa. I came to realise that schools consequently formulated their own arbitrary, ad hoc language policies, which were not based on sound research-based principles. To me this violated the right to quality education promised in South Africa’s Constitution.

There is widespread agreement that strong literacy skills are what give learners access to a quality education. Smuts (2002) suggests that in South Africa the lack of a defined language policy in
schools for the Deaf has resulted in an ineffective use of unscientifically based English manual signs that cannot be regarded as Sign Language. This becomes a handicap for the schools for the Deaf since literacy is compromised.

In my reflections, I began questioning and scrutinising the language and literacy curriculum at the school. I began to make some interesting observations during my visits to classrooms as well as in discussions with the teachers (Fig. 30). I found that although Sign Language was considered the medium of communication in the school, teaching reflected various constructions, definitions and practices of Sign Language. In certain classrooms teachers used Signed English as a medium of instruction and communication. This is when every word is symbolised by a sign while following the word order of an English sentence. The purpose of Signed English is to be able to present spoken English visually. There is a clear distinction between Sign Language and Signed English as Signed English is not in fact considered an independent language. Signed English is a representation of the spoken English language and although it belongs to a signed system of language, it is not a true language (Swisher, 1998; Malloy, 2003). Signed English began globally when Deaf learners began experiencing noticeable difficulty in using oral language and communication programmes. Adding a sign to enhance oral communication proved to reduce the frustration levels of the learners. Teachers and parents quickly adopted this method of communicating with the children (see Appendix 2).

Figure 30. Engaging in staff discussions on language practice in the classroom.
In the early years of the establishment of Sign Language, teachers at schools began to adopt the concept of simultaneously signing English while speaking it in class, which allowed them the ability to use total communication. Total communication encourages the simultaneous use of Sign Language and speech. However, my observations in the classroom revealed that although signing is used in this approach, it is not in fact considered Sign Language. Signs used in this method followed the language structure of the spoken word; for example, if the spoken language being used is English, signs following the English word order are used simultaneously with spoken English (see Appendix 2). This differs from Sign Language, which is an independent full language with its own vocabulary, grammar, literature and poetry (Malloy, 2003).

Figure 31 shows the teachers’ answers to questions I raised, as documented in my personal diary:

Figure 31. Journal extract: 15 August 2002.
After observing the responses of the teachers, I came to understand that there was clearly no uniformity in the language of instruction within the school. What was even more concerning was that the teachers had no underlying philosophy, values or theoretical principles that supported the choices and decisions they made in their language and curriculum practices. There was an evident mixed approach throughout the school, where both Signed English and total communication was being used by most teachers (Fig. 32). Another concern was that many teachers were not aware of whether they were implementing SASL or not. Were the teachers not trained in SASL? What were their levels of proficiency in SASL? I felt that this had to be crucial for professional development in the months to follow.

What was evident was that the teachers were not using SASL as a medium of instruction, nor were they teaching it as a school subject. Additionally, adding isiZulu as a *curriculum* subject increased the confusion over the issue. Sign Language is considered the home language of the Deaf. I also discovered that teachers did not in fact view Sign Language as another language in

---

4 *IsiZulu* is one of the official languages of South Africa. It is spoken by approximately ten million Zulu people who live mainly in the province of KwaZulu Natal. The Zulu people originate from the Bantu/Nguni tribe in Africa.
South Africa. They were not aware that their teaching was underpinned by unsound theoretical beliefs and pedagogical skills in teaching Sign Language. Teachers held the misconception that they were using SASL, when in fact they were using either speech using several signs, or Signed English. What disturbed me most of all was the low achievement of learners in language and literacy. Test results of a reading test conducted by the audiologists in 2001 with Grade 4 learners revealed that their reading levels were at a Grade 1 level.

![Analysis of reading levels — Grade 4](image)

**Figure 33. Reading levels of nine Grade 4 learners.**

Figure 33 depicts the results of nine learners who were assessed on their literacy skills. Two learners obtained a raw score greater than 30, indicating reading levels > 7 years/Grade 1 level. Seven learners obtained raw scores less than 30, indicating literacy levels below 7 years/Grade 1 level.

After reflecting on the test results, discussing the matter with staff members and conducting classroom observations, I wrote in my personal diary (Fig. 34). This convinced me that the language and literacy curriculum was in desperate need of review. I knew that the language issue was extremely ideological and political, and that I had to approach curriculum change with great caution. Reflecting back, I experienced some anxiety and a degree of trepidation.
4.2.1 Collaborating for change: A pilot project for the hard of hearing

4.2.1.1 The right to a language

Scholars argue that everyone has the right to be given the opportunity to learn a language, (spoken or signed) well enough to ensure their psychological, social and economic wellbeing (for example, Allen et al., 2007; Simms & Thumann, 2007). Meadow-Orlans, Mertens and Sass-Lehrer (2003) proclaim that Deaf learners are continuously overlooked in countless schooling environments in comparison with their peers who are hard of hearing. Humphries et al. (2012) pointed out that 90% of children in schools for the Deaf in the United States of America possessed partial residual hearing. This means that only 10% of the learners were considered completely Deaf. Similar results have been documented in South African empirical research (Ross & Levitt, 2000; Reagan, 2008; Akach, 2010). Bekker (2002) found that hard-of-hearing learners are often combined with Deaf children in classrooms that are more attuned to the needs of the Deaf. In other words, despite the fact that the abilities of the hard-of-hearing demand different educational methods, they are exposed to the same educational programme of the profoundly Deaf, which requires a primarily visual mode of communication. At the time, I feared
that the hard-of-hearing learners at my school would become functionally Deaf over time as there was a de-emphasis on their auditory capabilities.

I became more and more convinced that children with residual hearing were fully capable of gaining crucial benefits from appropriate auditory management, and that this would enhance spoken language. I reasoned that the education for those with residual hearing could be transmitted directly through hearing, and this approach would give them access to an auditory language such as English. Pilling and Barrett’s (2008) study showed that learners with residual hearing hold some degree of hearing that provides the basis for auditory verbal language. I was aware of the major technological advancements that were occurring at the time for the Deaf, such as accessibility to digital signal processing, hearing aids and innovative classroom amplification systems. The idea that hearing could now be maximised with technology spurred me to act.

There was still a looming sense of uncertainty about the language issue in South Africa as a result of the constant ideological and political debates, particularly originating from within Deaf culture (see Appendix 2). Figure 35 shows an excerpt from my personal diary that reflects my struggle at the time.

Figure 35. Journal extract: 1 July 2002.
4.2.1.2 Self-questioning our professional practices

After a week of pondering, I daringly began discussions with staff, sharing my concerns and reflections, and inviting them to engage with me. I was as open as I could be, laid bare my own limitations and inadequacies in this area of the curriculum, and invited what I sincerely believed to be their expert advice and support. The debates we had were intense, absorbing, honest and extremely insightful. Staff voiced their fears, concerns, possible barriers to change and different possibilities. Figure 36 is an extract from my diary that captures my thoughts at the time.

![Figure 36. Journal extract: 18 August 2002.](image)

These were all troubling questions. I was pleased to notice that the staff were beginning to self-question their professional practices. Many critical issues emerged from debates and discussions, including the fear of change, the concern about exclusionary pressures from certain sectors in Deaf education who were thought to be politically powerful, and anxiety about how the curriculum would be reconfigured and mediated for learners.

From these discussions I came to see that the hard-of-hearing learners were exposed to what I considered exclusionary pressures and even exploitation in our classrooms. This deeply troubled
me. Teachers were using them almost as teacher assistants! My question was the following: Although using learners as resources to peers is a good concept, to what extent was this compromising access to education for the hard-of-hearing in this context? A class teacher commented at one of our meetings:

*We use the hard of hearing learners to help us to communicate with those that are profoundly Deaf. Since hard of hearing children understand us better when we sign and speak, they are able to teach other children. They are like teacher assistants and can communicate better with other learners using Sign Language. They are able to use two different languages, English and Sign Language. We really depend on them. But because we are a signing school, we don’t really encourage them to speak in the classroom to other learners. Sometimes some teachers pretend that these learners can’t hear.*

*(Mjwara, 2002)*

A member of my management team made the following remarks:

*In the hostels, there is often rivalry between those who can speak and those who cannot speak. Although only a few learners can speak, they are regarded as the ‘pets’ of the housemothers. Everyone knows them because of the recognition they receive from the hostel staff. Because they can speak, they communicate better with the staff and are therefore always required to run errands and assist the staff with communication. Staff in the hostel have limited signing skills; therefore, the hard-of-hearing learners are considered valuable to them in their work.*

*(Sithole, 2002)*

These critical issues mentioned in the extracts above intensified my determination for a strategic intervention for the learners at Hilltop School. I grew strongly committed to the goal of unlocking the literacy potential for all Deaf learners, including those who were hard-of-hearing. To my dismay, I learned that hard-of-hearing learners were very rarely assessed. Elementary audiological tests were conducted for admission purposes only. In addition, due to limited funding and the shortage of adequately trained audiological staff, hearing aids were allocated only to newly admitted learners. New admissions averaged about twenty learners per year. The primary aim of the hearing aid for these Deaf learners was not to access speech sounds but to identify louder environmental sounds. I was assured by the audiologist that an increase in the identification of environmental sounds was a safety precaution for Deaf learners; for example, when a Deaf child attempts to cross a road, he or she will be able to hear the low-pitch sounds of cars and trucks approaching through the use of a hearing aid.
I requested audiological testing of our learners to ascertain and identify the total number of hard-of-hearing learners in the school. The outcome of these results was that twenty-four learners out of a total of 320 learners had moderate hearing loss. Moderate hearing loss means that learners would be able to access speech sounds with appropriate amplification. The assessments further revealed that these learners were able to speak, although not completely fluently. They were using English as a form of communication with each other in social settings, such as playgrounds, dining halls and in the hostels. It was interesting to note, however, that they did not speak in the classroom.

In the days that followed, I sensed a new excitement in the attitude of both the therapist and audiologist as they began to question their own professional practices within the school. They soon agreed that the learners who possessed usable residual hearing were marginalised by a curriculum that failed to cater for the language needs of the hard-of-hearing learner. They proceeded to petition for a language policy that would address this inequality. They explained that with appropriate auditory management, in terms of hearing aids and speech and language therapy, these learners were capable of using audition as their primary channel for acquiring an auditory-based language system. The audiologist reassured me further with the following remarks that I recorded in my journal (Fig. 37):

![Figure 37. Journal extract: 1 September 2002.](image-url)
The conclusions that arose from the assessments by the audiology team inspired a new confidence in me. It became clear that it was imperative for the school to design a language policy that would cater for the diversity of all learners within the school. Thus, when the audiologist and speech therapist suggested a pilot project for the hard-of-hearing learners, I felt that my prayers had finally been answered. I agreed with the proposal that the Grade 5 hard-of-hearing learners (those I had heard speaking outside my office) would constitute the pilot class. There were ten learners in total. I decided that grouping the Grade 6 learners in one class would be an easy operational task. To my surprise, a substantial number of teachers showed enthusiasm for this idea (Fig. 38). Many now came to understand that the language curriculum for those who were hard-of-hearing needed urgent review. An insightful interview with a Grade 5 teacher conducted during the writing of this thesis captures this sense of enthusiasm:

I was very excited at the prospect of the new class. I often felt that it would be a good idea to have all those that were hard-of-hearing in one class. So when I heard that it was going to happen I was overjoyed. But I was also worried because I knew that there would be some that wouldn’t be happy at this idea since some learners were helping teachers teach other learners. I knew that the timetable would have to change and we would have to include speech reading as well as adopting the oral approach while still being aware that the speech therapists would guide and support in the process. I knew that the learners were going to benefit so I was willing to work hard and help them.

(Radebe, 2012)

Figure 38. Discussing the hard-of-hearing pilot class at a staff development workshop.
4.2.1.3 Reactions to the proposed pilot

At the time, there were varied reactions to the proposed language intervention we wanted to implement with the hard-of-hearing learners. Many members of the school management team were uneasy and expressed concerns as recorded in my journal extract in Figure 39.

Figure 39. Journal extract: 4 September 2002.

I soon discovered that a group of staff members was disgruntled. They opposed any kind of language intervention and confronted me by declaring that Sign Language was the only language for the Deaf. These teachers were passionate that Sign Language should remain as the sole medium of instruction at the school. My interaction with staff during meetings as well as informal discussions made me realise that a few teachers were anxious and feared change. I also noticed that there was a group of teachers who remained indifferent and merely awaited the outcome of the pilot programme with disinterest.

As I reflect on the reactions of the staff, I am able to see that many teachers who held the view that Sign Language was the only language for the Deaf had their philosophical underpinnings in the socio-cultural construction of deafness. Sign Language is seen as an essential cultural component of deafness; hence, the introduction of an alternative medium of instruction
threatened this fundamental belief. Furthermore, I am also able to see that my proposed change initiative evoked feelings of tension and uncertainty in certain members of staff. This I believe led to those staff members being disgruntled and apathetic.

Despite these negative views, I remained steadfast in my belief that supporting a curriculum policy that did not cater for diversity amongst our learners was perpetuating a social injustice. I shifted my focus to the teachers who supported the proposed initiative, and turned for support to these staff members who were committed and enthusiastic about the pilot project. The apprehension and anxiety felt by certain members of staff interested me, and I was determined to support them during the change process. I knew that their concerns were legitimate, and I certainly did not want to create new exclusions in the process of implementing what I thought was the launch of a more inclusive curriculum for the hard-of-hearing learner. I fervently hoped that the project would enhance the collaborative, supportive, and inclusive ethos and culture in the whole school as an institution. I was driven by my passionate desire to achieve quality education for all learners in the school.

Looking back, I have to admit that as the pilot project took shape I was very aware that I was perceived as being autocratic in my management style. I did, however, question myself at times: Am I acting in a unilateral way? Am I taking a perilous risk? Am I acting in haste? Have I made a considered decision?

4.2.2 Mapping the pilot project

4.2.2.1 Our ‘working for change’ committee

Teachers volunteered to set up a core committee comprising the Grade 6 teachers, the audiologist, the speech therapist, the deputy principal and the head of the curriculum committee (Fig. 43). I was also a member of the committee, and the deputy principal was nominated by the committee as chairperson.

As agreed, the pilot class would comprise the 10 learners who were identified as hard-of-hearing. Although these learners had different degrees of hearing loss, audiological testing revealed that seven out of the 10 learners had only moderate hearing loss. The other three learners bordered on moderate to severe hearing loss. Moderate hearing loss ranges from 41dB to 55 dB, and moderate to severe hearing loss ranges from 56dB to 90dB (Fig. 40).
Figure 40. Representation of degrees of hearing loss.

Figure 41. Visual representation of the loudness and pitch of everyday sounds (http://uknewbornhearing.volasite.com/resources/audiogram.familiarsounds.jpg)
Learners ranged from the ages of 13 to 15 years old (Fig. 42). All 10 learners had hearing parents. These learners were able to converse through speech, although their speech was not always completely intelligible. There was one particular learner who had post-lingual deafness and had come from a mainstream school. He had acquired speech and then lost his hearing when he was eight years old. As a result, he was able to lip read and understand spoken language. The academic achievement levels of these learners varied, but overall they functioned below grade level in all areas of the curriculum.

Figure 42. The group of hard-of-hearing learners.

The committee engaged in in-depth debates around curriculum issues at the numerous meetings held (see Fig. 44). Various questions were raised and argued: Would this be an exclusively oral class? What would be the status of Sign Language? Would Sign Language be abandoned in favour of speech? What curriculum would be followed? Which teachers would teach these learners? Would learners be able to understand the speech of teachers? What difficulties could we anticipate? Which language would become their home language, English or Sign Language? Whom should we consult? How do other schools for the Deaf in our province cater for the learners who are hard of hearing? What would the medium of instruction be? Would it be English exclusively or both Sign Language and English? Should we encourage learners to use English outside the classroom? Should these learners be separated from the general signing
population of the school during breaks, in the hostel and in social activities? What levels of support would be needed from the speech therapist and audiologist? Which curriculum should be followed? Would learners be able to follow the National Curriculum for mainstream learners? What criteria would be used for the selection of teachers?

Being fully aware of my lack of experience and expertise when it came to education for the Deaf, I depended on the teachers to guide me as we debated crucial issues. Seeking help from other schools for the Deaf was futile, as I soon discovered that all schools for the Deaf in our province were considered 'signing schools' with no programme for the hard of hearing. Looking back, I regret my limited search for direction. I could have explored lessons from international contexts had I turned to technology and online searches.

After much deliberation, the committee finally decided on a way forward. Five strategic steps would be implemented: 1) the mode of instruction for all subject areas would change from Sign Language to English; 2) Sign Language would be used as a support to aid in the explanation of difficult English words and concepts; 3) the curriculum would be aligned with the national curriculum for mainstream schools; 4) we would adopt an individualised approach to teaching; and 5) the use of audiological intervention, including speech and language therapy and intensive reading programmes, would become the cornerstone of this intervention.

Figure 43. The ‘working for change’ committee deliberating on a way forward.
As I reflect on these strategies through the looking glass, I ponder the principles that guided our critical decisions at that time. I am certain that staff members recognised that our hard-of-hearing learners were at risk of marginalisation, exclusion and underachievement; hence, we felt a moral obligation to implement a principle of inclusion that would ensure the full participation and achievement of these learners in the educational system (UNESCO, 2003). I am also aware that we had developed an attitude of openness to diversity, as we recognised that the learners in the class for the hard of hearing represented a wide spectrum of hearing loss and exercised different choices in their mode of communication. This led to a respect for individual needs and

### Figure 44. Agenda of a Language Steering Committee meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOTICE : LANGUAGE STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE : 14 AUGUST 2002 AT 10H00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENUE : SCHOOL BOARDROOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENDA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. OPENING PRAYER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. APOLOGIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. MATTERS ARISING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. NEW MATTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• REPORT BACK ON AUDIOLOGICAL RESULTS - SPEECH THERAPIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• REPORT ON CURRENT POLICY AND WAY FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TEACHING STRATEGIES TO BE ADOPTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CORE FUNCTIONS AND TASKS TO BE COMPLETED BEFORE NEXT MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MANAGEMENT PLAN TO UNROLL STRATEGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WAY FORWARD AND RECAP OF DISCUSSION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. CLOSURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
differences, which gave rise to our application of an individualised approach to teaching and the creation of a communicative environment with specific communication strategies.

4.2.2.2 Turning to stakeholders

As a school we were aware that we had powerful stakeholders whom we had to confront in any change initiative at the school. Early on, this was an issue that was raised in our discussions and there was some trepidation felt by all. I therefore deemed it necessary to seek validation from the School Governing Body (SGB) and the parents first. The SGB comprises of representatives of the Church, parents, the Deaf Federation of South Africa (DeafSA), teaching as well as non-teaching staff, and learners. The chairperson of the SGB is a representative of the Church. Hilltop School itself is built on Church property and the Church is a critical sponsor of the school. DeafSA is a national organisation in South Africa whose principal role is to promote and protect the status of SASL in schools for the Deaf (see Appendix 2).

I requested a special SGB meeting to discuss the pilot project in September 2002. The pilot project was discussed and explained to all members, and DeafSA raised objections to the use of English as a medium of instruction. Being aware of the custodian role that DeafSA plays in Deaf culture, I was not surprised by this reaction. Representatives of DeafSA emphasised vehemently that Sign Language was the only language that could be used by Deaf people. I was relieved when the chairperson interjected and challenged DeafSA, stating categorically that there was merit and value in the proposed strategic intervention for those learners who were hard of hearing. The support of the Church was invaluable for me and enhanced my confidence. The Church was a significant stakeholder due to the influential role it played as a major sponsor of the school. After much intense deliberation, DeafSA surrendered and the pilot project was given endorsement and support. I was ecstatic, as I was now a step closer to achieving my impossible dream. Could the hard-of-hearing learners finally become linguistically competent and function at and above grade level? How would the learners navigate the new curriculum, and what impact would this have on the identities of the learners?

With a renewed sense of energy, a follow-up meeting was held for all parents and learners in the pilot project. As discussed in Chapter 2, most of the parents hail from rural areas and are from very poor socio-economic and educational backgrounds. Consequently, organising a special
unscheduled meeting had financial implications for them. On account of the fact that I deemed their participation vital, I decided to sponsor any travelling costs incurred.

At the meeting parents and learners were briefed on the nature of pilot project. The results of the audiological tests were presented together with the aims and objectives of the proposed project. The goal of the intervention was to maximise and increase residual hearing so that the English language could be used as a means of communication. We trusted that this would lead to linguistic competence and facilitate access to the curriculum. It was, however, emphasised that Sign Language would not be abandoned!

To my surprise, parents endorsed the project unanimously. At the time, I wondered about their decision and what underpinned it.

Was their response related to the fact that they were hearing individuals, and that the new curriculum would enhance communication within the family?

Did they want a better quality of education for their children?

Did they desire a curriculum that would be responsive to their children’s individual needs and strengths?

Did their decision relate to their aspirations and long-term goals for the children, in particular that of independent citizenship?

Did they see a pilot project as the conduit to secure a place for their children in a hearing society?

Akach (2010) in his study of South African parents’ expectations for their Deaf children found that

the ultimate parental aspiration for their deaf children is for a child to grow up, get a good education, find employment, marry and eventually have children of their own, thus perpetuating the family structure (p. 119).

The learners were very excited about the new proposed class and were positive that their academic performance would improve. However, a few of them expressed concern about the reaction of other learners to them speaking and not using Sign Language. I once again
emphasised that Sign Language would still be used and that they could exercise choice in their mode of communication with other learners.

4.2.3 Implementing the pilot project: A step closer to a dream

The new class of hard-of-hearing learners that comprised 10 Grade 6 learners was started in January 2003. Staff members were unanimous in the goal of providing an education that was on par with that offered to hearing children. We were convinced that the language barriers faced by our hard-of-hearing learners, and not their sensory disability, were the core problems related to their poor academic achievement. It is hypothesised that the academic problems of Deaf learners are characterised by poor communication between Deaf learners and their teachers (Reed, Antia & Kreimeyer, 2008; Powers, 2003; Akach, 2011). The language of learning and teaching is cited internationally as the single most important contributing factor to poor literacy acquisition for Deaf learners (Glazer & Van Pletzen, 2012). We were therefore convinced that the use of English as a medium of instruction for the hard-of-hearing learners would improve their literacy. As discussed earlier in this chapter, these hard-of-hearing learners were already communicating in English, and had moderate hearing loss. It is for this reason that we felt convinced that English would help them to access written texts and improve their literacy.

My own experience at Hilltop School confirmed that language and communication is considered one of the greatest challenges for teachers of the Deaf. I consider the language system of Deaf learners to be very complex. Many Deaf learners use SASL as their primary language of communication, and at school they are usually introduced to English as a language of teaching and learning. In addition, many Deaf learners may come from families who speak yet another South African language at home. Negotiating between these different language systems can be an area of concern for teachers in Deaf education. With regard to the hard-of-hearing learners, I learned that they were using SASL as their primary language of communication and learning from Grade 0 until Grade 5, and were also able to communicate orally in English. Children who have adequate hearing and an internal language base are able to use these skills to develop a second oral language (Storbeck, 2003; Akach, 2011). It is my understanding that SASL and the residual hearing that they possess is used as a scaffold for them to learn English. I am inclined to believe that the fact that these learners have a fair amount of hearing assists them with acquiring English (written and spoken) as an additional language.
With our goal of improving literacy and academic performance firmly in mind, we accessed the National Curriculum as prescribed by the Department of Education for mainstream schools. The content of this curriculum comprised eight learning areas: Languages, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Technology, Economic and Management Sciences, Life Orientation and Arts and Culture. Detailed assessment criteria for each learning area are included in the policy framework of the curriculum statement.

Since this was not a homogenous group of learners, teachers had to respond to their different degrees of hearing loss, language proficiency and levels of academic achievement; hence, an individualised approach to teaching was adopted. The following factors assisted teachers in implementing individualised instruction: the small class size (10 learners); teachers being entrenched in Deaf culture, for example being fluent in Sign Language; and teachers’ ability and confidence to communicate with learners both in English and Sign Language.

In the delivery of the curriculum, language and literacy took precedence. Our focus in the area of language became listening, speaking, reading, thinking and reasoning, writing, language structure and language use.

Every effort was made to maximise the hearing of learners through technological interventions and speech training. To this end, all learners were fitted with digital hearing aids. This audiological intervention was designed to enhance the development of language by improving acquired language, speech development and auditory awareness. The language therapy sessions conducted by the speech therapists targeted learners’ expressive and receptive language skills. During these sessions, language and vocabulary associated with different themes (aligned with those in the curriculum) were explained and discussed with the learners. Learners were encouraged to express themselves using the language skills taught and to transfer these skills to other communicative environments.

Speech development was achieved by teaching learners how to produce individual units of sound. This involved instructing learners on lip-reading patterning, placement of articulators (lips, tongue and palates), voice versus voiceless sounds, and airflow control.

Auditory awareness encouraged learners to use their residual hearing optimally. In this regard learners were exposed to different environmental sounds, music and speech sounds. Activities with learners were designed to develop skills in the areas of sound detection, localisation, memory, and the sequencing of everyday sounds.
Reading became the cornerstone of the language programme. The reading programme was designed to inculcate in learners a passion for reading. We envisaged that reading would enable learners to access the curriculum, increase their general knowledge and explore links with other areas of the curriculum. An additional hour per day was allocated in the timetable for reading. This reading programme was designed by the school speech therapist and included independent reading, teachers reading to students, shared reading and writing, and meaning-based vocabulary instruction. Learners were exposed to books and magazines that stimulated their interests. Books were carefully chosen according to the ability of learners.

Another vital focus in this pilot class was assessments. As mentioned earlier, detailed assessment criteria were provided in the National Curriculum Statement. Assessments are critical to measure learner achievement levels. Since assessments were designed for hearing learners, teachers had to ensure that while assessments remained comprehensive and equitable, the tests had to be fully accessible to our learners. To this end the language of the instructions in the assessments often had to be adapted. For example, idiomatic language and subordinate phrases embedded within sentences had to be avoided. Often instructions had to be changed to become more ‘Deaf friendly’. For example, ‘left’ or ‘left over’ was changed to ‘how many are left?’ Multiple-choice questions had to provide enough context because learners with limited hearing need more context to answer multiple-choice questions than their hearing peers. Careful consideration had to be taken when testing the content of subjects such as mathematics, social studies, etc. Teachers had to ensure that assessments did not become a test of the learners’ ability in the English language but instead a direct test of the actual content, unless the test was to test knowledge and skill in English.

In addition, teachers often designed their own methods for assessments, such as interactive interviews and observation scales. Individualised testing was done frequently to ascertain learners’ understanding so that teachers could adjust and review their teaching methodology and levels to suit learners’ needs.

Looking back, we employed what may be described as an action research approach. We held regular monitoring and evaluation meetings, and we were extremely reflexive. We placed the teaching and learning under constant scrutiny and analysis, and made changes and adaptations on the basis of the data obtained. Some of the changes and adaptations were as follows:
The new words of the different learning areas were provided to learners in advance so that they had sufficient time to assimilate the language of their subjects.

Often written assignments and projects given to learners had to be modified with simpler instructions or with more visual representations.

Teachers discovered that learners understood them better if their speech was clear, if they provided contextual clues and if they refrained from speaking when writing on the board.

If worksheets were provided before lessons, learners were given sufficient time to read before a lesson and seemed better prepared in class.

The timetable had to be changed as teachers found that contact teaching for the whole day can be tiring for hard-of-hearing learners, as they have to concentrate intently to focus on lip reading and listening. Therefore, group work and independent study had to be built into the timetable.

A successful way of reinforcing lessons was with written notes.

Printed material had to be written in simple English that was easy to understand. For example, ‘the school was founded in 1963’ could be replaced with ‘the school was built in 1963’.

The extensive use of visual aids was very helpful with language since the Deaf are visual learners and do not rely on their auditory memory. As a consequence the school had to invest in overhead projectors and movies and videos with sub-titles.

In addition, every effort was made to create an individualised visual and auditory communicative education environment to maximise the learning potential of our learners. We aimed to create a classroom environment with optimum sound reception. Thus, the classroom was chosen with great care. We ensured that there was no window behind the teacher that could cause a silhouette on her face. The classroom was fitted with good lighting, so that the teacher speaking was visible to all learners. In order to improve the acoustics in the room, carpets were fitted to aid in sound absorption. A print-rich environment was achieved with the display of charts, pictures and the written work of learners displayed on the walls and hallways of the classroom (Fig. 45).
4.2.4 Some successes

Within 10 months of beginning the pilot project, teachers reported a notable improvement in the academic performance of learners in all learning areas. The most significant improvement was in their reading, writing and speech. The learners’ improved reading skills had a direct impact on their writing, as did the improvement in their spelling and vocabulary skills. The improved writing skills of learners are illustrated in Figures 46 and 47.
The day I was born
She was there
She was the first
To hold me
She was the first
With a smile on her face
She loved me
She cried when
I was sick
She took good care for me
Because she was the first
To see me
She made me brave
She gave me life
Today I am here
Because of her
She is the best
The most greatest
Woman in this world
Without her I was not
Gonna be as I am today
Handsome is because of her
Bravely is because of her
Wow! She is my heroine
My mother I love you so much.

By: Alex Mjaiwo

Figure 46. A poem written by a Grade 6 learner.
Teachers reported that the improved literacy of the learners enabled them to follow both verbal and written instructions for assigned tasks, tests and assignments accurately. Previously a common concern of all the teachers at Hilltop School had been that learners were unable to follow simple written instructions in tests and daily tasks. Instructions had had to be repeatedly signed to learners, and this had become a stumbling block to accessing the curriculum.
The marked improvement in their speech was noticed by all members of staff, and learners spoke to the hearing staff with confidence. I was amazed when a hard-of-hearing learner spoke to me requesting that I invite a neighbouring school for a soccer game. His speech and articulation were so clear that I was astonished. I became so emotional that I had to fight back my tears, and the notion of impossibility registered in my mind!

All staff and learners listened in amazement as learners participated in debates, talk shows and quizzes in our school’s general morning assemblies (Figs 48–50). A Sign Language interpreter was used so that all Deaf staff and learners were included. Four out of the 10 learners frequently read the morning prayers because they had achieved fluency in their speech. Two learners became popular ‘programme directors’ at social functions such as Christmas and farewell parties. Sign Language interpreters were utilised for the general signing population of the school.

As their confidence grew, our learners began participating in speech competitions, drama and debates with their hearing peers from mainstream schools in the community, and they excelled!

Figure 48. Hard-of-hearing learners delivering a speech at the morning assembly.

---

5 A school assembly is a gathering of all learners and teachers to communicate information and share learning.
The improved literacy levels had an impact on all learning areas in the curriculum. A conversation with a Life Orientation and Social Science teacher during the writing of this thesis confirmed this improvement. The teacher remarked:

*Learners were given a task on ‘Your goals for the future’. They had to read their prescribed textbook on the section ‘The importance of goal formulation and how to achieve it’. They were then asked to*
formulate their short, medium and long-term goals on a timeline as explained in the text book. Learners had to present their task in front of the class...My observation as learners presented this task was the noticeable improvement in their reading, writing and verbal skills. They were able to read and comprehend what they read from the textbook and apply this knowledge. Some even asked me pertinent questions relating to goals. I was so impressed.

(Khanye, August 2012)

Figure 51 is an example of a learner’s work presented to the class. The Social Science teacher reported:

Because learners are able to read and follow simple instructions it became easier to give them projects that required them to work independently. Sometimes I expected them to go to the school library and access books for additional information. There was a particular project that I remember giving them to do for their mid-term assessment. The topic was ‘Slavery’. All the learners were able to get information from books and many presented very impressive work.

(Charmaine, August 2012)

Figure 52 contains excerpts from one of the learner’s projects. The examples shown in Figures 46–53 illustrate how learners were able to follow simple written and verbal instructions, collate information, work independently, present their work in an impressive manner, demonstrate improved reading and writing skills, display confidence in speaking and show a motivation to learn.

A further indicator of their overall academic improvement was their achievement of accomplishing all the required assessment outcomes for Grade 6 (Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS)). All learners progressed to the next grade.
NAME: Simokwane Mako

MY FUTURE GOALS

My name is Simokwane Mako. I am in Grade 6. My goal is to be a firefighter. This year 2003 I am working hard. I study hard in class to pass.

MY SHORT TERM GOALS:

I am studying to pass at the end of the year. I wish to do Grade 7 2004. I am doing all the work in class. I listen to the teacher and I do my homework.

MY MEDIUM TERM GOAL:

By 2004 I will be in Grade 12. I will work hard. I also like soccer. School I play soccer. I always run at playground. I make my body strong and exercise. Be a firefighter I must be strong to help people. I visit library and read more.

LONG TERM GOAL:

In 2009 I finish Grade 12, and go to college. I finish firefighter course. I study hard at college. I pass all subjects. I will save people and animals from fires.

FINAL GOALS FUTURE:

I finish college and pass. I work and buy food for my mother, father, sisters and brothers. I am proud of them. I will buy a house. I will people. My dream is to have the car. I will work and keep money.
Social Science Research Geography

Slavery happened long ago; it is better to forget it.

What is slavery?

Slaves were conquered by the Romans, and had to serve them.

Things they were not allowed to do:

- They couldn't marry.
- They couldn't choose their jobs.
- They couldn't own land.

They were going to the Cape (Cape Town) if they tried to escape.

They were beaten and often punished.

How did they treat slaves?

Slaves were treated extremely badly. The West Africans knew about these traders, and some Africans tried to become capture by disfiguring themselves.

When they were not allowed to do:

- Couldn't choose their jobs.
- Couldn't own land.
- Couldn't marry.
- Belong to their owners.
- Rented if tried to escape.

What are slaves?

Slaves were people who were owned by another person and assigned to work for him or her.

How did they treat slaves?

Slaves were treated extremely badly. West Africans knew about these traders, and some Africans tried to become captive by disfiguring themselves.

Things they were not allowed to do:

- Couldn't choose their jobs.
- Couldn't own land.
- Couldn't marry.
- Belong to their owners.
- Rented if tried to escape.

They were beaten and often punished.

- Could't own land.
Figure 52 c

Figure 52. Samples from a Grade 6 Social Science project (a, b and c).

ALL ABOUT SLAVERY PEOPLE AND HOW THEY WERE TREATED.

Slaves worked in Cape Town. They did many jobs and these jobs were not the same. Some of the worked as hard worker in the farms on the wine and wheat farms on the Western Cape. They were treated badly by their owners and their owners could punish them even for very small things. By the early 1800s, there were about 30,000 slaves at the Cape. Slaves were taken from Africa to America. They traveled across the Atlantic ocean. They were taken to America to work on the plantations. They were escape from armed men who showed no power with no conscience. They were forced to do everything they didn't like.

Opinion: my opinion is to focus in the modern thing and forget about the past.

Slaves were marked with burning irons on their arrival at the coast.

SLAVERS
Based on the overall academic improvement of these learners, management and staff members showed great enthusiasm when I suggested that my goal was to prepare the hard-of-hearing learners for the Grade 12 National Certificate examinations at the end of 2009. This is discussed in more detail in the following chapter, which deals with the achievement of academic excellence at Hilltop School.
4.3 The second innovation: The Natural Auditory Oral Approach (NAOA), Cued Speech and THRASS

4.3.1 Where to from the pilot approach?

The success of the pilot class with the hard-of-hearing learners at the end of 2003 is what propelled me to search for a scientifically-based language programme for learners who were hard of hearing. In 2004, 97 out of 320 learners were registered as hard-of-hearing learners at the Hilltop School. These learners were exposed to an educational programme designed exclusively for the needs of profoundly Deaf learners. In taking on the leadership of the school, my research had shown that hard-of-hearing learners were often placed together with the fully Deaf learners and were only exposed to a curriculum based on the needs of the Deaf learners. The consequences of this were that a learner with partial hearing could, over time, become functionally Deaf if exposed exclusively to Sign Language. Current research in South Africa reveals that 86% of learners in Deaf schools have some form of partial hearing (Baker, 2011). The Sunday Times (2010) presented the results of a study conducted by Deaf organisations in South Africa, which revealed that out of the four million hard-of-hearing learners in South Africa, an overwhelming majority were attending schools for the Deaf. These learners were never able to graduate from high school with a matriculation certificate and access tertiary education. The study highlights that the curriculum in most schools for the Deaf does not meet the requirements of the National Curriculum of South Africa, which leads to the matriculation as an outcome.

Smith (2011) of the DeafNET Centre of Knowledge in Worcester in the Western Cape pointed out that the average Deaf school leaver has the same level of written language comprehension as the average eight-year-old hearing learner. Studies conducted in the United States of America and Britain concur that the average learner with a hearing loss graduates from high school with literacy levels of a Grade 4 pupil. Furthermore, approximately twenty Deaf students leave school annually with a reading level at or below Grade 2 level (Marschark, 2008; Martin, 2010; Karchmer & Mitchel, 2003). These statistics made me all the more steadfast in my goal to enhance the literacy performance of hard-of-hearing learners in my school. I did not want our learners to leave school with low literacy levels, a critical life skill.

Early in my principalship at Hilltop School I discovered very low literacy levels in the learners. In 2003, I found that Grade 10 learners were functioning at Grade 4 level or below. This troubled me deeply and filled me with despair.
Figure 54. Reading levels of twelve Grade 10 learners.

The graph in Figure 54 depicts the results of twelve learners who were assessed on their literacy skills. One learner obtained a raw score greater than 39, indicating reading levels > 10 years/Grade 4 level. Eleven learners obtained raw scores less than 39, indicating literacy levels below 10 years/Grade 4 level.

4.3.2 Moving forward cautiously

My primary focus became the improvement of the literacy and language levels of all Deaf and hard-of-hearing learners. I was convinced that the Deaf were not in fact disabled because they could not hear, but because they could not read and write. Literacy is essential, not only for enhancing achievement outcomes across the curriculum but for becoming informed citizens.

I first decided to investigate the language and literacy policies and curricula offered at other Deaf schools in KwaZulu-Natal. Through my conversations with school principals, I found that all seven schools in the province had adopted the manualist method of communication. Six out of the seven schools were using Signed English as the communication medium and only one was using American Sign Language. Although the principals indicated that they were fully aware of the introduction of SASL in certain schools, they were awaiting further direction from the National Department of Education on the implementation of a standardised curriculum for SASL. I shared my concerns with the principals regarding the issue of the language curriculum at schools for the Deaf, and the need for the curriculum to be responsive to diversity. We discussed the option of an oral language, namely English, being used as a language of communication and teaching and learning for the Deaf.
Not a single principal was prepared to engage in any discussion around the use of English as a language of communication. They were adamant that Sign Language should be the only recognised language of communication for the Deaf. On reflection, I can see that their stance was located within the socio-cultural paradigm of Deafness that advocates deafness as a cultural difference. What troubled me even more was that the issue of diversity with respect to the degree of hearing loss amongst Deaf learners in our schools was denied.

I was unsettled and unnerved by my peers’ reactions. However, I held on to the questions that constantly distressed me: Why were our learners’ literacy levels so low? How can we raise the literacy levels of our learners? I reasoned that if Hilltop School did not address this issue, it would continue to fail its learners as an institution.

At the time, my research had made me aware that achievement outcomes were poor for the Deaf on a global scale. I was convinced that Sign Language was not the sole reason for the academic achievement concerns within Deaf society. Harkin (2011) points out that Deaf children experience considerable difficulty in developing their language and literacy skills in both signed and spoken speech. Albertini & Schley (2003) postulate that most Deaf adults who use Sign Language demonstrate poor literacy skills. This trend was noted in a South African study performed by Akach (2010) who found that two out of three people who use Sign Language in South Africa are unemployed. A study by DeafSA (2009) confirmed that in South Africa as few as one in three Deaf people who use SASL are functionally literate. The key barrier to accessing employment is low literacy levels amongst the Deaf. Marschark (2009) asserts that Deaf children in America generally learn less than their hearing classmates overall and the key factor responsible for this trend is low literacy. Low literacy restricts a Deaf learner’s access to content areas in the curriculum; hence, poor literacy has a negative impact on curriculum access across all school subjects (Aarons & Akach, 2002).

In November 2003, I made the decision to pursue an alternative route to the language and literacy curriculum at Hilltop School. I was driven by the encouraging achievements in our pilot project undertaken in January 2003. I began searching the Internet for any South African institution that was using an oral approach. I was elated when I discovered that a private mainstream school in Pretoria was implementing an innovative approach, the Natural Auditory Oral Approach to Language and Literacy (NAOA) for Deaf learners. I immediately made contact with the school principal, explaining my concerns about the language curriculum at Hilltop. At the time, I felt that this was some kind of divine intervention! The principal informed me that a workshop on the NAOA was to take place at the school. I was thrilled by this news.
and knew that I had to attend. In February 2004, I was able to access funding (Fig. 55) that enabled my audiologist and me to attend the three-day workshop at Aquarius School (pseudonym), a mainstream school in Pretoria. Was this the early answer to my belief in accomplishing impossible things?

![Figure 55. Letter of sponsorship from the D.G. Murray Trust.](image)
4.3.3 My first encounter with the Natural Auditory Oral Approach (NAOA)

The workshop was conducted by Dr Morag Clark (Fig. 57), an international consultant for the NAOA. The aim of the workshop was to present a theoretical and practical understanding of its potential to enhance language and literacy for the Deaf (Fig. 56).

I was intrigued that the NAOA was considered a programme that would develop language for the Deaf in the natural way, and that research showed positive outcomes for moderate to profound hearing loss. I learned that this approach emphasised day-to-day communicative contexts when promoting speech and language development. The acquisition of spoken language in Deaf children was highly dependent on appropriate and high-quality hearing aids and FM systems, as well as exposure to communicative language in day-to-day situations. FM systems are hearing systems that allow for better speech access, even in situations where there are interfering background sounds. Teachers talk into a hand-held microphone that transmits the sound of the teacher’s voice directly into a Deaf child’s hearing system. The key principle is the maximum use...
of residual hearing through proper amplifications with proper technological devices. Research findings presented at the conference were extremely encouraging. With the optimal use of hearing aids, including cochlear implants and other supporting devices, Deaf children are able to acquire speech and language at the level of normal hearing children, although often at a slower rate. However, it is vital for Deaf learners to be surrounded by hearing children as much as possible.

Since then, I have read numerous empirical studies that have evaluated this approach. Internationally, the findings show the same positive trends. Through this approach Deaf children make significant progress in language acquisition, receptive vocabulary and speech (Turan, 2010; Turan, 2010; Young, Grohne, Carrasco & Brown, 2000). A recent case study conducted by Turan (2010) in Turkey indicated that the listening skills of Deaf children placed on the programme improved significantly. Longitudinal studies conducted in Australia and the United Kingdom by Turan (2010) revealed that children exposed to NAOA showed considerable improvement in speech. The key facets of NAOA are the creation of language-enriched learning contexts, the use of technology, high levels of support in classrooms, and intensive parental involvement.

The delegates at the workshop were a diverse group of people from organisations for the Deaf, schools for the Deaf, non-governmental organisations and the National Department of Education. I learned that the NAOA approach promoted complete inclusion for the Deaf learner in regular, mainstream classrooms and schools. Although I was impressed with the various presentations, particularly the results from the empirical studies, I could not help thinking that such an approach would without doubt raise highly political and ideological debates — after all, it promoted mainstream education for the D/deaf.

Dr Clark presented evidence from her research conducted in Turkey, Japan, Singapore, Germany, Mauritius and Hungary to illustrate the success of NAOA in terms of speech and language outcomes for Deaf children using this programme.
Figure 57. Dr Morag Clark.

Figure 58. Classroom activity at the Aquarius School.
Part of the workshop programme involved delegates visiting the classrooms at the Aquarius School (Fig. 58). The Aquarius School is an independent private institution, with pre-school, primary school and high school sections. It is a mainstream, parallel-medium school offering English and Afrikaans as the languages of teaching and learning. The school is unique in that it caters for both hearing and Deaf learners. Deaf learners are educated alongside hearing learners. Their classes comprise on average 25 learners. One Deaf learner for every five hearing learners tends to represent the composition of a classroom.

Without doubt, we were all impressed with the high language and literacy levels of the Deaf learners present at this school. We observed Deaf learners reading on par with their hearing peers. They were able to engage actively with texts, and to respond to questions based on texts read to them. When looking across the classroom, I was unable to distinguish the Deaf learners from those who were hearing during classroom participation. There were high levels of participation and involvement from all learners, including the Deaf.

I experienced a sense of euphoria. Would it finally be possible to achieve my cherished dream?

As the workshop proceeded and as I had predicted, the debates grew intense and exceedingly political at the various plenary and discussion sessions. There were two factions: the manualists (who promoted Sign Language and were rooted in Deaf culture), and the oralists. The manualists argued from a social-justice position that Sign Language was the only language for the Deaf and that any deviation from Sign Language was tantamount to oppression for the Deaf people and their minority culture. The oralists focused on the argument that the ultimate goal was for Deaf learners to become productive and independent citizens in a society that was predominantly a hearing world, and that it was essential to address the most pervasive barrier to full citizenship: low levels of literacy and academic outcomes. To my utter dismay, the workshop ended with the Sign Language supporters storming out in anger and frustration. Those of us who remained were dumbstruck.

On our trip back to Durban, the audiologist and I contemplated our experience in silence for a good segment of the journey. I remember being absorbed in questions about why the discourses that circulate in Deaf education are so utterly and diametrically opposed to one another. Do they not see that the D/deaf are not a homogenous social group? Could they not concede that education had to cater for diversity in any learner population?
My audiologist and I then began interrogating our experience, and it was clearly an emotional space that we were in. We were experiencing all kinds of conflicting emotional spaces ranging from despair and trepidation to excitement and hope. We were adamant that deafness is more than a medical condition; and that education has to be responsive to diversity. We held strong joint views that for D/deaf children, identification with Deaf culture and the Deaf community is a crucial part of social-emotional development, in the same way as growing up with a particular ethnic or religious affiliation. In the same vein, we believed that the social and educational goal for D/deaf children is eventual and full integration into the larger society. Wauters and Knoors (2008), and Marschark and Knoors (2012) emphasise that the crucial goal is to leave the education system with the best possible proficiency in reading and writing.

We questioned our observations of the NAOA programme at the Aquarius School, particularly during the classroom visits. A number of key issues emerged that would prove critical to any decision we would take at our school.

- Full audiological management was crucial to the programme, which included intensive parental support, parental guidance programmes, state of the art hearing aids, cochlear technology, advanced FM technology in every classroom (to ensure an optimal listening environment for the Deaf and to minimise the effect of distance background noise) and well-trained teacher assistants.
- The Aquarius School is a private school that is funded by affluent parents who pay high school fees to fund the programme.
- Not only are digital technology and support systems expensive to purchase, but the maintenance of such equipment requires sustained funding.
- Many of the learners at this school had received or were awaiting cochlear implants. A cochlear implant is when an electronic medical device is implanted surgically in the ear and replaces the function of the damaged inner ear. Unlike hearing aids, which make sounds louder, cochlear implants do the work of the damaged parts of the inner ear, (cochlea) to send sound signals to the brain. This is an expensive medical procedure with an estimated cost of R300 000 per ear in South Africa (Kerr, Tuomics & Muller, 2012).
- The language of communication at the Aquarius School and the home language of the learner are the same, namely English. This is a critical advantage. English is the spoken and written language at school and is reinforced at home.
Strong links between the home and school are essential for support of the programme. To this end, parents are provided with regular parental support sessions to assist the children in their home environment.

We navigated through a range of competing and complex emotions. We were in awe of the programme and its potential to enhance language and literacy. We were exhilarated by the powerful possibilities and outcomes that the programme promised. We agonised about the funding implications. We were filled with sadness and utter dismay that the key stakeholders of Deaf education could not work together in the best interests of our children. We were disappointed that ideology and political agendas blinded certain individuals, who clearly refused to acknowledge the worth of the programme in promoting language and literacy. Finally, we were consumed with fear and trepidation at the thought of having to face those who wielded power in Deaf education, if we made the choice to implement the programme at our school.

I questioned myself constantly in the days that followed.

_Why can we not find common ground?_

_Why is there such a dichotomy in the ideological arguments?_

_Are the rights of our children truly the focus, their right to an equitable and quality education?_

_Can we not bridge the deep ideological divide?_

_If technology is utilised to enhance hearing, does this really translate into pathologising deafness and the Deaf culture?_

This took me back to the concerns that had begun to become etched into my very heart and soul: the poor language and literacy levels of my learners. Was it not the task of us leaders to actively promote and protect the linguistic rights of learners by enhancing literacy? Is choice of language not a fundamental human right enshrined in South Africa’s Constitution?

The Sign Language Education and Development (SLED) organisation in South Africa recently released some troubling statistics that support the findings that most Deaf learners who matriculate are functionally illiterate (SLED, 2010). Because of this they are forced to find jobs as unskilled workers with meagre earnings, and find themselves generally trapped in a space of dependency and poverty. Findings by DeafSA (DeafSA, 2009) indicate that 75% of the Deaf
population in South Africa are functionally illiterate as a result of the poor literacy outcomes at school level.

My audiologist and I saw many barriers to the implementation of the NAOA at Hilltop School. We realised that we would need funding as it would be a costly intervention. We would have to win the support of the school management team, the SGB, teachers and parents. As previously mentioned, Hilltop is a residential school that serves rural children whose families mostly live long distances away from the school. We were also aware that the school did not operate in a political vacuum. How would we deal with what would in all likelihood be strong opposition from powerful organisations that promoted the exclusive use of Sign Language in schools for the Deaf?

Despite these reservations, after a week of deep contemplation I decided I was going to embark on the ‘impossible’. I knew that no matter how challenging this would be, I had to seek the support of all the relevant stakeholders. I would have to sway them to embark on this risky endeavour. I was anxious and nervous, and experienced many troubled, sleepless nights.

4.3.4 Would they take the risk?

I called a special staff meeting at the end of February 2004, where my audiologist and I began by sharing our experience of the NAOA workshop we had attended. We presented an overview of the approach and what we deemed to be its potential in relation to enhancing language and literacy levels for our learners. There were varied responses from members of staff at the meeting. Most staff members were in awe of and excited about the potential of the programme, but intersecting with this were feelings of fear and uneasiness, and a lack of confidence in a change that involved such risks. Then there were those who were clearly resistant to an approach that has its roots in oralism. A few teachers voiced their deep concern about the poor literacy levels of our students, and felt that the time had come to bring this under scrutiny and explore curriculum change.

This resistance was based on the following legitimate concerns, many of which I empathised with: inadequate training, a lack of financial support, a lack of parental support, heavy workloads, unrealistic expectations for Deaf learners, and possible opposition from Deaf organisations. I knew that the ideological issue was a powerful underlying factor circulating in the discussion: oralism perpetuated the marginalisation of Sign Language and oppression of Deaf culture.
Looking back now, I believe that openly airing tensions, dilemmas, insecurities and conflicting ideas was a crucial stage in the change process. I allowed the discussion to take its course and tried my best to play the role of supportive listener and facilitator. I encouraged a questioning and critical ethos, as I thought this was essential for healthy debate. I acknowledged the various concerns but stressed that risk-taking would be an inevitable part of this innovation. To my amazement, as the debate progressed, so the atmosphere changed, and a growing sense of enthusiasm and openness could be detected.

The final decision was that the staff would agree to a two-year pilot programme. This new approach would be implemented in the foundation phase with the Grade 0 class. During the pilot programme, the learners’ progress would be closely monitored, and rigorous evaluation would be undertaken.

I was truly elated, because I wanted this so much! My staff were the key stakeholders, and I knew I had to have them as my partners in this risky journey. Believing in the impossible was proving possible. My greatest victory was that the SGB endorsed the project. Members voiced their commitment to quality education for all our learners (Fig. 59).

We decided that all new learners from the intake for the following year (2005) would participate in the programme. Eleven learners with varying degrees of hearing loss formed the new class. Our key reason for this choice was to test this new methodology on this diverse group of learners.

Parental consent was crucially important to me. Parents were briefed about the pilot study before applying for admission to the school. Of the 11 sets of parents, nine were hearing and two were Deaf. In the case of the Deaf families, both sets of parents were Deaf and used Sign Language as their mode of communication. Seven out of the 11 learners were from single-parent homes. All learners were from deeply impoverished rural areas throughout the province and had limited financial resources. In addition, almost all the parents had poor educational backgrounds.

We were very pleased that we had no resistance whatsoever from the parents. Every parent gave consent wholeheartedly. I was quite surprised at this, particularly because I had expected resistance from the Deaf parents since Sign Language was the mother tongue of these Deaf learners. All the parents were enthusiastic about their children learning to speak.
**New Matters:**

**New Natural Auditory Approach:**

- Mrs Naidoo informed all members present of the proposed new language intervention. She highlighted some critical issues in respect of the new programme.
- The project entails utilizing the New Natural Auditory Approach, which promotes the development of spoken language in Deaf children.
- The acquisition of spoken language is largely dependent on the fitting of appropriate hearing aids and FM systems.
- The new approach requires the following to be successful:
  - Appropriate amplification (digital hearing aids and FM systems).
  - Imperative that the learner be fitted with 2 hearing aids so that maximum auditory benefit can be achieved.
- FM systems provide an increased opportunity in the classroom with regards to improving the sound quality received. These systems optimize speech intelligibility in all situations where distance, noise and reverberation interfere with communication.
- FM systems pick up speech signals directly to the ear. This is especially beneficial to a child with a hearing loss since it provides the opportunity for the learner to listen to the teacher in one-to-one setting even though the entire class is present. This is possible due to the fact that the teacher wears a transmitter (mic) and each of the learners has a receiver attached to their hearing aid, receiving the improved speech.
- Discussion on the new method ensued. The chairperson thanked the Principal for the informative presentation but raised the concern of financial implications for the project.
- Mrs Naidoo responded that she had already secured funds from the D.G. Murray Trust as well as from hearing aid companies.
Other members also raised questions and concerns regarding the project. Some questions pertained to the following issues:

- The management plan and how the project will be implemented.
- Parental reaction to the project.
- Staff capacity.
- The validity of this new method.

The Principal and Speech Therapist answered all questions raised.

The SGB was informed that the parents of learners to be involved have been consulted and willing for their learners to engage in the project.

Staff that were fluent in English and Sign Language would be utilized. Staff had already being selected based on their expertise and willingness to engage with this new method. Training for selected staff will be conducted at Eduplex.

Observations and research presented at the conference attended by the Principal, Speech Therapist and School Management Team were presented by Mr V.P. Mazibuko.

The Speech Therapist, Ms K Naidoo then outlined to SGB, the proposed management plan. A pilot project with a new Grade 0 class will start subject to the approval of SGB.

Discussion on the new group (pilot project) learners being isolated was then discussed fully.

There was unanimous agreement that the be monitored closely and a policy be put in place to ensure that the learners following the New Natural Auditory Approach remain an integral of the school community and are not different.

Fr. Southward mentioned that he approved of the new intervention as he visualized this as an opportunity to open new doors to enhance achievement.

Mr V. Mkhize from DEAFA said that he vehemently opposed any form of oral teaching in the school and emphasized that Sign Language is the language for all Deaf learners.

His opposition was accepted by the house, but the parent representative at the meeting responded that it is the prerogative of the parents to decide on the education of their children.

The chairperson also responded the new method should be sanctioned as it seems that it will benefit and not harm the learners.

After much discussion it was agreed by all members with the exception of Mr V. Mkhize that the decision to embark on the New Natural Auditory Approach be ratified, however if learners do not show improvement in their literacy at the end of one year, it must be abandoned.

The Principal thanked all members for their vote of confidence and their time. She assured them that all staff were committed to do their best and that the SGB will be
I reflected now on what may have been the underlying motivation for their endorsement of the pilot programme:

In the case of the Deaf parents, was their response related to the fact that they had experienced the challenges of poor literacy and low levels of educational outcomes in general?

Did they believe that the use of spoken language would enable curriculum access and quality education for their children?

Did their decision relate to their aspirations and long-term goals for the children?

Did they believe that one could achieve more in society with spoken English and good literacy levels than with Sign Language exclusively?

4.3.5 Embarking on the second pilot: The first steps

The project began with a focus on a key facet: staff development. I arranged for key staff members to participate in a two-week in-service intensive training course at the Aquarius School. Funding for this purpose was secured from a private enterprise (Figs 60 and 61). The group included two teachers, a teacher’s assistant, the audiologist and a member of management.

Figure 60. Receiving a sponsorship cheque.
MS. MAVIS NAIDOO
PRINCIPAL

PO Box 35103
NORTHWAY
4065

Dear Ms Naidoo

RE: FEEDBACK / REPORT ON THE

We appreciate your feedback on the conference that we sponsored for you to attend. We also acknowledge and accept your request to sponsor your management staff to visit the institution in Pretoria for further deliberations.

Please receive an amount of R15 000.00 towards visit and travelling costs. We would appreciate feedback and details of the new programme and its implementation at your school.

We wish you well in this endeavour.

Yours sincerely,

THE D.G. MURRAY TRUST

[Signature]

Leonie Sampson
GRANTS COORDINATOR
Direct Line: (021) 670-9051
E-mail: leonie@dgmt.co.za

Trustees: G.W.J. Radcliffe (Chairman), D.M. Green, M. MacRobert, D.J.R. McKinstry, V.Ogijie-Thompson, D.L. Oron
Chief Executive Officer: A.W. Taylor

Figure 61. Sponsorship letter for the staff development workshop at the Aquarius School.
The focus of this staff development initiative was on the philosophy, principles and methodologies of NAOA; classroom pedagogy; curriculum content; parental support; the daily academic and extra-curricular programme; parent training; and intervention. The audiologist learned new techniques for the fitting of hearing aids and how best to manage FM systems (Fig. 62). Much of the visit involved classroom observations and discussion with staff and parents.

![Image](image.jpg)

**Figure 62. Our school audiologist practising hearing aid fitting techniques.**

The staff members returned feeling optimistic and enthusiastic. They were in awe of the academic performance of the Deaf learners. They were particularly impressed with the reading, writing and listening programmes. They shared that it was the first time they had witnessed Deaf learners reading and comprehending with such competence. The audiologist was excited about the new techniques she had learned in relation to digital hearing aids and the use of FM systems. However, certain reservations were voiced. At the Aquarius School Deaf learners were integrated into a regular school setting and were therefore taught in an inclusive classroom environment that included hearing learners. Hilltop School was a unique socio-cultural context — a segregated school for the Deaf. We soon realised that no innovation can be implemented in a decontextualised manner. How would we navigate the barriers to implementation embedded in our context? For example, there were no hearing peers; parental involvement was virtually non-existent, given that our parents were from far-flung rural contexts and saw their children mainly during school vacations; and the home language of the learners was isiZulu.
At the Aquarius School, intensive parental involvement was crucial to the programme. The spoken language at school matched the home language: English. Deaf learners were in an exclusively oral environment with no exposure to Sign Language. Parents at Aquarius School were from middle to upper-middle-class backgrounds and were able to meet the cost of the resources required to support the programme.

Our context did not lend itself to meeting the criteria at the Aquarius School. We knew that we would have to implement the programme in our own unique way, and engage with different contextual influences. Providing an inclusive environment that included hearing learners would be impossible. In terms of the Department of Education, we were categorised as a special school for the Deaf. Because our school is a residential school, as previously discussed, parental involvement is minimal due to the far rural contexts from which parents had to travel. The majority of the parents came from poor socio-economic backgrounds. Transport costs to and from the school were exorbitant. Since Hilltop School is a residential establishment, teachers and housemothers play the role of surrogate mothers. The housemothers were first-language isiZulu speakers with very limited proficiency in English. In the case of our parents, their home language was also isiZulu, with very limited English proficiency.

I encouraged my staff and tried to instil in them the thinking that ‘nothing was impossible’. We had to commit as a team to seeking creative ways of responding to the contextual influences on the project. I also stressed that we were in this as partners, and that our leadership of this project had to be a shared activity. I wanted them to understand and believe that we were joint change agents and risk takers. Drawing from Wenger (1998), I wanted us to enter the new initiative as a ‘community of practice’. I wanted to create a secure space in which we could draw on each other’s strengths and help one another. I thought of Hargreaves and Fullan’s (1998) contention that leadership is about crafting safe spaces in which creativity can flourish and where “efforts are coordinated and new directions set by learning, information gathering and dialogue rather than through administrative regulation and hierarchical control” (p. 285).

4.3.6 Implementation of NAOA

The NAOA project at Hilltop School was launched in January 2005. It was a successful day. I was excited but filled with trepidation. My confidence grew, however, as I watched teachers arrive, eager to experience, participate and learn.
Eleven learners formed the new Grade 0, NAOA class. Their ages ranged from three to six years old. They were assessed and results showed that they had moderate to profound hearing loss. Seven learners had no identifiable language or means of communication. Two learners had a basic vocabulary of Sign Language. These learners had Deaf parents.

NAOA promotes a normal and natural way of language development.

![Figure 63. The Natural Auditory Oral Approach (NAOA) (www.elzeno.com)](image)

Figure 63 depicts the fundamental argument of NAOA, which is that language is ‘caught and not taught’ in a language-rich learning environment. NAOA consists of three essential components: the natural (yellow frame), the auditory (green) and the oral (purple). The premise is that hearing children attain language naturally or spontaneously through everyday interactions. Deaf children can imitate this natural language acquisition through the use of auditory devices (green box). As a result of audiological intervention and exposure to daily interactions in a language-enriched environment, Deaf children can learn to use expressive oral language without signs (purple box).

In keeping with the principles of NAOA, all learners were fitted with digital hearing aids to ensure the maximisation of their residual hearing. An FM system was used to amplify sound. Since NAOA emphasises one-on-one interaction between learner and teacher in order to promote language development, teachers carefully designed individual conversation sessions with
a focus on learners being able to ‘pick up’ the unspoken rules of conversation, for example turn-taking, eye contact and natural pauses in conversations. Figures 64–71 show NAOA in progress.

Figure 64. Grade 0 learners after acquiring hearing aids.

Figure 65. Grade 0 learners with their teacher and teacher's aid.
Figure 66. Programming a learner’s digital hearing aid.

Figure 67. Programming a learner’s digital hearing aid.
Figure 68. Connecting receivers to the hearing aids.

Figure 69. Campus S transmitter and receivers.
Figure 70. Learners after fitting the FM system.

Figure 71. Teacher utilising the FM system in a one-on-one setting.
Books, props and activities were used to enrich these language conversations. Despite the fact that NAOA recognises facial expression, body language and natural gestures, the emphasis is on listening — a principle based on the premise that all children learn through listening. Teachers therefore encouraged learners ‘to listen’ rather than ‘to look’.

One of the key principles in NAOA is the provision of a language-enabling environment, in order to facilitate language acquisition. In this regard, teachers used natural daily interactions such as eating, dressing and playing, as well as entertainment and literacy activities that exposed learners to a variety of oral vocabulary. It was believed that these activities would provide opportunities for learners to experience language. Turan (2010) explains that natural daily interactions provide children with the context for language development and communication skills. It is further contended that the amount of talk within the context of activities has a powerful effect on language development (Hart & Risley, 1995).

Sign Language in any form was prohibited. This was in keeping with the NAOA belief that the introduction of Sign Language or sign-assisted communication will seriously interfere with the development of speech and language if the spoken language has not yet been well established. Our intention was to introduce Sign Language in the third year of the programme. We envisaged that most learners would have acquired some degree of English after the first three years. However, this did not materialise because we were unable to separate learners from their signing peers. Thus, learners were exposed to Sign Language in the hostels and playgrounds. I will discuss the issue of Sign Language in this programme in section 4.3.8.

4.3.7 Overcoming limitations: The adoption of cued speech as an educational tool

Within the first six months of introducing NAOA, the class teacher began to experience difficulties with phonetic processing. She observed that learners were experiencing some confusion caused by similar spoken sounds and similar lip patterns in spoken language; for example, she encountered a problem when attempting to teach diphthongs and digraphs such as ‘c’ and ‘h’, which is not pronounced as ‘ch’. I then contacted the Aquarius School to establish whether their learners experienced similar difficulties. The response I received troubled me as I was told that most learners at the school had cochlear implants; hence, they experienced no
difficulty in this regard. However, the recommendation was that teachers continued using speech with a focus on listening skills. I was not convinced that this was the answer.

This did not discourage me. I encouraged the audiologist and class teachers to research the issues of sound and lip patterns. My own readings enriched my understanding that Deaf learners learn to read and engage text using essentially the same processes as hearing learners. The hypothesis was that the relatively poor reading skills of Deaf individuals resulted from deficiencies in phonological processing. The argument of scholars who emphasise that Deaf children must develop phonological capabilities in order to become skilled readers intensified my quest to solve the phonetic problem that was being experienced in this class (Davis & Humphrey, 2012; Hansen, 1991).

The class teacher reported that an article written by Dixon (1987, in Kipila & Williams-Scott, 1990) called “Cued Speech” had captured her interest. In this article Dixon explains the meaning of Cued Speech and highlights the potential for its use with Deaf learners in particular. Dixon maintains that “the one thing I am surest of in connection with Cued Speech is that any deaf child who grows up with Cued Speech and becomes able to communicate fluently with it before he is taught to read, learns to read just the way a hearing child does” (p. 156).

Cued Speech is an auditory visual approach that uses hand shapes to supplement and support spoken language (Fig. 72). This tool has the potential to remove the ambiguities of lip reading, allowing for the Deaf learner to understand correctly what is being said. It is argued that Cued Speech is based on a simple hypothesis: if all essential sounds of our spoken language were to look different on the lips, then even a completely Deaf child could learn language much the same way as a hearing child, the difference being that Deaf children use their visual rather than their aural sense (Campbell, 2008). The aim of Cued Speech was thus to overcome the problem of lip reading, enabling Deaf learners to understand spoken language (Heracleous & Beutemp, 2010).

The class teacher Rosemary (pseudonym), the speech therapist and the audiologist were all excited about the possibility that Cued Speech could be the answer to developing phonological processing. If so, Cued Speech could be used as a supportive mechanism within NAOA. I was not averse to the idea as long as Cued Speech would help me realise my goal of improving the language and literacy levels of learners.
Training in Cued Speech then became our priority. Rosemary was fuelled with passion and enthusiasm, and this propelled her to do an Internet search for any training offered in Cued Speech. She discovered a course in Canterbury, England. On her own initiative she secured a sponsorship to attend the Cued Speech Foundation course that was held in early 2006. Here she attained proficiency (level 1) in Cued Speech. In July 2006, she was sponsored by the Cued Speech Foundation in America to attend the fortieth anniversary of Cued Speech in the USA, where she then attained proficiency (level 2) in Cued Speech.
After completing these courses, she returned to school confident that Cued Speech could be used as a strategy for the phonetic processing of new words. She convinced me that the use of Cued Speech in all learning areas in her pilot NAOA class would help learners to read.

I was willing to attempt this method, and so I arranged for training workshops for all the relevant personnel (Fig. 73). Rosemary conducted the workshops, sharing her experience and knowledge with management and all other staff members who were involved in the NAOA initiative.

Figure 73. Cued Speech workshop conducted with staff members at Hilltop School.

At the workshops she demonstrated how Cued Speech could be used to assist with phonetic processing in the acquisition of new words. Through her demonstrations I was able to visualise how Cued Speech could assist Deaf readers whose orientation in reading is typically visual. While some staff members were receptive to the idea of using Cued Speech as a supportive mechanism to NAOA, others were sceptical and expressed concern that Cued Speech ‘seemed’ like an unnatural method to assist communication. To demonstrate the effectiveness of Cued Speech as a language-acquisition tool, Rosemary conducted an auditory discrimination test on her pilot class. This was done to determine the learners’ accuracy of receiving a spoken language when using cues and audition together.
Figure 74. Testing discrimination and reception of sounds.

Sounds and words were tested in isolation and not in the context of a sentence. The sounds in Test 3 and 4 look the same on the lips. Figure 74 clearly indicates that the learners were receiving Cued English with greater accuracy than using the audition only or audition/lip-reading modes.

I was impressed with the results of the test. Around 80% of the class could spell the majority of the words correctly when following the cues of the teacher. I could immediately foresee the positive impact that Cued Speech would have on the word-learning abilities of Deaf learners, and in addressing any deficiencies in the phonological processing of Deaf learners. I decided to back the project fully. Although I initially felt apprehensive, my belief in the need for a programme of this nature and its potential affects meant I overcame any misgivings. My passion to improve literacy, and my belief that Deaf children have the capacity to develop language and speech motivated me to proceed. Cued Speech was thus implemented in the second year of the pilot project (2006). The Grade 0 (pilot) class had now progressed to Grade 1. The class teacher recommended that the eleven learners be split into two class units, Grade 1A and Grade 1B, with five and six learners respectively. It was anticipated that smaller class units would facilitate individual attention for learners.
4.3.8 Enriching NAOA: The adoption of THRASS

Almost simultaneously with the implementation of Cued Speech, the school audiologist and a class teacher (Annette) attended the launch of a new reading programme at a neighbouring school for the Deaf. The programme was named THRASS (Teaching handwriting reading and spelling skills). Through my discussions with both the audiologist and Annette, I learned that THRASS is a British keyboard phonics programme that helps learners of all ages and abilities to pronounce the right sounds when they read, and choose the right letters when they spell. THRASS focuses on the 44 phonemes of spoken English, 120 graphemes of written English,
and the reading and spelling of 500 high-frequency words taught in daily sessions using a structured body of work (Fig. 75).

I began to understand that THRASS implements a same sound/different spelling system and is based on a philosophy that learners need to know at the onset; one that explains how English holds a complex spelling system, based on sounds and that some letters contain more than one sound. In addition, the programme had a phoneme machine with a Cued Speech option (Fig. 76).

![Figure 76. The word 'computer' demonstrated from the phoneme machine (www.phonememachine.com).](image)

Once again I was beset with questions. Could this programme ameliorate the difficulties that were being experienced in relation to the teaching of phonics to the Deaf? Both the speech therapist and audiologist were convinced that the programme would be beneficial to the learners. They assured me that the programme was compatible with Cued Speech and would function within the principles of NAOA. Based on their confidence, I agreed to purchase the programme and THRASS was implemented in mid-2007.

Spelling and dictation tests conducted by the teacher indicated that within a few months of implementation, notable improvements in the learners’ assessment results could be seen.
Figure 77 represents the improvement of individual learners’ spelling and dictation skills over four terms. It must be noted that learners acquired English primarily through listening and Cued Speech. The digital hearing aids and FM systems provided strong auditory support. Although there was no pressure for the learners to use spoken language exclusively, the teacher reported that learners were using their voices increasingly as they became confident with sounds in words. The ability to articulate words correctly meant that learners now had access to their voices as an alternate tool for communication. The class teacher reported:

being deaf myself made it a non-issue...I could not hear them anyway but insisted on correct lip patterns to enable me to lip-read them and to teach them to receive spoken language more accurately via lip-reading, a skill needed to cope with understanding people who don’t know how to sign or cue in the hearing world.

(Rosemary, August, 2007)

4.4. A glimpse of the complexities, struggles, tensions and feats

Reflecting on those early months of the project, I see so many tensions and struggles that I had to overcome. I was able to glimpse into the creative practices that emerged from our community:
of practice. A unique method that would suit our own unique educational environment emerged from the NAOA.

### 4.4.1 Adopt a Granny

With prior knowledge that parental involvement would be a challenge, given the poor academic and socio-economic status of parents, we tapped into resources in the community. A community-based programme called “Adopt a Granny” was born. We discovered that close to Hilltop School was an English-speaking retirement village. I made contact with the retirement village and was given an audience with the residents. I gave them an overview of the NAOA programme, and invited them to ‘adopt’ a learner from the NAOA programme. Research by Hart & Risley (1995) conducted in the USA demonstrates that children of mothers who talk more during meal times, dressing and play, have a larger vocabulary than children who are in less talkative environments. The amount of talk within this context has a powerful effect on language development. Thus, the objective of “Adopt a Granny” was to recreate this interactive scenario by role-playing daily routines. The programme was conducted twice a week (Figs 78 and 79).

![Figure 78. ‘Adopt a Granny’ programme.](image)
Training the grandmothers for their role in the programme was the task of the speech therapist and the audiologist. They would have to engage in activities such as entertaining, bathing, eating, reading, and story-telling. Although I was aware that this programme would not compensate for the lack of parental involvement, I hoped that this initiative would allow for learners to experience various new literacy spaces.

4.4.2 Initiating parental involvement

The lack of involvement of parents as partners in the programme was an obstacle that proved difficult to overcome. We recognised the importance of collaboration with families and remained steadfast in the belief that parents could not be excluded from the programme in spite of the “Adopt a Granny” initiative. This forced us to initiate monthly meetings at school with the intention of teaching parents Basic English and Cued Speech so that they could communicate with their children during the holidays (Figs 80 and 81).

Figure 79. ‘Adopt a Granny’ programme.
Figure 80. Our first training of parents.

Figure 81. Encouraging parental involvement.
We were eager for parents to interact and participate with learners in the classroom as well as at home. Although the school met the transport costs of parents, the initiative failed after the second month as parents failed to keep their appointments.

Because parents failed to keep their monthly appointments, we were forced to limit these sessions to once every term when parents collected their children for the holidays. In addition, we initiated cluster meetings in particular areas, for example if two parents came from the same area, the audiologist drove to their homes. The focus of these cluster meetings was three-fold: to strengthen the link between home and school; to teach parents Basic English so that they could communicate with their children; and to teach parents the use and care of hearing aids. Sadly, these meetings did not materialise as most of the parents lived in remote areas that were not easily accessible. In addition, parents were reluctant to have staff members in their homes because of limited resources. As a result, we were never able to solve completely the problem of parent participation.

My autoethnography has compelled me to interrogate the issue of parental involvement at a residential school that admits learners from far-flung rural communities in the province of KwaZulu-Natal (Table 1).

The majority of learners are from poor socio-economic backgrounds. The cost of transport to Hilltop School is exorbitant, with the result that most parents see their children only at the end of each term when they are taken home for the school vacation. We enrol children from the early age of three years. This is to provide early intervention, particularly in order to remediate the delayed language development of a Deaf child. The majority of parents, caregivers and the families are not proficient in Sign Language, which means that in reality there is a communication barrier between families and children. Sign Language classes that are organised by the school have often failed because of poor parental attendance. Below are some parents’ views on this issue captured from my interviews during the writing of this thesis:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural context</th>
<th>Distance between home-school</th>
<th>Number of learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inchanga</td>
<td>8km</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammarsdale</td>
<td>39km</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato Ridge</td>
<td>28km</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietermaritzburg</td>
<td>47km</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>59km</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mooi River</td>
<td>62km</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escort</td>
<td>168km</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladysmith</td>
<td>247km</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergville</td>
<td>270km</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underberg</td>
<td>200km</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molweni</td>
<td>39km</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinetown</td>
<td>44km</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durban</td>
<td>52km</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanzimtoti</td>
<td>87km</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Shepstone</td>
<td>260km</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanger</td>
<td>118km</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empangeni</td>
<td>220km</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Bay</td>
<td>248km</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manguzi</td>
<td>400km</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vryheid</td>
<td>230km</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>225km</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>270km</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I was taught basic signs at Grey's Hospital and unfortunately I am unable to attend the classes offered by the school. Transport is expensive and I don't have money. No, there is no one in the community who teaches Sign Language. At the hospital I was given a contact number for a lady that could help. I tried to call but unfortunately I had no luck of getting hold of her.

(Parent TT)

I would like to learn Sign Language and attend the classes that are conducted at Hilltop. It will make life easier. My home is far and it is expensive to come to school. My daughter teaches me the basics.

(Parent TM)

My happy times are Deaf awareness week because the whole world is made to know about deafness and to accept them. Sometimes I feel there are not enough deaf structures in the community, deaf community is always down. There are no developments regarding the deaf community so that makes me sad.

(Parent TP)

I now pose the questions: Is a large residential school serving rural communities a model of schooling in the best interests of our children, or is it perpetuating exclusions for our learners? Would smaller schools or units in mainstream schools located close to communities so that parents can have easy access be an alternate model to pursue?

Small special school contexts close to communities have the potential to build agency and transform communities in various ways. For example, school-parent partnerships would be enhanced, and this could have the ripple effect of building an understanding of the social rights of the disabled; addressing the negative attitudes, stigma and misconceptions related towards the Deaf, promoting Sign Language in the community; and the overall inclusion of the Deaf as valued citizens. My argument here aligns with discourses that promote resilience and wellness, and the generative theory of rurality articulated in the emerging scholarship on rurality (Balfour, Mitchell & Moletsane, 2008; Nkambule, Balfour, Pillay & Moletsane, 2011). The theory by Balfour et al., (2008) foregrounds the potential of the rural environment as an active force in shaping self and community identities. An important facet of this theory is the focus on rural people, and the “ability of people in space and time to sustain themselves both as subjects and as agents able to resist or transform the environment, depending on [the] resources available” (Balfour et al., 2008, p. 4). The theory also constructs rural people as having the agency to contribute to the direction educational institutions should pursue in order to serve the community to the fullest (Balfour et al., 2008; Balfour, 2012). Closer links with schooling contexts that provide an education for their Deaf children can be transformative and can inspire
caregivers, parents and community members to become change agents and to be active participants in the education of their Deaf children. Learners, teachers and school leaders could serve as critical resources and partners in education.

4.4.3 An exclusively oral environment

The criteria for providing an exclusively oral environment made it difficult to implement at Hilltop School. Some ideas to create an exclusively oral environment included moving the NAOA learners into a separate hostel and separating them from their signing peers during break times. I was quick to realise that the logistics of this idea made it difficult to implement, and the idea itself would create dissention and disharmony among the larger signing community. Furthermore, I did not want the learners to view themselves and be viewed by others as an elite group.

4.4.4 Funding

One of the greatest stumbling blocks that I encountered in implementing NAOA was the lack of funds. Although I engaged in intensive fundraising and sponsorship drives, in both the local and international community (Figs 82–84), the high cost of purchasing and maintaining hearing aids and FM systems with minimum funds meant that resources remained limited. My fundraising efforts at the end of three months helped with the purchase of one FM system and four pairs of digital hearing aids. A further six pairs of digital aids was directly sponsored from hearing aid companies. Both digital hearing aids and FM systems are fragile instruments and are easily susceptible to damage, thus necessitating frequent repairs. I tried to minimise the high maintenance costs. I started by upgrading the computer systems with the latest technology and then ensuring that the audiologists were adequately trained to operate and do minor repairs. The maintenance problem still persisted, however. Fundraising for technological devices became an added responsibility for me.
Special message from the Principal of School, Mrs Mavis Naidoo

Dear Mission Patron Friend of our Children

When I heard that through your kindness the children in our Natural Auditory Group were to receive extra desperately needed FM transmitters and receivers, I knew we had been specially blessed.

How can I ever thank you enough?

As staff, as parents (mainly poor people), and as learners, we all do our best at on a daily basis. But without the support of wonderful people - like yourself - the school simply wouldn’t function or go forward.

Your special generosity is helping us go forward into 2006 - a year for which I have a special vision: to extend ourselves!

Whilst education is paramount, these children also need more from us. Because not only are they hearing disabled, their emotional and social needs as well as their home life all need our attention and support.

Please pray that our outreach will be successful. And ‘thank you’ again, from all of us - children, teachers and parents.

Mavis Naidoo
Principal

Figure 82. Article of gratitude published for the international Catholic Community.
THE SOUTH DORSET HUNT
POINT-TO-POINT RACES
AT MILBORNE ST ANDREW
(By kind permission of M H Miller Esq)

Something to think about

SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

The school is a school in Kwa-Zulu Natal, South Africa. It caters for coloured children who mostly come from severely underprivileged families. The school relies entirely on charity. There have been occasions when parents of a child have simply abandoned the child to the school through poverty or even death, mostly Aids. The school picks up the pieces and looks after the child somehow.

The school aims to educate severely to profoundly deaf children and ensure they develop skills to make them useful members of their community.

The need — money! (you may have already guessed this!)

Could you find it in your heart and pocket to buy one hearing aid for a child or pay for a child’s tuition for a month or year.

Today the Principal of the school, Lingesperi Naidoo, is a guest of the South Dorset Point to Point.

For more information call 0771 910 7563 or 01305 848684

Visit Flick Baker on her trade stand, or even talk to Timothy Atkinson, I am on the course today!

Enjoy your day’s racing

Figure 83. Fundraising efforts in Dorset, England.
Figure 84. A newspaper report of a hearing aid donation.
4.4.5 Political agendas and criticisms

Implementation of spoken language at our school evoked strong reactions from Deaf organisations and schools for the Deaf. The tension was felt from the criticism that was directed towards us. DeafSA in particular reacted strongly to the introduction of oralism at Hilltop School. The organisation lodged its dispute against the school on the grounds that Sign Language was the mother tongue of Deaf children, implying that the oral method was contradictory to the philosophy and values of the Deaf culture.

My reassurances that Sign Language was being used by the learners in social settings did not appease them. Parental support of the school’s initiative was a strong shield against the denigration of our efforts. The pressure of criticism from my peers, some of whom were heads of other schools for the Deaf in the province, was particularly difficult to endure. I experienced the tensions often at provincial meetings and conferences, where I felt isolated and criticised. I remember a particular provincial meeting held in September 2005 that I attended. The majority of my peers chose not to interact with me even on a social level. One principal refused to be seated next to me; he ridiculed me and declared with a great deal of cynicism that my inexperience in Deaf education was the reason for my irrational attempts to make the Deaf try to speak. I later came to learn that I was labelled as “the principal who was forcing the Deaf to speak”. In various forums I tried to argue my position regarding the oral approach. But I was still seen as a novice in Deaf education whose naïve views had no validity.

I often experienced feelings of dismay and disillusionment, and I questioned my competence as a leader, while steadfastly holding on to the beliefs and values that underpinned my motives and actions. In my personal journal (Fig. 85) I wrote:
In the months that followed, my staff members experienced similar exclusion from their peers at the school who were not part of the project. The following is an extract of a reflective dialogue between myself and a member of management conducted in 2012:

Figure 85. Journal extract: 8 September 2005.

In the months that followed, my staff members experienced similar exclusion from their peers at the school who were not part of the project. The following is an extract of a reflective dialogue between myself and a member of management conducted in 2012:
Yes I had many negative experiences. There were many Deaf teacher aids in my department that were anti speech. Some even went out to other schools and Deaf organisations and convinced others that we were forcing the Deaf to speak. As a result, when I went for meetings to other schools I was often treated negatively and ostracised. I felt that people did not want to talk to me but they were always talking behind my back. I could just sense it.

(Mrs K)

It was a really difficult period. I conducted many workshops and even invited professionals to build the proficiency of staff in Cued Speech. I provided the Deaf staff in particular with evidence, showing them the spelling tests of learners who were doing Cued Speech. I was elated when one of the Deaf teacher aides, who had some speech, came to see me. She stated: “If only I had known about Cued Speech, I would have accessed tertiary education and been a doctor today.”

Many of the other staff members began to shift their views as they came to understand the NAOA approach and its underlying principles. However, there are a few who continue to resist. The dominant discourses of the Deaf culture and the influence of DeafSA continue to shape their thinking.

The words of Sir Thomas Buxton (1845) ring true for me: “With ordinary talent and extraordinary perseverance, all things are attainable”. I believe that through perseverance, commitment and strong beliefs, a new and unique methodology was explored — one that contributes to creating an inclusive curriculum at Hilltop School.

4.4.6 The emergence of a new Bilingual Approach

The pilot project that started in 2005 continued for three years. In those three years a new method of teaching language emerged. For the main part, this method fitted within the ambit of NAOA; however, we deviated in order to accommodate the unique socio-cultural environment of Hilltop School. While listening in a language-enriched environment remained the cornerstone of the method, Sign Language was not excluded from the classroom. Cued Speech and THRASS were adopted as strategies to support reading and language acquisition. It must be emphasised that Cued Speech is not used as an instructional communication method but as a language-learning tool. Learners use Cued Speech when they read in English and use Sign Language expressively if they do not have the English word they want to express. The teachers use Cued
Speech during English language lessons or when English is written or read. Sign Language is used to explain any new vocabulary and in social settings, such as when the children are in hostel and during breaks. A major deviation from NAOA principles is the use of Sign Language. Upon reflection, I have come to understand that although Sign Language was used in the classroom in the first few months of the programme, learners learned Sign Language spontaneously through mentorship of other learners who were exclusive Sign Language users. The class that started in 2005 are presently in Grade 8. In 2008 a new Grade 00 class started that followed our new approach.

### 4.4.7 Success stories

The literacy levels of learners involved in the NAOA project improved significantly. A marked development in learners has been reported by teachers in the areas of speech and language. This was clearly evident in spelling tests conducted in the two classes that were exposed to Cued Speech at the school in 2006, 2007, 2011 and 2012 (Figs 86 and 87).

![Figure 86. Spelling test averages for the pilot class for the years 2006 and 2007.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>L4</th>
<th>L5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2 Spelling Average for the year 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3 Spelling Average for the year 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Through the use of the THRASS Picture Chart, learners were tested on the different consonants and vowels of the English language. Figure 88 below shows that the NAOA learners who were using Cued Speech achieved either full scores or averaged scores between 80% and 90% in their accuracy in spelling target words. The THRASS Keyword Spelling Test was administered.

Figure 87. Spelling test averages for the second class exposed to Cued Speech in 2008.

The graph in Figure 88 indicates that many learners who used Sign Language exclusively either failed or achieved minimal scores. Hard-of-hearing learners performed better than the Sign Language users. However, those learners using Cued Speech excelled and showed better performance than the hard-of-hearing learners. The THRASS baseline assessment was
administered on Grade 5 learners (Fig. 89) as some of these learners were originally from the pilot class and were exposed to Cued Speech earlier on in their schooling.

Figure 89. THRASS baseline assessment results for Grade 5 learners conducted in May 2008.

The language development of learners who use Sign Language exclusively remains a challenge; however, Cued Speech is being introduced to these learners as more teachers are becoming proficient in it.

In addition, THRASS Baseline Assessment tests were conducted in 2008 for all learners from Grade 1 to Grade 6. This test required all 120 keywords to be written. The results of the tests revealed that learners who were exposed to Cued Speech performed better than those who did not engage in Cued Speech (Fig. 90).
Figure 90. THRASS baseline assessment tests administered on learners from Grade 1 to Grade 6 in May 2008.

Figure 91. Average scores in Grade 1 literacy on ANA 2011 (Department of Education, 2011).
The results of the 2011 Annual National Assessment (ANA) indicated that Hilltop School learners who were involved in the NAOA programme performed better than their hearing counterparts at other schools. These tests are standardised national assessments for Grade 1 literacy and numeracy. The results obtained are depicted in Figure 91.

The first Grade 0 NAOA class that was supported with Cued Speech and THRASS are presently in Grade 10 (2013). It should also be noted that at the end of 2012, Hilltop School was the only Deaf school in South Africa that had four natural auditory oral classes. It remains the first school in South Africa to use Cued Speech in conjunction with the THRASS phonic programme as an educational support tool. The school hosts a website on information regarding the use of THRASS and Cued Speech (www.thrass.co.uk/kt/09.htm). This website illustrates the successful implementation of a combination of educational tools and methods in the area of language and literacy in Deaf education. The class teacher involved in the NAOA pilot programme is presently the co-founder of Cued Speech in South Africa and her teaching assistant has since qualified as a teacher, and has made history by being one of the first teachers trained in South Africa to use Cued Speech. At present she is a board member of Cued Speech in South Africa.

Presently (2013), 36 learners are currently engaged in the modified NAOA programme, which is supported by Cued Speech, THRASS and Sign Language. All 36 learners have been fitted with binaural amplification and the school now has four FM systems. The therapists have undergone intensive audiological training at different hearing aid companies in South Africa, in relating to the calibration of hearing aids. This ensures that all hearing aids are maintained and serviced at minimal expense to the school.

4.5. Gazing back now on my instructional leadership

As I gaze back into the looking glass of my journey of instructional leadership, I am compelled to raise critical questions concerning the language issue. What ideologies and values influenced my enactments as a leader? Why did I feel so compelled to face resistance? What influenced this risk taking? How can I make sense of my agency, despite my limited experience as a leader in Deaf education?

Heywood (2000) defines instructional leaders as those who are able to create schools in which student education is continuously on the rise. Instructional leaders encourage collaboration; they create a culture that allows for the development and guiding of teachers, whilst also providing
professional development opportunities for them. Most importantly, instructional leaders feel a strong sense of accountability for student education (Fink & Resnick, 2001). Further, an important leadership skill indicated in literature is a high level of reflective awareness (Mendels, 2012; Sharma, 2012; Msila, 2012).

I am deeply aware that I stepped into instructional leadership with limited knowledge of language and literacy issues in Deaf education. Looking back, I was guided by a set of values, in particular the right to quality and equitable education for Deaf learners. Furthermore, during the writing of this autoethnographic study, I have engaged and questioned literature on the complexities of a language curriculum for the Deaf more deeply, and this has enabled me to reflect on the diversity amongst our learners and the notion of a responsive curriculum. These insights have helped me to critically analyse my leadership practices.

My vision of enabling Deaf learners to be more linguistically competent in order to improve their literacy skills and to have a stronger sense of their own identity is what made me challenge the language curriculum that existed. I engaged with the dilemma of the entitlement of the Deaf to their mother tongue (Sign Language) on the one hand, and the entitlement of the Deaf to a spoken language that would enable greater inclusion in society and independent citizenship. It is my view that the exclusion of either of these language mediums is a violation of human rights. It is this belief that made me aware of the limitations in my instructional leadership — the neglect of the linguistic rights of the profoundly Deaf learners who are unable to benefit from advanced technology. While learners in the NAOA and programmes for the hard of hearing showed a marked improvement in their literacy and language, learners using signs exclusively lagged behind in these areas of the curriculum.

I started to question whether I had fulfilled my vision of raising the bar of literacy for all the learners at Hilltop School? Was I committed to quality education for all learners? Yunis and Iqbal (2013) contend that sustained commitment to a clear vision is an essential principle of instructional leadership. Msila (2012), drawing on his study in South Africa, argues that a focused leader, one who embraces vision, will enable schools, even those with few resources, to succeed. In my instructional leadership enactments I believe that my vision shaped my agency in all the initiatives and innovations I facilitated at the school. I knew that literacy was the only way to achieve independent citizenship for my learners. My search for an alternative method for the hard of hearing exemplifies my agency. On reflection, I was able to enable my staff to understand that our change initiatives encapsulated a sense of purpose and meaning. I believe
that I fostered a collaborative, interdependent school culture of mutual support. The numerous meetings with the staff, parents and the SGB ensured maximum participation and commitment to our goals from all stakeholders of the school. I tried my best to shift away from top-down, bureaucratic paradigms of leadership. My aim as a leader was to provide an enabling environment to support change, innovation and creativity.

When I look back at the curriculum change at Hilltop School, I believe that organisational adaptation was the key. The restructuring of an educational programme to suit the needs of those who were hard of hearing, the implementation and adaptation of the unique NAOA programme, the method of Cued Speech to support the NAOA programme, the THRASS programme and Sign Language, and the “Adopt a Granny” initiative were initiatives that involved organisational adaptation. My narratives in this chapter elucidate the dynamic, complex systems and processes that comprise instructional leadership and change in an institution. I believe that as a leader I was able to create a dynamic generative space of possibilities (Waldrop, 1992).

Another dimension of instructional leadership that I have alluded to above relates to the school as a learning organisation. Fink and Resnick (2001) describe effective schools as “nested learning communities” (p. 601). My study points to the importance of instructional leaders being engaged in improving their own capacity as well as the capacity and social capital in the institution as a whole. As an instructional leader I became a learner, and I led my staff in this process of building their competencies. The new teaching methodologies for the hard of hearing and the NAOA without doubt led to organisational and personal growth. The training that took place at the Aquarius School for the NAOA programme, and in the USA for Cued Speech, built a valued capacity in my staff. Many of my teachers are now instructional specialists in Deaf education and have the capacity to provide leadership in critical areas of the curriculum. As mentioned earlier, it was a teacher from Hilltop School who became the first teacher in South Africa to be proficient in Cued Speech. One of my teachers was elected a member of the Cued Speech Board in South Africa.

My instructional leadership did involve risk taking, as we stepped into terrain that was completely new and unfamiliar to us. According to the National Center for Biotechnology Information (USA), risk taking can be defined as “undertaking a task involving a challenge for achievement or a desirable goal in which there is a lack of certainty or a fear of failure” (NCBI, n.d).
I think as members of staff we have come to understand that all innovations, moments of creativity and improvisation involve a degree of risk taking — it is inevitable. I have learned that managing risks in an institution is a key skill that is required of a manager. Limiting risk taking may lead to the creation of a static rather than a dynamic, adaptive organisation. I think I have learned that the risks of an institution becoming stagnant are without doubt more significant than the risks involved in pursuing impossible things. I also believe that leaders need to foster a culture that rewards risk-taking, tenacity and persistence.

This autoethnographic study has compelled me to engage with various approaches to language and literacy learning for the Deaf. I have to add that my professional development and that of the staff members involved with this component of the curriculum will be ongoing, and influenced by research and advances in technology. However, at this point I believe that a bilingual-bicultural education that is adapted to the needs of all learners is the most inclusive approach for D/deaf learners. The key instructional principle is that Deaf people have the same potential for language as their hearing peers (Akach, 2012). While the traditional bilingual-bicultural approach advances Sign Language and written English, it advocates Sign Language as the first language for Deaf children. I maintain that all children can benefit from a bilingual-bicultural programme, even if they choose a spoken language as their first language, depending on the degree of hearing loss. Those who view their deafness as ‘deaf’ would use their spoken language as their first language (L1) and Sign Language as their second language (L2). For those who identify themselves as ‘Deaf’, Sign Language would be the first language (L1) and written English would be their second language (L2). In essence this would be a bilingual-method for all D/deaf children, enabling learners to fit into the Deaf and hearing culture. A key issue is early access to language, as this would enhance cognitive development, and promote early literacy and quality academic achievement. Providing a sound, fully fledged bilingual-bicultural education within this context for all D/deaf children at Hilltop School would be my next pursuit in achieving the impossible as a school leader. On reflection, I created an enabling environment to build both intellectual capital and social capital at Hilltop School.

In the next chapter, my narratives focus on my quest for quality academic achievement on the part of my learners, not only in the schooling phase but post schooling as well.
CHAPTER 5
MY FERVENT QUEST FOR QUALITY ACHIEVEMENT OUTCOMES FOR MY LEARNERS

“Alice had got so much into the way of expecting nothing but out of the way things to happen, that it seemed quite dull and stupid for life to go on in the common way.”

(Lewis Carroll, Through the Looking Glass)

5.1. Introduction

I have always held the view that lack of access to a sound education destines children to marginalisation and exclusion from tertiary education and access to a productive life. Having been raised by a single parent and coming from a working class background, in all humility I believe that I have achieved what many children with a similar life history fail to accomplish: I beat the odds. I achieved what many would have thought – impossible. My schooling occurred in the apartheid era. The schools I attended served working class and poor communities. Despite growing up in an unequal and oppressive society, on reflection I am thankful that my schools were functional with deeply committed teachers and school leaders who respected my right to a good education and my right to become an independent citizen. I knew that my single mother and my educators believed in me and my capabilities. In return, I was steadfast in my goal to excel academically.

Advice from my mum remains etched in my mind:

Education can unlock every door and change your life. Always remember that no one can take education away from you.

Now as a school principal, I realise that the issue of access to quality education and equity in achievement outcomes continues to be a complex challenge internationally (Unterhalter & Brighouse, 2007; Christie, 2010; Riley & Coleman, 2011; Kyriakides & Creemers, 2011). Although there have been major gains in access to education in sub-Saharan Africa over the past decade, serious concerns have been voiced over the poor achievement outcomes in mathematics,
science and literacy (Akyeampong, Pryor & Ampiah, 2006; Carnoy, Chisholm, Chilisa et al., 2011; Fleisch, 2008; Pontefract & Hardman, 2005). In South Africa, despite the legal and legislative frameworks for equitable, quality education for all promulgated since 1994, poor educational outcomes remain a troubling concern for all stakeholders in South Africa. The right to quality education for all learners is enshrined in the South African Constitution (RSA, 1996c). The Constitution’s Bill of Rights emphasises that everyone has the right to a basic education, including adult basic education and further education. It further states that it is the responsibility of the State to make education progressively available and accessible through reasonable measures. Yet, policy analysts, educationists and scholars continue to raise the concern that education in South Africa is in ‘crisis’ (for example, Bloch, 2009; Soudien, 2011; Tikly & Barrett, 2011; Frempong, Reddy & Kanjee, 2011).

Upon entering Deaf education, I was alarmed by the poor academic achievement of learners in schools for the Deaf in South Africa (Akach, 2010; Aarons & Reynolds, 2003). South Africa has approximately four million Deaf or hard-of-hearing people but an overwhelming number never graduate from high school. DeafSA points out that of the forty-seven schools for the Deaf in South Africa, only twelve offer an endorsed Senior Certificate (DeafSA, 2008). Internationally, the same pattern persists, as Deaf children are substantially behind their hearing peers in all measures of academic achievement. Many learners at schools for the Deaf in the United States of America and the United Kingdom are channelled into skills courses at an early age, as expectations for them are low (Traxler, 2000; Marschark, 2009).

From the moment I stepped into the principalship at Hilltop School, I was saddened by the low academic achievement outcomes of learners. Many thoughts vexed me in those early months: Why do the Deaf, in essence a language minority, struggle to achieve quality learning outcomes? What are the structural barriers that cause poor learning outcomes for Deaf learners? Are there particular dominant hegemonic discourses and embedded values, beliefs and expectations that produce and reproduce low levels of achievement for the Deaf?

My quest became the achievement of equity and quality education for my Deaf learners at Hilltop School. This quest continues to be both my obsession and my inspiration as I enact the principalship. I share with you my journey to achieving academic excellence for the learners at Hilltop School.

---

6 An Endorsed Senior Certificate means that the student did not meet the programme and or promotion requirements of the National Senior Certificate.
5.2 Educating the Deaf: my evolving understanding of the struggle of curriculum access

I resolved to gain an understanding of the key issues that impede curriculum access for Deaf learners internationally. I read widely and was attentive to debates at formal and informal forums in which I participated. I found that Deaf learners in many parts of the world leave school with poor competencies in most school subjects. A crucial reason documented in studies I examined at the time is the lack of linguistic access to the content areas of the curriculum. Furthermore, teacher beliefs about learners’ ability and capacity to learn have a direct impact on academic performance. Generally, teacher expectations are low. A range of more recent studies continue to come up with these insights (for example, Musengi & Chireshe, 2012; Kiyaga & Moores, 2009; Reed et al., 2008).

As I gained experience at Hilltop School, I came to believe that one reason for the poor linguistic ability of our learners is the lack of early and effective exposure to language. This has been substantiated by research insights, of which I provide a brief account. Marschark and Wauters (2008) maintain that this lack of early language exposure seriously impedes the formal and informal learning of language. Research by Marschark, Sapere, Convertino et al. (2008) shows that there is a correlation between low learner performance outcomes, and an impoverishment in early language experience in Deaf learners. The majority of Deaf people are born into hearing families and as a result they receive no linguistic mediation from the spoken language and no communication using a visual language in their early years. This results in delays in their language acquisition and eventual academic performance, as access to the curriculum is seriously compromised (Smith & Allman, 2010; Antia, Jones, Reed & Kreimeyer, 2009; Garberoglio, Gobble & Cavthon, 2012). Thus, a Deaf learner entering school for the first time does not have the language competence (either signed or spoken) that their hearing peers have, and lags behind in linguistic, cognitive and social development.

This problem is often compounded when learners arrive at school and are taught by teachers who are unable to use Sign Language adequately. In South Africa, studies have shown that more than 50% of the teachers at schools for the Deaf are not fluent in SASL (Peel, 2005; Ram & Muthukrishna, 2011). Martin (2010) and Akach (2011) assert that when learners are unable to improve their reading and writing skills, it is always assumed that it is either the result of inadequacies of the learners or the difficulty of teaching English to Deaf learners. It is seldom suggested that the failure can be attributed to the inability of the teacher to communicate with the learner effectively through Sign Language. In South Africa a DeafSA (2009) report indicated that Deaf learners often enter Grade 0 (pre-school) with no speech, and that most teachers in the
Foundation Phase (Grade 0–3) do not have adequate signing skills. Further, many teachers employed at schools for the Deaf have no specialist training in SASL and Deaf education.

While linguistic difficulty is acknowledged as a reason for poor academic outcomes in Deaf education, it is a point of contention that since most arguments on pedagogy centre on the means of communication, it distracts attention from what should be the central focus. Scholars maintain that the focus should rather be on how support can be extended to the diverse range of Deaf learner needs (Russell, 2004; Swanwick & Marschark, 2010). Marschark (2008) emphasises that one cannot indict language alone for the challenges in classroom learning experienced by Deaf learners. There is a need to examine the instructional practices that support learning and achievement. For example, teacher expectation plays a significant role in learner achievement (Smith, 2008; Brown & Paatsch, 2010; Kiyaga & Moores, 2009). International research demonstrates that low expectations for student achievement permeate educational systems. In Deaf education in particular, it has been established that low teacher expectations affect learner outcomes. These low expectations have given rise to the belief that low academic achievement is an inevitable consequence of deafness (Smith, 2008; Pagliaro & Kritzer, 2005; Brown & Paatsch, 2005).

Marlatt’s (2004) study in the USA on knowledge and practice among teachers of the Deaf confirmed the correlation between low teacher expectations and poor academic outcomes. His study pointed out that while pre-service teachers reported high levels of learner achievement, experienced teachers displayed the lowest level of expectations. It is believed that as new teachers gained experience, their expectations of learners decreased.

In the case study by Smith (2008) conducted in the USA, it was revealed that high expectations on the part of a teacher yielded above average achievement in Deaf learners. Smith identified some factors that constituted high and low expectations. High expectations are characterised by assigning students challenging levels of work, encouraging students to do better if they do not meet the high expectations of the teacher and setting a positive and friendly classroom atmosphere. Low expectations, on the other hand, are exhibited as demanding less effort from students, giving students limited time to answer questions, giving answers without eliciting effort from students and giving overt praise for marginal answers.

Studies also show that reduced curriculum content is often a consequence of low teacher expectations. Lytle, Johnson and Hui (2005), drawing from their research in China, support the view that the curriculum for Deaf learners is governed by the low expectations of hearing people.
Studies conducted by Luckner & Muir (2001) in the USA indicate that professionals working with the Deaf believed that exposure to the general education curriculum contributes to high academic success. I also hold the view that demanding less from learners results in an impoverished curriculum (Meadow-Orlans et al., 2003; Good & Brophy, 2003). In other words, the classification of ‘limited ability’ by teachers does potentially alter instructional methodology and curricula (Powers, 2003; Pagliaro & Kritzer, 2005).

In the last decade or so, it has been argued that low academic performance is perpetuated by the lack of standards and accountability in the field of Deaf education globally (Smith, 2008; Luckner & Velaski, 2004). Programmes lack content and performance standards, clear assessment procedures and a comprehensive accountability plan.

Currently there is a growing consensus that the curriculum for the Deaf should be exactly the same as the curriculum for their hearing peers to the greatest possible extent (Musengi & Chireshe, 2012; Green & Engelbrecht, 2007). Luckner & Velaski (2004) argue that an individual’s perspective of hearing loss and deafness will undoubtedly influence what he or she thinks should be included in the curriculum. I agree with this view, particularly if one constructs the Deaf as a language minority who have a right to equity in education.

The above perspectives from research on curriculum access for the Deaf have been invaluable to me as I write my autoethnographic account of my principalship — as I look back through the Looking Glass. In my engagement with curriculum issues at the school I was confronted with and disturbed by the insidious systemic exclusionary factors that serve as barriers to access. My view was that historically the school as an institution was failing our learners. In the next sections of this chapter, I disclose the paths I traversed to address the issue of curriculum access and achievement outcomes. I strongly felt that issues of teacher beliefs about the Deaf child, issues of accountability, teacher competencies and teacher professional development were critical to fulfilling the rights of learners to an equitable and high quality education.

5.3 Historical background to curriculum development at Hilltop School

The Looking Glass metaphor serves as a reflexive tool to analyse my enactments as a leader at Hilltop School. As I relive this period in my life during which I engaged with curriculum issues, I am keenly aware of the multiple, overlapping and competing roles I performed: Was I a manager, a politician (I was often thrown into debates on Deaf education that were intensely
political), instructional leader, researcher, architect of teacher professional development, fundraiser? How did I survive? How did I grow?

Early on I deemed it necessary to have a clear conceptualisation of the notion of curriculum. I explored various constructions in literature, and eventually decided that the definition put forward by South Africa’s National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training and the National Committee on Education Support Services (NCSNET/NCESS, 1997) clarified the concept for me:

Curriculum can be defined as everything that influences the learner, including: who teaches; how it is taught; how learning is assessed; teaching and learning materials and equipment; the way in which learning programmes are organised and the psycho-social environment within which teaching and learning take place (p. 2).

I shared this definition with my teachers and members of management in the early years of my principalship. This would become our working conceptualisation.

Making sense of the curriculum at Hilltop School was an arduous task. At the outset, I wanted a picture of the historical context of the curriculum and how it had evolved. I recorded my research insights in my personal diary. My analysis indicated that since the school had opened in 1983, how learning programmes were organised was linked to how class groups were defined and how learners were classified.

In 1983, all classes consisted of a group of learners of mixed ages. Classes in the school were classified as ‘special classes’. Special classes in schools usually imply that learners with ‘disabilities’ are grouped together so that they can receive specially designed instruction. Thus, I interpreted the classification of all classes as ‘special classes’ to mean that all learners were viewed as having learning disabilities by virtue of the fact that they were Deaf.

When a new principal was appointed in 1985, the grouping and classification of learners at the school changed. Learners were grouped according to age and the classification ‘special class’ was replaced by the term ‘step’. ‘Step’ was used to denote progress in terms of age. Hence, classes were classified as ‘step 1’ (youngest learners) to ‘step 5’ (oldest learners).

---

7 In October 1996 the Ministry of Education appointed the National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training and the National Committee on Support Services to investigate and make recommendations on all aspects of special needs and support services in Education and Training in South Africa. The focus was to ensure that the educational system become more responsive to the diverse needs of learners by providing more support.
In 1986, the classification changed once again. Learners continued to be grouped according to age but the classification changed from ‘step’ to ‘sub-standard’. The word sub-standard can be defined as something that does not meet a basic established level. My understanding is that learners were constructed to be performing below the standard of achievement at mainstream schools.

I admit that at the time I did not make much sense of this, and had no time to delve deeper into the motives and underlying rationale for changes, if there were any. To me it seemed that the grouping system was rather ad hoc and that change emerged from the personal inclinations of particular individuals. Staff members I talked to as part of my autoethnography suggested that the grouping and categorisation of learners was based largely on perceived ability, and curriculum decisions were made by the succeeding principals on notions of who had intellectual potential and who did not? I am truly appalled as I reflect on this with my researcher lens! Is this kind of deficit construction of learners not a violation of social rights?

As I focus my lens further, I see that another contentious issue was the content of the curriculum at Hilltop School. In essence, there was no evidence of a theoretically informed curriculum policy at the school that would guide decisions in key facets such as content areas, pedagogical approaches, syllabi, assessment procedures, and the language of instruction, which was Sign Language.

It became evident to me that teachers had the licence to choose subjects or learning areas for their particular class groups. Furthermore, there was little evidence of collaborative or shared curriculum planning. Teachers were required to draw up syllabi to meet the needs of learners in their respective classes for the subjects they chose to teach. Teachers reported that most programmes were skills-based as management and teachers believed that Deaf learners were incapable of academic achievement. Hence, school subjects included Basic English, needlework, art, gardening, weaving and cookery. The inclusion of these subjects was intended to teach learners basic survival skills and keep them occupied at school. One teacher remarked that in many ways Hilltop School was a ‘day care centre’. The lack of clear, accountable assessment and promotion criteria led to learners being promoted mostly according to age and at the sole discretion of the class teacher. Since there was no prescribed exit age for learners, many remained in school up to the age of 26 years. The curriculum reflected facets of the curriculum directed at post-school preparation.
In discussions with teachers both individually and in the focus groups, it emerged that there was no consultation with staff by management regarding the grouping and categorisation of learners. In addition, the rationale for the choice of labels used, for example, the category ‘sub-standard’ was never explained to members of staff. It is noted that the staff did not question the decisions made by the principal at that time.

The appointment of a new principal in 1992 saw further changes to class structures. Classes were now classified as ‘grades’ as is the practice in mainstream schools. However, the curriculum remained inferior to that of the mainstream. Learners were grouped from Grade 0 to Grade 9, and followed an adapted mainstream curriculum from Grade 0 to Grade 7. A special pre-vocational curriculum was offered for learners in Grade 8 and Grade 9, which included woodwork, hairdressing and cookery. At the end of Grade 9, learners exited the school system with no national qualification but with a school-leaving certificate. This certificate did not allow Deaf learners entry to tertiary institutions or places of employment.

Certain comments gleaned from my interviews with staff members bring to the fore some critical underlying issues related to curriculum access and delivery at Hilltop School.

“When I was transferred to this school for the Deaf, I was told by the inspector that it was a ‘special school’ so I did not have to worry as all the learners are ‘slow’ learners. The work is very easy. I was told that I didn’t need to know Sign Language and that teaching the Deaf was easy. I was confused and accepted the post as I thought it was going to be easier than a mainstream school.

(Class teacher, Njoko, July 2012)

I think that calling the classes sub-standard was the right term since we had no standard syllabus. We taught anything as long as the learners were occupied. We decided to teach whatever we (individual teacher) felt was important and we got our information from anywhere we could.

(Management member, Sithole, May 2012)

Many of the teachers at that time, referred to the classes as remedial classes because that is what they were. Trying to go over the same thing over and over made it remedial. We were always stuck with basic stuff. Many of us did not know Sign Language so we were unable to teach as well, so the best we could do was keep the learners occupied. We were also afraid to question the management in fear of losing our jobs.

(Class teacher, Mchunu, May 2012)
Most of us were happy to go with the flow as we knew that other schools for the Deaf were doing what they wanted as well. To the Department of Education we were just a special school and all we had to do was keep the learners occupied. No one checked on our class work. We liked this as it made our work easier and we did not question the principal or the management and were happy to do as we were told since we were not adequate to do anything else.

(Class teacher, Pillay, May 2012)

These reflections point to salient issues. The use of the words ‘special schools’, ‘sub-standard’ and ‘remedial’ are all indicative of low expectations on the part of teachers. I argue that the curriculum offered during that period was watered down because of the belief that Deaf learners are unable to achieve academically. Labels are pervasive as they are underpinned by particular discourses that determine the curriculum decisions and choices — and questions about who gets what, how and why. The medical/deficit discourse clearly underpinned the thinking of school management and staff. Deafness was viewed as a ‘disability’ that required remediation. In addition, as put succinctly by Johnson, Liddell & Erting (1989, p. 103), Deaf children were seen as “defective models of normal hearing children”.

The issue of poor Sign Language proficiency on the part of teachers is raised in one of the excerpts above. Obviously this was not an imperative for leadership at the school historically. This continues to be one of the crisis areas in Deaf education. Akach (2010) emphasises that in South Africa, teachers do not have competence and fluency in signing skills yet they are tasked to deliver the curriculum to Deaf learners. Akach & Morgan (1999) questioned why the South African Department of Education condones the employment of teachers who do not have proficiency in Sign Language. Deaf learners at a rural school in KwaZulu-Natal were vehement that the most significant barrier to education for them was teachers’ poor proficiency in Sign Language (Van der Riet, Hough, Killian, O’Neill & Ram, 2006).

My understandings led me to question whether the poor academic outcomes of Deaf learners could be attributed to a failed educational system rather than the inadequacies in learners. High student achievement was not a priority at the school. One teacher intimated to me that the view was “just do not question management because it makes our work easier”.

I wondered: How could this context compromise teacher accountability in this way? What influences constrained teacher agency? How could teachers and school management accept and entrench the limits placed on the right to quality education for learners? Why did leadership not adopt an inquiry-based approach to curriculum policy and practice?
5.4. I enter the curriculum arena: What do I see?

One of my first tasks as the new acting principal in 2001 at Hilltop School was to supervise the academic programme and the curriculum of the school. Since this was to become a new area of supervision for me, I began with an evaluation and analysis of the existing academic programme of the school.

Discussions with management and staff confirmed that the school formulated its own internal curriculum policy with a ‘watered down’ syllabus. Since the curriculum was determined by the school, it was not governed by Departmental regulations and assessment standards as no national curriculum was available for schools for the Deaf.

My observations indicated that learners were exposed to an inferior curriculum when compared to mainstream schools and they were not required to perform to the level of their hearing peers. Underperformance was an accepted practice, with, for example, Grade 5 learners engaging with Grade 1 work (which was simplified and modified).

At this time I became aware that attempts for a joint co-ordinated curricular programme in English, mathematics and science was being initiated by the eight schools for the Deaf in the province. To this end, curricular committees were formed with representation from all schools. Despite these attempts to offer uniform subject areas and a common syllabus, these committees disintegrated as teachers lacked interest. In addition, since this was not a Department of Education directive, the lack of accountability was a further factor that caused this initiative to fail.

Through my ongoing interactions with, discussions with and observations of teachers and members of the management staff, I ascertained that low expectations of staff prevailed at the school. As a result, ‘ceilings’ were placed on learner competencies. I recall questioning a teacher on the reason for the poor standard of mathematics being taught in a Grade 7 class. This teacher was engaging the learners with Grade 1 work (basic addition and subtraction). The teacher explained to me that it was her understanding that Deaf learners are unable to accomplish difficult work tasks, and could not reach grade-level performance in mathematics and reading. I soon began to understand that as a result of such misconceptions, teachers taught elementary work and did not apply creative strategies to raise academic achievement. One teacher expressed the view that
Deaf learners are intellectually inferior and are capable of concrete understanding only. They cannot engage in abstract thinking and understanding. They can’t cope with complicated work.  

(Class educator, Nelisiwe, July 2012)

I tried to make sense of the comment of this teacher. I learned that such attitudes and perceptions in Deaf education have been documented internationally. During my autoethnography, I felt affirmed when I read literature on the issue. Studies have shown that there are no significant differences between hearing and Deaf learners’ ability to conceptualise and engage in abstract and other high-level cognitive skills (Powers, 2003; Luckner & Muir, 2001; Traxler, 2000). A survey conducted by Pagliaro and Kritzer (2005) in the USA with 290 teachers on the mathematics knowledge of Deaf learners revealed low expectations on the part of educators. Teachers stated that mathematics topics were too ‘high level’ for their learners. Drawing on experiences in the USA and the United Kingdom, Garberoglio, Gobble and Cawthon (2012) and Powers (2003) argue that teachers’ low expectations in Deaf educational settings raise questions about the role of teacher beliefs on student outcomes. Teaching enactments are shaped by the teachers’ ideologies and philosophical assumptions about the Deaf. How educators view deafness is cited as a salient factor responsible for the low expectations and negative attitudes and beliefs of teachers towards the Deaf learners (Gutman, Sameroff & Cole, 2003; Peel, 2005; Ram & Muthukrishna, 2011; Martin & Mounty, 2005; Garberoglio, Gobbl & Cawthon, 2012).

Through my interrogation of literature I learned further that how one constructs deafness determines how one evaluates the learning potential of Deaf people. Essentially there are two paradigms of deafness: the clinical pathological paradigm and the socio-cultural paradigm. The clinical pathological paradigm is also referred to as the medical model, which focuses on a person’s impairment. This model views deafness as a ‘disability’ and it regards deafness as a ‘personal tragedy’. From this perspective, deafness is interpreted as having a very limiting effect on the Deaf person’s ability to participate in mainstream society (UNESCO, 2003). Teachers who view deafness from this viewpoint see Deaf learners as ‘disabled’ because they cannot hear. Deaf people are constructed as having limited intellectual ability (Smith & Allman, 2010).

On the other hand, the socio-cultural paradigm focuses on the way in which the social environment in which the Deaf live, acts to exclude them from full participation (UNESCO, 2003). According to this perspective, Deaf people are viewed as a linguistic minority sharing a strong identity, a common language (Sign Language) and a unique culture (Deaf culture). From this perspective, the Deaf should be respected and accepted as a separate cultural group having
their own language and values. Thus, if teachers operate from a socio-cultural perspective, they view Deaf learners as having the academic potential to achieve at the same level as their hearing counterparts if they are given the opportunities to succeed. It is through this viewpoint that the barriers of negative attitudes, lowered expectations and stereotyping of difference can be disrupted (Martin, 2010; Martin & Mounty, 2005; Ram & Muthukrishna, 2011).

From my discussions with staff I was able to glean that many teachers at Hilltop School were operating from a clinical pathological paradigm that emphasised the deficit of Deaf people. Ideologically, I was located within the socio-cultural and a human-rights paradigm. High academic achievement for the Deaf was a non-negotiable goal as far as I was concerned. They were a language minority, not a group of learners who were intellectually impaired or had cognitive limitations. Was this a belief in another impossible thing?

5.5. Reinventing the curriculum at Hilltop School: Breaking the ceiling

Against this background, and with the new knowledge that I had acquired from my interaction with the Deaf community in the school and the wider community, as well as my readings on Deaf education, I decided to try to break the ‘ceiling’ effect and address the ‘watered down’ syllabus that was being taught at Hilltop School. My own experience as a teacher in a special school for 10 years demonstrated to me that if teachers do not encourage their learners to achieve and experience complex work, many learners will not achieve, as they may feel that they lack the capacity to do so. However, I believe that if teachers constantly challenge, motivate and expect their learners to achieve, many learners will endeavour to obtain higher academic results.

My first impossible task was to change teacher beliefs about our Deaf learners. My view was that this was the critical barrier to the achievement of quality education at Hilltop School. I knew that this was a complex task. How do I trouble and disrupt misconceptions and oppressive views that seemed to be so deeply embedded in the psyche of teachers? I was aware that deeply held misconceptions are very resistant to change. Since then, I have read numerous studies that provide evidence to suggest that teachers’ epistemological beliefs about the nature of knowledge, about their learners, about knowing and about how learning proceeds may be part of a broader set of attitudes and beliefs about the nature of ability and disability (for example, Jordan, Schwartz & McGhie-Richmond, 2009; Brownlee & Berthelsen, 2006). Would alternative
paradigms and ways of constructing Deaf learners I present to teachers be meaningful to teachers?

I had to shift teacher constructions of deafness as a deficiency. At the same time, I was acutely aware how teachers constructed me. They attributed my strong ideas on the capabilities and potential of Deaf learners to my inexperience and limited understanding of Deaf education.

I soldiered on despite the apathy of the staff members who firmly believed that they did not need personal and professional development. I conducted many workshops presenting the various paradigms and discourses that have influenced Deaf education (Fig. 92). I particularly drew their attention to the socio-cultural discourse of deafness. I invited organisations that promoted the academic achievement of Deaf people to share their knowledge and experiences with us. A key theme in all workshops and forums was the Deaf as a language minority, who had the right to quality education. I motivated staff by inviting many successful Deaf role models that had achieved academically to tell their stories to both learners and staff (Fig. 93).

My aim was to persuade teachers that the Deaf had the potential for high academic achievement. In the ensuing months, I could sense a new excitement amongst staff members in formal and informal forums at the school — an excitement about our learners and their capabilities. They began to observe their learners competencies and skills that were invisible to them before. I could tell that there were shifts in their thinking and their beliefs — and a renewed commitment to making quality learning and teaching happen at the school. A Deaf teacher commented to me:

_I am so happy, at last someone is listening. If the teachers use the proper Sign Language then the children can learn. Deaf people are not stupid. The problem is hearing teachers do not know the language of Deaf people so we cannot learn because we do not understand what they are saying._

_(Deaf teacher assistant, James, 2012)_
Date: 13 March 2002

Programme: "DEAF CAN ACHIEVE"

1. Welcome : Principal
2. Prayer : E.B. Ndlovu
3. Introduction & objectives : Principal
4. Speaker from Parliament : Mrs Wilma Newhoudt-Druchen
   ("My Life Story and how I overcome my obstacles")
5. Deaf Ex-learner : Ms Nompilo Khanyile [SLED facilitator]
7. Refreshments
8. Discussion, questions & way forward - formation of steering committee.
9. Vote of Thanks : Mrs D.G. Zwane
10. Closing prayer.

Figure 92. A programme for a ‘Deaf Can Achieve’ workshop.
For the first time, I sensed that the Deaf staff had a voice. At staff meetings they were very vocal about their beliefs. They argued that suppressing the potential of Deaf learners was a form of oppression and abuse. Some staff members were concerned that my drive to effect change was creating divisions amongst the staff. This did not trouble me as I knew that change is never a linear process, and gives rise to spaces of resistance, discomfort, conflict and disharmony as people challenge their own thinking, beliefs and assumptions. I tried to listen and be supportive of all staff members as they journeyed through complex spaces. I understood that one reason for their misguided beliefs was a lack of professional development.

Driven in my quest to improve the quality of education at Hilltop, my next priority was to make all members of staff proficient in SASL. I secured funding and enrolled all teachers and management staff for a basic Sign Language course (Figs 94–96).
Figure 94. Sign Language lessons with the Sign Language Academy of KwaZulu-Natal.

Figure 95. Sign Language lessons with the Sign Language Academy of KwaZulu-Natal.
The cornerstone of the course presented by a Deaf tutor was a glimpse into Deaf culture, its ideological stance and the socio-cultural perspective of deafness. Reflecting back, this was a moment of enlightenment and illumination for the staff. I was convinced that staff realised their poor proficiency in Sign Language, and were awakened to the fact that this was a major barrier to learning and teaching at Hilltop. I was so proud of the staff members who were able to acknowledge their inadequacies — this was truly a step forward for me.

![Certificate of Completion](image)

**Figure 96. My Sign Language certificate (completion of Level One).**

Within a short period of time (about two months) I noticed that as teachers became more fluent in Sign Language, their confidence in the classroom improved. Many teachers started to show a deeper understanding of deafness and Deaf culture. To ensure continuity, a Sign Language committee was formed with representatives from all sectors of the school. Sign Language professional classes were conducted at the school on a weekly basis and all staff members were required to attend discussions. These classes were facilitated by the teachers who were proficient in SASL. These discussions still continue presently.
5.6. My pursuit of academic excellence for all learners at Hilltop School

With the management team firmly behind me, I proposed that the year 2003 be declared a year for academic excellence for all learners at Hilltop School. This proposal was supported by the SGB, and was accepted by most members of staff. A few remained cynical regarding the academic potential of Deaf learners.

The next few months saw many changes to the curriculum. A curriculum committee was formed. A new standardised curriculum for English, Mathematics and Science was formulated by staff, using Departmental guidelines for mainstream schools. In the main we attempted to follow the curriculum designed for mainstream schools, making minimum changes.

Since there were no guidelines for pre-vocational subjects, I initiated teacher visits to other schools and Further Education and Training (FET) centres in the hope of revising the existing programme so that it could be more market-oriented and could enable some form of accreditation. Accredited certification would ensure access to employment opportunities for our learners. The improved academic performance of the hard-of-hearing pilot class (discussed in Chapter 4), served as an inspiration to the staff, and resulted in an energy and drive to achieve quality teaching and learning that I had never witnessed before.

Concurrent with the academic changes that I was initiating at Hilltop School, a wave of new policies to address barriers to learning and create new possibilities for success was being introduced. Previously in South Africa, fundamental pedagogics and the traditional model of special education were skewed towards a restricted pedagogy that set ceilings for learners (Department of Education, 2002). I was fortunate that it was the climate for change nationally.

My drive towards academic excellence for the Deaf coincided with the release of key policies by the National Department of Education, including Education White Paper 6: Building an Inclusive Education and Training System (July, 2001) and the Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS) (Department of Education, 2002).

Education White Paper 6 suggests major philosophical shifts and a radical departure from the traditional special education model in South Africa as encapsulated in the Special Education Schools Act of 1948. Education White Paper 6 calls for a paradigm shift from a medical deficit view of need to one based on a social-rights model with a focus on transforming the system, attitudes and approaches to accommodate a range of diversity in the learner population (Department of...
The key guiding principles for achieving an inclusive education and training system are articulated as follows:

- human rights and social justice for all learners
- participation and social integration
- equity and redress
- access to a single inclusive education system
- access to the curriculum and community responsiveness.

*Education White Paper 6* also provides a framework for developing an inclusive system through systemic change. It states that an inclusive system acknowledges and respects diversity amongst learners and provides enabling education structures, systems and learning methodologies to meet the needs of all learners. *Education White Paper 6* defines ‘inclusive education’ as:

- Acknowledging that all children and youth can learn and that all children and youth need support.
- Creating 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, behaviour, teaching methods, curricula and environment to meet the needs of all learners.
- Maximising participation of all learners in the culture and the curriculum of educational institutions and uncovering and minimising barriers to learning.

The above became the goals that I instilled in staff and the school stakeholders. My priority was transforming Hilltop School into an inclusive school.

The RNCS provided us with guidelines on what should be taught from Grade 0 to Grade 9. It specifies the required outcomes, what is expected of learners in each grade, learning areas and the standards to be used to assess learner achievement of the expected outcome. Although the curriculum lends itself to different interpretations and enactments in diverse contexts, the guidelines are very streamlined. There are eight proposed learning area statements in the General
and Training band (Grades 0–9). A learning area is a field of knowledge, skills and values that has unique features as connections with other fields of knowledge and learning areas. The learning areas in the RNCS are languages, mathematics, natural sciences, technology, social sciences, arts and culture, life orientation, economic and management sciences (Department of Education, 2002).

At a principal’s meeting in late 2003, the National Chief Director of Education emphasised that it had become mandatory that all schools (including special schools) adhere to the values, principles and proposals of Education White Paper 6 and the RNCS. This was most welcome as it fitted perfectly into my plan for academic excellence. Education White Paper 6 emphasises that learners are to be educated in the most appropriate, least restrictive environment to enable them to develop to their full potential.

In addition, the RNCS provided me with a standardised curriculum that I had envisaged for the school. This directive was opposed by most special school principals because many of them felt threatened that the inclusive model proposed by Education White Paper 6 would mean the possible closing of special schools. Furthermore, many educationists in the Deaf education sector were of the firm opinion that Deaf learners would not be able to access the RNCS. However, their protests fell on ‘deaf’ ears as it was emphasised that both the RNCS and Education White Paper 6 were legislated policies, and that all schools had to abide by the proposals.

For our school, it meant that we could now be treated as a mainstream school that served learners in a specialised learning context that used Sign Language as a medium of instruction. The most important implication was that if we followed the RNCS, it signified that our learners would be eligible to write the National Grade 12 examination, my ultimate goal of the academic achievement for our learners. While some teachers viewed these policies as threatening and based on contentious assumptions, others viewed them as a moral victory for society and as part of a wave of legislative action that affirmed the rights of all children, even those learners who are difficult to teach.

Because the RNCS was mandated by the Department of Education, implementation at the school became easier, since teachers are often more accepting of changes that are initiated by the Department of Education as opposed to internal school changes. In the main, teachers were enthusiastic as they were acutely aware that the school was striving for academic excellence. Despite reservations from a minority of staff, school management in consultation with the SGB and staff formulated a strategic plan for curriculum transformation and implementation.
provided strong and sustained leadership throughout the process. I studied all policy documents in considerable depth and engaged in debates with peers in education in general.

I marvelled at my own agency. On reflection, I am convinced that it was the climate of creativity and innovation that inspired me and fuelled and ignited my agency.

Our plan included a focus on the wellbeing of educators. Research has shown that the wellbeing of employees should be an essential part of an organisation’s management philosophy. Teacher wellbeing is often cited as a psychological determinant of occupational success (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2009; Saklofske, Austin, Galloway & Davidson, 2007; Day & Gu, 2007; Keele & Bell, 2008). According to Kremenitzer, Mosja and Brackett (2008), the wellbeing of teachers has positive effects on the organisation, which include minimising negative outcomes experienced by teachers and learners. Keele and Bell (2008) confirm that social support in the working environment is an important factor in coping with situations that may disturb professional wellbeing. My view was that the wellbeing of staff is linked to their professional capabilities and confidence in themselves as teachers. I therefore wanted to create an institutional space in which teachers knew they were valued as professionals and human beings.

In this regard, I ensured that teachers were supported with good teaching and learning resources. I created opportunities for intensive upgrading of their professional skills, particularly as curriculum enactors. This included pedagogical content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge — areas in which they needed development. I encouraged and created space for teachers to attend all workshops on curriculum development that were organised by the Department of Education. Our communication networks and systems were improved through the purchase of new computers (Fig. 99), which gave teachers access to the Internet so that they could keep abreast of the latest technology, educational trends and innovations in Deaf education internationally and nationally. Information was cascaded in daily briefing meetings, where staff were given opportunities to share information, challenges, achievements and engage in problem solving. We planned team-building outings (Figs 97 and 98), invited motivational speakers and planned regular social activities in the hope of fostering a team spirit and a sense of caring amongst teachers.
Figure 97. Staff team building.

Figure 98. Staff team building.
The implementation of the RNCS was phased in in 2004, beginning in the foundation phase (Grade 0–3). Teachers were required to attend orientation workshops that were part of the roll-out plan of the RNCS organised by the Department of Education. Teachers were often frustrated as they were of the view that the facilitators of the workshops were not adequately trained to mediate the content and materials to participants. Furthermore, many teachers claimed that they felt marginalised as the focus was on hearing learners, and important issues that pertained to curriculum access for the Deaf were not included, nor was space allowed for discussion. Such pertinent issues included the complexity of the home language and first additional language of the Deaf, time allocation for learning areas, promotion requirements for progression and prescribed workbooks.

Because the curriculum was designed for hearing learners, it is taken for granted that their Home Language (HL) and First Additional Language (FAL) are clearly defined. Hearing learners arrive at school with an intact HL. Their HL is usually the language of learning and teaching (LOLT). In cases where the HL differs from the FAL, transition is not problematic as these learners still have an intact HL with developed cognitive skills and a vocabulary base. However the same does not apply to Deaf learners. A teacher who attended the workshop gave the following feedback to me during an interview I conducted for my study:

Figure 99. Teachers accessing the Internet in our new computer lab.
When the language dilemma of our learners was mentioned to the facilitators at our training, they were at a loss to help us find a solution. We explained to them that our learners come to school with no home language. They do not know isiZulu, English or Sign Language. Therefore we have difficulty determining what is home language and first additional language. They had no answers for us.

(Class teacher, Rosemary, August 2012)

Another issue of concern that was raised was the time allocation for learning areas. Teachers reported that when they attempted to address the need for a wider time frame in the language learning area due to the language delays experienced by Deaf learners, officials at the training workshop failed to accommodate any form of discussion. Teachers were all instructed to adhere to the specified guidelines as set out in the curriculum.

Promotion progression was yet another issue contested by teachers of the Deaf. It is stipulated in the curriculum that learners could only fail once in the foundation phase (Grade 0–3); however, if they failed more than once, they should be condoned to progress to the next grade. Teachers from Hilltop expressed the view that sometimes it was imperative for learners to develop a proficiency of concepts in order to reconcile the language backlog they experience. Condoning failure of learners could result in compounding the delay experienced by many Deaf learners.

Furthermore, it was evident that in the designing of workbooks for foundation phase learners, no consideration was given to learners with language delays and language impairments. Although the layout of the books was appealing and included exceptional imagery, they did not address systematic language structure development as needed by Deaf learners. Books were designed on the notion that all learners were fully equipped with fundamental phonetics. No concessions were made for learners with no/limited vocabulary skills.

In response to our teachers’ evaluation of the training of the Department of Education on the RNCS, I requested that subject committees be formed at school level to engage in our own analysis of the RNCS and how it could be tailored to meet the needs of our learners yet conform to the national standards and benchmarks.
In the months that ensued, we explored important questions:

- How can we find the appropriate space on the continuum between access to the general National Curriculum and meeting the individual needs of Deaf students who have struggled to progress academically?
- What are the limits and possibilities of our learners accessing the National Curriculum through SASL and a bilingual approach we have adopted at our school?
- How can we make appropriate adaptations to the curriculum, particularly in areas of assessment of learning outcomes?
- How can we make Department of Education curriculum materials intended for the hearing learners relevant to our context? How can we provide alternative or supplementary materials in literacy, for example, to packaged programmes offered by the Department of Education?
- How can we introduce functional academic skills without limiting access to critical academic skills?

Figures 100, 101 and 102 are some examples of adaptations designed in collaboration by teachers of the Foundation phase.
### Kwa-Thintwa School for the Deaf: Lesson Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade: Pre Grade 0</th>
<th>Learning Area: Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme: My Body</td>
<td>Topic: Taking care of myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome and Assessment Standards</td>
<td>Differential Assessment Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skill</td>
<td>Simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT 1: ASQ2 Personal hygiene</td>
<td>Life skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT 2: LG2 Language while doing creative art work</td>
<td>Life skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td>Life skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT: 1 Counting</td>
<td>Life skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIAV</td>
<td>Life skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS1 Concepts and vocabulary relating to identity, size, colour and opposites.</td>
<td>AS2 Expressive and receptive language skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexicon: Body parts and their names</td>
<td>Lexicon: Visual attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand shapes drill</td>
<td>Body song: &quot;This is the way we wash...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Activities:</td>
<td>Learning Activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources / LTSM</td>
<td>LTSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Resources / LTSM</td>
<td>Adopted Resources / LTSM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teaching Approach / Facilitation Methods

- **Emphasis on sensory experiences**
  - Demonstration
  - Creative artwork
  - Role play

- **Assistant Devices**
  - FM system
  - Listener wears dark clothing, no patterns

- **Assessment**
  - Observation: CASS
  - Expressive skills - point/cue/mime
  - Listening skills - concentration
  - Manipulative skills - modelling, cueing following simple instructions

- **Teacher Reflection**
  - Learners over-excited and highly distracted. Second (unnoticed) group for more focused and responsive. The lesson needs to be followed up to consolidate and assess lexicon using expanded opportunities. Loved bubbles! See expanded notes for ROE on following page.

---

*Figure 100. Curriculum for Pre Grade 0 to address the language backlog of preschool learners.*
**Figure 101. An example of a Grade 0 learning programme.**
The learner will be able to communicate confidently and effectively in sign language in a wide range of situations.

**Assessment Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differentiated Assessment Standards: Sign Language</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS 1. Understand family and friends.</td>
<td>AS 1. Signs about family and friends.</td>
<td>AS 2. Expresses own feelings and the feelings of real or imaginary people with signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 2. Signs and sounds simple songs and rhymes.</td>
<td>AS 3. Signs and sounds simple songs and rhymes.</td>
<td>AS 4. Uses language imaginatively for fun and fantasy (e.g., make up rhyming words).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 3. Uses language imaginatively for fun and fantasy (e.g., make up rhyming words).</td>
<td>AS 4. Uses language imaginatively for fun and fantasy (e.g., make up rhyming words).</td>
<td>AS 5. Asks questions when the learner does not understand or needs more information and responds clearly to questions asked by the learner with signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 4. Uses language imaginatively for fun and fantasy (e.g., make up rhyming words).</td>
<td>AS 5. Asks questions when the learner does not understand or needs more information and responds clearly to questions asked by the learner with signs.</td>
<td>AS 6. Biases on non-manual messages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 5. Asks questions when the learner does not understand or needs more information and responds clearly to questions asked by the learner with signs.</td>
<td>AS 6. Biases on non-manual messages.</td>
<td>AS 7. Recognizes own personal experiences using signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Differentiated Assessment Standards: Cued English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS 1. Signs about family and friends.</td>
<td>AS 2. Expresses own feelings and the feelings of real or imaginary people with signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 3. Signs and sounds simple songs and rhymes.</td>
<td>AS 4. Uses language imaginatively for fun and fantasy (e.g., make up rhyming words).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 5. Asks questions when the learner does not understand or needs more information and responds clearly to questions asked by the learner with signs.</td>
<td>AS 6. Biases on non-manual messages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Outcome 1: Listening**

The learner will be able to listen and understand a wide range of situations.

**Assessment Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differentiated Assessment Standards: Sign Language</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS 1. Understands and responds to questions and announcements, and responds appropriately.</td>
<td>AS 1. Understands and responds to questions and announcements, and responds appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 2. Listens to and understands simple songs and rhymes.</td>
<td>AS 2. Listens to and understands simple songs and rhymes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 3. Listens to and understands rhymes and poems.</td>
<td>AS 4. Listens to and understands rhymes and poems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 4. Listens to and understands rhymes and poems.</td>
<td>AS 5. Listens to and understands rhymes and poems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Differentiated Assessment Standards: Cued English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS 1. Understands and responds to questions and announcements, and responds appropriately.</td>
<td>AS 2. Listens to and understands simple songs and rhymes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 3. Listens to and understands rhymes and poems.</td>
<td>AS 4. Listens to and understands rhymes and poems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 5. Listens to and understands rhymes and poems.</td>
<td>AS 6. Listens to and understands rhymes and poems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Outcome 2: Speaking**

The learner will be able to communicate confidently and effectively in sign language in a wide range of situations.

**Assessment Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differentiated Assessment Standards: Sign Language</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS 2. Expresses own feelings and the feelings of real or imaginary people with signs.</td>
<td>AS 2. Expresses own feelings and the feelings of real or imaginary people with signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 4. Uses language imaginatively for fun and fantasy (e.g., make up rhyming words).</td>
<td>AS 4. Use signed language imaginatively for fun and fantasy (e.g., make up rhyming words).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 5. Asks questions when the learner does not understand or needs more information and respondents clearly to questions asked by the learner with signs.</td>
<td>AS 6. Biases on non-manual messages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Differentiated Assessment Standards: Cued English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS 1. Talks about family and friends.</td>
<td>AS 2. Expresses own feelings and the feelings of real or imaginary people with signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 3. Signs and sounds simple songs and rhymes.</td>
<td>AS 4. Uses language imaginatively for fun and fantasy (e.g., make up rhyming words).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 5. Asks questions when the learner does not understand or needs more information and respondents clearly to questions asked by the learner with signs.</td>
<td>AS 6. Biases on non-manual messages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eager to discuss some of the difficulties experienced in the workshops and in designing and adapting the curriculum (within the frameworks of RNCS) I tried to form a supportive network with other schools for the Deaf in our province. I initiated a principal’s forum. Over and above support for each other, my intention was to form a united voice to make representations to the Department of Education on curriculum issues in education for the Deaf that may arise in the future. My attempts unfortunately were unsuccessful. The lesson learned was that schools were open to collaboration in extra and co-curricular activities, for example sport. However, there seemed to be resistance to engaging with issues related to the academic curriculum. I have to admit I could not make sense of the politics of the issue of collaboration. I knew there were underlying power dynamics at play that were very complex to unravel. Personally, at the time I did not have the time or space to pursue this further — and more importantly I was very aware that I ran the risk of suffering unnecessary emotional distress. Hence, my agency was quelled.

5.6.1. Implementation of the Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS)

At Hilltop School, we therefore embarked on our own solitary journey in implementing the RNCS for Grade 0 to Grade 3. Implementation was effected with very limited support from the Department of Education and other schools for the Deaf in the province. I requested for Departmental subject advisors to visit the school in order to monitor and evaluate our programme, as is done in mainstream schools. After numerous requests both in writing and telephonically, a subject advisor did visit our school towards the end of the year. However, it was evident that he had limited knowledge and skills to serve as a resource to us. I realised that all we had were our own capabilities and experience in the field. We had to build and use our own expertise and soldier on in our endeavour. Our key curriculum enactments are highlighted below.

- Developing our own curriculum materials tailored to our learners’ levels of functioning and aligned to the RNCS. The workbooks did not consider the language delays and poor general knowledge of Deaf learners on arrival at school.
- Interrogating the Department of Education standards in respect of the pace required to achieve the desired learning outcomes. We had to take into account the diversity amongst our learners. Many learners, given their schooling histories, needed more time to assimilate and apply new content because of the historical language delays and communication barriers.
• We developed a rich resource of visually based learning materials, much of which was teacher produced in collaborative work.

• We revised our timetable in all grades to enable adequate time for key learning areas such as literacy and numeracy in the early phases.

• We integrated learning areas in creative and innovative ways to facilitate cross-curricular learning and teaching.

An example of an adaptation for the learning outcome reading and viewing in Grade 3 can be seen in Figure 103.

Figure 103. Samples of learners’ work: 25 July 2007 and 3 August 2007.

The learning outcome reading and viewing enhances learners’ ability to recognise and define letters and words in longer texts. To achieve this outcome, the teacher used Cued Speech to make the spoken language visible for learners and to assist them in language acquisition and with pronunciation. The teacher asked learners to draw pictures of what they had read to ensure that
learners could comprehend (see Fig. 103). This formed part of their reading programme. In addition, spelling tests were written fortnightly, with Cued Speech dictation.

As Deaf learners have a limited vocabulary, they were taught a list of twenty words (as seen in Fig. 103), with a specific phonic, i.e. the ‘i’ sound. To help learners consolidate the vocabulary taught, the syntax of sentences and vocabulary was modified daily for them to learn additional meanings of target words. Syntax was taught by practising the sentence and altering only certain vocabulary to help learners internalise the structure of sentences.

The seeds of an inquiry-based, collaborative approach to curriculum and institutional development at Hilltop School were sown in those years. We continue to work and develop as partners in the inquiry with every Department of Education innovation. At present the National Curriculum in South Africa is being amended so that the curriculum becomes more accessible to teachers. A single comprehensive Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) is being developed so that every subject in each grade will have a single comprehensive and concise CAPS. It is envisaged that details on the curriculum content and assessment for each grade and subject will facilitate easier implementation of the curriculum.

We are confident in managing and implementing this curriculum amendment since we have a history of successful curriculum transformation to meet learner needs initiated by our engagement with the RNCS and NCS.

I engage now in an analysis of our enactments at the time — a process that continues to this day. I see myself as the driver and catalyst in this process.

I conceptualise our professional development at Hilltop School as a collaborative inquiry. Furthermore, without a doubt I see it as situated, contextually responsive and a co-construction. We are truly a community of inquiry — a community of learners and thinkers. We nurtured and continue to nurture our own professional development, and our enactments are without doubt action-oriented inquiry cycles based on occurrences, events and influences in context. Lave and Wenger (1991) contend that learning takes place through the experience of social participation, and further conceptualise the idea of communities of practice as theory of situated experience. Successful models of teacher professional development have highlighted the contextual nature of teacher actions and reflections, and the potential inherent in iterative cycles of inquiry, and position teachers as (co-)inquirers into their practice, and thus (co-)constructors of situated innovations (Fullan & Ballew, 2001; Pennington, 2007; Timperley & Alton-Lee, 2008; Cochran-
Further dimensions of our professional development were shared values and a deep sense of accountability.

5.6.2. My ultimate goal: Learners accessing the National Senior Certificate

Ever since I took on the leadership of Hilltop School, I dreamed that my learners would one day sit for the National Senior Certificate Examination — that is, graduate from high school. As discussed earlier in this chapter, research in South Africa has revealed that in many schools for the Deaf, the highest grade offered was Grade 7; however, schools offering higher grades focused primarily on skills and vocational training (Peel, 2005; Storbeck, 2003, DeafSA, 2003). The UNESCO report (1999) also confirms the low academic achievements of learners internationally, by claiming that there are a limited number of Deaf matriculants and an even more minuscule number of Deaf graduates worldwide. I found that the same situation prevailed at Hilltop School. A ‘watered down’ curriculum up to Grade 9 was offered. Thereafter, learners pursued a skills programme that emphasised vocational training, irrespective of the learners’ academic potential or achievements. As a result of this, learners were unable to write the National Senior Certificate examinations. This compromised their access to further training with opportunities for professional qualifications.

The extension of the National Curriculum by the Department of Education for Grade 10–12 in 2007 created an opportunity for me to realise my dream of the National Senior Certificate for learners at Hilltop School. This dream was strengthened by the encouraging academic performance of the hard-of-hearing learners in the pilot class. I started to believe and felt confident that these learners had the potential and motivation to graduate from high school.

Another factor that influenced me to act on this dream was that these learners (who were being taught the National Curriculum for mainstream schools through English —spoken and written — and Sign Language, as discussed in Chapter 4), had completed Grade 9 successfully, fulfilling all required assessment criteria. In addition, there was now pressure placed on the school from parents that their children be given the opportunity to complete secondary education at Hilltop School. Thus, with the introduction of the NCS extending to Grade 12, we faced the question of extending our academic programme to include Grade 12.
Despite insufficient funding, lack of hostel space and inadequately trained teaching personnel for the senior phase (Grades 10–12), the management and staff unanimously supported the proposal that the senior phase be introduced at the school at the beginning of 2007. It was decided that the class of hard-of-hearing learners be piloted as the first class to attempt the Grade 12 examinations by virtue of the fact that they were the only class that had completed all assessment requirements for the senior phase. This decision was sanctioned at an SGB meeting and a meeting of the parent community held in September 2006.

I was encouraged by this but I have to add that there were certain misgivings from teachers voiced at formal and informal discussions. To enter our students for the National Senior Certificate Examination was seen as enormous risk-taking. One of the daunting issues was that for the first time learner performance at Hilltop School would be revealed to the wider public through the media. The prospective teachers of the senior-phase classes feared that the school’s name would be tarnished if our learners did not perform well in the National Senior Certificate.

On a personal level, I once again found myself apprehensive and anxious about embarking on unknown territory yet again. I immediately began to familiarise myself with the new curriculum and assessment requirements for Grades 10–12. I found myself more and more immersed in teaching and learning components of my leadership over and above my managerial tasks.

My first task was to appoint a senior management member as caretaker of the project. I approached Mrs Dlamini (pseudonym). I knew that she was an excellent teacher and was committed to a quality education for our learners. At first she indicated that this was a huge responsibility and she found it extremely daunting. I assured her that we would work as a team in supporting this new phase of the curriculum. I immediately set up a steering committee made up of subject teachers. This committee was formed to steer and support the project. My vision was that we would work as a community of inquirers — thinkers and learners. Looking back, my view is that the enthusiasm and excitement displayed by the parent and school community persuaded and inspired management and teachers to take the leap forward.

A critical issue we faced at the outset and continue to encounter to this day relates to the language curriculum for the Deaf in the context of the National Curriculum. A requirement for obtaining the National Senior Certificate, as stipulated in the NCS, is that learners must enrol for two official languages in the senior phase (Grade 10–12): a home language and a first additional language. Sign Language is the home language of the Deaf. However, it is not recognised and listed by the Department of Education as an examinable subject. As a result, the first group of
Grade 12 learners had to enrol for six instead of seven subjects (with English as a first additional language). This six-subject curriculum would entitle them to an endorsed National Senior Certificate, which does not meet the criteria for university entrance in South Africa. This raises the question of equity in educational access for the Deaf.

Despite this obstacle, we persevered and registered for the following subjects: English (first additional language), Mathematics Literacy, Consumer Studies, Dramatic Arts, Life Orientation and Computer Applied Technology. Since the teachers had minimum qualifications in these subjects, they had to engage in extensive reading and enlisted the help of teachers from colleagues at mainstream schools. A positive aspect was that all the teachers were proficient in SASL. I assured teachers that various sources of support would be accessed to enhance the teaching and learning. Early on, teachers did have difficulties explaining abstract concepts. We employed the support of Sign Language interpreters and Deaf teacher aides. Additional teacher resources were purchased. I initiated a school twinning programme, which involved the school twinning with other mainstream schools in our community. We worked during weekends and school holidays to ensure that learners had a quality education. Sadly, support from the Department of Education was very limited. What we found most disheartening and discouraging was that although we were registered on the National Certificate database, we were often not notified of curriculum meetings in our own district.

The results of the first Grade 12 examinations in 2009 are a clear indication of the commitment and dedication of all staff and learners. Ten learners in the class for the hard of hearing wrote the examination. Seven out of the 10 learners passed the examination and obtained the National Senior Certificate with endorsement. It was endorsed because they were unable to fulfil the requirement of two languages, as Sign Language is not recognised as a language of teaching and learning by the Department of Education in South Africa.

I regarded the 70% pass rate as a phenomenal achievement, as many had not envisaged such a success. My belief in impossible things was strengthened! The reactions of all key role players, inter alia, the SGB, the parents, the Church (our sponsor), the Deaf community and the Department of Education were positive and they intensified their support for the school, prompting us to register for our second Grade 12 classes in 2011.

My next goal was that the learners register for the National Senior Certificate without endorsement. After extensive discussion and requests to the Department of Education, I was granted permission to replace the home language (Sign Language) with an additional subject.
Subsequently learners could write seven subjects (with only one language included) and obtain university entrance (Fig. 104).

Figure 104. Department of Education circular making concessions for Deaf learners.
A diagnostic analysis of our 2009 Grade 12 results indicated that all our learners had not performed well in Computer Application Technology (CAT). I was given to understand that learners experienced difficulty accessing the content of this learning area. The teacher expressed concern that learners showed very little interest in this subject and were not motivated to achieve. After discussions with staff and consultation with learners and parents, we made the decision to replace CAT with Visual Arts. The primary reasons for the choice of this subject were that learners showed a keen interest in the subject, and discussions with other schools for the Deaf indicated that Deaf learners performed well in this subject. We also had a qualified Visual Arts teacher at Hilltop School. Tourism was offered as a seventh subject. These curriculum changes were made in Grade 11 (2010) with the consent and approval of the parents and the Department of Education. Since teachers of these subjects had limited teaching experience at senior level, they depended on support from other schools that were offering the same subjects, and teachers engaged in self-learning while teaching the subject for the first time. Completing Grade 10 and 11 content in one year became a formidable challenge for these subject teachers.

In order to meet the needs of the curriculum, a rigorous and sustained system of support for the learners and teachers was undertaken. Extra lessons were given to learners during afternoons, weekends and holidays. Sign Language assistants and interpreters were provided for teachers who needed assistance with content and pedagogy. Additional learning and support material was sourced through booksellers and the Internet. Through high expectations, commitment, dedication and hard work from all staff and learners, the school attained a 100% pass rate for Grade 12 at the end of 2011. Ten learners registered for Grade 12 in the subsequent year (2012) and the school once again achieved a 100% pass rate. The quality of results had increased phenomenally, with learners achieving distinctions in certain subjects. An analysis of the 2011, 2012 and 2013 National Senior Certificate results are shown in Tables 2, 3 and 4 below:
Table 2. Grade 12 Hard of Hearing: 2009 National Senior Certificate Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Wrote</th>
<th>Passed</th>
<th>Pass %</th>
<th>0–29%</th>
<th>30–39%</th>
<th>40–49%</th>
<th>50–59%</th>
<th>60–69%</th>
<th>70–79%</th>
<th>80–100%</th>
<th>No. Failed</th>
<th>% Failed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maths Literacy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English [FAL]</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Orientation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic Arts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Studies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Application Technology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Grade 12 Profoundly Deaf – Sign Language medium of instruction: 2011 National Senior Certificate results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Wrote</th>
<th>Passed</th>
<th>Pass %</th>
<th>0–29%</th>
<th>30–39%</th>
<th>40–49%</th>
<th>50–59%</th>
<th>60–69%</th>
<th>70–79%</th>
<th>80–100%</th>
<th>No. Failed</th>
<th>% Failed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maths Literacy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English [FAL]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Orientation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic Arts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Grade 12 Profoundly Deaf – Sign Language medium of instruction: 2012 National Senior Certificate results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Wrote</th>
<th>Passed</th>
<th>Pass %</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>No. Failed</th>
<th>% Failed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maths Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English [FAL]</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All learners who completed Grade 12 from 2009 onwards are either enrolled at tertiary institutions or are employed. Table 5 shows a summary of the placement of learners post Grade 12.

Table 5. Summary of learner placements post Grade 12: 2009–2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of learners</th>
<th>Placements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3 learners enrolled for hospitality studies at the National Institute for the Deaf (NID). 2 of these learners are presently working in the hospitality industry and 1 is now a facilitator at the institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 learners are still enrolled at a University of Technology for a computer course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 learners are currently enrolled in an aluminium learnership course at a place of industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4 learners are enrolled at NID (beauty, computer course, hospitality).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 are studying at a University of Technology doing an Information Technology diploma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 are studying at a Creative Arts College majoring in graphic design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 is employed at a retail store as a cashier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 learners are enrolled at NID (jewellery making and hospitality diploma).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 are enrolled at a University of Technology for Information Technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 are in learnership programmes in industry (WISPECO aluminium).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 is at a Creative Arts College, studying design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the writing of this autoethnography I interviewed parents and ascertained their views on the education of their children at our school. Three parents, one of whom is Deaf, commented:
It is very good because there is a lot of improvement since my daughter started at this school, she can now read and write. And she is so happy. The work she does looks same as the work in the schools for hearing children.

(Parent TM)

Oh when I was in school it was very very bad. We could not read and write and we did baby work all the time. The children in the hearing schools did so much work but we did nothing most of the time. Me and all the other students could not read when we left school and we also was not so good in Sign Language. I think deaf education was very bad. Everyone thought we were stupid because we were deaf. But now when I see my son’s work and what he is doing, the education is better. When I talk to the teachers and check his school work its okay. The education is very good, unlike before when I was still a learner. Things are not the same as to what they were before. The education has improved. Even they write the matric exam in this school. Some of the other schools are still bad and they only do needlework and woodwork. My son can read and write better than me. Nothing much to change, the school that he is always in the newspapers and the matric results are outstanding.

(Deaf Parent TP)

I think it’s the best because she learnt English, to read and write and she is the only one in the family that finished matric. She has made the whole family proud and she helps to write letters for her siblings. Although the other children can hear, she did better at school.

(Parent M)

These results are indicative of the fact that we had grown in our competence in ensuring that we have a responsive curriculum for our learners, underpinned by our belief that our learners have the potential to learn. We had engaged in an extremely successful school-based professional development programme.

Our professional development occurred through a very strong community of inquiry. Our professional development can be described as a contextual, situated, responsive co-construction of practice and learning. Furthermore, teacher knowledge was derived from practice — a deep engagement with and interrogation of teaching and learning outcomes. There have been many scholars who have researched how teacher knowing and learning are derived through practice (for example, Clandinin & Connelly, 2004; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). Teaching practice is filled with spaces of complexity: “uncertainty, instability, uniqueness, and value conflict” (Schon, 1983, p. 49). Teachers navigate such spaces and make decisions based on a number of influences that impact learning, many of which are unpredictable. An important point is that teachers
should be seen as makers who have the potential to shape their practice using knowledge from the situated context of teaching and learning.

5.7. Further education and training at Hilltop School: A satellite campus

An exceedingly important facet of the curriculum at Hilltop School is the skills development programme. This programme is offered to learners who have completed Grade 9 but do not wish to pursue an academic career. The aim of the programme is provide learners with further education and training and a pathway to work placement that provides productive independent citizenship for our learners.

Over the years I had developed strong links with the National Institute for the Deaf (NID), which is based in Worcester in the Western Cape. This institution is a private college and it is also the only FET College for the Deaf in South Africa. They provide accredited qualifications for Deaf learners in the areas of beauty and cosmetology, construction, upholstery, jewellery manufacturing and hospitality studies. The institution’s programmes operate within the National Qualification Framework (NQF) of South Africa.

I was invited to be an advisor to the college over a number of years. I was impressed with the success rate of Deaf learners in acquiring the various qualifications offered. This motivated me to propose a satellite campus at Hilltop School (Fig. 105). I soon discovered that this venture would be a complex undertaking as I had not envisaged the financial implications of such a project. Firstly, teachers had to undergo extensive training as facilitators at NID in the Western Cape. Secondly, teachers had to register as accredited assessors with the college so that they were able to administer assessment within the specific guideline requirements of the NQF. Thirdly, a management member had to train as a project manager of the satellite campus. Furthermore, learning materials essential for the course were expensive. Finally, this increased my workload as I had to attend regular meetings at the college and my management and administrative duties increased tremendously. In addition, I was once again tasked to secure funds for all travelling, operational and tuition costs for both staff and learners in terms of implementation.
Despite these factors, 12 learners were registered for hospitality studies at NID in 2009. Hospitality studies is a two-year programme that encompasses three basic disciplines: training to become kitchen assistants, cook-convenience assistants and assistant chefs. Our programme started with the kitchen assistant occupational course. This programme comprised of four fundamental learning areas: Life Skills, Numeracy, Communications and Hospitality: Food Preparation and Cooking. The first three learning areas were allocated limited time, while Hospitality took precedence both in time and focus. The Kitchen Assistants programme is an accredited course that comprises of 18 credits at NQF Level 1. A detailed programme framework includes assessment criteria, moderation criteria, unit standards and experiential in-house training in the workplace.

Two trained facilitators were responsible for delivery of the theoretical and practical curriculum for the first six months of the year. Practical training was conducted at our school restaurant, which hosted many functions for the public (Figs 106 and 107). This served as rich learning experiences for our learners.
Figure 106. Our learners engaged in intensive training at Hilltop School's satellite NID campus.

Figure 107. Practical training in preparation for a public dinner.
Figure 108. Newspaper article reporting on the involvement of learners with a fundraising dinner at a prestigious restaurant.

During the second six months, learners were placed in local restaurants and hotels for practical training and experience (Figs 108–112). On-the-job training and monitoring was done on a daily basis by staff from our satellite campus. Regular moderation from NID staff was conducted to ensure adherence to the prescribed standards of work as set out in the curriculum.
The learners will be issued with a timesheet. It is their responsibility to keep it up to date. This will serve as part of evidence for their portfolio at the end of the training session.

They will also receive two evaluation forms. One on their attitude and the other one on their work. It will be of great help if you can complete it and send it to our postal address or given to learners at the end of the training.

If you experience any problems whatsoever, I will appreciate it if you contact me as soon as possible. Please indicate to us if you are willing for us to have a meeting with your staff members to make them aware of the Deaf Culture of our students and give some hints on communication with Deaf students.

I am looking forward to this partnership and am sure together we can make a change in someone's life.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

Mrs P.O.Xula
Project Manager
0842098505
kwathiintwasa@school@yahoo.com

[Signature]

Ms L.Naidoo
Principal
083503454
kwathiintwasa@school@yahoo.com

Figure 109. Letter pertaining to job placements for learners.
21 August 2009

To whom it may concern,

This letter serves as reference that Nosiphiwe Mkhize worked at Chantecler Estate, as part of her practical work experience during her Kitchen Assistant Course from August to December.

I have found Nosiphiwe to be very competent, helpful, efficient, tidy and time conscious. The kitchen department has really enjoyed having all of the students here for their practical work experience, and they have all been very friendly with a positive attitude.

The students were also competent and willing to help with banqueting, setting up for functions and assisting in Housekeeping, Food & Beverage. The attention to detail is very impressive and commendable.

Regards

Lisa Mash
Kitchen Manager
At the end of the 2010, all 12 learners successfully completed the two-year hospitality course, specialising in becoming kitchen assistants. They obtained 35 NQF credits in total (see Appendix 5 for the credit outlines of the programme). Four of the 12 learners gained employment as kitchen assistants in local restaurants and the other eight learners were accepted at NID in the Western Cape to register for the assistant chef programme, which is a 51 NQF credit programme. Our hospitality programme continues at our satellite campus at Hilltop School. To date a total of 56 learners have successfully been enrolled in the hospitality programme, which has been extended to include the assistant chef programme.

Figure 111. The opening of the school restaurant.
Our school provides an excellent opportunity for Deaf learners to engage in accredited skills training at a school level. This satellite campus is not a Department of Education initiative; hence, the school is responsible for the financial management of the satellite. This is sponsored through the funds raised by the Roman Catholic Church and other sponsors. Learners who complete the hospitality courses through the satellite campus gain entrance to the NID, even if they do not complete Grade 12 with a National Senior Certificate. Two of our learners who completed their studies at the NID are now employed as facilitators of hospitality studies at the college. Another student is employed as a chef in the Western Cape.

As I write this thesis I am presently negotiating with the NID to extend our programme to include Beauty and Cosmetology (NQF level 1) and Upholstery (NQF level 1).

5.8 Critical reflections on curriculum enactments during my leadership

As I reflect on my pursuit of academic excellence I analyse my leadership in the area of curriculum development at Hilltop School during this time. How did my impossible dream of achieving equitable achievement outcomes for Deaf learners become possible? What leadership behaviours enabled or hindered this success? Could I have done things differently?
My gaze into the looking glass reflects a strong belief in impossible things. This influenced my belief in the achievement of Deaf learners, amidst the controversies and tensions prevalent in Deaf education. I believed that the majority of Deaf learners are as academically capable as their hearing peers, but Deaf learners need additional strategies and support in order to access the curriculum. It was this firm belief that challenged the notion of low expectations of Deaf learners. Subsequently, I became goal-focused in trying to ensure that the Deaf learners at Hilltop School were given every opportunity to reach their full academic potential. I argue that it was this belief that became a catalyst for my leadership behaviours and interventions in curriculum matters.

Figure 113. Recognition received for excellence in inclusive teaching.
"We turn disability into opportunity," says Naidoo. It rings true in the excellent results the School for the Deaf in Inchanga produces and the way it markets itself. From the moment this management team walks into the room, you know you are dealing with a force to be reckoned with. "We offer the best education for the deaf in KwaZulu-Natal, if not the whole of South Africa," they say. The late Archbishop Denis Hurley founded the school in 1981 after meeting a severely underprivileged deaf child in Richmond. In 2009, the school entered its Grade 12 class into standard final exams for the first time. It achieved an overall pass rate of 70% and a 100% pass rate in English and drama. The school follows the National Curriculum Statement, which is designed for the hearing child. Sound is taught through vision, sign language and cued speech. It is a case of using the child's first language to teach them their natural language. Through its early childhood development programme, the school admits children as young as three. It has 317 children enrolled and a staff of 93. The school has its own organic garden, which it uses to feed the boarders and surrounding community. In 2009, it started its own restaurant called the Laughing Pot, run almost entirely by learners. The school's drama students have won numerous competitions and their winnings have financed three computer laboratories.

Figure 114. Newspaper article reporting on management winning a provincial award for excellence in inclusive education.
A member of the management staff who co-ordinated the academic programme at the school constructed me as having a goal-focused leadership style. She reflects:

At first I was really sceptical about the changes that the principal was making with the curriculum. Those of us who were working in the classrooms and had experience teaching Deaf learners knew that it is not easy for the Deaf to learn. It is really difficult to teach the Deaf because of the language problem. I could see that she was determined to change and improve the academic programme at the school. Looking at what she did when she first came to the school I knew that once she has a goal she will make sure it will be achieved.

Some teachers were really unhappy because they felt pressured and knew that the Deaf learners would not manage with the mainstream syllabus. I was really worried because I was not convinced whether the teachers and learners would manage with the mainstream curriculum, but I decided to support her because I knew that once she set a goal, you will make sure you get it. I also felt that we had nothing to lose by trying to follow the mainstream curriculum. I knew that the learners would benefit and I also wanted them to succeed so I supported the principal. I also realised that we were changing years of how things were done. I think that the principal was very brave to attempt such a huge task. Now I don’t regret when I look at how well the learners are doing and the good quality passes we are getting.

(I am able to see that irrespective of the feelings of members of staff I remained focused on my goal of academic achievement for our learners. I knew there were teachers who feared risk-taking. While engaging with the new curriculum myself in considerable depth, I could ascertain what training and resources they required. I monitored teaching and learning closely in a sustained manner, and teachers knew that I was there for them.

As I gaze into the looking glass, I realise that I took many risks. I registered learners for a national Grade 12 examination, and knew that the results would be available for public scrutiny. Was I placing the school at risk when I changed the curriculum, set standards, and created high expectations for teachers, parents, and learners? Was I setting the staff and learners up for failure because of my belief in impossible things? Was I equipped to deal with the consequences of failure and did I have the capacity to protect my teachers and learners if the academic outcomes were poor? What assurance did I have that the new curriculum would be the answer to equitable academic outcomes? Was the school ready for the challenge of academic achievement given the history of Deaf education as discussed earlier in this chapter? These are some of the questions I now ask and as I attempt to answer them I am convinced that my leadership was a risky one.)
Risk taking is about undertaking an initiative involving a challenge for achievement or a desirable goal in which there is a lack of certainty or a fear of failure. I know many staff members feared failure. I was reminded of the words of Robert Kennedy who said: “Only those who dare to fail greatly can achieve greatly.”

Why was I so amenable to taking risks? I did have uncertainties and fears – but I set them aside. I was very driven to initiate change. Why was I able to see opportunities and not risks?

Now reflecting on these issues, I see the Hilltop School as a complex socio-cultural context that portrayed underlying tensions in terms of competing ideological orientations and beliefs about teaching and learning for the Deaf. In this environment of struggles, tensions and unpredictability, the context determined our enactments. However, despite this, we pioneered programmes of academic excellence for the Deaf (Figs 113 and 114).

A class teacher remarked:

I was really concerned when the principal said that we must prepare our learners to write the Grade 12 National Senior Certificate. I wondered how that was going to be possible since there were so many issues in our school about teaching the Deaf. Some of us knew SASL and some did not. Some of us believed that our learners could not do difficult work and some believed they could. Our environment with hearing and Deaf teachers was so complex and the principal was adding to these issues. Other schools for the Deaf were not following the mainstream syllabus, so why were we expected to do such a difficult thing.

(Class teacher, February 2013)

I often recalled questioning my intentions and wondering whether I was making the right choices for the Deaf learners. Was I being competitive — trying to prove my worth as a leader? It was an emotional time for me. However, based on what experiences I had at Hilltop School, I sincerely believe that the school as an institution is an adaptive system. The willingness to take risks and seeing risks as opportunities are critically important. I believe that I expected that there could be setbacks to face; however, I did not construct them as failures but as opportunities for further learning. As evident in my narrative, I was able to engage with the setbacks and chart a way forward. I wondered whether I was more resilient than most people, and whether this could be linked to significant events experienced during childhood. I was a child of a single parent who grew up in a lower socio-economic home. Yet I was driven to achieve academically in my schooling years and in tertiary education.
As I reflect on my curriculum enactments I am able to recognise that a part of my intense pursuit for quality education for the learners at Hilltop School was a moral stand that was guided by issues of human and social justice. I believe that my leadership behaviour was one of moral obligation. I felt that it was my moral obligation to ensure that Deaf learners are taught in a language of their choice and given every opportunity to achieve academically, thus becoming productive members of society. I was convinced that it is a human right to be able to access equitable educational outcomes. I question whether my leadership behaviours were displaying ‘moral courage’. Ladd (2005) advocates that moral courage is the cornerstone of ethical leadership and that moral obligations of leadership are related to justice, competence and the greatest good. Ladd (2005) defines moral courage as having an intersection of three concentric circles: applying values, recognising risks and enduring hardships. In this regard I believe that I displayed moral courage. My belief and high expectations of the Deaf learners, my commitment to academic outcomes, my risk-taking in implementing the new curriculum, and the resilience I displayed when faced with adversity from colleagues and organisations for the Deaf showed a strong moral stance and ethical leadership. The outstanding results in the NSC examinations can be considered a moral victory for Deaf education. The letters of congratulations in Figure 115 encapsulate my own leadership reflections.
To: School for the Deaf

The Principal

SMT

SGB

Staff

Sir/Madam,

Excelent Performace With National Senior Certificate 2011 Grade 12

On behalf of the Pinetown District Directorate, I, the Director, take this opportunity to firstly congratulate your school for the excellent performance in the NSC Examination 2011. We as the education community of KwaZulu-Natal are very proud of your achievement. Your success is even more impressive when one considers that yours is a rural school that serves learners from rural communities.

Your achievement proves that all students have the potential to succeed if they have access quality education in a "learning enriched school" which I believe is the most appropriate description of your school. The key is effective leadership, committed teachers who believe in their students – and most of all a school that has a shared commitment to high expectations for its learners.

May I also wish you all the best in your operations during the 2012 academic year.

E M Kupela
District Manager

Catholic Schools Office

Archdiocese of Durban; Dioceses of Mariannhill, Kokstad and Umzimkulu

Telephone: (031) 700 - 8000
Fax: (031) 700 - 8091
e-mail: ciedurban@mail4africa.co.za

P.O. Box 11103
Mariannhill
3601

12 January 2012

Mrs Mavis Naidoo
Principal:

School for the Deaf

Dear Mavis

Congratulations on your Matric Results. What an achievement!

"The future of humanity lies in the hands of those who are strong enough to provide coming generations with reasons for living and hoping" (From the document of the Second Vatican Council)

You are truly an incredible witness to authentic leadership and what can be achieved for the sake of our children.

"May the beauty of the Lord be upon you" (Psalm 90:17)

Please convey my best wishes to your staff.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Lionel Samuel

Director

Figure 115. Letter of congratulations for matric exams.
My impossible dream for academic excellence and equitable learning outcomes for the Deaf became a reality. For me this success was evidence that the belief in impossible things leads to impossible achievements.

In my next chapter I analyse the narratives recounted in Chapters 3, 4 and 5, and discuss the themes and critical issues that emerged in my leadership enactments.
CHAPTER 6

EMERGING FROM THE LOOKING GLASS — WHAT DO I SEE?

How it happened, Alice never knew, but exactly as she came to the last peg she was gone. Whether she vanished into the air or whether she ran quickly into the wood … there was no way of guessing … but she was gone.

(Lewis Carroll, *Through the Looking Glass*)

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I have returned to my starting point; I have come through the looking glass. I stand before the looking glass, almost touching its surface as Alice did. As I emerge from my autoethnographic study, I am a changed person in many ways, more importantly in respect of my understandings of my leadership, the notion of leadership and what enacting leadership means. Through the autoethnography I was forced to hold every aspect of myself before a mirror. I emerge into a world that is both familiar, yet changed, and aspects are permanently altered by own reflections and reflexive engagements. I have learned to question and interrogate every interpretation I make and meaning I create, and every facet and dimension of the person in the principal’s office and the principalship in context. I have realised that my journey is not over, and it has not ended. It is ongoing, constantly open to critical dialogue, new ideas and perspectives, and new learnings and change.

In the previous three chapters, I have provided a glimpse of my enactments and growth over the years as the person in the principal’s office. I highlighted evolving facets of my educational leadership and the various stages in my journey. My personal narratives included the first steps in my leadership journey as deputy principal of Hilltop School; my engagement with instructional leadership in all its complexity; and my quest for quality achievement outcomes for my students. In this chapter, as I shift my gaze across the narratives, I am able to identify a number of key themes that marked and were at the forefront of my journey. In the process of retelling and re-living my stories, I found myself engaging in a reflexive analysis of who I was through the journey, and what shaped my identity as the person in the principal’s office.

In this chapter, I engage in some depth with the key themes that unfolded during this journey, and the implications for the professional development of school leaders. I hope that other
scholars, educationists and researchers engaging with my personal narratives will be able to make sense of them and find meanings that are relevant to their own and other contexts.

6.2 My evolving identity as a leader

Through this narrative inquiry process, and particularly in response to questions from two of my critical friends, I have come to see my development as an educational leader to the present time in four layers:

- Building an organisational ethos of accountability through a collaborative, reflexive process.
- Meeting the commitment to equity and quality education for my learners.
- Creating intellectual and social capital within the school as an institution through effective instructional leadership.
- Generating a professional learning environment and a commitment to promoting inquiry amongst members of the school as an institution, including the person in the principal’s office.

As evident in Chapters 3, 4 and 5, in all the above four layers of enactment I tried to develop a strategic and problem-centred orientation in staff members, including myself, based on values and a vision around student learning and achievement. I continue to instil in staff a strong sense of accountability for student achievement and wellbeing. As an instructional leader I aim to create a synergy between a focus on improving teaching and learning on the one hand, and capacity building of my staff on the other.

Furthermore, I have come to realise that to be an effective leader, I myself have to be open to learning continuously in order to respond effectively to the needs of the context. On reflection, much of what I did at the school was building a learning community or a learning organisation. At Hilltop School we continuously sought to transform ourselves and our organisation. Senge (1990) explains that a learning organisation is one that aims to create its own future, believes that learning is a continuous and creative process for its members, develops, adapts and transforms itself in response to the needs and goals of the context, and enables members at all levels to continually improve their capacity to produce outcomes they value. Senge’s (1990) key focus is on what he refers to as “higher human essences”, and he argues that learning leads to the heart of what it means to be human (p. 13). In all humility, this is what I have attempted to promote at
Hilltop School as the person in the principal’s office. My focus has been on thinking, communicating and collaborating, which Senge foregrounds in his research (Senge, 1990). I am sharply aware that own learning journey and my identity as a school leader is never complete, but is ongoing. According to Hall (2003), identity is in perpetual, constant motion and thus representations of identity are always incomplete. There is “unfinishedness” as articulated by Goodreau (2011). I will continue to evolve as I develop new insights and uncover new understandings through my interactions with my context, my present and past experiences, and the members of my organisation, including my learners.

My identity as the person in the principal’s office is brought under scrutiny in my study. My narratives show how I mediated my leadership practices, drawing on different positionings, experiences and resources to enact my leadership in particular ways. As I reflect on my story, I tend to agree with McNay (1999) that “identity is contingent upon a particular set of social relations; it is not fixed” (p. 323). My autoethnography provided a lens into my subjectivities and the multiple and often contradictory subject positions I took up in my professional life as a school leader. The study made explicit the workings of power in my leadership, particularly related to dominant norms, values and ideologies in Deaf education and Deaf culture, and the spaces I created for resistance as explicated by Weedon (1987). My narratives reveal that it is not possible to completely resist and overturn power. However, I believe that engaging with power and its dynamics produces a kind of reflexivity that enables a leader to better monitor, scrutinise and manage relations of power and their pervasive influences.

Lather (1991) and Weedon (1987) argue that the self needs to be understood as a site of contradiction and conflict, as is evident in my narratives in the three preceding chapters. The self is complex, as it is shaped and formed by multiple discourses of power and knowledge. As the school principal I constantly negotiated my multiple identities and my subject positions through dialogue with my staff and key stakeholders, and through examining our practices at the school, for example the complexities of transforming the language curriculum.

A key issue in my leadership enactments is that of agency. My critical friends and I engaged in many debates and discussions interrogating the nature of my agency, and how it played out within the socio-cultural context of the school. From these debates, I have come to recognise that I cannot separate agency and social context (structure) or the complexities of the social institution within which I have live and acted. “Structure” refers to the recurrent patterned social arrangements that shape or limit the choices and opportunities that individuals have within their realm of being. Structures underlie all the things that humans do, think, perceive, believe and
feel. However, my narratives show that I am able to challenge the constraints of structure despite the emotionality this generated — in particular dominant ideological constraints embedded in the Deaf culture, and historically entrenched assumptions, beliefs and practices at the school. For example, I questioned the discourse of low academic expectations for our learners that circulated within the school in insidious ways.

My study questions the polarised debates on structure versus agency, and shows that the agent or social actor is both subjective and objective. In all my endeavours as a leader I have come to know that human social life is steered and guided in and through patterns of collaborative interaction. My study has foregrounded not only the subjectivity of the individuals but in the ways in which intersubjectivity is achieved and maintained through the social. Social relationships are intertwined with reason, emotion, commitments, beliefs, and attitudes — the aspects of consciousness that make up agency and action. I am a subject, in the sense that as an agent I have thoughts, beliefs, emotions, desires, values, commitments and so on, which in turn contribute to the actions and the professional life I live. But an agent is also objective, in the sense that, in my case, I am embedded and developed within a concrete set of social relationships and institutional arrangements (structures) — Hilltop School, a unique socio-cultural context in which complex ideologies play out. According to Sewell, structures are “sets of mutually sustaining schemas and resources that empower and constrain social action and that tend to be reproduced by that social action. But their reproduction is never automatic. Structures are at risk…in all of the social encounters they shape” (Sewell, 2005).

My study foregrounds the person in the principal’s office as a socially situated and socially constituted individual, located within a particular set of social relations. So we cannot separate agency and social location (structure). The fundamental unit of social activity involves both facets. My interpretation of my agency resonates with the sociologist, Anthony King who contends that

> human agency is a collective product, germinated with others and dependent upon the social networks in which we all exist. Human agency is better understood as the collective product of social relations ... than as an autonomous individual power (King, 2006, p. 475).

A further dimension of agency that I believe emerges in my study is that agency is not merely an act of individual will but lies in the spaces of possibility that generate new and creative thought. Agency lies in the capacity to step back from thought, to be open to and to visualise what else is
possible and what it might accomplish, and to envision how it might be different. This perspective is particularly evident in my enactments of instructional leadership at Hilltop School.

6.3 My leadership: a complex interactive dynamic

In my reflexive analysis of my narratives, I realised that my leadership enactments were open, non-linear, often messy, and constantly changing. In trying to understand my leadership, one of my critical friends directed me to literature on complexity theory and complexity leadership, which offers a new perspective for leadership research, and for understanding of how leadership is enacted and received in complex institutional contexts. Complexity leadership was introduced by Marion and Uhl-Bien (2001). Since then various scholars across the globe have collaborated in elucidating the theory within the social sciences, for example, Brown, 2011; Lichtenstein & Plowman, 2009; Lichtenstein, Uhl-Bien, Marion, Seers, Orton & Schreiber; 2006; Osborn Hunt & Jauch, 2002).

Complexity theory presents an alternative paradigm for leadership — one that conceptualises leadership as a complex interactive dynamic from which adaptive outcomes emerge, for example new learnings; innovative approaches and strategies; and different patterns of behaviour (Hazy, 2006; Osborn Hunt & Jauch, 2002). Complexity leadership theory recognises that social processes are too complex to be ascribed to a single individual (the leader) or to a predetermined set of events (Brown, 2012; Osborn Hunt & Jauch, 2002). The theory examines leadership in the context of processes within institutions through which the collective and interdependent actions of many members come together to achieve particular adaptive outcomes. Lichtenstein et al (2006) and Brown (2012) explain that leadership outcomes are the result of complex interactions rather than independent variables that can be easily isolated.

I concede that my leadership emerges through dynamic interactions within the socio-cultural context in which I work. In my reflections, I can see that I created an enabling environment for change and innovation. I also believe that there were key agents within my socio-cultural context who interacted with me in dynamic ways to make my leadership an emergent process. Complexity theorist M. Mitchell Waldrop explains that a dynamic generative space of possibilities unfolds in an “endless dance of co-emergence” (Waldrop, 1992, p. 12). Waldrop refers to this generative space as the “edge of chaos” — a space where “components of a system
never quite lock into place, and yet never quite dissolve into turbulence, either…the one place where a complex system can be spontaneous, adaptive, and alive” (Waldrop, 1992, p. 12).

Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) critique traditional leadership theories that focus on achieving order and stability, and understanding cause and effect relations. The thinking that leaders control outcomes and that goals are rationally conceived are questioned. Marion and Uhl-Bien (2001) point out that in traditional theories the analysis is on how leaders influence others to achieve goals. Traditional leadership is associated with alignment and control; change efforts are bureaucratic, driven from the top down and are reliant on leadership vision and its implementation. Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) explain that traditional organisations are deterministic, and are exemplified by simplicity, stability, control, boundaries and rules.

From an alternative standpoint, Osborn and Hunt (2007) argue that particular leaders do not produce change and transformation directly. Instead they set in place conducive conditions to enable the emergent process. I believe this was and is the nature of my leadership at Hilltop School. I began by troubling historically embedded, existing practices, and the majority of my staff came to engage with me in this endeavour. We then began to search for alternative paradigms, ideologies and practices. I was nervous of the risks we took as I realised that as a leader I could not control outcomes, since social reality is complex and predictability is difficult. Taking a more reflexive stance now, I agree with Lichtenstein and Plowman (2009) that leadership is embedded in a complex interplay of numerous interacting forces and not merely the powerful act of an individual or individuals. The key concepts in complexity leadership are adaptability, emergence, interaction, unpredictability, and risk (Brown, 2011; 2012).

Under my leadership, as evident in my narratives, Hilltop School can be seen to be a complex institution because its ethos and culture are dynamic, emerging, transformative and changing. Marion (2008) describes the notion of emergence as “a sudden, unpredictable change event produced by the actions of mechanisms” (p. 9). The argument made is that when complex systems are dynamically interacting, they often generate emergent changes. These changes are not linear, step-by-step paths to predictable outcomes. Emergence arises through interaction and the energy of agents and not through the actions of any single individual (Hazy & Silberstang, 2009). This process is clearly evident in the enactments of curriculum change at Hilltop narrated through my autoethnography. As a team, we took risks and ventured into relatively unknown terrain in the history of the school, despite the politics of Deaf education that lurked at the edges of our work. In our change initiatives, the socio-cultural setting of Hilltop School can aptly be described as a complex adaptive system. Various heterogeneous agents interacted with and
influenced each other, and in the process generated novel behaviours and innovations for the setting.

In reflecting on my narratives, I would describe myself as an enabling leader — a notion developed by Uhl-Bien, Marion and McKelvey (2007). Without doubt, I strove to create spaces to enable creativity, interdependence and the adaptive capacity of Hilltop School as an institution. Through my leadership, support and joint actions, my staff and I engaged in disrupting current practices, setting goals for change, building a vision, assessing strategic needs, building networks and network resources; planning, accessing resources to achieve goals, and managing the tensions and dilemmas that emerged. As I have explained, we ventured into the unknown in many of our enactments. I believe that we collectively created institutional conditions, that is, enabling conditions, for innovation and creativity to flourish.

As an enabling leader, without a doubt, I had to find ways to engage with crises that threatened our goals and adaptive practices. My study shows that change is never predictable, and its emergent activities can evolve in directions that are unexpected that may limit our goals. I worked hard to protect our creative processes, innovations and change initiatives from crises and threats such as personal conflicts, departmental bureaucracy, influences of other organisations and conflicts with non-governmental structures for the Deaf.

6.4 Leadership and spaces of emotionality

A growing body of research on teacher emotions and how emotions shape and influence teaching has emerged internationally in the last two decades or so (for example, Boler, 1997; Hargreaves, 2001a; 2001b; Zembylas, 2003a; Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). There has also been a shift from examining emotions from the domain of psychology to seeing the notion of teacher emotions as social and cultural (Hargreaves, 2005b; Zembylas, 2003b, 2005; Kelchtermans, 2005).

According to Zembylas (2003b), there are three levels at which emotions operate. The individual or *intrapersonal* level relates to how ‘teachers experience and express emotions’; the social or *interpersonal* level refers to how teachers engage with their emotions in their social interaction with others; and the socio-political or *intergroup* level focuses on the relation between teachers’ emotions and social and cultural dynamics within the “classroom or school setting” (p. 84). Zembylas (2002, p. 83) contends that
genealogies of teachers’ emotions describe events, objects, and persons and the relationships among them ... and the ways in which these emotions are experienced in relation to the teacher-self (individual reality), the others (social interactions) and the school culture in general (socio-political context).

Throughout my narratives, it becomes evident that emotions are a key dimension and integral to my subjectivity and the subject positions I took. Further, my emotionality operated at those three levels proposed by Zembylas (2003b). Zembylas (2003b) contends that emotions play a critical role in subject formations since emotions connect individual’s thoughts, judgements, beliefs and give meaning to experiences. Emotions are socially constructed within a context that is shaped by the tensions of power relations. Furthermore, in my case I created spaces for risk taking that generated complex and shifting emotions in me and my staff. Hargreaves (2000; 2001a) presented the notion of “emotional geographies” which he explains is “the closeness and/or distance in human interactions and relationships that help to create, configure, and colour the feelings and emotions we experience about ourselves, our world and each other” (p. 1061).

In my study of international research I find that there is a dearth of studies on the emotions of school leaders. Scholars have highlighted the need for a focus on the affective dimension of leadership (Beatty, 2000; Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee, 2002; O'Connor, 2006). Furthermore, there has been new thinking on how emotions should be understood. The shift is from conceptions of emotions as individual, autonomous and private psychological states to understanding emotions as collaboratively and interactively formed and a public phenomenon (Zorn & Boler, 2007; Fortier, 2005; Harding & Pribram, 2002). In addition, emotion and reason are not seen in dualistic terms and as concepts that can be separated from each other. Zorn and Boler (2007) stress that dualistic conceptions of emotion tends to universalise, essentialise and individualise emotion.

Through my stories, I have shared how emotion and my emotionality are inextricably linked to my life as a leader within a complex socio-cultural context of Hilltop School. Drawing on his research, Hargreaves (2000) asserts that “organizations and workplaces are prime sites in which adults experience and learn to express their emotions in particular ways” (p. 815). Nias (1996) argued that teachers invest their selves in their work and thus their personal, emotional and professional identity often merge.

My study illuminates this new space for debates on emotions — the interactive, collaborative, open and exposed ways in which my emotionality was experienced by me as the person in the
principal’s office emerges. To me my emotions had an institutional, cultural dimension. In other words, my study highlights the organisational and personal influences on my experience of emotionality. The feelings of vulnerability and exclusion I felt that emanated from school leaders at other schools for the Deaf were not privately formed but collaboratively and publicly formed. My emotions were the basis of collective and individual social resistances to injustices in my school setting; for example, the history of poor achievement outcomes not addressed. Furthermore, my emotions that were shaped by my socio-cultural context were not separate from reason. My emotionality spurred me on to interrogate, question and act to address injustices and to seek our innovations in collaboration with my staff and other key stakeholders.

In my engagements with the competing ideologies in Deaf education and with teacher unions, my emotions can be described as a site for political resistance. Zembylas (2005) argues that power relations and their dynamics are key to the construction of emotions. Dominant and resistant discourses generated particular emotions in me and my staff. However, I view emotions and emotionality in a positive frame. Zembylas (2003b) in his work with teachers argues that emotions are “sites of resistance and self-transformation” (p. 213).

6.5 Doing instructional leadership

My autoethnographic narratives in Chapters 4 and 5 provide an account of how I evolved as an instructional leader at Hilltop School. In essence, I grew into a curriculum leader. When I took up my leadership positions at the school, I held the firm belief that the purpose of a school as an institution was to achieve quality learning outcomes for its learners, and that one of my key roles would be to nurture the learning and teaching environment. Hoy and Hoy (2002) articulated it in this manner: “The centrality of student learning in the school is irrefutable” (p. 1). Zepeda (2007) contends that “effective principals engage in work that supports teachers in improving their instructional practice. Effective principals are instructional leaders” (Zepeda, 2007, p. 11).

In the initial period of my leadership, I came to realise that the school as an institution was not achieving its primary goal — quality academic achievement outcomes. This troubled me from the outset. To me student learning was the key criterion against which to measure an effective school. I also believed that the school leader has to be held accountable for poor learning outcomes. I knew that I had to be the catalyst for change. In the section below, I examine my role as instructional leader and the processes that enabled collective initiatives to effect
curriculum change at the school. I focus on my reflexive analysis of what emerged. I believe my analysis may be useful for leadership in curriculum change initiatives in other contexts.

I have to emphasise that much of what occurred related to curriculum change was not pre-planned, in a step-by-step linear manner. The whole process of instructional leadership was clearly emergent — shaped by contextual events and our critical observations and analyses of various aspects of the school curriculum. To us, the notion of curriculum encompasses various facets including our philosophy, values and beliefs; teaching methodologies; the goals of the curriculum; curriculum content; teaching methodologies and assessment approaches and strategies.

I explicate my understanding of how I navigated, in collaboration with my team of management staff, teachers and therapists, the curriculum change processes at the school in my role as instructional leader.

- An inquiry-based approach was central to our work. This involved building a reflexive culture that involved self-questioning, professional dialogue between principal and staff, and collaborative interrogation of teaching and learning. Blase and Blase (1999) argued that effective instructional leaders “integrate reflection and growth to build a school culture of individual and shared critical examination for improvement” (p. 370).

- I was visible in all curriculum initiatives at Hilltop School. I constantly interacted with my staff on curriculum goals and strategies and learner performance. I made myself accessible to staff for discussions on instructional matters. I supported my staff in their endeavours to try new instructional methodologies and made them feel safe to take risks. I tried to create a climate at the school in which teachers critically discussed instructional issues.

- A key facet of my instructional leadership was building a professional culture of openness and trust where staff felt safe and confident to engage in innovation and become learners.

- I facilitated opportunities for staff to set measureable goals, work in teams, focus resources effectively on curriculum development and implementation, and establish accountability for learning outcomes.

- I created spaces for capacity building of staff, professional learning, and extending staff competences, and researching best practices internationally and locally. This process also
involved growing leaders within the school in relation to different aspects of the curriculum, for example Cued Speech.

6.6 Concluding reflections — turning to possibilities for leadership development

I have learned from my study that to achieve perfection in leadership is almost impossible. Leadership is a site for continuous, ongoing processes of learning and change. Cammack and Phillips (2002) suggest that leaders need to be able to develop an ethos and culture in a school that celebrates the dilemmas, tensions and contradictions that emerge. My autoethnography has made me understand that leadership is a generative emergent, contextual process of recognition of gaps for further development, achieving new insights, and creative social action. Leadership development programmes should engage leaders in exploring generative spaces of performance and new possibilities (Uhl-Bien, Marion & McKelvey, 2007).

In addition, my reflexive analysis of my own leadership enactments suggests that leadership development programmes should enable leaders to understand that their actions and practices are socially and culturally situated. In this process, the key is examining questions such as: How do the discourses that circulate within the socio-cultural context of a school shape leadership practices? How can leaders trouble, interrogate and resist dominant discourses that shape particular identities? Discourses are evident in the ideas, talk, silences and patterns of behaviours and actions within a social setting (Johannesson, 1998). They are the normalised beliefs, ideas and practices, what is articulated and not articulated, that constitute our current knowing of the socio-cultural context.

Leaders are social actors, and they need to be able to examine critically their own subjectivities and subject positions and the discourses that shape their actions. My autoethnographic study has enabled me to engage in this process and emerge as a person with new insights about who I am and the socio-cultural context in which I work. Subjectivity can be understood as the patterns by which our experiences, emotions, thoughts, beliefs, feelings, images and memories are arranged to form a person’s sense of self, who we are and the cultural positions we hold (Cammack & Phillips, 2002). I have come to understand that subjectivity is seen as an active agent that shapes and is shaped by and within social, cultural and political spaces. Engaging in the deconstruction of the notion of subjectivities can enable leaders to examine the multiple and often contradictory
subject positions leaders take up in their personal and professional lives. Weedon (1987) has argued that the self is complex and multifaceted — a site that is shaped by multiple discourses of power/knowledge. Through my autoethnography, I have come to understand the multiple, competing discourses that resided at the site of my own subjectivities, for example cultural discourses, religious discourses, discourses of Deaf culture, social-rights discourses, and the discourse of quality education.

Although my study involved the dynamics in a special school context, it has illuminated issues of relevance to any educational institution, for example, that leadership is embedded in context and “socially constructed in and from a context”, as also explained by Osborn et al. (2002, p. 798).

Finally, it is my view that organisations have the potential to be dynamic, interactive adaptive systems. Linked to this contention, I believe that a key to sound institutional development is the notion of the “enabling leader” (Uhl-Bien, Marion & McKelvev, 2007).
CHAPTER 7

MY CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

‘Of course I’ll wait,’ said Alice, ‘and thank you very much for coming so far … and for the song … I liked it very much’.

‘I hope so,’ the knight said doubtfully, ‘but you didn’t cry as much as I thought you would.’

(Lewis Carroll, *Through the Looking Glass*)

7.1 Introduction

In this chapter I begin by presenting a synthesis of the study, drawing together the various threads: theoretical, conceptual, methodological and empirical. I reflect on the research method and process, and finally, illuminate the key findings to offer implications for future research and for the professional development of school leaders.

In Chapter 1 I stated that the aim and purpose of my study was to open myself up as a living textbook, by recollecting, sharing and theorising my life experiences as a school leader. More importantly, my purpose was to make meanings from my past experiences as a leader and reach a deep understanding of myself as a social actor within the complex socio-cultural context of a school for the Deaf. My critical research questions were:

What are my leadership practices, and how are they enacted and experienced within the dynamic socio-cultural context in which I work and live? Why are they experienced in particular ways?

How can an autoethnographic exploration enable a deep understanding of self and my principalship within the dynamic socio-cultural context in which I work and live?

In the extract above from *Through the Looking Glass*, Alice is about to proceed to the last square where she will be crowned queen. This step is meant to symbolise her coming of age, which is captured in the melancholic song of the knight. She is oblivious to the meaning of this final step and the meaning of the knight’s song. She is not aware of the fact that she is growing up. She
lives in the moment and will only realise once it has already happened that she is an adult and no longer a child.

As I reflect on my autoethnographic journey in this last chapter, I feel that the extract holds meaning for me, the person in the principal’s office. This chapter in many ways symbolises my ‘coming of age’ in terms of the new understandings and new meanings that have emerged in me related to my leadership enactments. However, unlike Alice, whose maturation happens in a rather unmindful manner, my transformation was visible and emergent at all stages of my autoethnography through the processes of self-awareness, self-reflection and self-analysis. Thus autoethnography became a tool for a deep exploration of myself, my leadership enactments, and my resultant ‘coming of age’. My journey backwards into the looking glass enabled a deep interrogation of the person in the principal’s office.

7.2 Synthesis of my study

In this study I examined and interrogated my reflexive practice of leadership within a unique socio-cultural context using autoethnography as a tool of enquiry. In other words, I used autoethnography to investigate and relate my personal encounter of leadership occurring within a particular educational and social context. The notion of impossible things and the metaphor of a ‘looking glass’ drawn from the book Through the Looking Glass by Lewis Carroll guided my reflexive analysis in the study. In other words, the use of the metaphor as a reflexive mechanism enabled me to gain deep insight into significant experiences and the inner realities and personal meanings that shaped my leadership identities and subject positions. Shaw, Barry and Mahlios (2008) explain that metaphors “serve as a cognitive device as a means for framing and defining experience in order to achieve meaning about one’s life” (p. 35).

At the beginning of my study, in order to gain insight into current scholarship, I launched into a deep critique of studies emanating from Africa that focused on the principal as a leader. This literature review located my study within current research debates, thereby providing a further justification for its focus.

The study utilised autoethnography as research method. I argue in Chapter 2 that it is a qualitative research method that seeks to connect self with others, self with the social, and self with the context (Wolcott, 2004). In my study I explored how the context in which the self is located shapes the self, and how the self, in turn, responds, counters, disrupts or resists the
influences that circulate within context. In Chapter 2 I present how the study involved a complex blending of various voices accessed through a range of data-generation techniques.

Identity theory from a post-structuralist paradigm provided the lens for the analysis of my leadership enactments. This theoretical lens enabled a deep interrogation of the identity formation and the subject positions I took to elucidate my multiple selves, and the inherent paradoxes, contradictions and ambiguities. My study foregrounds how my identities and leadership practices are negotiated, and how my identity as a leader is situated and produced simultaneously in many different contexts, events, and by different agents for diverse purposes (Meynert, 2007). Further, I am an agentic being — my agency is always impregnated by and through the socio-cultural context in which I operate. I have come to believe that there is no autonomous agency detached from context. Further, as I reflect on myself as a social actor, I am aware that much of my agency emerged through and from acts of resistance and troubling dominant discourses and discursive practices.

In Chapters 3, 4 and 5 I narrate my leadership journey as the leader of Hilltop School for the Deaf. In these chapters I use the looking glass as a tool to reflexively go back to my leadership during the past ten years, examining, re-examining, interpreting and reinterpreting my leadership behaviours and my identity. In Chapter 3 I track my appointment from teacher to deputy principal to principal within a two-year period and examine the barriers I experienced and the complexities of change initiatives I manoeuvred and negotiated.

In Chapters 4 and 5 I share my journey as I traversed the intricate and often tortuous terrain of instructional leadership. I zone in on two facets of instructional leadership: the language curriculum and the academic achievement outcomes of my learners. A crucial issue that emerges in my narratives is the inextricable link between the personal and the socio-cultural context in which I work.

Chapter 6 is the integrating chapter in which I theorise my leadership enactments within the socio-cultural context in which I work, as evident in my narratives, using the lens of complexity leadership theory.
7.3 Methodological reflections on the study

In this sub-section I reflect on my use of autoethnography as a method of inquiry. My fundamental reason for embarking on such a study was to understand myself deeply as a leader and social actor in a particular schooling context. Ellis (2002b) argues that those who seek out autoethnography are those who want to understand themselves better. My study also enabled me to draw on my own experiences as a leader in a particular socio-cultural context to reflexively examine self–other interactions.

Autoethnography is characterised by writing, telling, retelling and self-analysing one’s own story, and this proved to be the perfect methodology to fulfil this aim for me. Clandinin and Connelly (1994) argue that the study of personal experiences is simultaneously focused in four directions: inward, outward, backward and forward. In my reflections I have searched backward and inward in a personal and scholarly pursuit to gain a deeper understanding of myself. Because autoethnography illuminated the shifting aspects of my ‘self’, it enabled me to write about my experiences within a broader socio-social context. For me, it was an empowering methodology as it resulted in new learnings, new ways of thinking and sense making, and it raised new questions about the school leader as a social actor. In many ways, it has inculcated in me a new world view about school leadership as I have highlighted in Chapter 6.

The metaphor of the looking glass that permeates my narratives was forceful, as it raised new and multiple levels of consciousness about my identity and my lived experiences as a school leader. Through my writing I have been able to question, reconsider and reinvent the various facets of my storied professional life. Wall (2006) explains that autoethnography is a balancing act between the research and the writing. He further contends that it enables the researcher to trouble, unsettle and contest current constructions of social reality.

However, my experience of writing this dissertation has been that autoethnography was in some ways a very difficult journey for me, the researcher. I had to deal with many anxiety-generating questions and issues relating to the issue of subjectivity versus objectivity, validity, ethics, credibility, reliability and legitimation, as highlighted by researchers such as Holt (2003), Muncey (2008), Sparkes (2000) and Wall (2008). In addition, the highly personalised style of autoethnography challenged me, as I had not written in this way in my previous academic work. I found it very complex that I was at the centre of the research as a ‘subject’ undertaking the study, and also as an ‘object’ in the sense that I was the participant being investigated.
In spite of the fact that autoethnography is characterised by the story of a person, I struggled with how to position myself in my own story. In discussions, interviews and in my writings I was always aware of my position of both researcher and the person in the principal’s office. I often questioned whether I was using my position and power as principal to tell a biased story, or whether I, the participant, was being self-indulgent and opportunistic?

In the initial stages of my study, my narratives were criticised heavily by my PhD cohort group and my supervisor (who became my critical friends). They perceived my narratives to be a heroic glorified portrayal of myself, constructed by me as a highly successful leader who should be revered. I was hurt and distressed by this critique. The emotional experience propelled me to immerse myself in literature on self-study and autoethnography in order to gain a sound understanding of this genre of writing that was completely new to me. I used my supervisor as a critical friend who constantly challenged my ways of thinking and shifted my understandings away from traditional notions of what is research. On reflection, my supervisor as my critical friend encouraged me to question, and seek out divergent views and alternative lenses. Her aim was to help validate the quality and legitimacy of my understandings and interpretations.

I came to realise that a key facet of autoethnography is its self-reflexive mode, and this understanding made a huge difference to the narratives I began writing from this point on. This intensely reflexive nature of the method led me to constantly interrogate and question my assumptions, thinking, actions and my sense-making of events and actions. Bochner and Ellis (2006) argue that reflexive thinking is the hallmark of autoethnography and that experience is best understood in retrospect and in complex reflection.

I found myself constantly working through anxiety, tensions and fears. I was mindful of the suggestions and ideas of my critical friends, and as I wrote I tried to balance my desire to present my story as I had experienced it, and to ensure that my stories were authentic. I was mindful that the credibility of narratives is established through the ‘ringing true’ of the story revealed (Dyson, 2007). The narratives of my staff are embedded in my narratives. It also became clear to me that I would have to interlace my personal narratives with relevant theory so that my work would have legitimate value. Therefore, I tried to ensure that my narratives showed evidence of scholarly analysis and interpretation.

By the time the final draft of my thesis was written, I stopped seeing myself as a glorified hero. Analysis of my story, input from my critical friends and intensive interrogation of literature and theory revealed to me that there were multiple ways to make sense of my leadership enactments.
I began to confront my flawed self and my shortcomings as a leader, and often reflected that in many situations I could have done things differently.

The key challenges I experienced in my study related to issues of self-disclosure/exposure and holding my ‘self’ up to scrutiny. I came to realise that opening up one’s life comes with self-awareness that can generate pain. I experienced intense vulnerability and self-consciousness, especially when reading and listening to the critiques of my critical friends. I was always apprehensive when I sent my chapters to my supervisor. I felt that in many ways I was laying myself bare. These spaces without doubt were anxiety provoking. I knew that both as a social actor, a researcher and a leader I was about to be critiqued, interrogated and deconstructed. The words of Ellis and Bochner (2000) that autoethnography is an unruly, dangerous, vulnerable, rebellious and creative mode of inquiry began to ring true to me.

My critical friends constantly drew my attention to the silences in my narratives, largely around issues of self-critique and emotionality. My reflections on my initial years of leadership made me grapple with my emotions. Anxiety, apprehension, vulnerability and fear underlined my leadership experience during those initial years. The writing of this thesis was in a sense therapeutic for me. It created an opportunity for me to unearth and expose difficult emotions that I had silenced and to make meanings of them. Ellis (2000) contends that in autoethnography, the writer tells a story that includes emotions and intimate details and examines the meanings of human experience. For me, writing my autoethnography was both an intellectual and emotional experience of writing.

Contrary to the above issues I raise, what I found particularly valuable about autoethnography as a methodology was that it is researcher-friendly. Autoethnography is self-focused, since the researcher is the centre of the investigation; thus, as the researcher I had easy access to the primary data source, which was me. Although the blurring of the researcher-participant relationship has become a source of criticism for the methodology, access to sensitive issues and innermost thoughts makes this research method a powerful and unique tool for understanding the ‘self’ (Chang, Hernandez & Ngunjiri, 2010). Wall (2006) argues that an individual is better suited to describe his or her experience more accurately than anyone else. Data is familiar when one researches oneself; thus, data collection and in-depth data analysis become more accessible. As I progressed on my research journey, I realised that autoethnography as method created the space for me to adopt a more personal and engaging writing style, since my goal was to give a personalised account of my leadership experiences. I also came to realise that this form of personal writing appeals to the reader, thereby making my study more accessible to others.
Chang (2008) emphasises that “the voice of the autoethnographer is a voice to which readers respond” (p. 52). This was clearly evident in the engagements of my critical friends with my writing.

As stated above, writing my own autoethnography evoked self-reflection, self-examination, self-analysis and reflexivity. It allowed me to find out about myself and the culture within which I enacted my leadership. Through these processes I came to understand myself better and also those around me. My focus became my own leadership enactments, others in relation to me and them, and the controversies in Deaf education. Understanding myself enabled me to confront my preconceptions and assumptions about others and determine whether they are “others of similarities”, “others of difference” or “others of opposition” (Beatty 2000).

In terms of the distinct cultural element of autoethnography, I was able to experience at first hand the connection of the personal with the cultural, and witness the illumination of culture in relation to my personal story (Ellis, 2002b; Reed-Danahay, 1997). I believe that through this method, I was able to “use myself to get to culture” (Pelias, 2002). The controversies in Deaf education, African culture and the Christian culture, which are the competing cultures at Hilltop School, helped me in particular, to look at what shaped me and my leadership practices as well as what informed my sense of self. This self-transformative potential of autoethnography was beneficial for me, particularly because I work with people from diverse cultural backgrounds. Through this increased awareness of self and others in relation to culture, I continue to question my assumptions, understandings and constructions of the diverse cultures in which I am a social actor.

In addition, by telling, retelling, and analysing my story, it brought to the fore not only my leadership strengths and limitations, but more importantly it highlighted the notion that leadership is not only the act of an individual but is rather embedded in a complex, unpredictable and non-linear interplay of various interacting influences. I was able to identify this dynamic interplay through the use of autoethnography.

In my interrogation of my leadership practices as a school principal, I frequently felt compelled to question the scholarly value of my study. There were moments when I not only struggled to find my voice but felt overwhelmed and experienced a degree of vulnerability when exposed to a research method that generates questions, provokes thought, troubles understandings and raises issues of trustworthiness (Chang, 2008). I often questioned whether my work was worthy
scholarly, worthy of research and whether I would be able to theorise my life successfully, as I had envisaged.

After extensive immersion in autoethnography literature over the past three years, I am convinced that autoethnography was certainly the most suitable qualitative research method that I could have used to achieve the purpose of my study. Looking back I am intrigued by the method, in particular the fact that it advances a way of giving voice to personal experience and extending sociological understanding. I used autoethnography as a means to tell my story and to share its personal connectedness, to explore issues of personal significance to me as a social actor, within a particular educational and social context, and make sense of my actions, drawing on literature in the field of education and leadership. I engaged in constructing and re-constructing my social reality and in many ways reinventing my reality through the narrative text.

7.4 My autoethnography: What is its original contribution?

My study context was a school for the Deaf. However, I believe that the sociological understandings that have emerged from my study have implications for schools as institutions in general, where inevitably competing and often conflicting discourses play out to shape leadership actions and practices. My study points to the potential of complexity theory to enhance the study of institutional/organisational behaviour and the practice of leadership. The study reveals the complexity of an educational institution — it is complex because of the sense of deep interconnectedness and the dynamic interactions that play out within its borders and boundaries (Brown, 2011).

My study further shows that the school is dynamic and adaptive, and involves diverse interacting entities and networks. Furthermore, emergent events arise from these interactions and networks — as in the case of Hilltop School, these included new learnings, innovation, creativity, change and adaptability (Marion, 2008; Brown, 2010). For me as a leader, the study of complexity leadership theory and practice has offered me a powerful lens to make sense of the notion of educational leadership and my own practices. I have come to view an institution such as a school as a complex and adaptive system rather than a controllable, predictable reality. My leadership practices were emergent and I was able to create enabling conditions in which the new institutional behaviors and directions emerged through dynamic interactions. Rather than trying to control or direct in a linear way what happens within the organisation, I have learned that a
good leader influences institutional behavior through providing an enabling ethos and culture for the creation of networks and dynamic interactions.

As a leader I was able to “drop seeds of emergence” (Brown, 2011, p. 12). Brown explains that effective leaders drop seeds of emergence by identifying, cultivating, nurturing, empowering and fostering connections between knowledge resources within and outside an institution. In addition, Brown speaks of creating a “space of organized disorder” (p. 13) that germinates and breeds dynamic activity, emergent behavior, and creative outcomes at multiple places throughout the system. In collaboration with my staff, we were able to attempt new approaches, build our social capital, pilot novel ideas and programmes, interrogate and evaluate them and effect changes, where necessary. Complexity theorists would argue that since a school is an adaptive system, it is a fertile space for innovation and creativity.

The stories I have told reflect multiple, complex emotionalities embedded in my leadership enactments — my vulnerabilities, my precarious spaces and positions, my self-doubts, confusions, uncertainties, moments of trepidation and distress, my anxieties, delights and fateful moments. Through my autoethnography, and drawing from Hargreaves and Fullan (1998), I have come to understand my leadership as not merely a cognitive practice but an emotional practice. In my narratives, complex emotions were expressed in the collaborative pursuit of accountability and social justice by me and my staff. Leadership contexts can trigger intense emotions that in my case were generated in micro-political actions of resistance or enactments of change and innovation. Zembylas (2003b, p. 108) contends that the continual shift, realignment and amendments of borders around the self is loaded with emotions as well as ‘new ideas.’ The above analysis indicates that my study has generated knowledge that could inform the professional development of school leaders. Leaders need to understand that emotions are integral to leadership enactments, that emotions are collaboratively and socially constructed and often public in nature rather than private and individual, as also stressed by Zorn and Boler (2007).

I believe that my research has made a contribution to studies in research methodology through the use of autoethnography as a form of inquiry. In addition, my interrogation of my reflexive practice of leadership within a socio-cultural context has contributed to the existing knowledge in the discipline of leadership and management studies. The study has foregrounded leadership as dynamic, interactive, emergent and contextual, and as a messy, unpredictable yet generative space (which is often neglected in leadership studies). The study points to the need to interrogate
and research spaces of discomfort, vulnerability, resistance, excitement and euphoria in the context of acknowledging the professional development and growth of the school leader as he or she unfolds on the “edge of chaos” (Waldrop, 1992, p. 12). In other words, my study points to a model of leadership grounded in complexity rather than a controlled, predictable bureaucracy. Hence, my research raises new questions for researchers and scholars in the field, and for the professional development of school leaders.

Through the exploration of the complexities of educational leadership in a school for the Deaf, this study has contributed to the field of disability studies. My enactments of instructional leadership at Hilltop School for the Deaf, in particular our curriculum journey and how learning co-evolves through collaborative support, critical engagement, risk-taking and nurturing, points to a generative framework of possibility for the transformation of Deaf education. My study also highlights that it is though limitations and inadequacies that learning happens, and through reflexively engaging with tensions and contradictions that new beginnings and new possibilities emerge. My study clearly shows that instructional leadership is also an emergent event located in an interactive dynamic of embedded interactions amongst diverse network agents. My previous studies on educational leadership have suggested that traditional thinking views leadership as the powerful act of an individual or individuals. My study without doubt shows that leadership is embedded in the complex interplay of numerous interacting agents and forces.

My study suggests that research on the sociology of emotions and the emotional resilience of school leaders is an important, under-researched issue, and has the potential to deepen our understanding of the complexities of leadership in schooling contexts. My study illuminates how the subject positions I took and the subject positions of others with whom I interacted, and my experience of change and the inherent contradictions, ambiguities and vulnerabilities, generated a range of competing emotions. Researchers need to explore emotions as situated in social and institutions processes, dimensions and social interactions. More recently, Zorn and Boler (2007) assert that “power and cultural dynamics within institutions can be placed more centrally in the foreground of research into the area of emotions and educational leadership to resist the tendency to individualise and essentialise analyses of emotionality”(p. 145). These scholars argue that the political and socio-cultural facets of emotional geographies must be the unit of analysis (Zorn & Boler, 2007). Furthermore, drawing on my autoethnography I believe that emotions need to be researched not as located within the individual but in a “mediating space” (Boler, 2004) where divergent views are navigated, contested, negotiated and shaped. Zorn and Boler
(2007) suggest that research needs to focus on examining the situated dynamics of emotion in their entire social and political contexts.

7.5 Conclusion

My intention throughout this study was to take the reader into the intimacies of my world of leadership. I had hoped to do this in such a way that “you are stimulated to reflect upon your own life in relation to mine” (Sparkes, 2000, p 467). It is through this autoethnographic study that I have evolved intellectually and emotionally in transforming my consciousness about what shapes the person in the principal’s office. Through the use of autoethnography as a method, I believe that I have come to learn to use “the self as an instrument of understanding and have arrived at passionate knowing” (Belenky et al., 1986, p. 86).
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Abstract

The paper provides a review and critique of 22 empirical investigations conducted in the African context on the leadership of the school principal. Two questions guided the review: How can current research on the principalship in the African context be characterized? What are areas for future research on the issue? Applying an inductive analysis of the 22 studies, this review suggests that the studies reviewed focussed on issues that can be categorized into five themes: professional development; shared leadership; gender and leadership; critical competences and practices of the principal; and identities and subjectivities of the school principal. The majority of studies employed a qualitative case study approach. This analysis builds on educational leadership research by identifying contributions and limitations of this body of research, and providing recommendations for future research.

Introduction

Over the last two decades, the field of education globally has been characterised by a surge in reform policies and intensive change. Cheng (2011) examines these changes at the macro-, meso- and micro-levels of the education system. Amongst others, the focus of educational transformation has been on issues such as access to education including curriculum access, education outcomes, teacher professional development, decentralisation of governance, education quality and accountability, equity in education, school improvement and the development of effective schools, and education financing (Cheng, 2011; Latham, Ndaruhutse & Smith, 2003; Weber, 2008; World Bank, 2007). However, debates over the
most suitable leadership of educational institutions have dominated these reforms (Bottery, 2005; Christie, 2010; Herriot, Crossley, Juma, Waudo, Mwirotsi & Kamau, 2002).

The pivotal role of the school principal has been highlighted more than ever in research globally (Barbour, Clifford, Corrigan-Halpern, Garcia, Maday-Karageorge, Meyer, Townsend & Stewart, 2010; Harmony, 2006; Rice, 2010; Toreman, 2008). Harmony (2006) points out that the principal is the most important contributor to the effectiveness of a school, and that in the school management team it is the school principal who is core. Rice (2010) contends that in an era of school accountability, reform and shared decision making and management in schools, leadership is crucial. In recent debates, transformational and distributed leadership styles are being hailed as the new forms of leadership that are needed for educational transformation (Pennings, 2005; Grant, 2008; Townley, 2010).

Internationally, effective schools research has shown that good principals influence a variety of school outcomes such as student achievement, motivation of quality teachers, well-articulated school vision and goals, effective allocation of resources, the development of organizational structures to support instruction and learning as well as emotional well-being of staff (Daries, Hammond, LaPointe & Meyerson, 2005; Branch, 2009; Rice, 2010). Hence there has been a refocus on the role of the school principal in recent years. Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe & Meyerson (2005:6) indicate that the role of principal has grown to be complex as “principals are expected to be educational visionaries, instructional and curriculum leaders, assessment experts, disciplinarians, community builders, public relations/communications experts, budget analysts, facilities managers, special programs administrators, as well as guardians of various legal, contractual and policy mandates and initiatives. The link between school leadership and improved student achievement has been the focus of much empirical research (for example, Day, C., Sammons, Hopkins, Harris, Leithwood Gu & Kington, 2009; Louis, Dretzke & Wahlstrom, 2010). Although studies have found that the relationship is largely indirect, these debates have placed importance on the role of the principal as an instructional leader who is responsible for controlling factors that impact teaching and learning including attracting, selecting and retaining teachers, creating a culture of high expectations, teacher professional development, promoting an instructional vision. Further, trends in effective school leadership are characterised by the devolution of decision making powers from central to school level, leading to a major shift towards greater self-governance, institutional autonomy and school based management,
placing greater responsibility on the principalship (Raihani, 2008; Tyala & Van der Mescht, 2008; Schaffer, 2007; Grant, 2008; Strain, 2009).

However, major debates internationally have been influenced largely by perspectives from countries of the North. It has been often assumed that the western model and practices of leadership are universal (Martin, 2007). Leithwood, Harris & Hopkins (2008) have argued that a one size approach to leadership will not work. Instead, it is suggested that in each context leadership models and practices must be based on economic, political and geographic needs. Oplatka (2004) states categorically that the structures of educational systems throughout the world differ and in view of the extensive cultural diversity in relation to education and schooling, there is a need to study principalship in different national contexts. She emphasises:

‘a review of principalship in developing countries is warranted, mainly because educational reforms and policies draw almost exclusively on perspectives of educational leadership taken from western literature and practice, thereby giving an impression that western models of principalship are universal’ (p. 428).

Against the above background, the need for greater insight into research on the principalship in the African context became evident. The aim of this paper is to provide a systematic review of research on the principalship in the African context, drawing on English language literature. In addition to synthesising the available knowledge base, the review examines empirical studies in terms of their aims and foci, and their research methodologies and designs. Areas for further research are also identified. The following research questions were explored: How can current research on the principalship in the African context be characterized? What are areas for future research on the issue?

**Search strategy**

This review draws on all published peer-reviewed empirical studies in the last 10 years (2002-2012). Both quantitative and qualitative studies were included. The search was confined to English language literature emanating from the African context. Grey literature was not included due to resource constraints.
Studies were largely identified using keyword searches of electronic databases. Databases sourced were Advanced Google Scholar, Academic Search Premier (EBSCOHost), Educational Resources Information Centre (ERIC) and Wilson Web. South African ePublications was accessed specifically to source publications in South African journals. The keywords used in the search initially were ‘school principal’, ‘head teacher’ and ‘school head’ and the ‘school leader’. During the search process, it was soon evident that these key words produced a limited number of articles. The search strategy was then extended to include the key words ‘educational leadership’ and ‘educational management’. Reference lists of all articles were checked to identify further relevant studies. All identified abstracts were checked against the inclusion and exclusion criteria set. The literature search strategy yielded a total of 22 peer reviewed journal articles met the criteria for inclusion, and formed the basis of the critical review.

Results

The results of the literature review are outlined in the following sections. Firstly, an analysis of the research methodologies and designs of the studies will be presented. Secondly, the major findings will be discussed.

Table 1 provides an overview of the studies. Of the twenty three (22), 17 were published in the last 6 years (2007-2012). The country contexts in which the studies were conducted were: Kenya (2); Ghana (2); Zimbabwe (1); South Africa (17).

Through the analysis, it was possible to identify five broad categories of studies:

1. Five studies examined the issue of the professional development of school principals,

2. Five studies explored the issue of shared management,

3. Four studies focussed on gender and leadership

4. Seven studies explored critical leadership capabilities, competences and practices

5. One study explored the identities and subjectivities of the school principal
**Examining research methodology and design**

The majority of studies (13) reviewed used a case study methodology with multiple data sources (refer to table 1). The study by Msila (2008) was an ethnographic case study. Data production in the form of interviews and observations took place over a 10 month period. A methodological flaw was evident in three of the case studies in that multiple sources of data were not accessed (Botha, 2006; Kamper, 2008; Mncube, 2009)). Five of the studies used a survey approach. Two studies had a pre-post intervention design (Grobler, Bisschoff & Beeka, 2012; Van der Merwe & Parsotam, 2011). Fataar (2009) undertook a study using an ethnographic approach. Mestry & Schmidt (2012) used a post-colonial feminist methodology indicating a narrative inquiry. Data production techniques involved semi-structured interviews, observation, document analysis and questionnaires. None of the studies explored other innovative techniques, for example, visual methodologies (for example, Prosser, 2007; Mitchell, 2008). In the majority of studies, the data produced were analysed for emerging themes and patterns. Two studies (Botha, 2006; Mestry & Singh, 2007) were purely descriptive and made no mention of a conceptual or theoretical framework.

In the next sections, the studies reviewed will be examined in terms of the four broad categories listed above.

**Professional development of the school principal**

Five studies had a common purpose to explore the issue of professional development for the school principal. (Herriot, Crossley, Juma, Waudo, Mwirotsi & Kamau, 2002; Van der Westhuizen, Mosogen & Van Vuuren, 2004; Mestry & Singh, 2007; Van der Merwe & Parsotam, 2011; Grobler, Bisschoff & Beeka, 2012). As in many other countries in Africa, school leaders in South Africa begin their professional careers as teachers and progress to the post of principal either directly or through middle management positions. There is no formal training for school principals to equip them to be leaders and managers (Bush and Oduro, 2006; Mestry & Singh, 2007). Thus, the assumption is made that a teaching qualification and teaching experience are the only requirements for one to assume the leadership of a school. The five empirical studies suggest that a lack of training programmes and support for school principals compromises effective leadership and management and the quality of education in schools.
Four of the studies examined the South African experience. Since 1994 when the democratic government came into power, new educational policies and legislation posed complex challenges for school leaders in light of the national commitment to building a just society (for example, the South African Schools Act of 1996; Education White paper 6, July 2001; Curriculum 2005, ). These initiatives directly impacted the roles and responsibilities of school principals. Various professional development initiatives emerged to support school leaders in implementing change such as ‘Changing Management to Management Change (Department of Education (DoE), 1996); IQMS and Whole-School Evaluation (Department of Education, 2001); National Policy on Whole School Evaluation (Department of Education, 2000). In order to action these initiatives, and enable principals to cope with their new roles and responsibilities in policy and legislation, the national Department of Education initiated many leadership in-service training programmes for school leaders, including the principal.

A qualification, the Advanced Certificate of Educational Management (ACE) is one such formal programme. It is a two year part-time practice based course geared towards principals and prospective principals. The objective of the programme is to provide principals with competences to influence school improvement, such as assessing school needs; strategic direction and development of the school; their role in teaching and learning; legislation and policy issues relating to schools; and empowering staff to enable them to be involved in the development of the school. Mestery & Singh (2007) examined the perceptions of principals in the Gauteng province about how the ACE programme influenced their leadership and management capabilities. Although the authors make mention of a survey, it seems that only data from interviews with a sample of four principals formed the basis the article. The qualitative data included in the paper is rather limited, and gives the impression of selective use of data. The findings suggest that principals benefitted significantly from the ACE programme in certain key areas including collegiality, personal and professional development, and improved relations with stakeholders.

Another professional development initiative was the in-service Education Management Development (EMD) programme conducted for principals in Mpumalanga province initiated by the provincial Department of Education. The programme was organised by the Education
Management Development component and was conducted between May 2000 and March 2001. The aims of the programme were to develop a school that functions efficiently and effectively; ensure accountability between departments, districts, circuits, schools and other stakeholders in education; ensure that school leaders have a vision and a sense of purpose in schools; and improve the quality of learning and teaching. The curriculum included topics such as school development planning, classroom management, management tasks, staff induction, conflict management, promoting a culture of teaching and learning, change management, budgeting, aspects of educational law and basic Information Technology (IT) skills. Using a framework referred to as the Strategic Training Model (or Performance-based Training), Westhuizen, Mosoge & Vuuren (2004) examined the quality and effectiveness of this programme through the lens of principals and district managers. The findings indicated that principals and district managers were satisfied with the quality of their training and indicated that the training was effective. In the article, the researchers raise some key issues regarding professional development programmes. Firstly, they draw attention to the need to differentiate training to suit the needs of participants and their school unique schooling contexts. Secondly, they argue for the need for rigorous research to evaluate the effectiveness of training programmes. They suggest that future research should explore methodologies that do not rely on self-ratings by participants. They point out that in reviews of research on transfer of training show that it has been found that, self-ratings by participants may have an “error of misplaced precision” (Westhuizen, Mosoge & Vuuren, 2004, p. 717).

Grobler, Bisschof & Beeka (2012) argue in their article for the need for holistic leadership. Through a review of literature they identified seven salient competences of holistic leadership, namely, the creation of a professionally inviting culture, effective communication, ethical foundation, and vision of excellence, empowerment of followers, personal mastery, and authentic collaboration. They maintain that the key challenge that principals face is that they are unable to use the various dimensions of leadership in a more holistic way. This empirical investigation was in the form of a pre and post- test experimental type design. The study explored the perceptions of 400 teachers from the Secunda region of Mpumalanga province about the effectiveness of 20 principals who were exposed to the holistic leadership intervention programme. The study was a pre-post design using a structured questionnaire. There was a control group of principals who were not exposed to the programme. Grobler, Bisschof & Beeka argue that the perception of teachers as followers is more accurate than...
the self-perceptions of principals exposed to the programme. The findings revealed that those principals who were exposed to the holistic intervention programme were perceived by their teachers as more competent with respect to the seven dimensions targeted than those not exposed to the programme. The researchers raise the issue of sustainability of such training programmes. They also allude to the fact that the holistic programme can be contextualised although it is not clear how this can be achieved.

Influenced by international agendas the Ministry of Education in Kenya, in the context of capacity building and support for head teachers, began a professional development project referred to as the Head Teachers Support Groups (HTSG). The aim of the project was to develop school leaders professionally and to enhance school development planning. The objective was also to enhance the cascade system of training. School heads were required to form school clusters of approximately six schools in close proximity to one another. The clusters would serve as a forum for head teachers, community members and education officials in the area to share knowledge and ideas and support one another

Herriot, Crossley, Juma, Waudo, Mwirotsi & Kamau (2002) conducted a descriptive study to examine the impact of the HTSG in schools and their communities. The findings indicated that all the support groups were functioning, and had a positive impact on school governance, pupil participation and performance. Slight positive changes were evident in access, equity and completion rate of learners. The study raised concerns over certain operational matters such as low frequency of meetings and the lack of records. Participants in the study acknowledged that women members of the HTSG often did not have adequate voice but it was evident that attempts made to address this.

International research has shown that leading a school particularly in the era of reform, transformation and constant change has been perceived to result in high levels of stress for both novice and experienced school heads. In addition, their multifarious roles and responsibilities such key decision-maker, facilitator, change agent, problem-solver and solution finder can lead to stress, physically and emotionally (for example, Phillips, Sen & McNamee, 2007; Young & Yue, 2007; Weinstein, Jacobowitz, Ely, Landon & Schwartz, 2009). The study in South Africa conducted by Van der Merwe & Parsotam (2011) to determine the effectiveness of a stress relief programme, Sudarshan Kriya, with six primary school principals. The programme involved controlled breathing. Self-efficacy theory
(Bandura, 1997) was used to understand the influence of controlled breathing on school principals’ stress relief. The study was a pre-post intervention design. There was no control group. The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) was administered to participants, and in-depth individual interviews were conducted. Findings indicated that controlled breathing had a positive effect on participants' levels of stress. Other benefits were revitalised energy levels, restored clarity of thinking and improved interpersonal relationships.

Summary: The analysis of the above five studies show that professional development focussed largely on building competences of the school principal and collaborative support to enhance school effectiveness. In line with international debates, the studies suggest that a core set of leadership practices and behaviours are relevant and valuable in schooling contexts (Leithwood & Reihl, 2003; Stronge, Richard & Catano, 2008), and that these should be the target of professional development programmes.

Shared management

In the last decade or so, the decentralisation of decision making powers to the level of the school and local citizenry has been an international trend (Hargreaves & Bascia, 2000; Arnott & Raab, 2000; Kruger, 2003; Chrispeels, 2004). This is directly related to a move towards institutional autonomy, school-based management or self-management of schools. Scholars have maintained that decentralisation practices have not only created more demands on the school principal but boundaries are becoming blurry (Bezzina, 2001; Mulford, 2003). The power of the principal has shifted and management has now become the prerogative of many stakeholders in education. In addition there has been an evolution of leadership approaches with the emphasis being on participative management and team leadership and accountability (Singh, 2005; Taylor, 2010; Bush, 2008).

In this review, five empirical studies that focussed on the issue of decentralisation and the goal of shared leadership by the principal were identified (Mescht & Tyala, 2008; Botha, 2006; Swanepoel, 2008; Mncube, 2009; Msila, 2008). I discuss these studies conducted in South Africa under the theme 'shared management' (Refer to Table 1). The study by Botha (2006) was a qualitative case study in four divergent schools in Gauteng province in order to establish the role that principals play in ensuring school improvement through effective School Based Management (SBM). SMB requires a decentralisation of decision-making, and
that all stakeholders work together in democratic and participative ways. The assumption made by the researcher was that the principal is an essential dimension of successful, collaborative school-based management. The four divergent schools selected were categorised as ‘struggling schools’ and ‘successful schools’ on the basis of their academic achievement. The researcher examined the perceptions of school principals and teachers on SBM and the leadership of the school principal in the process.

The analysis and interpretation of the data was descriptive in nature with little evidence of theoretical engagement. The findings suggest that the role of the principal differed considerably in the two categories of schools. In the ‘successful schools’ the principals had a clear shared vision and philosophy; were goal oriented, empowered to make decisions and were trained for their roles and responsibilities. The schools had a collective ideology that which defined the schools identity and purpose. Participants indicated that the leadership of the school principal was crucial to effective school based management. In the “less successful schools” participants reported that more guidance and support was required from the Department of Education. A lack of community support was also cited as a reason for SBM being ineffective. Teachers perceived their principals to be weak and dependent on the Department of Education to initiate change.

A second study that focused on School Based Management (SBM) was a multiple case study conducted by Mescht & Tyala (2008) in ten secondary schools in the Eastern Cape province. The aim of the study was to explore school principals’ experiences and perceptions of team management. The findings revealed that the principals acknowledged the benefits of team management which included the sharing workloads, empowerment of staff, staff development. However, some tensions in the process were evident. Principals displayed problems with ‘holding on’ to power and ‘letting go’ of power. Trust was revealed as a key ingredient in ensuring cohesion and effective management and participation of principals in SBM. Tension existed between getting the job done while at the same time showing a commitment to team work and personal growth. These tensions enabled the researchers to conclude that although SBM teams are in place, team management is still not effective. They strongly recommend leadership training that focuses not only on skills but also on attitudes and values that underpin team participation and management.
Swanepoel (2008) also examined school based management in his empirical research which used a quantitative survey method. The sample consisted of 50 secondary school principals, and 176 secondary school teachers from the province of Gauteng. Two separate structured questionnaires were administered to each group of participants. The aim of the study was to examine, firstly, how principals viewed shared decision making and, secondly, whether their perceptions about the extent to which teachers want to be involved in shared decision making hamper the involvement of teachers in management related to school change. The results of the study indicated that a majority of teachers were keen to be involved in change initiatives and in SBM. Overall the results demonstrated that the principals’ underestimated the wishes of teachers regarding their involvement in SBM significantly. Similarly, teachers underestimated principals regarding the teacher involvement level principals would promote. Swanepoel contends that these misperceptions are detrimental to the implementation of effective school-based management. He recommends a follow-up intervention study that would aim at attaining mind-set changes for both principals and teachers.

Another study that focused on the issue of shared, participative leadership and management is an ethnographic case study of one school conducted by Msila (2008). Specifically, the researcher examined the principle of ubuntu and school leadership at a school where the principal used the Ubuntu philosophy in her leadership model. Ubuntu philosophy as argued by Msila (2008) marks a shift from authoritarian, hierarchically structured management style to one that values collective solidarity, common purpose and cooperation. The values of respect, empathic compassion, and team work are embedded in Ubuntu leadership.

The study explored whether participative-based strategies embedded in ubuntu could help a school leader to enhance teachers’ positive attitude towards change. He further examined if teachers were open to participative strategies of leadership associated with ubuntu principles. Interviews were conducted with the principal of the school, teachers, Heads of Departments, and the deputy principal over a 10 month period. Observations were also conducted in classrooms and at meetings. The researcher examined whether the leadership style at the school impacted classroom practices and facilitation of meetings. The findings showed that the use of an inclusive, collective leadership approach and participative based strategies influenced by the Ubuntu philosophy can have a positive impact on leading a school. However, it paradigm shift on the part of all stakeholders at the school. All members of school leadership need to understand be open and receptive to the approach. Certain idealised
values such as *ubuntu* are not easily accepted and adopted by people. The study demonstrated that teachers who have not been prepared to be change agents cannot embrace the value of *Ubuntu*, promoting a culture of interdependence is a complex endeavour, and the *ubuntu* model is not a simple solution to the challenge of participative leadership. The *Ubuntu* as a philosophy cannot be seen as a simple solution to the challenges that South African schools and society face today.

Mncube (2008) investigated the perceptions of members of the School Governing Body (SGB) about the role that the principal plays in democratic school governance at secondary schools in the South African context, particularly in promoting parent and learner participation. The study was conducted in the context of the South African Schools Act of 1996 that was intended to promote tolerance, rational discussion and collective decision-making, communication, consultation, collaboration, participation and freedom of expression in school governance. The study followed a qualitative approach and was conducted in four secondary schools in KwaZulu-Natal. Data production was done through interviews. Although the study was in the form of a case study of four schools the researcher did not access multiple data sources. Four categories of members of the SGB were interviewed: the principal; two parent members, two learners, one teacher and one non-teaching staff governor. The perception of the participants was that the role of the principal is pivotal in the SGB in terms of professional development, ensuring all duties are carried out adequately, setting the tone in SGB meetings, interpreting educational policies; promoting maximum participation of learners and parents. The principal was also viewed as a resource person to other members of the SGB. The study revealed that in the rural schools principals tended to be dominant, and this leads to tension among SGB members. Most participants in the other schools agreed that the principals promoted democratic values such as tolerance, open communication and collective decision-making in schools. In certain schools participants were of the view that parents and learners were not actively involved suggesting a need to examine in a more nuanced way imbalances in power relations that may exist.

*Summary:* All five studies established that the creation of shared, school based management is a positive move and that the role of the school principal is pivotal to ensuring success. Botha (2006) argued that if the principals were empowered to make decisions and trained in
their new roles this would lead to effective SBM and school improvement. Leadership tensions regarding the issues of accountability, trust, empathic communication, emotionality, and efficiency versus effectiveness are foregrounded in the studies. The studies also foreground the need for professional development of the school principal to ensure effectiveness when implementing a democratic management style. Mescht & Tyala (2008) contend that professional development programmes for school principals should focus on team work and team management, not only as theory but as an experiential as well.

**Gender and leadership**

Despite numerous legislation that entrenches gender equality in Africa, many African women still suffer discrimination and have unequal power sharing especially in education (Coombs, 2004; Moorosi, 2006; 2010; Sobehart, 2009). Myths and stereotypes of women being inadequate as leaders still persist and form stumbling blocks to women attaining positions of power. The patriarchal system in Africa remains deeply rooted in many societies and places many constraints on women’s advancement into senior leadership positions. The studies under the theme gender and leadership” had the common purpose of exploring women principals’ experiences of leadership in the context of gender equity. Mesty & Schmidt (2012), maintain that a recurring theme in gender and leadership is the different types and forms of discrimination that women experience. Their empirical research examined the barriers that South African women experience in their work as school principals. The participants were six female principals’ experiences as leaders in secondary schools in South Africa. The study used a post-colonial feminist research methodology to explore the women’s complex personal, contextual and situated experiences. Semi-structured interviews were conducted over a 12 week period.

The data was analysed with the lens of a post-colonial feminist perspective. The findings the main indicated that stereotypes concerning female inadequacy as leaders still exist. It was found that patriarchy is still rife in schools that have female heads. Females are faced with numerous challenges, some of which are, being labelled emotionally unstable, insubordination and sabotage. As a result of stereotypes, women prefer to settle for lower positions which prevent them from taking up leadership roles.
Through a descriptive analysis the researchers identified four patterns of meanings that depicted the women principals’ experiences of leadership: stereotypes, cultural beliefs, leadership style, and emotions. The strength of the study is that the researchers interpret the findings in deep and nuanced ways using a postcolonial feminist lens, for example, the tension of being an agent of change and displaying agency with being an a bureaucrat, and how the women negotiate this tension.

The study conducted by Juma, Simatuwa & Ayodo (2011) focused on job satisfaction among female principals in public schools in Kenya. The aim was to assess job satisfaction among female principals in the Rachuonyo North and South Districts. A case study approach was followed utilising a descriptive survey and correlation design. The sample consisted of 20 female principals, 20 deputy principals, 200 Heads of Departments, 20 Board of Governors chairpersons, 20 parents, the chairpersons of teacher associations, and 2 district Quality Assurance Officers. Data production involved questionnaires, interviews, observations and document analysis. Findings indicated that 66.67 % of female principals were dissatisfied with principalship. The factors that would improve job satisfaction identified by female principals included autonomy to attend seminars and workshops; good relationships with teachers and board members; remuneration improvement; security, opportunities for promotion, and recognition by educational stakeholders. The key factors that promoted job dissatisfaction were negative attitudes by society, lack of advancement in career paths and political influence in school management. A limitation in the study is that no mention is made of how the data from the interviews, observations and document analysis informed the findings. The nature of the rating scale and interview schedule is not evident in the description of the research methodology.

A third study that focused on gender and leadership in two provinces in South Africa was conducted by Lumby & Azaolo (2011). Their focus was particularly on small schools (with an enrolment of 200 and under) headed by female principals. The researchers argue that small schools and the principalship in small schools are uniquely experienced. The assumptions made are that small are low status contexts, offer women a route to principalship that is less competitive, and may result in women being trapped in these low paid posts. The study examined the interplay between school size and the gender of the school principal. The notion of gender as social construction was the main premise of the researcher. The findings showed that the female principals in the small schools with their low-status experienced and
viewed gender in unique ways. Firstly, they tended to neutralise gender in that they denied its impact. Secondly, they unsettled gender by presenting in a positive way characteristics that are associated with gender stereotypes, for example, they considered notions such as the woman as a mother as social capital that they could use to lead smalls schools. The study also found that the relationship between gender and school size is mediated by poverty, marital status, ethnicity, religion and language.

In Zimbabwe, Chabaya, Rembe & Wadesango (2009) investigated the perceptions of women school leaders about factors associated with the under-representation of women in positions of school headship positions. The participants were school principals, deputy heads and senior teachers. Using a case study approach, individual and focus group interviews were conducted with participants. Findings of this research indicated that despite being adequately qualified, women do not apply for leadership positions because of stereotypes regarding gender. Cultural stereotypes were a pivotal factor that acted as a barrier to application for headship posts by women. One stereotype that emerged was the perception that family responsibilities should supersede career development.

Summary: discussed illustrate that gender continues to negatively impact the lives of women who strive for the principalship in the African contexts examined. Despite the governmental legislation aimed at gender equity, there still exist many challenges for women pursuing or already in leadership positions. Stereotypes and prejudices still prevail. Women principals often find themselves working in rather difficult circumstances, for example, small schools with limited career advancement opportunities, low status and low salaries. It was also found that job satisfaction was very low among female principals. The studies highlight the need for Departments of Education as well as governments to address and strategize around issues of gender related to school leadership.

Critical leadership capabilities, competences and practices

Internationally, there is a large body of research that has examined critical capabilities and competences for successful leadership in education (Leithwood, 2004; Prew, 2007). Scholars have argued that these competences and practices may be useful in many different cultural and organizational contexts (Bush & Glover, 2003).
The seven empirical studies that are discussed in this sub-section had a common purpose in that they examined the critical leadership capabilities, competences and practices of the school principal in a range of schooling contexts. One of the studies was conducted in Ghana, and seven studies were undertaken in South African. The discussion begins with the South African studies.

Kamper (2008) conducted a study in Mpumalanga and Gauteng provinces firstly, to examine the challenges facing high poverty schools in South Africa as seen through the lens of the everyday experiences of school principals. Secondly, the researcher explored how a high poverty school manages to create an effective learning environment, and finally, he examined what critical elements of effective leadership are evident in these schools contexts. The context of the case study was a group of six high poverty schools that achieved academic success measured by the matriculations results. The six schools achieved a matric pass rate of over 90%. The six principals were interviewed, and observations were conducted of the school facilities and environment to gain a profile of the context. A limitation of the study is that multiple data sources were not used to ascertain the nature of the leadership of the principal. The findings revealed the challenges that the schools experience including extremely poor socio-economic circumstances of learners and families, unemployment, violence and crime; lack of educational facilities and resources such as textbooks; poor support from the District Department of Education. In respect of critical leadership competences, the study showed that the principals displayed passion for the upliftment of commitment and care on the part of teachers; parental involvement, and a positive life-view of learners. The researcher argues that the leadership style in the six successful high-poverty schools corresponded with an invitational leadership style and its key principles of optimism, respect, trust and intentional care.

The aim of the study of Kruger (2003) was to understand the nature and impact of the instructional leadership role of the principal on the achievement of effective teaching and learning the school. The study explored the formal and informal actions of the principal in directing the academic or instructional programme, and in developing a sound culture of teaching and learning. Thus, a key focus was on the relationship between instructional leadership and school effectiveness. The research contexts were two effective schools in the provinces of North West and Gauteng that were purposively sampled. These schools were regarded as effective in view of their excellent matric pass rate over a period of time. The
research was a qualitative case study. The principal and two senior teachers at each school were the participants. A range of data production methods were used including semi-structured interviews, observation; focus group interviews and document analysis.

A key finding was that the principals did not engage in instructional leadership directly but displayed an informal, indirect and supportive role in ensuring effective teaching and learning at their schools. Both principals place a high value on academic excellence. Formal instructional leadership tasks, such as direct supervision of teaching and learning; curriculum management and supervision, were delegated to Heads of Department and subject heads. Kruger explains that this is in line with findings in other studies which indicate that due to time constraints principals give limited attention to directly involving themselves in teaching and learning. For example, both principals place a high priority promoting the professional development of the teachers and ensure attendance at Department of Education workshops.

A study by Prew (2007) was part of a larger research project that instituted an innovative school development innovation in schools in the Gauteng province. In this article, Prew presents a case study of four schools, two of which were successful in the implementation of the innovation and two were not. Participants were the four principals. The study sought to examine why some principals succeed and others struggle when faced with innovation and opportunities for transformation. In essence, the researcher examined the roles and skills that are required for a school principal to succeed in transforming a school in the context of an innovation. Data production methods were questionnaires, document analysis (e.g. the school development plans) and interviews.

The findings of the study indicated that the principal was key to embracing an innovation and effecting transformation in a school. The principals who were successful in implementing the innovative intervention were those that had flexible, transformative leadership styles and competences. The successful principals saw the intervention as a tool which they could adapt to drive a number of changes in their schools, and were also effective at working with surrounding communities and the local education district. Unsuccessful schools had principals who showed no flexibility and rejected opportunities for innovation, transformation and change. The study revealed the differences in the competences of the successful and less successful principals. For example, the leadership style in the less
successful schools was authoritarian. Principals in less successful schools excluded the community from decision making, and blamed the District Education Department for problems, and created tensions in their schools. The principals in successful schools were inclusive and confident. They had a relationship of trust, mutual support and accountability with the school community and the District Education department.

Msilā (2012) also focused on the issue of leadership effectiveness in schools. He sought to explore what school principals in ineffective schools attributed their failure to, and whether they shared common challenges. The study purposively sampled eight ‘failing’ schools in the Eastern Cape province. ‘Failing schools’ were selected using the criteria poor matric pass rate. Schools with less than 40% pass rate were designated ineffective in the local school community. The study was a qualitative case study of a group of eight schools with the eight principals in each of the schools as participants. Data generation methods include individual, observation, document analysis and group focus interviews. Findings indicated that was a common pattern of challenges that principals cited: poverty, trade union involvement and teacher strikes, no vision for school, lack of support from District Department of Education; and inadequate teacher professional development. The study also indicated various inadequacies in the leadership skills and competences of the school principals which needed to be addressed which include: no guiding vision in their leadership roles; inability to access resources and support for the school; lack of confidence & assertiveness to lead and manage; lack of skills to deal with current innovations in education; inability of handle complexities in the relationship with teacher unions, Department of Education, and empowered teachers who demand their voices be heard. The principals had difficulty developing a relationship of collaboration, trust, open communication and meaningful co-existence with their teachers.

Bush, Joubert, Kiggundu & Van Rooyen (2009) examined the significance of leadership and management in improving learner achievement outcomes in two province, Mpumalanga and Limpopo. The aim of the study was to examine the management of teaching and learning of literacy and numeracy by the school management team, which included the principal, Heads of Department (HODs) & teachers. The notion of Instructional leadership formed the conceptual framework for the study. The research was a case study of eight schools, primary and secondary level, four from each province. The majority of the schools served poor communities with a range of social and economic problems including poverty,
unemployment; inaccessibility, inadequate infrastructure, unfilled educator posts, high rates of teenage pregnancy. One school was located in a suburb.

Multiple methods of data generation were used that included document analysis of the schools’ performance in language and mathematics; semi-structured interviews with the Heads of Department for literacy and mathematics; non-participant observation of classroom practices; interviews with teachers whose class practice was observed. The findings demonstrated that most principals had a weak understanding of teaching and learning, and lack the competence and drive to promote, support and monitor teaching and learning effectively. This is the trend despite the fact the South African standards for principals indicate that they should be involved in setting frameworks and school policies for effective teaching and learning, ensuring that the curriculum is being implemented effectively, and monitoring teaching and learning successfully.

The principals had poor knowledge of the requirements of the national curriculum, and had a poor system for evaluating and monitoring teaching and learning. Instructional leadership at the school was restricted to checking work instead of making informed decisions regarding teaching and learning. Inadequate focus on teaching and learning fails to compensate for contextual barriers to learning. Teachers, HODs and the principal acknowledged poor learner achievement but did not take collective responsibility for poor achievement outcomes. Often they tended to shift blame to the learners, their parents or quality of education in previous schools learners attended. The researchers recommend that the professional development of principals should prioritise the management of teaching and learning as their core function.

The professional development of school principals in Ghana is brought to the fore by the empirical research conducted by Zame, Hope & Repress (2008) in the greater Accra region of Ghana. The aim of the study was to examine head teachers’ perceptions about what they considered to be proficiencies that effective head teachers needed, and what proficiencies did head teachers practice. The study was a quantitative survey of 224 principals.

The findings results indicated that Ghana faced a leadership challenge in terms of professional development as the absence of training programmes was cited as the main reason for ineffective head teachers. The head teachers in the study did not prioritise critical competences that are key to the development of effective schools such as on-going
professional development of teachers and assessing and monitoring learner performance. The study showed that the head teachers tended to engage largely in management and administrative tasks. Despite the fact that Ghana is engaged in educational reform with the intention of improving quality education, the study found that there is little focus on the professional development of the head teacher. This is a critical area that education policy makers need to address.

Summary: The above six studies that explored critical competences, capabilities and practices of school principals provide some interesting insights from African contexts. In Ghana, the key area of concern is professional development of head teachers to enable the shift from the role of managers to leaders given that international research has shown that the head teachers is pivotal to an effective school (Zame, Hope & repress, 2008). The study by Fataar (2009) is the only study that uses an in-depth ethnographic approach to understand the identities and subjectivities of the school principal as arising out of the broader societal processes. His nuanced analysis of the reflexive, spatially influenced performances and enactments of the school principal suggest a need for additional studies with this focus in the African context. Many studies reviewed in this paper tend to homogenize the professional lives of the school principal, and do not examine the situational and contextual realities being a school head.

The identities of the school principal

Internationally over the past two decades, there has been a proliferation of research on the issue of teacher identities as they relate to their work in schools and the school community (for example, Craib, 1998; Goodson, 1996). Goodson drew attention to the idea that teachers are active beings and their work is politically and socially constructed. Similarly, to Craib (1998) identity is seen as “a process, a matter of external negotiations between oneself and the people around.” (p. 27).

The only study that examined the identities of school principals was by Fataar (2009). He conducted in the Western Cape aimed, firstly, to understand how three school principals negotiated the specific social and educational conditions of the context in which they work. Secondly, the study explored the social dynamics that shape principals’ roles, practices and identities. Thirdly, to understand the adaptations they had to make to their professional &
leadership identities in the particular context. Key concepts used to make sense of the data are the notions of teacher ‘identity’ and ‘subjectivity’ and their reflexive nature.

This was the only study reviewed that explored the identities of school principals through a deeply theorised analysis. Fataar skilfully uses an innovative combination of ‘spatial’ and ‘performance’ lenses to explore the reflexive adaptations of principals. He drew on the notion of ‘space’ as a social construction and explored its relational dimensions. Fataar further draws Butler’s (1990) construction of performativity and reflexivity. The article draws on an ethnographic study conducted over a period of 5 months in 13 schools. This article zones in on the lives of three principals in township schools. Data production involved informal, semi-structured interviews with the principals, teachers and parents, and observations. To obtain a picture of the broader environmental dynamics, interviews were also conducted with civic and community leaders, public servants including police persons, health and welfare officers and senior city and educational planners.

The findings of the study indicated that an understanding of the identities of the school principals must be located in the analysis of the dynamics of lived space or social space. The social dynamics of the township flow into and shape leadership enactments. The researcher argues that principal identities of the school principals were enacted through a range of reflexive pedagogical performances and adaptations, based on creative and nuanced engagements with the social environment.

Summary:
Through a post-structural feminism lens, Fataar (2009) de-centers the subject, and focuses on the social/historical construction of the self. Fataar examines the self as a site of contradictions, tensions, dilemmas and conflict.

Discussion of Findings

The literature review presented in this paper illustrates that research has highlighted the lack of professional development for school principals; the complexities of a move towards school based shared management; the marginalisation of women in leadership posts, and
One study examined the identity of the school principal.

Further, the studies show that professional development for school principals in the particular contexts is emphasizing transformational leadership styles that are collaborative in nature. In addition one is able to see that recent research in Africa, in particular South Africa, is placing the lens on the critical role of the school principal in the creation of effectively functioning schools. In the sections below, I will examine how this literature review speaks to the two research questions set out at the outset: How can current research on the principalship in the African context be characterized? What are areas for future research on the issue?

**Methodological issues**

Nine (9) of the 22 studies were perception studies that explored perceptions of participants about issues. There is a need to re-think the value of perception studies to debates in the field of educational leadership. Questions that should be raised are: Do perceptions reflect or obscure reality? Are an individual’s perceptions selective? Do they perceive what they want to? Do expectations influence perceptions? What are the cognitive and motivational biases embedded in a person’s perceptions? To what extent do these distort perceptions? Do people recognise and interrogate their own biases embedded in their perceptions? None of researchers in the nine ‘perception’ studies adopted this critical sociological stance in their analysis and interpretation of the findings.

Most studies (14 of the 22 studies) used a conceptual framework to make meaning of the data yielded. Generally, the conceptual framework was framed around the notion of leadership and management, for example, educational leadership; invitational leadership; democratic leadership; instructional leadership; transformational leadership; *Ubuntu* leadership. These studies generally examine leadership from a competences lens, and often fail to engage with the leadership enactments in their complex, contextual embeddedness. Macbeath & Oduro (2003) draw attention to the fact that generic models of competences should not be seen as universally applicable as they do not factor in cultural and contextual influences on school contexts and leadership enactments.
It was interesting that only one of the studies explored in some depth the leadership of the school principal with a lens divorced from a narrow focus on debates within the discipline of leadership and management studies. Fataar (2009) used a combination of post-structural and feminist theory in powerful ways to understand three school principals in township schools. Through his ethnographic study, he employed the conceptual framework of teacher identity and subjectivity; Judith Butler’s performativity theory (Butler, 1990), and notion of ‘space as a social construction (for example, Lefebvre, 1991). Through his analysis he was able to capture the reflexive adaptations of the school principal and a nuanced picture of social relations and power dynamics of leadership in township schools. None of the studies examined the identity and subjectivity of the school principal. Although, a number of studies pointed to socio-economic factors that intersect with the leadership of a school in the African context such as poverty and underdevelopment; teenage pregnancy; inadequate resources and infrastructure, and the HIV/AIDS pandemic, it is only the study by Fataar (2009) that examined how situational and social challenges, in and out of the school environment shape the multiple and often contradictory subject positions principals take up in their professional lives.

**Implications for future research**

In this section, I will discuss some key areas for future researchers to explore, as illuminated by the review.

A question to be posed is: what are other critical topics and issues that need to be examined in research that focuses on the leadership of the school principal or head teacher. A key neglected issue is emotionality. There is a growing body of research internationally that explores the emotionality of teachers and the interplay among teacher emotions, context and identity (for example, Holt & Jones, 2005; Kelchtermans, 2005; Reio, 2005; Marshall, 2010; Darby, 2008). Drawing from his narrative-biographical work with teachers, Kelchtermans (2005) argues that research on teacher lives cannot limit itself to questions of technical efficacy, increasing efficiency and effectiveness but has to include the more messy issues of emotionality. I would argue that this most certainly applies to research on the principalship. The intersection of the technical, moral, ethical, political and emotional dimensions of the principal’s work is a dynamic and complex reality which research needs to illuminate. For example, Kelchtermans explains that teachers often have to make value choices and such choices inherently involves risk taking as decisions and commitments may be questioned or
overturned. Reio (2005) argues that “risk taking, emotions, and professional vulnerability significantly contribute to teachers’ identity formation” (p. 986). Darby (2008) contends that meeting the needs and demands of a range of stakeholders such as parents, learners, colleagues, education administrators evokes teachers’ emotions. Studies have explored teacher emotionality as a lens to make sense of the impact of educational reform and change on teacher identity (for example, Hargreaves, 2005; Zembylas, 2005). Zembylas (2002) in synthesizing research on teacher emotionality argues that scholars have questioned dichotomy between emotion and rationality, Emotions as are no longer viewed as irrational but ‘as sites of sites of social and political resistance and transformation of oppressions (p. 98 ). Boler (1999) a feminist theorist argues that we need to understand emotions as historically situated and socially constructed, as dynamic in its relationship to power, culture and context, rather than merely a psychological and individual phenomena.

It was only one study in the literature review presented in this paper that focussed on the affective dimension of the leadership role of the principal (Van der Merwe & Parsotam, 2011). In view of the above informative debates, I argue that the emotionality of the school principal is a promising new direction for research in the African context.

A second area that should be targeted for future research is the identity and subjectivities of the school principal. Much of identity research internationally in the field of education focuses on the classroom teacher (Gill & Pryor, 2006; Husu, 2007). The perspective in recent literature is on examining the shifting, multiple, and fluid nature of identity in the different contexts that reflect teacher lives. Further, as in the study by Fataar (2009) the argument has been teacher identity is formed within social and political contexts, through the ways in which they navigate and negotiate their workplace spatialities; and in the ways those spaces enable and limit their meaning making (Husu, 2007).

The leadership of the school principal in the context of social justice issues is dealt with in a limited way in the studies reviewed. Most studies describe the schooling contexts and exclusionary factors such as poverty, HIV/AIDS; teenage pregnancy, crime and violence. An important topic of relevance to African contexts is leadership, emotions, and personal and professional identity. However, very few of the studies examined in depth the adaptations principals engage in, the reflexive stances with which they approach students, families,
community members, and the beliefs that they hold around complex issues of diversity and social justice.

The issue of instructional leadership was examined in one of the studies reviewed (Kruger, 2003). It is well documented that the quality of education available to the majority of children in Africa is so low and that children are failing to achieve basic literacy and numeracy. For example, although South Africa is a middle-income country and spends a substantial amount of its national budget on education, the achievement of learners on standardized tests is below the average for African countries (Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI), 2012; UNESCO, 2011; Modisaotsile, 2012). Providing instructional leadership requires the principal to be involved in curricular and instructional issues that directly impact learning outcomes of students.

Scholars have argued that this role extends beyond the scope of the principal to involve other leaders in the school context (Blase, Blasé & Phillips, 2010; Lunenburg, 2010). Given the quality imperative in the Education for All commitment, instructional leadership is an critical issue to research.

The most common research method used was the qualitative case study located in an interpretivist paradigm. Thirteen (13) of the 22 studies employed a qualitative case study approach. Data generation involved mainly semi-structured interviews, observation and document analysis. The data collected were analysed for emerging themes in an interpretative manner. The studies were generally small-scale and ranged in degree of in-depth analysis. A few were merely descriptive, lacked adequate theorisation and the qualitative data included seemed rather thin. I also had concerns about whether the selective use of data in fact represented multiple realities.

The aim in these studies was to understand the bounded reality and gain insight into the experiential knowledge or practical knowledge of the case rather than engage in any kind of generalization. However, the studies are useful in that they allow for a cross-case analysis where the findings of multiple cases are compared and combined (Stake, 2005). There are concerns in certain studies around the issue of triangulation, in particular whether the studies accessed a diversity of views, and gained insight into the multiple realities in which
the participants lived (for example, Botha, 2006; Lumby & Azaola, 2011; Mncube, 2009). In these studies it was evident that the researcher/s failed to use multiple data sources.

From the analysis of the studies in this review, I call on future researchers in the African context to explore other research paradigms and innovative research methodologies from the social sciences, for example, biographical research such as life histories; self-study research; participatory research methodologies; narrative inquiry; ethnography and feminist research methodologies; visual methodologies; action research. Such research methodologies can result in more nuanced, contextually rich type of analyses.

Finally, I was unable to locate any studies that explored the leadership of the school principal in the context of special schools. This appears to be a neglected area of research on the African context.

Conclusion

The aim of this review was to examine what how research on the leadership of the school principal in Africa is characterised, and what are areas for future research. The analysis of the above studies suggests there are gaps in our current knowledge. I put forward questions that summarise some directions for future research in the African context:

- What innovative methodologies may be used to capture the contextual, situated and nuanced dynamics and adaptations in the lives and work of the school principal?
- What interdisciplinary theoretical and conceptual frameworks can be drawn on to understand the dynamic interplay among principal identity, agency, and context?
- What theoretical frameworks and methodologies can be deployed to understand the relations among the emotionality of the school principal, identity and context?
- How do school principals navigate and negotiate issues of diversity and social justice in relation to the multiplicity of voices in the socio-cultural spaces of the school?

In conclusion, I have to concede that the review has several limitations. First, as I describe above, the review is limited to those studies conducted in the African context published in
English language journals. The decision to exclude all others was made deliberately because of the difficulties with access articles written in other languages. Thus the findings do not give a complete picture of research in the African continent. However, the questions, issues, and findings of this study would be of interest to educators and researchers across countries.

Second, I organized our review around two questions that were of interest to me in the context of my broader research intentions: How can current research on the principalship in the African context be characterized? What are areas for future research on the issue? These questions influenced analysis. I acknowledge that there may be other important questions, and ways to synthesize and report the findings which may be of interest to other researchers.

Thirdly, my focus was on the principal or head teacher of a school. I concede that the notion of leadership of a school as conceptualized in current debates is seen as collective in nature and involves a range of stakeholders.
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APPENDIX 2: BACKGROUND TO DEAF CULTURE

1. The politics of the language of communication in Deaf education.

1.1 Introduction

The most appropriate education and curriculum for the deaf has been hotly debated internationally over many centuries. The controversial discourses concerning the most appropriate method of education for deaf learners gave rise to discussions on the various ways to eradicate the complexities of deafness enabling an improvement in educational outcomes for deaf learners. The issues of language which included the use of Sign Language, speech signs in English word order, created sign systems, contact sign, how to integrate speech, speech reading, auditory training with signs and integration of speech, has foregrounded much of the debates. Thus the contentious issues of Sign Language versus oralism, methods of total communication and Bilingual- Bicultural approaches emerged in my readings.

My readings and engagement with literature point out that these discourses are underlined by ideologies that centre on one’s construction of deafness. It is argued that deafness is a social construction which means that it would hold different meanings in different contexts (Batha, 2005; Lane 1997; Solario, 2004). Solario (2004) emphasises that since the term deafness is a social construction, it can be open to many interpretations which inadvertently impacts on the entire idea of the process of deaf education.

Hearing people demonstrate divergent orientations and reactions to deafness. Some pursue a cure for deafness, believing that deafness is a personal tragedy. In this case deaf individuals are treated as inferior to their hearing peers. Others view deafness as a deprivation of a functional language thereby treating deaf individuals as equals (Ladd, 2003, Akash, 2011, Ram, 2011). How teachers construct deafness influences and impacts on how they educate deaf learners. Professionals in the field of deafness have been reconciling these differences in constructions and perspectives, attempting to determine and find consensus, with the hope of improving educational outcomes of deaf learners.

1.2 Constructing deafness

Debates in deaf education regarding the most conducive methods of teaching have its roots in one’s meaning of deafness and the particular discourses defining it.

The clinical-pathological paradigm of deafness which is also known as the Medical or Deficit Model focuses on the impairments of people who are disabled and explain the differences and difficulties they experience in life on the basis of their impairments. Their disability is viewed as a ‘personal tragedy’, which becomes a limiting factor in his/her interaction with society (UNESCO, 2002). Within this perspective deafness is seen as a disability, deaf people are viewed as having a lack (hearing), different from the norm, and society is of the belief that they are responsible to assist the deaf to fit into ‘normal’ society. Accordingly educational practices and
Interventions focus on trying to rectify the deficiency of deafness using methods of speech, language and literacy (oralism).

Scholars argue that the limitation of this paradigm is that it regards hearing loss as a societal deficit and negates diversity that is clinically and medically based. This perception results in deaf learners being excluded from the mainstream of education. In addition it is further argued that this model eventually leads to deaf persons being perceived as inadequate thus making them unfit to be included in everyday economic and social life. Decisions affecting deaf people are usually made by hearing people who operate from a position of power and ultimately deaf persons are further disempowered as the hearing people assume the role of authority in vital decision making processes. The consequences of being viewed from a deficit model, creates negative attitudes to and stereotyping of difference which cause barriers to learning for the Deaf learners in particular.

My own experience in specialised education has demonstrated that many specialised education systems have been founded from the clinical pathological paradigm. The ultimate aim has been to provide assistance, as these learners are viewed as underachievers who are in need of institutional care and specialised schooling. My experience has pointed out that sensory and physical disabilities are often confused with intellectual disabilities leading to low expectations and overprotective attitudes towards these learners, often resulting in the attitude that these learners are significantly different from other learners and that they require separate education away from their mainstream peers. Thus, this construction invariably fits into the political discourse of disablement.

A new contrasting perspective of how deafness is viewed and constructed is from the socio-cultural paradigm. This perspective is also referred to as the Social Model of disability and does not construct deafness in terms of sensory impairment or disability but in terms of language and culture. Deaf people are defined by membership of a distinct community who share a unique culture and Sign Language.

The focus of this perspective is on how the social environment within which the Deaf live, acts to exclude them from full participation (UNESCO, 2002). The critical issue as mentioned is that the majority of deaf people do not view deafness as a deficit but a cultural identity (Lad, 2005; Moores; 2001; Mathews, 2011, Ram, 2011). Deaf people consider themselves as a minority culture that has the foundational physiological condition of deafness and elect to set themselves apart from the dominant hearing culture (Akash, 2010) This forms the foundation for the construction of deafness as a cultural phenomenon and not a physical impairment. Within this paradigm, Deaf people are viewed as a linguistic minority group, who share a strong identity, a common language (Sign Language) and a unique culture (Deaf culture). People who subscribe to this perspective advocate that the Deaf community should be accepted and respected as a separate cultural group having their own values and language. Arroyo (2011) defines Deaf culture as:

‘Culture results from a group of people coming together to form a community around shared experience, common interests, shared norms of behavior, and shared survival techniques. Such groups as the Deaf seek each other out for social interaction and emotional support. Shares a common sense of pride in their Culture and language’ (p. 1).
Sign Language is central and deeply rooted in Deaf culture which forms the cornerstone of the Socio-Cultural construction of deafness (Hanaland & Allen, 2009; Heap & Morgan, 2006; Skeleton & Valentine, 2003). Sign Language is understood to have its own grammar and syntax (Stokoe, 1960). Pickersgill (1999) emphasises that Deaf people are members of a minority group and are identified as this minority specifically through their Sign Language and Deaf culture. Ladd (2003) advocates that Deaf culture is a distinctive culture that is underpinned by a social, communal and creative presence which is strongly linked to language. Sign Language exists as a mother-tongue for Deaf cultures internationally. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with disabilities (United Nations, 2007) firmly recognises that culture, identity and language are integral and could not be separated.

Critics however have pointed out that Deaf culture can be blurred and the meanings and constructions of Deaf culture are not fixed. All Deaf people are deaf by virtue of the physical and physiological description of not being able to hear. This conceptualisation cannot be denied since it is this understanding that attributes meaning to deafness (Heap & Morgan, 2006; Hanaland & Allen, 2009; Arrayo, 2011). Mcknee & Mcknee (2000) argue that Deaf culture is also an attitude. This attitude can be used prejudicially in that Deaf culture can be used as a means to exclude others. However, Ram (2011) argues that Deaf culture is a positive concept that illustrates pride and a communal identity. She explains that the psychosocial basis of Deaf culture is such that members prefer to communicate and socialise with other Deaf people in preference to hearing people. Other scholars stress that despite their home or school backgrounds, many Deaf seek out other Deaf people and prefer to communicate in Sign Language (Hanaland & Allen, 2009; Heap & Morgan, 2006; Skelton & Valentine, 2003).

The establishment of socio-cultural construction of deafness (as discussed in chapter 2) is often known as the big ‘D’ Deaf. ‘D’ is capitalised to indicate membership to a cultural and linguistic minority group as opposed to the lowercase deaf which implies an audiological deficiency. Internationally there is a broad acceptance among deaf people that ‘Deaf’ (with a capital letter ‘D’) is linked to a unique social identity with strong allegiance to a specific social group and to supporting the use of Sign Language. The writing of ‘deaf’ (with a small letter ‘d’) is used by most academics and medical professionals to imply a definition based on medical descriptions of deafness as measured against the ‘norm’ of hearing. The ‘lower case’ deaf community relies on oral styles of communication such as lip reading or speaking rather than Sign Language (Bat Chava, 2000; Ladd, 2003). The use of the capital ‘D’ also distinguishes Deaf people from other individuals who experience hearing loss but who do not form part of the Deaf culture or who do not use Sign Language. Throughout this dissertation the word D/deaf will be used in this context.

Lane (2002) and Oliver (1990) emphasise that although those identifying within the socio-cultural construction of deafness do not identify as disabled, the progress made in establishing a socio-cultural model must be situated within a generalised shift away from viewing disabilities as inherently personal obstacles towards one which examines the role of the physical, social, economic or political environment in creating disability. Thus this construction of deafness fits into the discourse of the social rights of Deaf people with a shift.
Educators that operate from this perspective believe that learners are able to achieve the same outcomes as their hearing peers and in this way overcome and prevent negative attitudes to and stereotyping of difference that cause barriers to learning.

1.3 Oralism versus manualism

My interaction with literature has indicated that for at least a century the education for deaf children has been polarised into two main camps, the oralist (those who rely on speech and speech reading for communication) and the manualists (those who sign). This manual/oral debate in deaf education has gone on for over 200 years and Sign Language has always been central to these debates.

Scholars argue that the language of deaf children became a contentious issue after the International Conference of the Deaf in Milan in 1880. Lane (1989) refers to this conference as:

‘the single most critical event in driving the languages of the deaf beneath the surface’ (p.9).

It is recorded that the best teachers for Deaf education in the world (164 all hearing) were in attendance and among them were strong proponents for both the oral and manual perspectives. Each camp argued for recognition and dominance as being superior. After much contention, the participants of the conference passed a resolution that Sign Language be banished in all areas in Deaf education and that the oral method be the preferred method of teaching. Speech over sign was affirmed as superior and this resulted in signing being banned in classrooms internationally. Hence it was not uncommon for children to have their hands slapped for signing. Thus literature points out that oralism as a bona fide method of teaching came into prominence at this conference.

Many issues and complexities emerge within these discourses. Oralism works on the premise that the effects of deafness can be reversed if deaf children are taught how to speak.

Those that promote the oral approach argue that deaf people do not live in exclusive deaf communities nor do they work in ‘deaf only’ places. In addition deaf adults inadvertently are surrounded by hearing people as the demands of daily living necessitates contact with deaf (who use signs) and hearing people. Thus it becomes necessary for deaf individuals to learn speech so that the barriers of communication between hearing and deaf people can be broken. From this perspective speech is viewed as the passport out of isolation and Sign Language is viewed as a barrier to the acquisition of speech and social development. Oralists postulate that speech enables deaf people to be normalised, integrated and assimilated within mainstream society as opposed to being adopted by Deaf culture through the use of Sign Language where they can be counterparts of hearing society without completely fitting in (Mathews, 2011, Akash, 2011, Smuts, 2002, Lane, 2002). Oralists advocate that the use of new technologies will make it easier to teach the deaf with less time and effort.

The manualists in response to the discourse of oralism argue that the oralists neglect the psychosocial development of Deaf persons, claiming that oralists spend too much time and
energy focusing on developing a child’s ability to speak and lip-read, while ignoring the child’s social and educational needs. They advocate that many children who became deaf at an early age would finish school with poor speaking and speech reading skills, have difficulty integrating with hearing society and have lower education levels (Ladd, 2003; Lane 1989, Akash, 2011, Mathews 2011). In addition when orally trained deaf people meet they experience difficulty in communicating with each other without Sign Language. Of critical importance is the fact that the oralist approach denies Deaf children with opportunities to acquire language naturally and access to the Deaf community and Deaf culture.

The argument over the legitimacy of Sign Language being a true language frequently emerges in debates. Many scholars argue that Sign Language exists as a mother tongue for persons with hearing loss (Stokoe, 2001; Penn & Regan, 1995). According to Stoke (2001), Sign Language meets all the criteria to be classified as a fully developed language. Malloy (2003) emphasises that Sign Language is a full language that has its own vocabulary, grammar, literature and poetry. Although there is no universal Sign Language, my experience and readings point out that Sign Language exists as mother languages for Deaf cultures and each country has its own national Sign Language (Ram, 2011). In South Africa, South African Sign Language (SASL) is the national language used by Deaf people.

Current research and debate confirm and collaborate the issues on the use of Sign Language and the oral approach to Deaf education. The modern development of the cochlear implant has now served to renew the historical debate of oralism versus Sign Language. More recently Baker (2011) asserts that oral deaf education integrates the earliest and most natural intervention, as well as the most current and inclusive education along with today’s sophisticated hearing technologies to enable children with a hearing loss to listen, learn and talk. China has the largest population of Deaf in the world, but is also one of the countries where Sign Language is most invisible. In fact Sign Language has virtually no recognition whatsoever in China. Literally hundreds of preschoolers use oral language programs which are established to offer intensive, spoken language training at an early age which will allow Deaf children to be competent to attend mainstream schools. The success rate in mainstreaming Deaf children is phenomenal, 95% of Deaf children are mainstreamed (Biggs, 2004; Ram, 2011).

The terms ‘mainstreaming’, ‘cochlear implants’ and ‘inclusive classrooms’, however, pose a triple threat to Sign Language and the debate continues as Sign Language proponents strongly oppose the oral approach.

My attendance to the International Educational Conference for the Deaf in Vancouver (2010) enabled me to interact directly with many experienced professionals of Deaf education. This conference was attended by educational stakeholders of the Deaf world-wide and deliberated issues which included the best teaching method for Deaf learners. Emphasis on the major technological advances of present times which enables accessibility to digital signal processing hearing aids and innovative classroom amplification systems pointed in the direction of the new auditory approach. However there were many professional who pointed out that Sign Language was beneficial for the overall academic performance of learners. Anderson (2010) argued that children who learn Sign Language at an early age often score higher on standardized tests,
measure higher on tests of IQ and outperform their peers in a variety of social and academic arenas. After much deliberation on both methods it was suggested that the primary goal of all educators should be to increase the literacy level of D/deaf learners to an extent that their overall academic performance improves. To this end it was maintained that language and method of teaching was an individual choice and that no method is superior to the other, hence an eclectic approach was promoted. This impacted directly on my attitudes towards my instructional leadership in terms of language.

This study of literature and exposure to Deaf culture changed my perspective of how the D/deaf learn and pointed that while the debate between manualism/ oralism may seem a linguistic or pedagogical one, it goes far beyond the reaches of language and education to incorporate the social, economic and political. I gained deeper understandings of deafness and its impact on the education of the D/deaf. Initially I only understood and accepted the perspective of Sign Language but my interaction and exposure with literature pointed me in the direction of a mixed approach and I recognized the need for Sign Language as well as oralism in D/deaf education. Consequently, I adopted a very balanced view and was able to see the merits of both views and started to realize that both ideologies could be used effectively. However my dilemma was how was I going to achieve this balance when the proponents of each method were so opposed to the beliefs of the opposition? How would the Deaf community of Hilltop school view my neutrality? Would I be able to face the adversity of organizations that promoted the exclusive use of Sign Language? Would the more experienced educators be willing to try a different method? How is language related to Deaf culture? Further readings were pointing me in the direction of total communication and the bilingual/bicultural approach.

1.4 Total Communication

My interrogation of literature and research pointed out that in order to address the failings of oralism a new philosophy was introduced in the 1970s (Lynas, 1994). Total communication was a philosophy used to promote the right of the D/deaf child to use all forms of communication available to develop language competence. Essentially it is an eclectic approach that borrows techniques from a variety of methods, signing, speech, mime, pictures, lip reading and writing and encourages the simultaneous use of Sign Language, speech and audition. The method of communication chosen ideally depends on the need of the learners and the situation and it is believed that access to all channels of communication will facilitate the use of all sensory mechanisms to develop language and acquire a means of communication. It is however important to note that although signing is used in this method it is not Sign Language. The signs of this method follow the language structure of the spoken word, for example, if the spoken language is English, signs following the English word order, which is used simultaneously with spoken English. Therefore total communication uses spoken language supported by signs. This differs from Sign Language which has its own vocabulary, grammar, literature and poetry as discussed previously in this chapter (Malloy, 2003).

Proponents for the philosophy of total communication argue that not only can it provide a safety net for learners who have difficulty following the oral methods; it also creates opportunities for
learners to have some form of expressive communication (Smuts, 2002; Sloik, Taylor & Bednarezyk, 1992, Svartholm, 2010). Inspite of these benefits there has been widespread criticism regarding this technique as scholars argue that using 2 languages simultaneously can be psychologically and physically overwhelming for both teachers and learners even though the proper form of Sign Language is not used. Deaf learners lag behind their hearing peers as they experience problems in their language skills, particularly in reading, writing, vocabulary and abstract concepts. It is also reported that Total Communication can result in boredom, since learners receive limited amounts of knowledge as teachers take a long time to communicate with both speech and signs. One of the consequences of Total Communication is that the D/deaf learner is unable to communicate with both the Deaf and the hearing adequately. However while Total communication is believed to improve to improve the general communication skills between hearing teachers and Deaf learners and act as a means of facilitating the learning process, it is argued that it does not result in the full development of Sign Language or the improvement of spoken /written skills (Smuts, 2002; Komesaroff, 1996; Storbeck, 2000).

1.5 The Bilingualism – Biculturalism approach.

My readings and interaction with literature pointed out that internationally the bilingual – bicultural approach is cited as the best practice in the education of D/deaf learners. This approach is borne out of the failure of the Auditory/ Total Communication approaches to address the linguistic and cultural needs of D/deaf learners. In 1993 the World Federation of the Deaf called for the introduction of Bilingual/ Bicultural education into schools for the Deaf, for native languages to be recognised and used as the first languages for D/deaf children and for second languages to be taught through reading and writing. Cummins (1986) however acknowledged that bilingual education for D/deaf learners is controversial and complex because he maintains that it is bound with issues of culture, identity, linguistic rights and the marginalisation of Sign Languages (Cummins, 1986).

This new method recognises the use of Sign Language of the Deaf community as well as the importance of written/spoken language the hearing community. The primary medium of instruction is Sign Language and through Sign Language learners are introduced to literacy in the written word (English – second language). Thus the first language is Sign Language (L1) and the second language is written English (L2). Hence it is termed bilingual. It becomes bicultural because through the use of both language learners are exposed to 2 cultures, the Deaf and hearing cultures. It is contended that if D/deaf learners are educated to adapt and interact with both the Deaf and hearing communities they will become bicultural (UNESCO, 1999).

The primary goal of the bilingual –bicultural approach was to educate children in a natural Sign Language that is fully accessible without amplification or specific intervention. The premise is that this access would provide the basis of age appropriate language and cognition. This in turn would support the transition to text based literacy in the majority spoken language. The underlying factor was that literacy could be developed through reading and writing without exposure or proficiency in the spoken form of English. This is very significant based on the
notion that the focus of this approach is to improve educational outcomes of the D/deaf especially in the areas of language and literacy.

Empirical studies indicate that higher levels of reading fluency and overall academic achievement can be achieved through the Bilingual /Bicultural approach (Marivate, 1993; Heugh, 2002; Deumert, 2000; Biggs, 2004). However the lack of sufficient Deaf teachers as well as teachers who are adequately trained in Sign Language presents a threat to the success of the Bilingual/Bicultural model. It is for this reason that it becomes imperative that all teachers that use this approach are not only skilled in Sign Language but have a good understanding of second language acquisition. Scholars argue that knowledge of language acquisition theories is extremely useful for teachers of the D/deaf as it directly influences their ability to provide appropriate content area instruction to learners and this knowledge can improve the ability of teachers to serve culturally and linguistically diverse learners (Benedict & Legg, 2011; Nover, 2004; Valentine & Skelton, 2007).

Current theories of second language acquisition are based on years of research and one concept endorsed by most current theorists is that of a continuum of learning. This continuum of learning refers to the progress of a learner from no knowledge of the new language to a level of competency in the new language. Basically the stages are identified as, the silent/receptive stage, the early /productive stage, the speech emergence stage, the intermediate language proficiency age and the advanced language proficiency stage.

I do not intend to go into great depth on second language acquisition but will reiterate that in reviewing the Bilingual –Bicultural model as a suggested teaching and learning model for D/deaf learners it is necessary to have a broad understanding of research findings regarding the acquisition of both a first and second language amongst hearing people. In this regard I briefly discuss two theories, that is, Krashen’s Affective Filter Hypothesis (1981) and Cummin’s Linguistic Interdependence Model (1986).

Krashen’s Affective Filter Hypothesis suggests that an individual’s emotions can directly assist or interfere in the learning of a new language (second language). Krashen proposes that learning a new language is accompanied by anxiety, embarrassment or anger since the new language requires public practice. These feelings then result in the formation of a filter which acts to block the learner’s ability to process new or difficult words. This knowledge can assist teachers to provide classrooms that are non-threatening and affirming of a child’s native language and cultural heritage. This in turn can have a direct effect on the learner’s ability to learn by increasing motivation and encouraging risk taking.

Cumming’s (1986) theory of Linguistic Interdependence Theory proposes that a language user has an underlying set of cognitive and language abilities that are similar to the base of an iceberg. The surface features of a language are similar to the caps of an iceberg. Hence it is reasoned that a person who has 2 languages will have 2 icecaps with a common underlying base. The implication of this theory is that it will be easier for a person to acquire a second language if he/she has a language base. In this regard it becomes imperative for D/deaf learners to be given a solid language base (Sign Language) before the second language (written English) is introduced. It also becomes necessary that since their first language (Sign Language) has no written form, it is
vital that they are exposed to the culture of the spoken language that they are learning (Valentine & Skelton, 2007). There is an urgent need for D/deaf to have exposure to positive language and culture role models from both the Deaf and hearing communities and be enculturated into the cultural/social world of both the Deaf and the hearing (Bicultural). This ensures a good language base for D/deaf learners.

Thus a committed teacher with a clear understanding of language acquisition can make all the difference in achieving the goals of the Bilingual/Bicultural approach in Deaf education which is to enable D/deaf learners to become linguistically competent, provide them with a wider curriculum, facilitate good literacy skills and provide D/deaf learners with a positive sense of their own identity. I believe that it is important to acknowledge that the success of any educational approach is ultimately situated in learner achievement.

1.6 Analysis of language issues in South Africa

As discussed earlier, the study of language issues for the Deaf has been a debated topic internationally in past years. However in recent years there has also been a focus on linguistic human rights. In South Africa the issue of education, language and culture in terms of individual human rights has taken precedence in government as a result of the controversial political and educational policies of the past. The field of language and the non-implementation of language policies for the Deaf has become a political, social and economic debate.

Political dynamics in South Africa have involved the marginalisation of African indigenous languages. Historically English and Afrikaans were considered the main languages within the Republic as a result of successive political transitions. The privileged status of English and Afrikaans simultaneously diminished the status of indigenous languages. It can be argued that the status of Sign Language is entangled in this political debate as Sign Language is considered the language of a marginalised minority (Deaf). Scholars argue that Sign Language is further marginalised by being neglected at the expense of indigenous languages (Aarons & Akash, 2002, Tang 2006; Aarons & Reynolds, 2003). Tang, 2006, refers to this as linguistic imperialism and defines linguistic imperialism as any ‘situation in which the speaker of one language is dominated by another language to a point that they believe they can and should only use the foreign language when it comes to transactions dealing with the more advanced aspects of life such as education, literature, government’ (p, 5).

One can argue that the oralist approach to the learning of Sign Language and the using of manual language as a medium of instruction is a clear manifestation of linguistic imperialism because the system of Sign Language used previously had no grammar. Akash (2010) proposes that the 2 controversial methods of teaching the Deaf can be viewed as the beginning of linguistic oppression. He emphasises that on the one hand the Deaf were expected to oralise Sign Language so that they could use language the same way as the hearing population and on the other hand when Sign Language was eventually accepted, it was modified to suit the grammar of the dominant language.
Following the establishment of a democratic government in 1994, the constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 2000 of 1993 and the constitution of the Republic of South African Act no 108 of 1996, identified a total of 11 official languages. In South Africa, South African Sign Language (SASL) is the recognised language of the Deaf and although it is singled out in the 1996 constitution as deserving promotion and development by the Pan South African Language Board and it is recognised as a language of education by the South African Schools Act84 of 1996, Sign Language still suffers marginalisation as it is not considered one of the eleven official languages. Despite this legal framework, there are serious negative implications for the language policies in Deaf education and the arbitrary imposition of particular language policies with schools be it sign or spoken do not really address the underlying issues.

In many ways, South Africa has followed world trends towards a generalised shift away from viewing disabilities as inherently personal obstacles towards one which examines the role of physical, social economic or political environments in creating disabilities. This dominance has been played out in schools for the Deaf. In most countries ninety to ninety five per cent of Deaf learners are in mainstream settings. However in South Africa the reverse occurs as ninety to ninety five per cent of Deaf students are not mainstreamed but are in residential schools for the Deaf. Hence Sign Language and Deaf culture is entrenched and enforced. Although the lack of a clearly defined national language policy for the Deaf has resulted in an effective use of unscientifically based English manual signs as the most dominant artificial and unnatural language systems in Deaf education, the promotion of Deaf culture has ensured that SASL is promoted as the official language of the Deaf.

The Deaf Federation of South Africa (DEAFSA) is a national organisation whose chief role is to promote and protect the status of SASL in provincial Deaf structures and all other stakeholders in ways that will maintain SASL as the official language used by Deaf people in South Africa. In this way they act as caretakers of Deaf culture ensuring the exclusive use of SASL in all Deaf schools. To this end they lobby with government requesting for the recognition of Sign Language as an official language (DEAFSA, 2009, 2011). Reports from DEAFSA and empirical studies confirm that the Department of Education does not recognise Sign Language as a language subject in the curriculum in Deaf schools. As a result of this learners are unable to learn their first language at school. In addition results reveal that: teachers at Deaf schools do not know whether they are using SASL or something else but call it SASL, when a Deaf learner reaches High school, many still have difficulty with language acquisition, new teachers entering schools are taught SASL by learners (learner becomes teacher), due to the language delays in learners and the basic signing skills of teachers, completion of the curriculum becomes a challenge.

Against this backdrop I discuss the language policies and curriculum practices at Hilltop school, as well as the collaborative changes with its inherent tensions, struggles and tensions.
APPENDIX 3: CV — L. NAIDOO

KWAZULU-NATAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE
CURRICULUM VITAE
FOR PROMOTION POSTS

ALL INFORMATION MUST BE REFLECTED ON THIS FORM ONLY
COMPLETE THIS FORM LEGIBLY IN YOUR OWN HANDWRITING
UNSIGN ED/INCOMPLETE CVS WILL BE REJECTED.

1. Name: L. NAIDOO
   2. Pers No.: 105786161
3. Qualification: B.A/ED Dip(3rd) SPED
   4. Req: NG
5. Gender: FEMALE
   6. Present Post Held: EDUCATOR
7. Current years of continuous Teaching Service as at 30/6/99: 15 YRS
   8. Aggregate Service: 15 YRS

1. LEADERSHIP; ADMINISTRATIVE, MANAGEMENT AND RELATED EXPERIENCE

   FUNCTIONED EFFECTIVELY IN MANY LEADERSHIP POSITIONS: CO-ORDINATOR
   OF THE VARIOUS SUB-COMMITTEES AT SCHOOL RESPONSIBLE FOR GOAL ACHIEVEMENT
   AND OVERALL FUNCTIONING. CHAIRPERSON OF STAFF DEV. TEAM FOR APPRAISAL,
   ASSISTANT RESPONSIBLE FOR APPRAISAL OF ALL EDUCATORS AT SCHOOL AND SMOOTH ADMINISTRATION
   OF APPRAISAL TEAM. CHAIRPERSON OF PUPIL WELFARE COMMITTEE (1998-1999). SECURED
   SPONSORSHIP OF FOOD AND CLOTHING AS AN ONGOING BASE. PROVIDE A SYSTEM
   OF LIAISON BETWEEN EMPLOYER PARENTS AND EDUCATORS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION
   OF WORK EXPERIENCE FOR LEARNERS. HAS ENJOYED HIGH SUCCESS RATE FOR
   JOB PLACEMENT. ELECTED TEACHER REP FOR EDUCATION CRISIS COMMITTEE (1997)
   ELECTED TEACHER REP (1997-1999) FOR CONFLICT RESOLUTION BETWEEN STAFF
   MANAGEMENT AND DEPARTMENT; ELECTED SECRETARY, SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY (1998)
   INVOLVED IN BUDGETING AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES; EFFECTIVE MEMBER OF
   SCHOOL TIMETABLE AND EXAMINATION SUB-COMMITTEE.

2. ORGANISATIONAL ABILITY AND EXPERIENCE

   EXERCISED ENTHUSIASM AND ORIGINALITY AND PROVED EFFICIENCY IN
   ORGANIZING THE PTO EVENTS - CHAIRPERSON OF ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE.
   PROVIDED PROGRAMME FOR 180 NEW PUPILS. MARCH 1998. CHAIR ORGANIZER NETBALL
   TOURNAMENT. PROVINCIAL LEVEL (1998-1999) WITH SKILL AND THROUGH FINANCIAL
   SPONSORSHIP. TWO FIELD BASED OVERNIGHT ED PROGRAMME ORGANIZED FOR
   LEARNERS; DINNER AND DANCE (1998). LARGEST AMT RAISED FOR SCHOOL RECO

3. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT/EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE AND INSIGHT

3.1 What contributions have you made towards preparing your colleagues/learners and/or
parents to meet the challenges of transformation?
   ORGANIZED SOCIAL ACTION WORKSHOP (COMMUNITY) WORKSHOP WITH LEARNERS.
   OVERCOMING BARRIERS
   PROVIDED COUNSELLING FOR EDUCATORS REGARDING RACE AND RELATIONSHIP(2)
3.2 What have you done to promote COLTS?
ESTABLISHED A PERMANENT HEALTH UNIT WITH CHILITCE FOR AIDS AND LIFE SKILLS.
ORGANIZED 2 VISITS BY DANACO/FH/300/SUBSTANCE ABUSE CONFERENCE AND PREPARED AGC.

3.3 Complete the table below in respect of your educational involvement over the last five years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>VENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Semiinars/Conferences/Workshops you organised</td>
<td>APRIL WAREHOUSE</td>
<td>24/07/98</td>
<td>DAIMOROZA SEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>ORIENTATION WORKSHOP</td>
<td>01/09/99</td>
<td>DAIMOROZA SEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>LEADERSHIP COURSE, RUN BY NPC</td>
<td>13-17/06/99</td>
<td>LA PRECTORITE HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>O.B.E - RUN BY FRANK BERNARD</td>
<td>14/09/99</td>
<td>DURBAN COUNTRY CLUB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. LEADERSHIP: COMMUNITY RELATED

4.1 Give two activities in which you involved parents/community/agencies outside your own school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>VENUE</th>
<th>NATURE OF ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/03/98</td>
<td>DAMOROZA SEC</td>
<td>RAN A PROGRAMME FOR SIZE CONSIDERATION FOR ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/10/98</td>
<td>ST AUGUSTINE CHURCH</td>
<td>RAN A WORKSHOP WITH PARENTS/PEER EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Name one position of leadership you hold in the community.
ELECTED REPRESENTATIVE OF CONSEGDORR FORUM |

4.3 Indicate at least one project/activity initiated and successfully completed by you as the team leader. Make reference to dates, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/05/95</td>
<td>CHALLENGE WINDING REEFS</td>
<td>WAS FACILITATOR TO MOSTLY RURAL WOMEN IN S. COAST REGION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/08/95</td>
<td>S.A. GYMNASTICS COMPETITION AND DANCE PROJECT.</td>
<td>REACHED 50 SCOUTS AND SUCCEEDED WITH MAINSTREAM, REITON AND REGIONAL. 20 SCOUTS PARTICIPATED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. REFERRERS

Indicate names and details of TWO persons, other than educator colleagues, who could substantiate information provided in this CV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TELEPHONE NO./CONTACT NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAS ISAAC</td>
<td>45030163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RITA SOLEMAN</td>
<td>7094793/309305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I hereby certify that the information supplied is correct and I undertake to furnish any original document on request.

[Signature of Applicant] 12/10/99
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JOB DESCRIPTION OF DEPUTY PRINCIPAL

1. Personnel – DRIVERS
   Duties :
   - Leave taking supervision(sick/annual)
   - Roster for weekend relief / emergency
   - Maintenance of school vehicles (services, repairs, licensing)
   - Trips and route planning
   - Log books checking in all vehicles.

2. Personnel – GROUNDSMEN
   Duties :
   - Leave taking supervision(sick/annual)
   - Maintenance of equipment and machinery as well as servicing.
   - Supervision of cleanliness of the entire school premises

3. Personnel – Kitchen Staff
   Duties :
   - Ordering of groceries for the school kitchen
   - Drawing up of roster for the staff.
   - Menu formulating and supervision.
   - Cleanliness of the kitchen
   - Maintenance of kitchen equipment and utensils

4. Personnel – SECURITY GUARDS
   Duties :
   - Drawing up of roster (shifts)
   - Leave taking
   - Safety and security of the school supervision
   - Liaising with SAPS locally

5. Personnel – NURSE
   Duties :
   - Transportation of sick learners to the clinic/hospital
• Purchasing of medication as well as clinic equipment.
• Communicate with the school nurse on daily basis
• Leave taking

6. Personnel -- CLEANER
   Duties :
   • Supervision, distribution of cleaning detergent, toilet papers.
   • Buying of cleaning equipment from wholesalers.
   • Supervision of leave taking by cleaners.

7. Personnel -- GENERAL ASSISTANT
   Duties :
   • Leave taking for G A
   • Buying of tools and equipment for the G A
   • Drawing up of duties and roster to be followed weekly
   • Maintenance of buildings, sewerage, pipes, electricity, etc
   • Liasing with big companies regarding big maintenance jobs required in school as well as renovations and buildings.
APPENDIX 5: CREDIT OUTLINE FOR NQF PROGRAMME

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF**  
**NASIONALE INSTITUUT VIR DOWES**  
**OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING**  
**NID-COLLEGE**

---

**HOSPITALITY - FOOD PREPARATION & COOKING**

**KITCHEN ASSISTANT**  
*(HSP/KchCln2/0021)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAQA ID</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>INFO</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>CREDIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7793</td>
<td>Describe layout, services and facilities of the organisation</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7796</td>
<td>Maintain a secure working environment</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7799</td>
<td>Maintain a safe working environment</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800</td>
<td>Maintain health, hygiene and professional appearance</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7707</td>
<td>Clean cutting equipment</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7717</td>
<td>Handle and maintain utensils and equipment</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7748</td>
<td>Handle and store food</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7749</td>
<td>Clean food production areas and equipment</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7751</td>
<td>Clean and store crockery and cutlery</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7608</td>
<td>Handle and store cleaning equipment and materials</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7612</td>
<td>Handle and dispose of waste</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL OF CREDITS:** 17

**TOTAL CREDITS FOR BOTH PROGRAMMES:** 35
### HOSPITALITY - FOOD PREPARATION & COOKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAQA ID</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>INFO</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>CREDIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7793</td>
<td>Describe layout, services and facilities of the organisation</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7796</td>
<td>Maintain a secure working environment</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7799</td>
<td>Maintain a safe working environment</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800</td>
<td>Maintain health, hygiene and professional appearance</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7637</td>
<td>Maintain hygiene in food preparation, cooking &amp; storage areas</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7705</td>
<td>Handle and maintain knives</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7659</td>
<td>Prepare fruit for hot and cold dishes</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7660</td>
<td>Prepare vegetables for hot and cold dishes</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7661</td>
<td>Prepare cold and hot sandwiches &amp; rolls</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7664</td>
<td>Prepare and fry food</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7665</td>
<td>Prepare and grill food</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7697</td>
<td>Prepare and bake food</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7701</td>
<td>Prepare and boil, poach or steam foods</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL OF CREDITS:** 18
LETTER OF CONSENT

Study: An autoethnographic glance at the person in the principal’s office

Dear [Name],

Thank you for listening to the outline of my research study for the completion of a doctoral thesis. The following information is provided to you to decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that participation is completely voluntary and therefore you are free to decide not to participate.

The focus of my study is the person in the principal’s office through an auto-ethnography. I believe, firstly, my study has the potential to generate knowledge that will inform change and transformation in my practice as a school leader.

Secondly, it will explore particular complexities of educational leadership in a school for the Deaf, thereby contributing to the fields of disability studies and education for the Deaf.

Thirdly, it will contribute to studies in research methodology through its use of autoethnography as a form of enquiry. This study will provide insights into the complex world of the school principal operating within the context of Deaf education.

My aim in this autoethnographic study is to open my living textbook and to recollect, share and theorise my life experiences as the school principal of [Name of School]. More importantly, my aim is to make meanings of my past experiences as a leader and reach a deeper understanding of myself within a highly complex socio-cultural context.

In order to achieve this, I will need you to share your experiences of what you think are my leadership practices and how you experience them. This will be beneficial in my understanding of myself. To this end, I will have unstructured interviews with you and will be required to record and recall some of your experiences with me.

Do not hesitate to ask any questions about the study either before participating or during the time that you are participating. I will be happy to share the findings with you after the research is completed. However, your name will not be associated with the research findings in any way, and your identity as a participant will be known only to the researcher.
There are no known risks and/or discomforts associated with this study. The expected benefits associated with your participation are the information about the experiences of teaching children with autism. Please sign your consent with full knowledge of the nature and purpose of the procedures. A copy of this consent form will be given to you to keep.

Sincerely

__________________________
Mrs L Naidoo
Tel: 083 6034544
Email: mavis@mweb.co.za

__________________________
Professor A. Muthukrishna
Tel: 084 2459096
email: muthukr@ukzn.ac.za

CONSENT FORM
I understand the nature and purpose of the study. I also understand that I have an opportunity to withdraw from the study at any time, and that information I provide will be treated confidentially and will not be disclosed for other purposes other than the study. I therefore give my consent to participate.

Name: __________________________ Date ____________

Signature of Participant ______________________
APPENDIX 7: UKZN CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE

Research Office, Govan Mbeki Centre
Westville Campus
Private Bag x54001
DURBAN, 4000
Tel No: +27 31 260 8350
Fax No: +27 31 260 4609
sinymann@ukzn.ac.za

30 September 2011

Mrs L Naidoo (9042365)
School of Education

Dear Mrs Naidoo

PROTOCOL REFERENCE NUMBER: HSS/0930/011D
PROJECT TITLE: An ethnographic glance of the person in the principal’s office

In response to your application dated 19 September 2011, the Humanities & Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee has considered the aforementioned application and the protocol has 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 school/department for a period of 5 years.

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

Yours faithfully

Professor Steven Collings (Chair)
HUMANITIES & SOCIAL SCIENCES RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

cc. Supervisor – Prof N Muthukrishna
cc. Mrs S Naicker

100 YEARS OF ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

Founding Campuses:  Edgewood  Howard College  Medical School  Pietermaritzburg  Wathsville

371
APPENDIX 8: PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH: KZN EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Enquiries: Sibusiso Alwar
Tel: 033 341 8610
Ref.: 214/8/103

Mrs L Naidoo
30 Klooflands Road
Kloof
3610

Dear Mrs Naidoo

PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN THE KZN DoE INSTITUTIONS

Your application to conduct research entitled: An Autoethnographic Glance of the Person in the Principal’s Office, 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 01 September 2011 to 31 September 2012.
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 or dissertation or 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 the following Schools and Institutions:

[Signatures]

Nkosinathi SP Sibihi, PhD
Head of Department: Education

Date

KWAZULU-NATAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
POSTAL: Private Bag X9137, Pietermaritzburg, 3200, KwaZulu-Natal, Republic of South Africa
PHYSICAL: Office 0.25, 188 Pietermaritzburg Building, Pietermaritzburg, 3201
TEL: Tel: +27 33 341 8610/11 | FAX: +27 33 341 8612 | email: sibusiso.alwar@kzn.deed.gov.za
APPENDIX 9: PERMISSION FROM SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY

30 Klooflands Road
Kloof
3610

The School Governing Body

Permission to Conduct Research

Sir,

Please be informed that I am studying towards a PHD degree through the University of Natal. My research Topic is ‘An Autoethnographic Glance of the person in the Principal’s office.’. The purpose of my study is to study myself and in particular my leadership practices as a principal of a deaf school to reach a deeper understanding of myself and the complexities of managing a deaf school.

In this regard I am asking permission to conduct this study at [redacted]. At no time will the school, learners, staff or SGB be compromised or jeopardized. The highest degree of confidentiality will be maintained at all times.

Please feel free to discuss any concerns you might have regarding my research.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]
L. Naidoo

We the members of the School Governing Body (grant / do not grant), Mrs L. Naidoo permission to conduct research at the school.

[Signature]
Mh. Methetwa
Chairperson SGB
10/09/2011.
APPENDIX 10: EDITOR’S CERTIFICATE

PEN AND PIXEL (PTY) LTD
P.O. Box 100715
Scottsville, 3209
Tel: 071 540 8827
Email: debbie@penandpixel.co.za

Date: 25 November 2013

Confirmation of editing

I hereby confirm that I have edited the following thesis for errors in language and general layout:

Title: An Autoethnographic Study of the Person in the Principal’s Office
Candidate: Lingesperi Naidoo, School of Education, University of KwaZulu-Natal

Debbie Turrell
Pen and Pixel (Pty) Ltd
APPENDIX 11: TURNITIN REPORT