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EDUCATORS' EXPERIENCES OF THE TRAINING FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF SCREENING, IDENTIFICATION, ASSESSMENT
AND SUPPORT STRATEGY AT A
FULL-SERVICE SCHOOL.
ABSTRACT

The purpose of the research was to explore the experiences of educators regarding the training for the implementation of inclusive education in a Full Service school. A qualitative research design was chosen, using a case study. Three methods of gathering data were used, namely individual interviews, focus group interviews and observations. The study was conducted in a primary schools in the North West province that was converted into a full-service school in 2008. The findings indicated that educators demonstrated misunderstanding of the Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support strategy. The misunderstanding can be ascribed to the kind of training educators received. The training lacked in-depth content and practical demonstration. Recommendations on the content and the dynamics of the training process are made. The overarching recommendation on the dynamics of the training indicated that the training should be revisited for improved methods of training.
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ABSTRAK

Die doel van die navorsing was om die ervarings van onderwysers te ondersoek rakende opleiding vir die implementering van inklusiewe onderwys in 'n Voldiens Skool. 'n Kwalitatiewe navorsingontwerp is gekies en 'n gevallestudie is gebruik. Drie metodes is gebruik om data in te samel, nl. Individuele onderhoude, fokusgroeponderhoude en observasies. Die studie is uitgevoer in 'n primere skool in die Noordwes-Provinsie. Bevindinge het aangedui dat opvoeders 'n beperkte begrip toon van Sifting, Identifisering, Assessering en Ondersteuningstrategieë. Hierdie beperkte begrip kan toegeskryf word aan die aard van die opleiding wat die opvoeders ontvang het. Hierdie opleiding het ontbreek aan in-diepte inhoud en praktiese demonstrasie. Aanbevelings word gemaak rakende die inhoud en dinamika van die opleidingsproses. Die oorkoepelende aanbeveling oor die dinamika van die opleiding dui daarop dat die opleiding hersien/herhaal behoort te word ten einde van beter opleidingsmetodiek gebruik te maak.

Sleutelwoorde : inklusiewe onderwys, menslike hulpbronontwikkeling, SIAS proses, Voldienskole
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CHAPTER 1
ORIENTATION AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

1.1 Introduction

Educators play a key role in the inclusion of learners who experience barriers to learning. It is argued that the success of inclusion lies with the teachers, hence their attitudes are crucial to the success of inclusion, and their acceptance of inclusion as future educational trajectory is paramount. Yet educators seem to experience the inclusion of learners with barriers to learning as stressful since they often do not feel equipped for the task (Swart, Engelbrecht, Eloff & Pettipher 2002). The training of educators therefore is inevitably part of the implementation of an inclusive education system. The question is whether the training of educators facilitates the effective implementation of inclusive education? The intention of this study is to explore this question within the context of a full service school in South Africa.

1.2 Statement of the problem.

The transformation of special needs education across the globe is informed by the progressive movement on social justice and respect for human dignity. The movement is premised on practical and visible social integration of people with disabilities. Social integration not only focuses on including people with disabilities on a social level but also on economic, political and educational levels (Guzman, 1997; Frederickson & Cline 2003; South Africa 1996). Inclusion of learners with special educational needs in the mainstream education has consequently been advocated, and the advocacy for inclusion of people on all levels has seen the development of policies and legislative framework on a progressive basis. Some examples are:

- the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN, 1959);
- the Convention Against Discrimination in Education (UN, 1960);

Eventually, over 300 participants representing 92 governments and 25 international organizations committed themselves to the provision of inclusive education (Salamanca
South Africa was one of these countries. Yet, despite the commitment to embrace inclusion, the political contexts in South Africa did not allow for further development. It was only after 1994, with the advent of democracy, that South Africa became part of this advocacy on inclusive education (Engelbrecht, Oswald, Swart & Eloff 2003; Lomosfsky & Lazarus, 2001) and thus furthered the inclusion of all learners in an education system.

The milestone in the development of inclusive education in South Africa has been the appointment of the National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training (DoE, 1995) and the National Committee on Education Support Services (DoE, 1996) to investigate and make recommendations on all aspects of special needs and support services in education and training. The investigation heralded the development of the policy on building an inclusive education and training system in the form of Education White Paper 6: Special Needs Education (DoE, 2001). It is important to note that since its inception and throughout the investigation, one important recommendation has repeatedly taken centre stage, and that is the imperative to develop the role of human resources in the roll-out of inclusive education (NCSNET/NCESS, 1997; DoE, 1999).

In view of the focus on human resource development, the training of educators for the implementation of inclusive education has been foregrounded since 2001. The training initiatives included the SCOPE, The South African – Finnish Co-operation Programme in Education Sector (Vayrynen, 2003) and DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION/ DANIDA PROJECT entitled: Resource and Training Programme for Educator Development: Building an Inclusive Education and Training System (DoE, 2002b). Both training initiatives addressed certain issues but were criticized for not providing more practical guidance and more resource materials. As a result teachers struggled to cope with the extra demands on their roles as educators.

The implementation strategy of EWP6, in the form of the management plan, once again prioritized human resource development (DoE, 2005b). The educators’ preparedness and their plight in addressing possible challenges facing them with the implementation of the White Paper 6 were clearly stated. Based on the recommendation, the Sisonke Consortium developed the roll-out plan for the implementation of WP6. The plan will unfold with human resource development taking the form of educator training on screening, identification, assessment and support (DoE, 2005b) and the development of inclusive learning programmes (DoE, 2005d). The intention of the training was to address the disturbing lack of skills in identifying the needs of the learners and within the system, and evaluating support effectiveness (Swart et al 2002). In line with the implementation strategy a number of training workshops have been held for the educators and staff members involved with the
Full-Service Schools and special schools as resource centres. The training is currently continuing at provincial level and is also prevalent at the schools. The training currently continues at the levels of the province and schools. The training for screening, identification, assessment and support involved the use of transparencies that outlined the concepts and processes associated with the SIAS strategy (DoE, 2008b). Screening, identification, assessment and support were defined with reference to the SIAS documents (DoE, 2008b). These documents consist of a school pack, and Learner Profile. The Learner Profile in the SIAS process includes references to the vulnerability of the learner with diverse barriers. The school pack contains different forms required to be completed during the implementation of the strategy. These forms comprise a Diagnostic Profile, Support Needs Assessment Form (Section 1 and 2), Individual Support Plan (Section 3a), Assessment for Support Requirement (Section 3b), School Request Form for Additional Support, and Section 4, Action Plan for Additional Support Provision and Monitoring. The material explained the stages involved in the SIAS process with examples of different forms applicable to each stage. During the training, facilitators, with educators, scrutinized the different forms so as to ascertain what information was required for completion of the forms. The trainers explained how educators should complete the Learner Profile with particular attention to the indications of barriers to learning. Educators were alerted to the fact that whenever they detect barriers to learning, the Diagnostic Profile should be completed by a health professional, after which the ILST in consultation with the parent/caregiver will facilitate the completion of the Support Needs Assessment Form 1, Section 1. It implied that during the training particular attention was given to the ways in which educators, parents and ILST should communicate about the extrinsic as well as the intrinsic barriers (Landsberg et al 2005). The training provided clear guidelines for understanding the role of the DBSTs as they relate to the SIAS process, since the DBSTs facilitate the implementation of the SIAS process.

In view of the previous attempts at training educators, the question is whether the training sufficiently equipped educators to address the more severe barriers to learning experienced by learners in a full-service school. It seems important at this early stage of the roll-out plan to explore how educators experienced the training on SIAS strategy provided to them in order to inform the continuous evaluation of the implementation strategy and enhance teacher participation in the process.
1.3 Purpose of the study

In view of the above, the purpose of this study was to develop a clearer understanding of educators’ subjective experiences of their training for the inclusion of learners with barriers to learning in a Full-Service School.

The research question addressed in this study is: *How did educators experience the training for the implementation of Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support (SIAS) at a Full-Service School?*

In accordance with the above research question, the aim of the research was to explore educators’ experiences regarding the training for the implementation of SIAS strategy in a Full-Service School. To achieve this aim a literature study and an empirical study were conducted.

1.3.1 Literature study

A literature study based on relevant international and national sources on inclusive education and learner support was done. The Internet and various search engines, such as EBSCOHOST, GOOGLE Scholar, SCIRUS were consulted. The following keywords were used: inclusive education, education support services, human resource development, advocacy, screening, identification, assessment and support and inclusive learning programmes.

1.3.2 Empirical study

Qualitative research, which is explorative, contextual and descriptive in nature, was used to make sense of the experiences of educators regarding the training for the implementation of the inclusive education in a Full-Service School.

1.4 Research design

In order to achieve the stated aim of the research, the design was qualitative and participatory in nature. Mills (2007) confirms that qualitative research allows the researcher to obtain authentic data drawn from the knowledge and perception of the people with whom the researcher is working. Draper (2004), Brinkmann and Kvale (2005) also support that qualitative methods are most adequate means of knowledge production when the object is
concrete human experience and are designed to describe and understand certain patterns of behaviour.

The case study methodology was selected for its detailed and intensive nature that allowed the educators’ experiences to be studied in a specific context (Smith & Eatough, 2007, cited in Magare, 2008). The qualitative research design thus enabled the researcher to gain a more in-depth understanding of the training as experienced by the educators.

1.4.1 Research methodology

The application of qualitative methodology offered the opportunity to uncover the nature of people’s actions, experiences and perspectives (Jonker, 2005).

1.4.1.1 Research context and participants

The study was conducted in the North-West province at a primary school, converted into a Full-Service School in line with the time frame of the implementation of inclusive education and training system as outlined in the EWP 6 (DoE, 2001). The school is situated in a semi-urban area. The school has over 400 learners aged between five-and-half and fourteen years old. The average class size is 40 learners per classroom.

The school predominantly enrolls African learners who come from poor socio-economic backgrounds. Many learners come from the lower income bracket of the community. Although a predominantly Setswana-oriented school, it also accommodates learners from other ethnic backgrounds including isiXhosa and Sesotho.

The participants in this study were the principal and twelve educators; two were male educators and eleven were female educators. Their ages varied from the mid-forties to the late fifties, with a mix of qualifications and experience. Older educators have diplomas with many years of experience in the teaching profession and younger educators have degrees and less experience.

Data gathering

The following data gathering methods were used in this study:

Interviews

The researcher explored the experiences of educators in their training for the implementation of inclusive education by conducting individual interviews with thirteen (13) educators. The
educators were carefully selected as a result of their involvement in the training of the fieldtesting project on the implementation of inclusive education, thus making them the focus of inquiry (Stein & Mankowski, 2004). Interviews took place at the school to ensure easy access to the participants for direct interaction between researcher and participants (Mphahlele, 2008). Stein and Mankowski (2004) state that this access to the participants presents the image of the researcher as advocate and also his direct, personal presence in the lives of those being researched. The researcher is thus enabled to have an immediate personal stake in a process, with intentions to advance knowledge and contribute to a greater social good.

Individual interviews were conducted to elicit responses presenting participants’ attitudes, feelings, beliefs and experiences and reactions. Participants’ attitudes, feelings, beliefs and experiences and reactions represent ‘voices’ which needed to be amplified, thus encouraging the disenfranchised to discover their voices and to be heard by those in power (Stein & Mankowski, 2004). In individual interviews, participants were only given approximately 20 to 30 minutes to respond to questions. They were, however, allowed sufficient leverage to speak their minds freely on their experiences of the implementation of EWP 6, from the position of their involvement in the field-testing project. The interviews were exploratory and unstructured with the use of open-ended questions. Examples of questions are:

**Question 1:** How did you experience the training offered to you in relation to Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support (SIAS)?

**Question 2:** How did you experience training offered to you in relation to the development of Inclusive Learning Programmes?

**Question 3:** If you were afforded an opportunity to change anything in the training, what would you suggest should be done differently?

**Focus groups**

Two focus group interviews with six educators in each focus group were conducted. Focus group interviews were conducted to elicit responses revealing participants’ attitudes, feelings, beliefs and experiences and reactions. Similar to individual interviews, focus group interview participants were given approximately 20 to 30 minutes to respond to questions, also allowing them leverage to speak their minds freely. Additional probing interview questions were guided by the participants’ responses throughout the interviews. However, no deviations were entertained from the questions prepared. The in-depth focus group interviews directed the researcher’s attention to a meaningful and narrower portion of the educators’ experiences (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001).
Data analysis

Thematic content analysis was applied to analyse the data. The researcher identified themes and sub-themes related to the experiences of educators in the implementation of inclusive education. In order to identify conceptual similarities and differences in the data obtained from the different sources, data and themes were compared constantly in accordance with the guidelines given by Henwood and Pidgeon (2004).

1.5 Trustworthiness

The following strategies were employed to ensure trustworthiness in this project:

**Triangulation:** Data were obtained from multiple data sources Leedy & Ormrod (2001), including educators and the principal, to represent various perspectives on the implementation of inclusive education. Multiple methods of data gathering were also applied, including individual interviews, focus groups interviews, field notes with observation as well as document analysis.

**Thick descriptions:** The data were reported in detail, so that readers can draw their own conclusions from the data presented.

**Member checking:** To ensure validity of the findings, the researcher presented the findings to a selected group of participants in the study in order to ascertain whether the findings corresponded with the participants’ data as provided during the interviews.

1.6 Ethical considerations

Since data gathering involved people as participants, it was incumbent upon the researcher to act according to the ethical requirements of the North-West University (2003). Research participants were thus informed about the nature of the study to be conducted, and were given the choice of either participating or withdrawing from participating (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). The participants’ responses are anonymous and treated confidentially. Feedback will be given to all parties involved in the research project.
1.7 Research process.

Permission to conduct the research in the specific school was obtained from the Dr Kenneth Kaunda District Office of the Department of Education in the North-West Province of South Africa. Interviews with selected participants were conducted. Data gathered from the interviews have been organised and integrated with the literature study. The findings will be disseminated in a research report.

1.8 Structure of the report

Chapter 1: Orientation and problem statement.


Chapter 3: Research design and methodology

Chapter 4: Report and discussion of findings

Chapter 5: Summary of findings and recommendations

1.9 Rationale of the research

The research project intended to contribute to the existing research on the training of educators towards the implementation of inclusive education, and in the process enhance the implementation of the Management Plan for the roll-out of Education White Paper 6 on Special Needs Education.

1.10 Key concepts

Inclusive education

An education system which accommodates learners with special learning needs in the mainstream education without discrimination (Dinkebogile, 2005).
**Human resource development**

Provision for retraining of personnel through on-going pre-service and in-service training with the aim of improving their skills and knowledge and developing new ones (Joubert-Serfontein, 2007).

**The Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support process**

The National Guidelines and Protocol Document that outlines the process of identifying, assessing and enrolling learners in special schools and outlines the roles of teachers, parents, managers and support staff within the framework of a completely new vision of how support should be organised (DoE, 2008b).

**Full- service schools**

A converted, designated primary school to become a full-service school in line with the lessons learnt from the pilot phase experiences (DoE, 2005a).
CHAPTER 2
THE EVOLUTION OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter an overview of the evolution of inclusive education from the early 1960s is presented. The overview serves as a backdrop for our understanding of the current developments regarding the implementation of inclusive education in South Africa. The overview is followed by a discussion of the movement towards inclusive education in South Africa that started in the aftermath of Apartheid and the beginning of a new democracy in 1994. This historical moment in our history coincided with the Salamanca Conference in Spain where the Education for All Declaration was signed by 92 countries (UNESCO, 1994). Finally, this chapter describes the development of teacher education and training in an inclusive education system in South Africa.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

The ecosystemic approach provides the conceptual framework for this study. This approach demonstrates how individual human beings and groups of people interact and are dependent of each other in an environment. According to Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana, 2007:35 “Its main concern is to show how individual people and groups at different levels of society are linked in dynamic, interdependent, interacting relationships”. Cooper and Upton (1990), define the eco-systemic approach as describing the interdependence of organisms in the natural world. They illustrate the fact that living things are dependent on one another for their ecological existence. The eco-systemic approach encompasses the combination of ecological theory and systems theory.

Ecological theory’s main characteristic relates to the interdependence between living things and their physical environment (Cooper and Upton, 1990). Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana (2007) emphasise that in an ecological approach one part is equally as important as another and the balance of the system can be threatened when a disturbance occur in one part of the system. In order to maintain the equilibrium in the system, human systems constantly adapt in order to minimize the destructive effects of change. In addition,
Engelbrecht (2001) stresses that everyday life brings about experiences from which individual people act. These experiences afford a better understanding of individual people’s physical environment. Ecological theoretical perspectives entail the interdependence between the educators and their environments. Lazarus (2007) supports that educators’ analysis of their relationship with their environment is important for the purpose of promoting the well-being of all persons in the society.

Systems theory describes relationships between human beings and the interactive groups of people in their social contexts (Swart and Pettipher, 2005). Systems theory espouses a view that human values, understanding and actions are influenced by the social context in which they occur (Engelbrecht, 1999). Cooper and Upton (1990), support that human behavior is limited by the social systems, resulting in perceived ineffectuality of individuals actions. This implies that because social systems shape human behavior in different ways, actions taken by individuals in that social context are seen to be exerting no apparent effect to the same social environment.

Swart and Pettipher (2005) argue that in the field of inclusive education the systems approach is useful for understanding classrooms and school as systems in themselves in interaction with the broader context. It provides understanding of classrooms and schools and the relationships within them, between them and their social context. Systems theory / systemic approach will provide a clearer understanding of relationship of a school with its different parts such as staff, students, curriculum and its administration (Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana 2007).

Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana (2007) drew from the Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model of child development which Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana (2007) say is quite specific and focused on the child development. Therefore Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana (2007) definition of ecosystemic approach offers a broader conceptual framework for this study. Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana (2007) ecosystemic approach relates directly with the school context in this study. The school is situated in an African suburb of a semi-urban town. Although a predominantly Setswana—orientated school, the school accommodates learners from other ethnic groups including isiXhosa and Sesotho. The language of teaching and learning is English. The school enrolls learners who come from predominantly poor socio-economic backgrounds. Many learners at the school come from lower income bracket of the community. They come from impoverished environment characterized by high unemployment in the majority of households. Participants in this study are educators working in the school. They include the School Management Team members and the Principal. Many educators reside in the neighbourhood and are directly or indirectly aware of the impoverished environment learners come from. Teachers’ understanding of their
physical environment is shaped by the prevailing social contexts and how these subsystems have shaped the social context. The school as a system has teachers, learners and parents as subsystems which interact with one another whilst shaping and limiting each other.

2.2.1 International developments in inclusive education

The development of separate systems of education for learners with disabilities has been challenged from a human rights perspective since the 1970's (Engelbrecht, Kitching & Nel, 2009). Developed countries largely contributed to the development of the principle of inclusion. Their contributions are evident in the promulgation of the US Public Law 94-142 and the Individuals with Disability Education Act. Three years later the Warnock Committee report (Department of Education and Science, 1978) and the Education Act set the pace for the development of inclusion policy in the United Kingdom. The implementation of the act resulted in the integration of as many children as possible regardless of their various disabilities, into regular schools (Stakes & Hornby, 1996).

Consequently many countries developed a legal framework to integrate people with disabilities into mainstream social, economic, cultural and education systems (Hubbard, 2005). Various documents which reflected international mobilisation on social justice and respect for human dignity emerged. Some of the most important documents include:

- the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Disabled Persons (UNESCO, 1975), which stresses the realization of the full participation of disabled persons in social life and development;
- the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (South Africa, 1997), revised South Africa (1999), which recognizes the inherent dignity and the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family as the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world;
- the United Nations Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Disabled Persons (1993), which assert that girls, women and men with disabilities, as members of their societies, may exercise the same rights and obligations as others;
- the Convention Against Discrimination in Education (United Nations, 1960), which advocates for promotion of equality of opportunities and treatment for all in education, and the World Conference on Education for All, which supports the provision of education for children, youth and adults with special educational needs within regular education systems.

A highlight of the greater international awareness created due to the development of these documents was the release of the Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994) in Spain. During this conference 92 government representatives and 25 international organizations who formed the World Conference on Special Needs Education, committed themselves to the provision of inclusive education to enhance Education for All. The fundamental principles that
guided the direction for the future policies for Education for All (UNESCO, 1990) include the expansion of early childhood care and education, the provision of free and compulsory primary education for all, the promotion of learning and life skills for young people, the increase of adult literacy, the achievement of gender parity by 2005 and gender equality by 2015, and the overall improvement of the quality of education. The principles are aimed at the provision of equal access to mainstream education for all learners irrespective of the kind of barriers they may be experiencing (Peters, 2003). The principles also assert that equal opportunities should be provided for all learners by acknowledging that learners have diverse needs which should be accommodated. Social integration, human rights and dignity are an integral part of the implementation of Education for All as stated in the Framework for Action (1994): “Inclusion and participation are essential to human dignity and to the enjoyment and exercise of human rights.” (Nind, Rix, Sheehy, & Simmons, 2003)

In April 2000, at the UNESCO World Education Forum in Dakar, Senegal, the declaration Education for All was adopted (UNESCO, 2000). UNESCO member states have been expected to give an account of how they intend to achieve these objectives by the year 2015. Rich and diverse sources of knowledge about current practices, issues and challenges faced by UNESCO member states are provided in their reports of progress towards achievement of the EFA goals. These reports, for example, include the Iceland Committee Report, Ministry of Education, Science and Culture (UNESCO, 2002), Report on the Progress Made Towards the Achievement of Education for All in Zimbabwe (Zimbabwe, 2008), Education for All: Achievement of the E-9 countries including EFA Global Monitoring Report (UNESCO, 2009), Education for All (2008), and the South African report entitled, Education for All (EFA), 2009 Country Report: South Africa (DoBE, 2010a). This last-mentioned report in particular indicates the progress made in South Africa in the achievement of the EFA fundamental goals. On goal number one, the expansion of early childhood care and education, South Africa reported to have, over the past five years, considerably expanded access to early childhood education for five to six year-olds, both male and female. On goal number two, provision of free and compulsory primary education for all, the report noted that South Africa has almost reached the goal of universal access to primary education for both male and female learners. On goal number three, promoting learning and life skills for young people and adults, South Africa is reported to have met the goal through access to learning and life skills. This goal is indicated to have been addressed through the work of many different government departments. It must be noted, however, that on every goal mentioned, the report indicated areas which pose challenges, including the development of an inclusive education system in South Africa.
2.3 The development of an inclusive education system in South Africa.

2.3.1 The previous dispensation

Whilst the international mobilisation of inclusion took place around the world, South Africa, like many developing countries, suffered the consequences of colonialisation as described in the ANC’s document on *Building a National Democratic Society* (2007). The document clearly indicates that “colonialism interrupted internally-driven advancement of indigenous South African communities along the ladder of human development.” Evidently the developments regarding inclusive education were noted (Fiske & Ladd, 2004), but could not be implemented due to the Apartheid regime’s policy. As a result of the discriminatory nature of these policies, all educational institutions were segregated along the lines of race and disability. White learners received preferential treatment whilst learners from other racial groupings received second-class treatment. The situation also applied to learners with special needs. Schools for White disabled learners were extremely well-resourced (Naicker, 2000), due to fiscal allocation done on the basis of race. Black disabled learners had limited access to schools. They were mainly excluded from the education system or accommodated in under-resourced facilities (DoE, 2001, Engelbrecht, 2006; Lomofsky & Lazarus, 2001).

Due to the segregation described above, two separate education systems in South Africa, viz. regular education and special education, developed (Naicker, 2000; Lomofsky & Lazarus, 2001). The special education system was evidently based on medical discourse and supported by the charity discourse. The medical discourse assumes that whatever is wrong lies within the individual learner and can be put right by specialist intervention. Hay (2003), describes it as patient-diagnosis-treatment sequence. The discourse was applied to diagnose and categorise learners and make decisions about their placement in either special classes or special schools (Rouse & Kang’ethe, 2003). Learners were classified according to their different categories of disabilities for placement in special schools as indicated in the table below. The guidelines on disability terminology and definitions are extracted from *A Pocket Guide On Disability Equity* (Disabled People of South Africa: 2004). The definitions and terminology of different disabilities used in the figure below, may vary from one source to the other. Whilst the researcher would want to remain in line with the current acceptable terminology as pronounced by disability groupings, definitions of the disabilities are not provided by DPSA: 2004. Definitions from other sources are applied to describe the disabilities as follow;
### TABLE 1  Definitions of disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Persons with intellectual disability | “Substantial limitations in present functioning, characterised by significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning”  
(AAMR; 1992, as quoted in Hamill & Everington, 2002)                                                                                         |
| Persons with blindness                | Children who cannot perceive light, cannot distinguish between light and darkness, but who have light perception, who perceive objects as vague images or outlines only either in motion or stationary,  
who are able to count fingers up to a distance of one metre from the eye or who, according to the Snellen Test, have a visual acuity of 1/60  
(Pauw, in Kapp, (ed.), (1994))                                                                                                               |
| Persons with deafness                 | “People who have severe hearing impairments.”  
(Storbeck, 2005).                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Persons with disability               | “Severe, chronic disability of an individual five (5) years of age or older that:  
• is attributable to a mental or physical impairment or combination of mental and physical impairments;  
• is manifested before the individual attains the age of 22;  
• is likely to continue indefinitely;  
• results in substantial functional limitations in three or more of areas of major life activity  
(Federal Definition, 1994, cited in Hamill & Everington, 2002).                                                                               |
| Persons with mildly moderate intellectual disability | “Substantial limitations in present functioning, characterised by significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning”.  

Based on the medical discourse, it was argued that since the problem was within the learner  
(Swart et al., 2002), the child should be accommodated elsewhere. These learners were
perceived to have unique characteristics, abilities and learning needs that could not be met by the standard school curriculum. The arguments were strengthened by the charity discourse that views these learners as dependent upon others and in need of institutionalised care (Engelbrecht et al., 2003).

The practice implied that ordinary schools did not take any responsibility to accommodate learners with disabilities. The medical model certainly sustained the segregation that existed between normal and disabled learners, as well as between races. The results were in particular appalling for those learners who did not fall in any of the categories. These learners were deprived of the opportunities to receive support (Moats & Lyon, 2001) since they had not been accommodated in mainstream education. As a result there were a large number of “out-of-school” youth due to the application of the medical model in the South African education system (Engelbrecht, et al. 2003).

The Education White Paper 6 (DoE, 2001) illustrates that only about 64,200 learners with disabilities were accommodated in about 380 special schools. At the same time though, 280,000 learners with disabilities were not in schools. Muthukrishna and Schoeman (2000), indicated in their study that statistics available in the province of Kwazulu–Natal supported the above findings. In view of the political situation at the time, human rights and social justice were distant realities, thus a platform for equal opportunities was denied. It was evident under the circumstances that the status quo could not prevail unchallenged and that change was imperative.

What causes concern is that, despite a significant shift towards inclusive education, exclusionary pressures are strong and segregation in education still continues. This segregation is compounded by the apparent investments in a separate special school system which continues to be substantial (Shaw, 2002). The practice in South Africa still seems prevalent (Abosi, 2000). This might be ascribed to the fact that many of the educators who work in the current system have been trained within the medical discourse that also distinguishes between educators being trained to work either in special education or in mainstream education.

### 2.4 Moving towards inclusive education.

There was a strong mobilisation from all sectors of the population for the demise of the apartheid system of government, particularly from the alienated groups of the society. In 1981, which was declared the ‘International Year of the Disabled’, a massive campaign from the disability organisations was launched to claim their human rights and equal opportunities
in the economic and educational spheres of the country (Smith-Davis, 2002). The campaign
gave rise to The South African Federal Council on Disability. In 1995 the Council advocated
for the development of a single inclusive education system in South Africa.

The central theme of the campaign as indicated by (Engelbrecht, Swart & Eloff 2001) was
that learners with special education needs should have the right to equal access to education
at all levels in a single inclusive education system. Such a system should respond to the
diverse needs of all learners, accommodating both different styles and rates of learning,
discriminated against by different language needs, as well as ensure quality education to all through
appropriate curricula, organisational arrangements, technical strategies, resource use and
partnerships with their communities. The call from the South African Federal Council on
Disability was in line with the broad mass-driven campaign for a national democratic
revolution as stipulated in the Freedom Charter. The Freedom Charter heralded the key
themes of the South African Interim Constitution (1993), The Policy Framework for Education
and Training (ANC:1994), the first White Paper on Education (DoE, 1995), as well as the
Unity (SA,1996). These themes include non-racialism, equality and justice, non-sexism and
free access to education for all.

The campaign certainly gained momentum as the South African political landscape changed.
The advent of a new South Africa brought about radical transformation in the educational
system. The transformation was, as indicated by Lomofsky and Lazarus (2001), premised
on a democratic society, equitable and quality education under a single unified education
system South African Schools Act (DoE, 1996). The Act provides for the right to basic
education and quality education for all. This basic right is further entrenched in the

Based on the constitution, the government is committed to end the segregation in education
and provide education for all children and young people. This commitment was expressed in
the signing of the Inclusion Charter (Downing, Spencer & Cavallaro, 2004) by diverse
stakeholders such as political parties, local education authorities, trade unions, members of
parliament and various other organizations (Prinsloo, 2001). The signing of the Inclusion
Charter presented an important development in the evolution of inclusive education in South
Africa. The Charter is viewed as paving the way to the achievement of the Millennium
Development Goals relevant to education. Peters, Johnstone & Ferguson (2005),
summarized these goals as follows:
**Target 6:** Children and youth with disabilities will be an integral part of the population targeted by the millennium development goal of ensuring that by 2015 all boys and girls will complete a full course of primary schooling.

**Target 7:** At least 75 per cent of children and youth with disabilities of school age will, by 2010, be able to complete a full course of primary schooling.

**Target 8:** Provides that by 2012, all infants and young children (birth to four years old) will have access to and receive community-based early intervention services, which will ensure survival, with support and training for their families.

**Target 9:** Provides that governments should ensure detection of disabilities at as early an age as possible.

Although these goals provide a framework and guidelines, they seem idealistic to a certain extent and should mainly be used as an evaluation mechanism. The Inclusion Charter laid the foundation for the development of the new education system in South Africa.

The National Department of Education, in its quest to enhance the development of the new education system, established the National Coordinating Committee for ELSEN (NaCoCo for ELSEN) and the National Curriculum Committee for ELSEN (NCC for ELSEN) (Muthukrishna & Schoeman, 2000; DoE, 1997) to conceptualise the direction for the provision of Special Education in South Africa. These structures were stakeholder-driven, and key stakeholders from different backgrounds had to make joint decisions within the same forum. The exercise was very challenging due to the bitter experiences of the previous dispensation. There were blatant disagreements based on apparent credibility of some stakeholders. Stakeholders would engage in ‘blame game’ tactics for ‘the situation that the education system in this country finds itself in’ (Muthukrishna & Schoeman, 2000).

Through lengthy and tedious but effective engagements and interaction, the National Coordinating Committee for ELSEN adopted the policy of inclusion as a way forward for the provision of special education in South Africa. The researcher was involved in these committees as a participant observer representing the South African Democratic Teachers Union, until the release of the Report of the NCSNET and NCESS (1997). What is interesting to note is that most of South African literature on the development of inclusive education in South Africa tends to overlook the important role played by these committees (NaCoCo and NCC) in influencing policy trajectory towards inclusion (DoE, 1997).

The milestone in the development of inclusive education in South Africa through the recommendation by the NaCoCo, has been the appointment of the National Commission on
Special Needs in Education and Training (NCSNET) as indicated by Muthukrishna and Schoeman (2000), and the National Committee on Education Support Services (NCESS), to investigate and make recommendations on all aspects of special needs and support services in education and training. The investigation heralded the development of the Policy on an Inclusive Education and Training System in the form of the Education White Paper 6: Special Needs Education (DoE, 2001), which defines Inclusive Education and Training as follows:

- Acknowledging that all children and youth can learn and that all children and youth need support.
- Accepting and respecting the fact that all learners are different in some way and have different learning needs which are equally valued and an ordinary part of our human experience.
- 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 or HIV status.
- Changing attitudes, behaviour, teaching methodologies, curricula and the environment to meet the needs of all learners.
- Maximising the participation of all learners in the culture and curricula of educational instructions and uncovering and minimising barriers to learning.
- Empowering learners by developing their individual strengths and enabling them to participate critically in the process of learning.
- Acknowledging that learning also occurs in the home and community, and within formal and informal modes and structures.
- The challenge was to implement the policy, and structures were clearly needed to facilitate this process.

2.4.1 Structures for the implementation of inclusive education

To facilitate the implementation of inclusive education in South Africa the following structures were suggested by White Paper 6 (DoE, 2001):
**On national level:** The development of an inclusive education directorate.

The roles, responsibilities and communication lines as outlined in the *Framework and Management Plan for the First Phase of Implementation of Inclusive Education* DoE (2005b) state that the National Department of Education will also oversee the implementation of the programme. Landsberg (2005), support the idea that in the execution of its roles and responsibilities, the National Department of Education in collaboration with all the stakeholders involved in education, is to formulate policy. However, it must be noted that in its execution of the roles assigned to it, the NDoE has approached the implementation from a top-down approach. This approach has the potential to develop a legacy of restrictive centralised control which inhibits change and initiative (DoE, 1998).

This is evident in the presentation by Marie Schoeman, Deputy-Chief Education Specialist in the National Department of Education, during the roundtable discussion on the implementation of inclusive education held at North-West University, Potchefstroom Campus, in April, 2009, where she announced that implementation of the programme is centralised in the National Department of Education. Communication with subsequent structures has always been instructional and not reciprocal in terms of implementation. A recollection and reflection of the progress made since implementation, with stakeholders, remains a distant reality.

The National Department of Education is responsible to implement the programme and develop terms of reference for implementation. Service providers are contracted to undertake projects and the National Department liaises with programme managers and monitors and evaluates each stage of the programme (DoE, 2005b).

**On Provincial level:** Ensuring local support.

The role of the provincial department of education is to assist the National Department of Education to implement the programme (Landsberg, 2005). However, the Framework and Management Plan (DoE, 2005b) states that the provincial education departments will assist through facilitating projects and ensuring that there is appropriate local support. They will also ensure local buy-in so as to ensure sustainability and deep systemic change. Provincial departments of education in their assisting role assist by following directives from the National Department of Education. This role should be viewed against the backdrop of potential lack of effective implementation in particular areas of the programme, for example, the disfunctionality of the district-based support teams. One could argue that the challenge in the dysfunction of DBSTs may be as a result of lack of autonomy by provinces to prioritise the implementation of programmes (DoE, 2006a).
On District level: Developing support teams.

Education White Paper 6 (DoE, 2001) also describes the support at district level as a central part of the overall strengthening of education support services in South Africa. District based support teams comprise staff from provincial, district and regional offices as well as from existing special schools and Full-Service Schools. Specialists/professional education officials working in the district support structures include psychologists, specialised and general counsellors, therapists and other health and welfare workers employed by the department of education, and various learning support personnel, (for example remedial teachers and facilitators, language and communication teachers, and special needs teachers), departmental officials providing administration, curricular and institutional development support at district level, specialist support and learners who can provide peer support to one another (DoE, 2005a).

The composition of the DBST presents a multi-disciplinary approach in supporting teaching and learning. The DBSTs take responsibility for building human capacity in schools to recognize and address severe learning difficulties and accommodate a range of learning needs. It is deliberated that defining the roles of team members within a collaborative support team in inclusive educational contexts, and acknowledging and utilising the expertise that exists, may present a number of challenges (Engelbrecht, Forlin, Eloff & Swart 2007; Hamill & Everington, 2002). These challenges include the ability of role players to work together in coordinated and collaborative ways (DoE, 2008b). It implies moving from the current fragmented approach towards a more integrated approach to the provision of support for learners who experience barriers to learning.

The challenges are compounded by the reality faced by the Department of Education concerning the disfunctionality of DBSTs. These teams have not been able, since their establishment, to create a sustained effective collaborative team approach (DoE, 2006a). In many cases participants from certain categories of staff have proved not to be progressive in their understanding of the redefined approach towards this model (DoE, 2006a).

One argument that continues to surface in the informal discussions amongst the departmental officials about the status of the DBSTs, is that DBSTs will only be effective once the SIAS Strategy is in place. However the functions of DBSTs are not only confined to the implementation of SIAS, but continue to serve multiple other tasks, such as facilitating referrals of learners for placement in specialised settings, outside the implementation of SIAS, thus they must remain effective throughout (DoE, 2008b). This view on the DBSTs is emphasised by the previous Minister of Education, the Hon. Naledi Pandor in her Key Note Address at the 48th International Conference on Education on the status of district support
services. The status report on district-based support teams (DoE, 2006a), highlighted some of the challenges observed in different provinces.

The first challenge relates to the lack of an inter-sectoral consultative approach between government departments, such as education and health. An inter-sectoral consultative approach was not followed when the conceptualisation was workshopped at either provincial or district level (DoE, 2005f). The implications have therefore not been applied to the individual contexts in terms of human resource and time needed for the work. Many members of the District-Based Support teams were nominated without involving them in discussions of how this would impact on their future work.

Another challenge is that there is no common management and/or coordination approach followed. In some provinces the team is headed by the Senior Manager of the District, in others the coordination function has been delegated to an official from Education Management, Governance and Development or Inclusive Education. The intent of this aspect of the field testing project has not adequately been discussed at provincial senior management level so as to ensure that it will result in real systemic change, not only at a structural level but also in terms of changed roles.

It is evident that the district-based support team is the key role player to addressing barriers to learning within all education and training systems, and central to overall strengthening of education support services in South Africa (DoE, 2005f). District-based support teams must form an integrated professional support service at district level. To supplement the district-based support teams, expertise from support providers and local education institutions must be drawn from various community resources. The teams need to form a support base for education institutions including early childhood centres, schools, further education colleges, and adult basic education and training centres. The support needs to enable them to identify and address barriers to learning, and promote effective learning and teaching which will include both classroom and organisational support. Particular reference to curricular and institutional development and administrative support is needed in this regards. A district coordinator, whose responsibilities are delegated by the district manager, will be responsible for day-to-day management of the implementation, logistic arrangements and communication between various stakeholders and role players. The establishment of the district project coordinating committee is essential, with either the district manager or the district coordinator chairing the committee, and principals of special schools as resource centres as well as of Full-Service Schools (DoE, 2005e). The district project coordinating committee will from time to time liaise with service providers such as, providers in the built industry where renovations of the physical environment is needed etc, and schools on all the aspects of day-to-day running of the national field testing implementation project.
On institutional level: Coordinated support.

White Paper 6 (DoE, 2001) points out that at all schools and training centres in general, institutions for further and higher education will be required to establish institutional level teams. The primary function of the institutional level support teams is to put in place properly coordinated learner and educator support services. Literature has shown that teachers’ positive attitudes towards the implementation of inclusive education are enhanced when adequate support services are provided (Mupfuma, Mpofu, & Chataika, 2007), be it support services in material and physical resources or human resources. Support programmes for educators need to respond effectively to the demands of an inclusive educational system and to the needs of teachers who will be directly involved in the day-to-day implementation of these programmes (Engelbrecht & Green, 2007, Evans cited in Daniels, 2000). These support programmes will provide support to the learning and teaching process by identifying and addressing learner, educator and institutional needs. Engelbrecht and Green (2007) concur that support provision should reflect a commitment to an integrated approach as recommended by the NCSNET/NCESS (DoE; 1997). An integrated approach of support should be able to draw on all relevant resources such as, assistive devices, available in order to address barriers to learning and development.

The process of providing support to educators regarding their empowerment should consider local and indigenous resources and thus encourage an understanding of problems and their solutions in a systems framework (Engelbrecht et al 2007; Frederickson & Cline, 2003:7). Wamae and Kang’ethe-Kamau (2004), support the idea that teachers’ knowledge of the implications of disability such as, the severity of the condition, as well as their experience of children with particular impairments is important in influencing their attitudes. Teachers need knowledge and understanding of particular barriers if they are to feel competent to teach a learner experiencing that barrier, and to receive him or her willingly into their classrooms.

The EWP 6 policy advocates the establishment of an Institutional-Level Support Team in every school, for these teams basically fulfil the task of co-ordinating activities in the support provision of learners experiencing barriers to learning. Barriers to learning and development are the concern of everybody who is involved with learners. All teachers at all schools are responsible and obliged to identify and support learners experiencing barriers.

Where appropriate, these teams should be strengthened by expertise from the local community, district-based support teams and higher education institutions. The key functions of these teams will include, as cited in DoE: North West Province, (2006b), coordinating all learner, educator, curriculum and institution development support in the institution; collectively identifying institutional needs and, in particular, barriers to learning at
learner, educator, curriculum and institutional levels; collectively developing strategies to address these needs and barriers to learning, and drawing in the resources needed, from within and outside of the institution, to address these challenges. Monitoring and evaluating the work of the ILST within an action-reflection framework, working closely with DBSTs, working closely with any special school/resource centre and full service school in the area in terms of support for educators and learners and continually monitoring and evaluating the ILST's work.

It is recommended that members of the ILST should be dedicated and co-operate on an equal footing in order to provide holistic support to the educators and learners (DoENW, 2006b). Educators with skills and knowledge in areas such as learning support, life skills, or counselling are an essential component of the team. Educators who volunteer because of their interest, or who represent various phases, for example, the foundation phase, or who represent various learning areas, such as language and communication, will supplement the expertise in the team. Management representatives – principal, deputy–principal, or any member of the management team, are not eligible to lead the team because of their workload. Educators on the staff, who have particular expertise to offer around a specific need or challenge, including Schools as Centres of Care and Support educators, Media In Education Trust Africa (2007), should be roped in to join the team. Administrative staff or care givers are critical actors in the composition of the team, as well as learner representatives at senior, further education or higher education levels. This is important in order to support other learners by giving peer support.

Parents or care givers, DBST members, special school or resource centre or full-service school educators, members of the local community and other departmental representatives, (for example, health, social welfare) could be invited as additional members to the ILST meetings to help with particular challenges. Some of the challenges faced will require of the ILST to tap into these resources and expertise to effectively address them.

2.5 The implementation of a roll-out plan

The management plan for roll out of Education White Paper 6 on Special Needs Education: Building an Inclusive Education and Training System (2001) is a detailed step-by-step 20 years' time-line plan. The plan is envisaged to roll out in phases over a period of 20 years. Currently we are in the first phase of the plan. The first phase of the plan entails the transformation of special schools into special schools or resource centres, ordinary primary schools into Full-Service Schools and the development of district-based support teams (DoE:
The concept of Full Service school will be discussed in the following paragraph, since it is the focus of this study.

### 2.5.1 Definition of Full-Service Schools

The concept of Full Service Schools seemingly originates from other systems which apparently integrate education, social and/or human services that are beneficial to meeting the needs of children and youth and families on school grounds or in locations that are easily accessible as outlined by (Dryfoos, 1995). She asserts that Full Service Schools provide the types of prevention, treatment, and support services children and families need to succeed. Services that are high quality and comprehensive and are built on interagency partnerships among state and local and public and private entities, including education, health care, transportation, job training, child care, housing, employment, and social services. In the South African context Full-Service Schools are defined as mainstream education institutions that provide quality education to all learners by supplying the full range of learning needs in an equitable manner (DoE, 2005e). These mainstream education institutions which are converted into Full Service Schools should strive to achieve access, equity, quality and social justice in education.

Transformation of 30 special schools, 30 ordinary primary schools and the development of district-based support teams will take place in the 30 designated districts of the Department of Education country wide. This process is referred to as the 30, 30, 30 project (DoE, 2005g). Other phases of the implementation plan include phase 2 of the advocacy plan, phase 2 of the general orientation and introduction of management, governing bodies and professional staff to the inclusion model as well as curriculum and assessment adaptation (DoE, 2005b).

In the North-West provincial department of education where this study is conducted, we have seen the conversion of three special schools into special schools/resource centres, three ordinary primary schools into full-service schools and the establishment of three district-based support teams all in three designated districts following the implementation of the project (DoE, 2005b). It should however be noted that the work of the project is extended to districts which were not part of the implementation project. Currently more ordinary primary schools in all districts are identified and converted into full-service schools.

The implementation of the roll out plan is discussed with reference to the training of educators within the Inclusive Education System, the challenges educators face in the implementation of the plan and competencies required from educators to implement the training effectively.
2.5.2 Training educators in an inclusive education system.

In the direct words of the Education White Paper 6 “an acknowledgement is made that classroom educators will be primary source for achieving the goal of an inclusive education and training system” (DoE, 2001; Swart, 2002; Hay & Paulsen, 2001; Engelbrecht, 2003). Swart (2002) reiterates that there is overwhelming evidence that teachers are the key force in determining the quality of inclusion; they can play a crucial role in transforming schools, or bring about no change at all. Effective inclusive schools require a commitment to creating and maintaining a climate that is less restrictive and more conducive to learning (Robinson & Carrington, 2002). In order to enable educators to meet the diverse learner needs, their new roles in an inclusive setting should be clarified and redefined. The definition of the new roles of educators starts with an effective teacher education for both teachers entering the system and those already in the system.

2.5.2.1 Pre-Service and In-Service Training.

Literature in inclusive education has proven that existing pre- and in-service education to equip teachers with the skills and knowledge to accommodate diversity in their classes is very inadequate (Department of Education, 2001, Engelbrecht, 2006, Engelbrecht & Green, 2007, Hodkinson, 2006:20) One other challenge which has a bearing in the implementation of inclusive education regarding pre- and in-service training is the fact that teachers at all levels within the general system were not required, therefore not trained to respond to the learning of learners experiencing barriers to learning and development (Lambe & Bones 2006:167). Teachers working with learners experiencing specific barriers received specialized training in predominantly primary and secondary schools providing specialized education. The lack of training for majority of general teachers with whom special educators must collaborate to deal with diversity not only affected the learners but left educators feeling inadequate and demoralized (Gut, Oswald, Leal, Frederiksen, & Gustafson, (2003). It is without any doubt very clear that a decisive action should be taken to improve the quality of pre- and in-service education to equip teachers with necessary skills and knowledge to address barriers to learning and development (Prinsloo, 2001:1). General education teachers and special education teachers need the following competencies to become competent inclusive teachers as according to Logan, Diaz, Piperno, Rankin, MacFarland, & Bargamian (1995:2)

- Ability to problem solve, to be able to informally assess the skills a learner needs (rather than relying solely on standardized curriculum).
• Ability to take advantage of children’s individual interests and use their internal motivation for developing needed skills.

• Ability to set high but alternative expectations that are suitable for the learners, this means developing alternative assessments.

• Ability to make appropriate expectations for each learner, regardless of the learner’s capabilities. If teachers can do this, it allows all learners to be included in a class and school.

• Ability to determine how to modify assignments for learners, how to design classroom activities with so many levels that all learners have part. This teaching skill encourages more activity-based teaching.

• Ability to learn how to value all kinds of skills that learners bring to a class, not just the academic skills.

• Ability to provide daily success for all learners.

It must still be borne in mind that whilst teachers in inclusive education would require specific competencies to be able to address diversity of learning barriers, teachers have long before the introduction of inclusive education in South Africa, displayed some measure of competency in addressing certain barriers experienced by learners and such competencies must be acknowledged and should form the basis for further training provided to educators. That having been said, teachers have always recognized that their teaching profession involves more than just delivery of the subject matter, as it is evidently witnessed in their role as surrogate parents (Wikipedia, 2007) and act in *logo parentis*. The new roles are outlined in the National Policy Framework for Teacher Education.

2.5.2.2 National Policy Framework for Teacher Education.

The training of educators within the Inclusive Education System will be discussed from the premise of the new National Policy Framework for Teacher Education (DoE, 2007a). The new National Policy Framework for Teacher Education forms the basis for restructuring and transformation of teacher education. The transformation of teacher education is embedded in the principles of democracy, liberty, equality, redress and transparency (Pendlebury, 1998; Sayed, 2002). The transformation process includes new approaches, directions and demands on all educational personnel to recognise that appropriate development of personnel is paramount to promoting equality and access. The Education White Paper 6 (DoE, 2001) acknowledges that restructuring and transformation need to take place at all
levels of the education system including provincial and national levels, and should be
directed towards all necessary components of the system. The recognition of the
implications of the changes for existing personnel within the system and new personnel
entering the system at all levels is however considered to be crucial for the transformation
and restructuring of the system. Research by Moodley (2003), shows that the development
of human resource enhances the acquisition of skills and knowledge that will enable various
role players, including teachers to respond and accommodate diversity in the learner
population at all levels of the system.

The framework further considers teacher education as comprising two complementary sub-
systems: Initial Professional Education of Teachers (IPET) and Continuing Professional
Teacher Development (CPTD), underpinned by a vitally important support system for teacher
education and development. Initial Professional Education of Teachers forms an important
basis for committed, competent and confident teachers. It is therefore vital to provide
training in line with the demands of inclusive practices in order to promote positive attitudes
and equip student teachers with the skills and attributes to teach effectively in an inclusive
education system (Lambe & Bones, 2006; Donald, Lazarus & Lolwana 2002). Continuing
Professional Teacher Development, on the other hand, should support the continuing
development of new skills, insights, and qualities that could enhance inclusive practices
within schools and classrooms.

The Department of Education in South Africa, having realised its obligation for professional
development of educators through in-service training, partnered with other funding agencies
to develop in-service training programmes for teachers. One such an initiative is the
Department of Education/Danida Project: Resource and Training Programme for Educator
Development: Building an Inclusive Education and Training System (DoE, 2002b). The
Project has set the tone for the implementation of inclusive education and made provision for
the national quality evaluation through action research components in the Eastern Cape,
KwaZulu-Natal, and North-West provinces of South Africa. The other partnership between
the DoE and funding agencies is evident in the works of the South African-Finnish Co-
operation Programme in the Education Sector (SCOPE) (Vayrynen, 2004). The project
resulted in various training activities carried out in 21 sites of learning, 10 in Mpumalanga
and 11 in Northern Cape (Da Costa, 2003).

Despite these efforts, research indicates that the training aimed at equipping educators with
the skills and knowledge to accommodate diversity in their classes tends to be fragmented,
uncoordinated, inadequate, unequal and often inappropriate to the needs of a developing
country (Swart et al 2002; Engelbrecht, 2006; Engelbrecht & Green, 2007; Hodkinson, 2006).
2.6 Challenges educators face in implementing inclusive education.

In view of the concern about teacher training, it is important to determine the challenges educators face in this endeavour. Challenges facing educators in the implementation of inclusive education range from their readiness to implement the SIAS strategy (DoE, 2008b), to acquiring competencies that are useful in accommodating diverse learner needs. These competencies are premised on integrating an Outcomes-Based Education curriculum into inclusive education. The OBE curriculum and inclusive education emphasise the value of building learning and teaching environment that offers quality education for all learners. Such a culture requires a change in attitude from educators and reduces the stressors educators have to cope with as they respond to the diverse educational learner needs.

2.6.1 Integrating the OBE curriculum and inclusive education

Outcomes–Based Education was introduced in place of the old curriculum in 1997 alongside Curriculum 2005 which was perceived as the vehicle used to drive the Curriculum in order to achieve the transformational ideals in the new democratic South Africa (Fische & Ladd, 2004). Curriculum 2005 emphasised the value of building a culture of learning and teaching that offers a quality education for all learners, by responding to the educational needs of all learners including learners experiencing barriers to learning and development (DoE, 2006). The introduction of Curriculum 2005 was not without challenges as it posed some problems in terms of implementation in the classroom despite teachers receiving training in the new approach. As a result of these challenges, the Department of Education appointed a Review Committee to revise the Curriculum 2005 (DoE, 2006). The Review Committee recommended that strengthening of the curriculum required streamlining its design features and simplifying its language through the production of a Revised National Curriculum Statement (NCS) (DoE, 2002a).

Teachers are faced with the challenge of making conceptual links between inclusive education and the Revised National Curriculum Statement and National Curriculum Statement. RNCS/NCS and Inclusive Education workshops are running parallel and the contents do not illustrate the link between inclusive education and outcomes-based education (Engelbrecht, 2006). In trying to conceptualize the link between OBE and Inclusive Education, it becomes critical to understand the principles that underpin the two approaches and find the commonality for co-existence.
The (revised) National Curriculum Statement adopts an inclusive approach by specifying minimum requirements for all learners. The special educational, social, emotional and physical needs of learners are addressed in the design and development of appropriate Learning Programmes in the (Revised) National Curriculum Statement Grades R to 9 Overview (DoE, 2007b).

One critical aspect in the development of inclusive education in South Africa is the adaptation of the curriculum to adequately accommodate the diverse learning needs of all learners. The inflexible nature of the curriculum prevents it from meeting diverse needs among learners and thus addressing barriers to learning and development (DoE, 2002a, Daniels, 2000). Donald et al (2002) maintain that the curriculum should not be misunderstood as referring only to the syllabus or the content of what is taught. A curriculum includes how the programme is structured, the processes and methods of teaching/learning, methods of assessment and evaluation (Naicker, 1999). Donald et al (2002) note that OBE is a system of learning and teaching that is learner-centred and is based on the understanding that all learners can learn, but not at the same pace. They assert that each successful experience is a stepping stone to more success and that schools are pivotal to creating the conditions for success. Swart et al. (2002) suggest that a concern has been expressed about the relation between outcomes-based education and inclusion as well as about the need to adapt the curriculum to suit learners with special educational needs. The table below indicates the differences between the old and the new paradigm in the curriculum (Naicker, 1999). Old and new in this study refer to the content-base and outcomes-based as it used to define the paradigm of education before 1999.

**TABLE 2: Old and the new paradigm in the curriculum (Naicker, 1999)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLD PARADIGM</th>
<th>NEW PARADIGM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content-based</td>
<td>Outcomes-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on memorising, rote learning, recall and memory</td>
<td>Focuses on conceptual understanding comprehension skills and attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum, instruction and assessment are inflexible</td>
<td>Curriculum, instruction and assessment are flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time is fixed</td>
<td>Time is flexible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards are norm-referenced</td>
<td>Learners get credit for what they do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently grades students.</td>
<td>Defines students at their highest level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment focuses on the end product of learning.</td>
<td>Assessment focuses on both the process and end product of learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning breakdown is caused by individual deficit.</td>
<td>Learning breakdown is understood by locating an individual within the system and understanding the barriers to learning that learners may be confronted with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock, schedule and calendar organise education system.</td>
<td>Time is not fixed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrete subjects such as Maths, Economics, History</td>
<td>Integrated learning areas such as Life Orientation, Arts and Culture, Natural Sciences, Human and Social Sciences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexist, racist and disabilist thinking.</td>
<td>Non-sexist, non-racist, non-disabilist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One learning modality is focused on.</td>
<td>Several learning modalities are acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are the basic elements of curriculum planning as they relate to accommodating all learners and placing their needs at the centre of curriculum planning.

Curriculum design as prescribed by the NCS includes three levels of planning, namely:
LEARNING PROGRAMMES

Learning Area plan for the phase (all grades) and represents the first and broadest level of planning (DoE, 2005d).

WORK SCHEDULE

Describes what is planned for one year in a particular grade, in a particular Learning Area (DoE, 2005d).

LESSON PLAN

Describes in detail the teaching, learning and assessment plans for a single activity or a series of activities, spread over a few days or a number of days or a number of weeks (DoE, 2005d).

It must be noted though that there is a vehement discussion taking place in the circles of education in the country on the review of Outcomes-based Education and its replacement with the new education approach. The Report of the Task Team for the Review of the Implementation of the National Curriculum Statement (DoE, 2009), provides suggestions on aspects of the Curriculum Statement which need to be reviewed.

2.6.2 Competencies for the implementation of the management plan for roll-out of Education White Paper 6 on Special Needs Education.

One of the main challenges seems to be the lack of competencies amongst general education teachers to respond adequately to learners experiencing barriers to learning. According to Angelides, (2005) educators working in an inclusive education system need to demonstrate the ability to informally assess each learner’s needs rather than rely solely on standardized assessment procedures. This ability enhances educators’ competence to take advantage of learners’ individual interests and internal motivation for developing skills. Educators should be able to set alternative expectations that are suitable for the learners through developing alternative assessments. Setting appropriate expectations for each learner, irrespective of the learner’s capabilities, increases a learner’s cognitive functioning. Learners’ capabilities and all kinds of skills they bring to the class should be valued beyond their academic skills. Educators should be able to demonstrate the competencies to modify assignments and design classroom activities that accommodate all learners, thus ensuring daily success for the learner (DoE North West, 2004a).
Owing to the segregation between mainstream and special education, general educators have not been equipped with the specific competencies to address barriers to learning within the mainstream (Lambe & Bones, 2006). Educators working with learners experiencing specific barriers to learning as indicated in EWP 6, received specialised training that was not included in the training of educators in general education. The lack of training for the majority of general educators to deal with barriers to learning left educators feeling inadequate and demoralised (Gut, Oswald, Leal, Frederiksen, & Gustafson, 2003).

Magare, Kitching and Roos (2010) however, argue that we should consider the possibility that general educators might have some of these competencies but due to the fact that these competencies are not acknowledged, they regard themselves as ill-equipped for the implementation of inclusive education. Their research indicates that general educators in schools do apply some of the competencies associated with inclusive education, even though they did not receive any training in this regard.

In view of the above it seems important to train general educators with the necessary competencies to work within an inclusive environment in a manner that acknowledges and incorporates their prior experience as educators.

2.6.3 Challenges to consider in training educators for inclusive education.

2.6.3.1 Changing attitudes and dealing with stress.

Literature on the development of inclusive education reveals that in the main, the most stressful aspects for teachers working with inclusion emanate from the following:

limited contact with parents, ineffective teaching provision for other learners when including learners with disabilities, matters perceived to have an impact on the teachers’ competences (teacher turnover and transfers, class ratios and heavy workload), absence of support strategies for teachers, and inherent short attention span and poor communication skills of the learners with disabilities which disturb their learners (Engelbrecht et al 2007).

Engelbrecht and Green (2007) warn that any attempt to train educators for inclusion should consider teachers’ attitudes, beliefs and concerns and their stress and coping skills. It will be necessary to allow time for an adequate and well-planned training and professional development programme which will alleviate teachers’ doubts and resistance (Sharma, Forlin, Loreman, & Earl, 2006). Future teacher training initiatives need to take this into cognisance and focus on the stress and coping skills of teachers, and on conditions within which teachers are working, in order to empower teachers to address barriers emanating from outside and around learners (Peters, 2003:32). Because teaching is not a simple,
straightforward profession to master, Oswald (cited in Engelbrecht & Green, 2007) emphasises that teaching is a complex, demanding and multi-dimensional profession. Teachers need time to develop confidence and coping strategies in order to cope with turbulent and rapid changes in education, particularly in South Africa, in the context of continuous support in the classroom (Engelbrecht et al 2003; Peters, 2003). In light of the above, it remains evident that teacher education in South Africa is challenged to reflect and develop educators who are innovative and are able to give birth to a reconstructed education system (Joubert-Serfontein, 2007).

The one important aspect in the discussion around teacher attitude and coping with stressors is the fact that teachers themselves need to realise their legal responsibilities for meeting the needs of all learners in the least restrictive environment (Villa & Thousand 2003). To be able to achieve this obligation, teachers need to develop positive beliefs, values and attitudes about diversity, change, collaboration and learning (Mitchell, 2004; Topping & Maloney, 2005; Daniel, 2000; Robinson & Carrington, 2002). These values should be demonstrated through compliance with the prescripts of the South African Constitution and the Bill of Rights (SA, 1996b), which adhere to the democratic values of liberty, equality and human rights (Engelbrecht, 2006, Fiscke & Ladd; 2004, Naicker, 2000). The success of the implementation of inclusion policies relies on teachers’ acceptance of the policies, their belief in the value of the policies and ability to cope with the demands of the changing education system (Engelbrecht et al., 2003).

However, Engelbrecht et al (2003) argue that teachers’ attitudes towards inclusive education are positive regarding the inclusion of learners whose disabling characteristics do not require instructional or management skills on the part of the teacher. This sentiment is evident in the findings by Farrell (2001), which indicate that there is a rise in the number of learners with physical and sensory barriers attending mainstream provision. Artiles and Kozleski (2007) state that teachers today more fully recognise the value of inclusion because they see its power as an effective instructional practice.

Booth, Ainscow, Black-Hawkins, Vaughan and Shaw (2000) concur that the creation of an inclusive ethos is a foundation for all learning and development within a secure, accepting, collaborating and stimulating teaching and learning community in which everyone is valued. Research has shown that only skills and knowledge to cope with learners experiencing barriers to learning and development is not sufficient for teachers; they also require a positive emotional component which influences their attitude (Swart et al 2002). Unfortunately this emotional aspect is not often considered by policy makers, who tend to give attention primarily to knowledge, skills and practical support to teachers (Swart et al 2002).
In-service programmes have proved inefficient to equip educators (Engelbrecht et al., 2006). Resulting from this, educators are feeling insecure, inexperienced and lack confidence to teach and include learners experiencing barriers to learning and development in their classrooms. Owing to the inadequate pre- and in-service training provided in South Africa, there is a need to re-evaluate teacher education within the context and demands of inclusive education practices in South Africa (Sadek & Sadek, 2000). The Business and International Education is unequivocal as it relates to the basic training curriculum for teachers and the advice it should seek on how to translate relevant research findings into effective teaching practices. It also considers how to assess the progress of all students through the curriculum, including learners whose attainments are poor and whose progress is slow, and how to use assessment as a planning tool for the class as a whole. Drawing up individual plans for students, observing students in learning situations, including the use of simple checklists and observation schedules and relating the behaviour of particular learners to normal patterns of development are all important aspects of skills and knowledge to be acquired, as well as to involve parents and pupils in the assessment process, work with other professionals, and know when to call on their specialized advice and how to use their assessment for educational purposes.

2.6.3.2 Collaborating with other professionals as a key for successful roll out.

Collaboration is defined as working together on an activity or project. A collaborative relationship based on direct interaction among co-equal partners emphasises ecosystemic values such as promoting sustainability, alliance, co-operation and mutual support. There is a conspicuous need to interweave a network of varying supports into a comprehensive and coordinated system of support at national, district and school level (Engelbrecht & Green, 2007; DoE, 1997a). All the levels of support mentioned earlier should be collaborating with each other in order to create and sustain a shared and collective approach in the implementation of an inclusive education system (Donald et al 2002). Such support should be fostered to capacitate educators as problem solvers and frontline researchers through addressing barriers to learning and development (Villa & Thousand 2003). It implies the development of multi-disciplinary teams comprising specialist educators, parents and other professionals involved in education (Mutepfia et al 2007). Support teams such as the district-based support teams and the institution-level support teams as outlined in the White Paper 6 (DoE, 2001) must be empowered to support efficient and effective learning and teaching processes and put in place properly coordinated learner and educator support services and, where appropriate, be strengthened by expertise from the local community.
The concept of stakeholder-driven processes finds expression in the collaborative strategy of support among parents, educators, communities and government departments and non-government organizations in pursuit of inclusive education (DoE NW, 2002b, Engelbrecht, 2006). Support of this collaborative nature will require a dramatic change from what the support service providers are currently delivering; hence the fragmented and uncoordinated support service provided will need to be transformed and enabled to develop a welcoming, non-discriminatory and flexible environment where access to learning is facilitated through addressing barriers to learning and development (Daniels, 2000).

For inclusive education to work, educators must become effective and efficient collaborative team members. Literature on school effectiveness and improvement points to the collaborative professional as an important aspect in the development of a culture of collaborative problem-solving, which enhances the capacity of schools to respond to a diverse learner population (Daniels, 2000). Landsberg (2005), as well as Engelbrecht and Green (2007) acknowledge that collaboration is an important strategy of support for inclusive education. Engelbrecht (2006), the DoE NW (2006b), and the DoE (2005f) maintain that South African schools’ education support teams have to be established as part of the support networks for both teachers and learners, for example, institutional level support teams as outlined in the WP6 (DoE, 2001).

Whilst the literature on collaboration from the South African perspective emphasises inter- and intra-departmental collaboration, it must be noted that although such collaboration does exist among different departments and with various NGOs, there is no set of rules in place to structure such collaboration, thus it happens haphazardly and only in specific instances where a need arises. This point is supported by Daniels (2000), where every specialist or professional involved with a child would concentrate on a small aspect of the child’s needs for which he/she is directly responsible. To avert this kind of a situation, Engelbrecht and Green (2007) recommend a transdisciplinary collaborative approach, in which professionals perform their related tasks interactively and individual group members share their expertise and ideas and support one another. They further add that the concept ‘transdisciplinary’ is unique in the sense that it indicates transcending professional boundaries where a unified intervention plan is implemented.

The Department of Education has in recent years collaborated with various funding agencies, as mentioned earlier in this literature study. One such collaborative initiative is the Schools as Centres of Care and Support (SCCS), which is a partnership between the Provincial Education Departments of North-West, KwaZulu-Natal and Eastern Cape and the Media In Education Trust (MIET) Africa, funded by the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and a range of other donors.
(MIET, 2007). Although this initiative is not one of the inclusive education implementation projects, the initiative is committed to providing support for learners so as to improve access to quality education, improve school retention and improve learner performance, all of which are fundamental to the provision of inclusive education. This is a school-based programme which acknowledges the role of schools in communities and their position in taking a lead in the communal strategy of providing care and support to orphans, vulnerable children and families ravaged by poverty and HIV and AIDS (MIET, 2007). The social barriers mentioned are sadly the realities facing South African learners, which unfortunately manifest themselves in the classroom and have a devastating effect on effective teaching and learning processes. Having acknowledged and embraced the existence of the SCCS educators in schools involved in the programme, this partnership has been strengthened by inclusion of such educators in the ILSTs, so as to avoid duplication of services and strengthen support provision in schools for learners experiencing barriers to learning and development.

2.7 Current developments in teacher training for inclusive education.

The Department of Education has, during 2006, through the service provision of the Sisonke Consortium, who are the national project managers for the implementation of inclusive education, embarked on a massive training in the schools that are part of the National Field-Testing Project (special schools as resource centres and Full-Service Schools) in the implementation of inclusive education. The Consortium came into being as a result of a huge brief of the service requirements as advertised in the tender processes, which included, the establishment of 30 DBSTs, development of 30 Full-Service Schools and 30 special schools as resource centres, physical and material resources, human resource development and advocacy. When it was clear that no service provider would fulfil the requirements for the tender on its own, a number of educational organizations and institutions collaborated to deliver on the mandate of the tender (DoE, 2005g). From this initiative, planning for training emerged.

2.7.1 SIAS and development of Inclusive Learning Programme.

The training involved the screening, identification, assessment and support (DoE, 2008b) which have for decades been considered the competencies of specialist professionals (Johnson & Green, cited in Engelbrecht & Green, 2007), and the development of inclusive learning programmes which comprise the development of a work schedule, lesson plan and individual support plan.
It was evident during the application of the screening, identification, assessment and support that the tool was too complicated and was not user-friendly to educators, therefore it needed review. In 2007, the Department of Education (DoE, 2008b), approved the reviewed version of the screening, identification, assessment and support strategy, which seeks to overhaul the current process of identifying, assessing and enrolling learners in special schools and specialised settings, and acknowledges the central role played by educators and parents in the process. The strategy involves a set of forms which outline the protocol that has to be followed in identifying and addressing barriers to learning that affect individual learners throughout their school careers. It further clearly spells out the responsibilities of teachers, managers, district-based support teams and parents through a set of accompanying guidelines that assist in providing programmes for all learners requiring additional support so as to enhance participation and inclusion. The implementation of this strategy has unfolded with the training of educators, managers and district and provincial officials since 2007.

The strategy comprises four stages, namely screening, identification, assessment, and support. The screening process finds expression in Stage 1 which applies to all learners upon admission with the use of Learner Profile, SNA: Section 1 and any other reports including a learner progress report as the toolkit.

The identification process is applicable in Stage 2 and only applies to learners who have been identified as experiencing barriers to learning, with the use of SNA: Section 2 and SNA: Individual Support Plan.

The assessment process takes place in Stage 3 and is a formal assessment and review of the information provided in Stages 1 and 2 that informs the decision on the level of support needed and the type of support package needed. It comprises the toolkit SNA: Section 3a and b.

Support provisioning and monitoring processes are applicable in Stage 4 of the strategy in which the DBST reviews the motivation for additional support as outlined in the form and comprises the toolkit, SNA: Section 4.

Whilst the order in which the strategy applies is emphasized, it is noted that its implementation clearly indicates an overlap and systematic process in the stages.

Inclusive curriculum design components are differentiated to align to the National Curriculum Statement and include an individual support plan (ISP) (DoE, 2006b). An individual support plan is a plan that caters for the individual learning needs of a learner who has been identified as needing substantial support and provides a comprehensive record of the learner’s learning needs, goals and progress. The learner, parents, teacher(s) who are
directly involved with the learner, the ILST, Learning Support Educator, counsellor or other support specialist who are involved with the learner could be involved in the drawing of an ISP and implementing and monitoring the progress of the learner (DoE, 2008b). Daniels (2000), confirms that curriculum differentiation is a key part of successful inclusion. Topping and Maloney (2005) define differentiation as “teaching things differently according to observed differences among learners” and further list areas where differentiation strategies can be applied. The areas include teaching approach, content of the curriculum, assessment methods, classroom organisation, student grouping and teacher’s interaction with individual students.

Differentiation of the learning programmes and work schedules should take into account the diverse needs of all learners in a classroom and not only learners who have been identified as experiencing barriers to learning. The DoE (2006b) warns that even children who manage well with the curriculum have different learning styles, thus a teacher must make sure that there is a range of activities in his/her lesson plan to accommodate those learning styles. An example of a learner who really struggles with number work, and has to move at a much slower pace in numeracy, is relevant here, and the teacher will have to reflect in an individual support plan how this learner will work towards achieving the learning outcomes and assessment standards in the work schedule. Teachers must remember that adequate and timeous planning and modification of existing phase-long learning programmes, year-long work schedules and lesson plans can ensure that all learners will learn effectively and achieve their full potential. However a wider range of strategies has to be devised to ensure that the learner is making constant, individual progress towards achieving the outcomes while at the same time participating in the same lessons as other learners. It is also more manageable for the teacher than if s/he had to develop parallel learning programmes, work schedules and lesson plans for certain learners.

2.8 Supporting educators through a whole-school approach

Research conducted on the development of teachers’ skills to cope with the diverse needs of learners has highlighted all the encompassing strategies from a perspective of ‘whole school development’ which includes amongst others school culture, values and attitudes (Mitchell, 2004, Topping & Maloney 2005; Daniels, 2000; Robinson & Carrington 2002; Oswald & Engelbrecht 2004; Ainscow, 1995). It involves a process of school self-review on three dimensions concerned with school culture, policy and practice in an approach called ‘collaborative inquiry’ (Booth et al, 2000; Engelbrecht, 2006). All elements of school life should be able to reflect and work towards the development of values and norms that reflect
an inclusive and supportive teaching and learning environment (Naicker, 1999). One needs to look closely at the promotion of the concept of ‘whole-school development’ from the point of view of education support, which is conceptualised as a flexible network of service providers which fosters service delivery partnerships at all levels (DoE, 1997).

Whole-school development includes the development of a welcoming, non-discriminatory, and flexible environment and curriculum, where access to learning is facilitated through addressing barriers to learning and development at all levels of the system (Donald et al 2002). The philosophy is supported by many texts in the literature, a view that more preventative, multidisciplinary support might enable schools to address the diverse learning needs of learners (Topping & Maloney, 2005). Villa & Thousand (2003) suggest that creating planning teams, scheduling time for the teachers to work together, recognizing teachers as problem solvers, conceptualizing teachers as frontline researchers, and effectively collaborating with parents, are all dimensions to successful collaboration.

It must be understood that schools are organisations, therefore organisational development refers to a set of strategies for managing change, aimed at facilitating the development and fulfilment of people and increasing the effectiveness of the organisation as a whole (Donald et al 2002). Landsberg et al (2005) confirm that the goal of a whole-school development approach is to create inclusive cultures and practices that permeate every aspect of the school and all its activities. Robinson and Carrington (2002) argue that in order for a school to achieve a more inclusive culture, the staff needs to commit to change, progress and democratic discussion of current beliefs and practice.

2.9 SUMMARY.

In this chapter an overview of the development of inclusive education in South Africa has been presented. An overview presents the evolution of inclusive education in South Africa with the implications of teacher development in the implementation of inclusive education and its impact in addressing diverse learner needs in the education system.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research design and methodology applied to address the research question posed in this study, namely:

How did educators experience the training for the implementation of inclusive education in a full-service school?

In accordance with the above research question, the aim of the research was to explore educators’ experiences regarding the training for the implementation of inclusive education in a Full-service School.

3.2 Qualitative Research Methodology

Qualitative research was conducted in this study. Brantlinger, Jimenez, Klingner, Pugach, & Richardson (2005) describe qualitative research as a systematic approach to understanding qualities, or essential nature, of a phenomenon within a particular context. It describes the nature of certain situations, settings, processes, relationships, systems, or people, and explores the meanings, variations, and perceptual experiences of phenomena, (Crabtree & Miller, 1999). Denzil and Lincoln (2005), defines qualitative research as follow;

“Qualitative research is a multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. Qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials – case study, personal experience, introspective, life story, interview, observational, historical, interactional, and visual texts – that describe routine and problematic moments and meaning in individuals’ lives.”

The use of qualitative research design is confirmed by Mills (2007), Mertler (2009), and Jonker (2005), with reference to the following advantages of qualitative research: it allows the researcher to refine and adapt the questions as the understanding of the phenomena increases; it focuses on naturally occurring, ordinary events in natural setting so that a strong
indication can emerge of what “real life” is like, and allows the researcher to obtain authentic data drawn from the knowledge and perception of the people with whom the researcher is working. Brinkmann and Kvale (2005) support that qualitative methods are the most adequate means of knowledge production when the object is concrete human experience. These methods offer the opportunity to uncover the nature of people’s actions, decisions, beliefs, experiences and perspectives, about which little is known as yet Ritchie and Lewis (2003) and Draper (2004), confirm that qualitative research methods are designed to describe and understand certain patterns of behaviour and make actions and behaviour meaningful.

In this study the qualitative research methodology enabled the researcher to gain insight into the nature of a particular phenomenon, namely the training of educators for the implementation of inclusive education in a full-service school. The descriptions of the experiences of educators who took part in this study are therefore viewed as attributing significantly to understanding the training of teachers for participation in inclusive education system.

In relation to the use of a variety of empirical materials, the researcher generated volumes of data through interviews, observations and personal experience in a single instrumental case study (Henning, Van Rensburg & Smit 2005).

3.3 Research design

Making use of a qualitative research methodology, a single instrumental case study design was applied in this study. Studying a single case will allow the researcher to observe the characteristics of a school community as a distinct unit and provide in-depth insight (Bassey, 2000; Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). Denzin and Lincoln, (2005), concur that a case study concentrates on experiential knowledge of the case and pays attention to the influence of its social and political contexts.

3.3.1 Brief description of the case

The research for this study was conducted at a primary school which was identified by the North West provincial department of education. The primary school was converted into a full-service school, in line with the mandate for the implementation of an inclusive education and training system as outlined in the EWP 6 (DoE, 2001). As a case study the school thus provided, as argued by Simons (2009) the particularity needed to serve as an instrumental case.
The school is situated in a historically African suburb of a semi-urban town in the North West Province of South Africa. African learners who come from predominantly poor socio-economic backgrounds are enrolled at the school. Although a primarily Setswana – orientated school with over 400 learners aged between five-and-half and fourteen years old, the school also accommodates learners from other ethnic backgrounds including isiXhosa and SeSotho. The school has an average class size of 40 learners. Many learners come from the lower income bracket of the community, and the majority of learners do not enjoy a healthy breakfast at home before they go to school. The school feeding scheme provides relief for most of the learners at the school.

3.4 Participants

Participants in this study originally included the principal and 13 educators. Two male educators and 12 female educators agreed to participate in the study; however, during the interviews one female educator was not available due to other commitments. Their ages varied from mid-forties and late fifties with a mix of qualifications and experience. Older educators have diplomas and many years of experience in the teaching profession and younger educators have degrees and less experience. (See Appendix D)

The selection of participants was based on their involvement in the school as a case-study. Educators in the school were involved with the training provided by the Department of Education in the North West province. Their involvement was as result of the schools’ newly acquired status of a Full-Service school. Every educator at the school has undergone training on Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support (SIAS) and the training on the development of Inclusive Learning Programmes. The two training programmes initially took place in 2007 and again in 2009 during re-training on the National Strategy on Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support (DoE, 2008b).

3.5 Data Collection

The data in this study was collected through individual interviews, focus group interviews and observations.

3.5.1 Individual Interviews

In this study the researcher used individual interviews to embark on what Holstein and Gubrium (1997) describe as a reality-constructing and meaning-making occasion. Individual
interviews enable interviewees to express their views freely and as fully as possible (O’Hanlon, 2003).

The researcher explored the experiences of 13 educators in their training for the implementation of inclusive education by conducting individual interviews. Individual interviews took place at the school to allow easy access to the participants for direct interaction between researcher and participants. Stein and Mankowski (2004), state that this access to the participants presents the image of the researcher as advocate and the direct, personal presence of the latter in the lives of those being researched. Open-ended questions were used and participants were given approximately 20 to 30 minutes to respond. They were, however, allowed leverage to speak their minds freely on their experiences of the implementation of inclusive education in a full-service school. Prompts were used throughout the interview to gain a deeper understanding of the participants’ experience. The following open-ended question was asked during the interview: *Please, tell me about your experiences of the training for the implementation of inclusive education in a Full-Service School?*

### 3.5.2 Focus Group Interviews.

Focus group interviews serve as an explanatory technique to obtain relevant information on the reasoning, conceptions and representation of the interviewees. They use group interaction to discuss data, produce data and provide insights. Denzil and Lincoln (2005), support that focus groups induce social interaction akin to that which occurs in everyday life, but with greater focus. According to Leedy and Ormrod (2001), the in-depth focus group interviews direct the researcher’s attention to a meaningful and narrower portion of the educators’ experiences.

In this study two focus group interviews with six educators in one group and five educators in another were conducted. An outline of the questions to be posed was given at the beginning of the interviews and interviewees were notified that prompts would be used. Prompts were guided by the participants’ responses throughout the interview and no deviations from the questions prepared were entertained. During with the focus group interviews, participants were given approximately 20 to 30 minutes to respond to questions, allowing them leverage to speak their minds freely. The focus group interviews lasted for forty five minutes each. The researcher acted as the “mediator” for the group. Smith (2003), supports that the researcher in his role as a moderator poses questions, keeps the discussion flowing, and encourages full participation. All focus group interviews were recorded using an audio recorder, and were transcribed by the researcher.
3.5.3 Observations

Polkinghorn (2005) defines observation as the technique of gathering data through direct contact with the object – usually another human being. Although seen as supplementary to clarifying the data derived from participant interviews, observational data gathering may alter what people say and do and how significant events unfold, by the mere presence of the researcher (Leedy and Ormrod, 2001). Observations take on a larger role in qualitative research concerning experiences of persons who are only able to express their thoughts with difficulty (Polkinghorn, 2005). Observations need to be recorded in written form. Details that are recorded during observations include physical surroundings, people’s actions and people’s physical characteristics. Neuman (2006) argues that it is better to err by including everything than to ignore potentially significant details.

In this study the researcher conducted unstructured observations in four participants' classrooms. Although brief in nature, these unstructured observations provided useful data regarding the implementation of the training. The following guidelines by Mertler (2009) for conducting observations as part of qualitative study were used during the observations. The researcher was introduced to the participants who were observed, and a brief explanation of the purpose of the observations was given. Data were recorded during the observation by making notes and sketches. The researcher remained relatively quiet and inconspicuous during the observations.

3.6 Data Analysis

Brantlinger et al (2005), state that data analysis involves reducing the data that one has collected or has available to manageable proportions. In this study the researcher first did a global analysis of all the interview data as suggested by Henning et al (2004) to obtain an overview of the thematic range of the text. After the global reading of the text a more detailed thematic analysis, described by Braun and Clarke, 2006) as a method of identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns within and across data sets, was used in the study. The researcher identified common themes in peoples’ descriptions of their experiences to determine whether significant differences, relevant to the research question, exist. The data and their interpretations were scrutinized for underlying themes and other patterns that characterized the case more broadly than a single piece of information. The phases of thematic analysis suggested by these authors were applied in the analysis of the gathered data. It implied that the researcher identified initial codes as features of the data by hand, using colour markers. After the initial reading and coding of the data, main themes were
identified (Lewins & Silver 2008). The coding process enabled the researcher to organize the data into meaningful groups. Data extracts that demonstrated the codes were collated. Relevant information was separated from the irrelevant in the interviews and then broken into small segments that reflect specific experiences. In clustering data into meaningful groups, categories were identified. Segments were grouped into categories that reflect the various experiences of training context as they were experienced by the educators. Transcripts from interviews were coded according to themes. The codes were then combined into overarching themes with supportive subthemes. A preliminary thematic map was developed and the data-driven themes were examined to determine the accuracy of the representation of the data and discussed with the supervisor. The thematic map was then revisited by reading the excerpts from the data to establish whether they formed a coherent pattern, and whether the themes and subthemes sufficiently represent the data. The themes were then defined and refined to present the essence of the data and organized into a coherent account. The data were re-read and statements by participants that best illustrate the themes and sub-themes were incorporated into the report of the findings.

3.7 Trustworthiness of the study.

To ensure the rigor of this qualitative study the trustworthiness was ensured by applying the strategies suggested by Bryman (2001), namely credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

Credibility: Brantlinger et al (2005) describe credibility as a qualitative strategy or technique to demonstrate the soundness of the studies. It is the assessment of believability (Smit & Cilliers, 2006) and credibility of the research findings from the perspective of the members or study participants. Trochim (2006) confirms that participants are the only ones who can legitimately judge the credibility of the results. Nolan and Behi (1995), as cited in Cutcliffe & Mc Kenna (1999), argue that;

\[
\text{all criteria developed for use in qualitative studies rely heavily on presenting the results to those who were studied and asking them to verify whether or not they agree with them.}
\]

However, Simons (2009) stresses that fairness, justice and democratic process become important criteria in establishing credibility of the case. To ensure credibility of the research the reporting of the findings was credited by giving direct quotes from the interviewees, and all quotes were indexed so that they can be traced back to an identifiable participant. Greenhalgh and Taylor (1997) support that citing of actual data by the researcher would be
infinitely more credible if one or two verbatim quotes from the interviewees were produced to illustrate the gathered data. Furthermore, records of the individual and focus group interviews, including the recorded audio materials, are safely kept.

**Transferability**: refers to the degree that findings can be transferred or generalized to other settings, contexts or populations. Greenhalgh and Taylor (1997), warn that one of the commonest criticisms of qualitative research is that the findings of any qualitative study pertain only to the limited setting in which they were obtained. The researcher accepts that the findings of this study cannot necessarily be transferred to other contexts; however accepts that the person wishing to “transfer” the results to a different context will then be responsible for making the judgement of how sensible the transfer is (Trochim, 2006). Other full service school staff might be able to identify and relate to the experiences of the educators in this study and the findings can be applied to other contexts in which educators had similar training.

**Dependability**: pertains to the importance of the researcher accounting for or describing the changing contexts and circumstances that are fundamental to qualitative research. The researcher is responsible for describing the changes that occur in the setting and how these changes affected the way the researcher approached the study (Trochim, 2006).

The researcher provides clear description of the context and procedure and methods applied in this study. Complete records of all phases of the research are kept where they can be accessed, including interview transcripts. The supervisor and co-supervisor acted as auditors to establish how far proper procedures had been followed (Bryman, 2001).

**Confirmability**: refers to the extent that the research findings can be confirmed or corroborated by others. Lincoln and Guba (1985), outline strategies to enhance confirmability as including searching for and describing negative instances that run contrary to most findings and conducting a data audit that examines data collection and analysis procedures to pinpoint areas of bias or distortion Trochim (2006).

The confirmability of the research is done through the process of triangulation. The study presented written records of what the participants said and individual and focus group interviews were audio recorded. Verbatim accounts of the participants’ experiences were given (Maree, 2007). Participants were given leverage to speak their minds freely and the researcher remained objective throughout the study.

**Authenticity**: Fossey, Harvey, McDermott, and Davidson (2002) describe authenticity as the presentation of findings and interpretations in the voices of the participants presented in verbatim quotes; a presentation of a range of views including dissenting views, the
recognisability of descriptions and interpretations of data to those having experiences in the situations described, and the extent of power relations in data collection and analysis. Neuman (2006), defines authenticity as giving a fair, honest and balanced account of social life from the viewpoint of someone who lives it every day.

To ensure authenticity in this study, direct quotes from the participants were given and presented verbatim. A range of views including dissenting views were presented. A fair, honest and balanced account of the experiences of educators with their training in the implementation of inclusive education in a full service school was given.

3.8 Ethical considerations

3.8.1 Permission

To conduct this study it was incumbent upon the researcher to act according to the ethical requirements of the North West University (2003). Permission was sought from the North West University Ethics Committee and from the District Director of Education, Dr Kenneth Kaunda District of the North-West Department of Education, as well as the principal of the full-service school (DoE, 2001).

3.8.2 Informed consent

Research participants were consulted regarding the aims of the research and its methodology. They were thus informed about the nature of the study and were given the choice of either participating or withdrawing from participating (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). Denzil and Lincoln (2005) confirm that participants must agree voluntarily to participate, without any form of coercion, and their agreement must be based on full and open information. Educators’ responses were anonymous and each participant was given a consent form to sign (Neuman, 2006). The consent form further outlines their rights in terms of their participation in the research.

3.8.3 Privacy and Confidentiality

Subsequent to the use of human subjects in this study and in consideration of their vulnerability, safeguards to protect their identities were prioritized and confidentiality was assured as the primary safeguard against unwanted exposure. Denzil and Lincoln (2005) warn that all personal data ought to be secured or concealed and made public only behind a
shield of anonymity. Serame (2007), supports that the identity of the respondents should remain confidential throughout the research project and confidentiality should be preserved during the documentation and reporting processes.

Participants’ identities were concealed to avoid any harm or embarrassment, and to avert insensitive research practices. Jonker (2005), concurs that the required precautionary measures should be applied in order for participants to participate freely without the possibility that their private thoughts or behaviour would ever be misused or used in such a way that they would be embarrassed. On the same score Leedy and Ormrod (2001) reiterate that under no circumstances should a research report, either oral or written, be presented in such a way that others become aware of how a particular participant responded or behaved, unless the participant has specifically granted such permission, in writing, for this to happen.
CHAPTER 4
REPORT AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter the position of the researcher as the main research instrument in this qualitative study is explained. The SIAS training is discussed as a backdrop to the reporting and discussion of the findings. The findings are then reported with reference to themes and sub-themes that emerged from the data, followed by a deeper level engagement with the findings in relation to the research question posed at the onset of this chapter, namely:

How did educators experience the training for the implementation of inclusive education in a full service school?

In the discussion the various themes that were identified are elaborated on against the background of the literature and my own understanding in terms of the dynamics of the training process.

4.2 Position of the researcher

The researcher worked closely with the school and the school community under investigation in particular with the teacher component in the school, first as a leader in the branch structure of the teachers union, secondly as an educator at Ikalafeng Special School as Resource Centre which, according to EWP 6 (DoE, 2001), is part of the national field testing project, and should collaboratively work with the full-service school in the neighbourhood. During the period of this study the researcher moved to the district office of the Department of Education in his current employment capacity as an education specialist, thus becoming a member of the district-based support team. The researcher, in his current capacity, is supporting educators in schools through, amongst other duties, training of the educators on the conceptualisation of the Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support strategy (DoE, 2008b), and the development of Inclusive Learning Programmes (DoE, 2005d).

In view of the above, the researcher entered the research well aware that his position may have influenced the way respondents conducted themselves during the interviews. Some may have found this study an opportunity to vent their frustrations with the inclusion of
learners experiencing barriers to learning in their classrooms. Others may have refrained from antagonistic engagement with the researcher, because of dual roles of the researcher. Being the trainer from their employer, the researcher may have been perceived to be in a position of authority, representing an oppressive stance. In the process some participants may have reverted to a strategy of misleading the researcher by using “nice” phrases. The researcher therefore respected the participants’ opinion but realised that continued critical reflection on the data was necessary in view of his position of power.

4.3 The Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support training

The training for screening, identification, assessment and support involved the use of transparencies that outlined the concepts and processes associated with the SIAS strategy (DoE, 2008). Screening, identification, assessment and support were defined with reference to the SIAS documents (DoE, 2008b). These documents consist of a school pack, and Learner Profile. It was assumed that educators were familiar with the Learner Profile. This assumption was made in light of the fact that schools had been provided with Learner Profiles. However, it should be noted that the Learner Profiles currently used in schools differ slightly from the one provided for the SIAS process. The Learner Profile in the SIAS process includes references to the vulnerability of the learner with diverse barriers. The school pack contains different forms required to be completed during the implementation of the strategy. These forms comprise a Diagnostic Profile, Support Needs Assessment Form (Section 1 and 2), Individual Support Plan (Section 3a), Assessment for Support Requirement (Section 3b), School Request Form for Additional Support, and Section 4, Action Plan for Additional Support Provision and Monitoring. The material explained the stages involved in the SIAS process with examples of different forms applicable to each stage. During the training, facilitators, with educators, scrutinized the different forms so as to ascertain what information was required for completion of the forms. The trainers explained how educators should complete the Learner Profile with particular attention to the indications of barriers to learning. Educators were alerted to the fact that whenever they detect barriers to learning, the Diagnostic Profile should be completed by a health professional, after which the ILST in consultation with the parent/caregiver will facilitate the completion of the Support Needs Assessment Form 1, Section 1. It implied that during the training particular attention was given to the ways in which educators, parents and ILST should communicate about the extrinsic as well as the intrinsic barriers (Landsberg, 2005). The training provided clear guidelines for understanding the role of the DBSTs as they relate to the SIAS process, since the DBSTs facilitate the implementation of the SIAS process.
4.4 Findings

In this chapter a detailed report of findings emanating from the data collected through individual and focus group interviews is presented. The data present three overarching main themes of the findings namely, readiness for the implementation of the SIAS process, concerns about the training and challenges in the implementation of the training. The subthemes relating to each of the main themes are indicated in Table 4.1 below:

### TABLE 4 Main themes and subthemes relating to educators’ experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN THEMES</th>
<th>SUBTHEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| THEME 1 \ READINESS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SIAS PROCESS | • Readiness for screening and identification  
• Readiness for assessment  
• Readiness for support  
• Shifting responsibility for support  
• Changed attitude towards learners  
• Resistance to inclusion |
| THEME 2 \ CONCERNS ABOUT THE TRAINING | • Lack of consideration for trainees  
• Engagement with the trainers  
• Practical applications  
• Continuation of support |
| THEME 3 \ CHALLENGES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TRAINING | • Time constraints  
• Discrepancies between differentiation and assessment  
• Availability of human resources  
• Access to physical resources and assistant devices  
• Sustainable support for learners  
• Lack of parental involvement |

### 4.4.1 THEME 1: readiness for the implementation of SIAS

Readiness for the implementation of the SIAS process refers to educators’ subjective experiences of their own readiness to apply the SIAS process after they have completed the training. The following sub-themes regarding their readiness emerged from the data:
4.4.1.1 Readiness for screening and identification

Readiness for screening and identification refers to the ability of the educators to understand the problems experienced by the learners. The participants indicated that they realised the value of screening and identification as a way to gain insight into the learners’ problems and support needs as indicated in the statements below:

- *I think screening is like looking for their profiles and all those things. I think it is good because you cannot teach a learner whereas you don’t have information about her, you do not know nothing about her…* (INDV 10)

- *The identification itself I think it’s a positive issue out of the whole of this programme in the sense that we are becoming more aware of the learners’ special needs…* (INDV 13)

- *What I’ve received from the training from Sisonke was the identification was vital, it was the one that was opening my eyes for me so that I can identify learners who have barriers to learning and know the types of barriers we can identify in a school situation or in a classroom situation.* (FG 2)

- *The participants also reported that the training enabled them to be more efficient in the screening and identification of learners. They seem to be able to recognise the different types of barriers to learning:*  
- What I’ve received from the training from Sisonke was the identification was vital, it was the one that was opening my eyes for me so that I can identify learners who have barriers to learning and know the types of barriers we can identify in a school situation or in a classroom situation. (FG 2)

- *My strong point, I can identify learners with barriers the minute he comes in my class, I can see this one or may be after some few class works I am able to identify him.* (INDV 4)

- *I have got some information from my study, I can identify that this learner is not ready to write the shape of the letters and then you see that the maybe when he started he was not ready for writing. He can’t write in the lines so we can identify those learners …* (INDV 9)

- *If a child suffers from hearing loss you will be able to identify such learner. You are able to identify learners experiencing barriers to learning.* (INDV 7)
We are able to identify the learners with problems, we can identify and select that the learner has the ear problem or social problem. (INDV 7)

They also indicated that the ability to screen and identify enhanced their ability to provide support to the learners and recognise progress in the learners’ performance. The statements below serve as evidence:

I can screen, I can screen, I can help those learners and at the end of the day I can see progress that is why I’m saying the course really helped me a lot. (INDV 1)

I see that learners are progressing, those slow ones are progressing and the ones with barriers are becoming better. (INDV 1)

In terms of readiness for screening and identification, the findings apparently indicate that, based on the training provided, educators realised the value of screening and identification as ways to gain insight into the learners’ problems and support needs. Educators assertively indicated that they can screen and identify barriers to learning. However, based on the way in which they perceived screening and identification, it seemed as if educators did not clearly grasp what screening and identification entailed. The educators’ confusion regarding screening and identification was demonstrated by references to aspects such as lesson planning and preparation, differentiation of a lesson, and giving learners enough time to complete their tasks, as problems they were faced with in terms of the application of screening and identification in their classrooms. However these aspects rather relate to the provision of support for learners experiencing barriers to learning.

The indication that educators seem to understand screening and identification of barriers to learning as a spontaneous process that can take place outside the prescripts of the SIAS process, evokes concern regarding the training. In this study educators reported that they feel confident to screen and identify learners who experience barriers to learning as soon as they entered their classroom. However, Broderick, Mehta-Parekh and Reid (2005), warn against this practice and suggest that it might facilitate the labelling of students. This can predispose an educator to look for particular deficits associated with that label, as well as respond to the student in day-to-day classroom interactions as though the student truly possessed the expected characteristics. In line with the argument of Broderick et al. (2005), the SIAS strategy prescribes a shift away from the identification of intrinsic barriers of the learners without making a thorough investigation of the contextual factors which impact on teaching and learning (DoE, 2005c; DoE, 2008b).

Screening and identification are closely linked to admission of learners (DoE, 2008b). The admission processes are aimed at the development of a proper learner profile from the day
the learner enters either Grade R (DoE, 2008b) or when referred to the school. Gordon (2003) contends that the development of a learner profile from the moment the learners enter the school facilitates early identification and support that might prevent labelling. The use of a learner profile will ensure that the support needs of learners are understood.

However, in this study the educators did not even refer to an admission process when they reflected about screening and identification. Lack of reference to the admission process is understandable if one keeps in mind that educators in most schools, including the school under investigation, have never been involved with the admission processes. The process is mainly relegated to management staff informed by professional staff.

The SIAS strategy requires educators to take an active role in the admission of learners as a prerequisite for the implementation of the strategy. The educators’ claim that they can screen and identify learners experiencing barriers to learning when they were probably not even involved with the admissions of learners is therefore questionable.

Being involved with the admissions of learners is considered essential and encompasses the completion of a learner profile in consultation with the parent/caregiver. The completion of a learner profile in terms of the SIAS process enables educators to identify initial risk factors (DoE, 2008b). Educators’ apparent limited involvement in the admission of learners therefore poses serious problems in the implementation of the SIAS process. This lack of involvement in the admission process seems to relate to the lack of in-depth understanding of the SIAS process, which might indicate that training lacks clarity in this regard. Due to their lack of involvement in the admission of learners, educators will probably continue to screen and identify in a spontaneous manner, based on their experience as educators. The apparent lack of involvement in the admission process might therefore lead to the misinterpretation of information about the barriers to learning experienced by learners in their classrooms.

Therefore, a need for re-training arises to facilitate a deeper understanding of barriers to learning. Such a deeper understanding will enable educators to extend the screening process into their usual education duties of lesson preparation, marks administration, and when they assign tasks, to assess comprehension of work covered. In the execution of education duties the educator would then be alert to such patterns and unusual behaviour. They would become active participants in the ongoing process of screening and identification that is supposed to happen in the course of ordinary teaching. This process of screening and identification is not an isolated event, as some educators’ responses about screening and identification seem to suggest.
Readiness for assessment refers to the educators’ ability to assess the nature and level of the barriers to learning to determine the support package required. In terms of readiness for assessment, participants in this study have indicated that assessment is a difficult process, thus they are not clear about it. The statements below bear testimony:

Assessment is a very difficult process………. (INDV 6)

I’m still not clear about assessment………. INDV 3)

However, it has emerged from the findings that participants confuse assessment of the nature of the support needed and the level of the intensity of the support to be provided. The latter is confused with assessment as it relate to teaching and learning which encompasses evaluation and monitoring of the progress learners make in achieving the set standards. The statement below is evidence of the above:

Yes, in terms of SIAS because I know that this one, if this one is, he is having barriers I know how to assess him. I will go to the lower assessment standards. (FG1)

This one participant has however demonstrated his understanding of assessment as it relates to the SIAS process although, as rightly pointed out, they are not ready to assess the barrier learners experience owing to the lack of materials used to assess these barriers. Below are quotes illustrating the above statements:

The problem is that we are not ready to assess them, the barrier that they are experiencing… ……. (INDV 9)

We don’t have these materials which we can assess those learners. (INDV 9)

In terms of the SIAS process, the particular interpretation of assessment should be understood in relation to assessment in the context of teaching and learning that encompass the evaluation and monitoring of the progress learners make in achieving the set standards as prescribed. Landsberg (2005) indicate that assessment should be ongoing throughout the learning support to determine whether the learner has mastered the skills from a learning-support session. In the training on the development of inclusive learning programmes, differentiation of assessment standards as defined in the Guidelines for Inclusive Learning Programmes (DoE, 2005d) were outlined. The training asserted that assessment needs to be appropriate and relevant to the realities and context of the person or institution concerned. It is for this reason that the multi-dimensional or systemic nature of assessment should be located within the framework of barriers in respect of the individual learner and educator,
curriculum, institution, and family, community and social contextual levels. In terms of the SIAS process, assessment refers to a formal review of the information provided in Stages 1 and 2 which will ensure that informed decisions about the level of support needed and the type of support package required are made (DoE, 2008b).

During the training referred to in this study, the trainers indicated that assessment in the implementation of the SIAS process involved the completion of SNA, Sections 3a & 3b. It was explained that the completion of SNA, Section 3, attempts to understand the nature of the support needed and the level of the support to be provided. The forms need to be completed by the district based support team in consultation with the institutional-level support team. This should be done in consultation with the educator and parents or caregivers of the learners. This Section 3 only applies to learners who have been identified in the screening and identification stages as having high or very high needs (DoE, 2008b). Learners thus identified are rated level 4 and 5 in the rating key. It was emphasised that high or very high needs are defined in the SIAS strategy as requiring high frequency intervention once per week or even daily by either a member of the ILST or specialist staff in consultation with the DBST. The facilitators took educators through the form to ensure that they are familiarised with the information required to determine the information needed to provide support.

The educators who participated in this study repeatedly expressed difficulties with the implementation of this level of assessment, as explained during the training. The reference to the difficulties seems to relate to the fact that the educators understood assessment as part of their curricular duties as described by the role as assessor (Landsberg, 2005). This understanding is not wrong but may diminish the SIAS understanding. In the inclusive learning programmes training, assessment was presented as part of an integrated process of support. Due to the various definitions of the concept of assessment, educators apparently find it difficult to distinguish between the different forms of assessment and still see assessment only as a curricular activity that is an essential part of teaching and learning. As long as educators are not clear regarding assessment as it relates to the level and nature of support as prescribed or suggested by the SIAS process, they will remain confused, and therefore not ready to effectively implement the SIAS process as trained. It should be emphasised that in light of the confusion around the unpacking of assessment in the SIAS process, it cannot be expected of educators to adequately assess for the nature and the level of support as required by SIAS (DoE, 2008b; DoE, 2005c). In relation to this Hamre and Oyler (2004) say that, unlike their special education counterparts, educators entering ‘regular education’ do not have much experience with people with disabilities. In view of the above, it seems necessary to accept that the DBSTs will be expected to lead the assessment process.
for support (DoE, 2008b), and get more actively involved in the assessment of severe barriers to learning until mainstream educators are sufficiently equipped to be involved in the assessment.

On reflection, it seemed evident that the SIAS training regarding assessment was a formalistic form-driven event. Due to this state of affairs, educators are not equipped to facilitate the assessment process, as indicated by their repeated reference to the difficulties that they experience with the implementation of assessment after being trained. Therefore educators alone cannot be blamed.

### 4.4.1.3 Readiness for support

Readiness for support refers to educators’ understanding of their roles and responsibilities to provide support to learners in the teaching and learning process. Participants reported that adaptation and differentiation were not well explained. One particular aspect of adaptation that is not clear is that they have to prepare a lesson for both learners experiencing problems and those without barriers at the same time. Participants report that they are not clear as to what should be done in a classroom. The uncertainty about adaptation and differentiation seems evident in the statements below:

………. And (the) drawback was when coming to differentiation and adaptation, then there we had a problem cause you have to prepare for learners with special needs and for ordinary learners in the mainstream. That was a problem for me because it was not clearly demonstrated how to do that although we tried but we are still struggling with that, we are not yet sure and even as clear as what one should do when we do adaptation in the classroom situation. (FG 2)

Concerning adaptation they should have shown us clearly, they should have demonstrated to us that this is how you do adaptation in the classroom because at the moment there is no set of rules or there is no clear guidelines as to how to conduct such a lesson or such evaluation in a classroom situation. (INDV 11)

I have identified problems in the classroom for example a child that doesn’t write, it’s a fact but I don’t know how to differentiate and adapt into that particular situation. (FG 2)

Like as I mentioned, the planning and preparation, how to go about in planning a lesson to help those learners with special needs. Differentiation let me say, lesson differentiation. I’m still experiencing a problem. (INDV 2)
It seems evident that the uncertainty about adaptation and differentiation is underpinned by a lack of understanding and confusion about what adaptation implies in practice, with particular reference to the differentiation in terms of assessment, lesson planning and the balancing of the interests of all learners when adaptation and differentiation is applied. The quotes below serve as examples of the confusion:

"Adaptation was not so well explained because what I've noticed is that if you have to evaluate learners with two different sections you have to go and set different sets of questions that one for the learners who got problems in learning and those learners who are in the main stream that is a problem because if you have to set questions for both of learners and you must put it in your teacher profile of which is not possible. (INDV 11)"

"What can we do in a classroom, what we should do just have to degrade the, downgrade the lesson so that it suits those learners who are very slow in class, so in other words no additional teaching aids, you have to use the normal textbook that you have in your classroom, there's no other textbook that show you how to deal with a specific learner who has a particular problem like a learner who is very slow like may be function at a certain level, we don't have a clear guide. (INDV 11)."

During the observations the educators also demonstrated that they could adapt their lessons through simplifying tasks for learners experiencing scholastic barriers.

"If you try other methods of differentiation other kids will take advantage of those ones and want to be the same as those at the end of the day. I don't understand, I don't understand then you are having a problem because they see that you are spending more time with that ones and those with the special needs their work is a little bit simpler than theirs. (INDV 6)"

The observations revealed that educators spend more time with learners perceived to be experiencing barriers thereby involuntarily ignoring other learners.

The participants indicated that they know when to apply lower assessment standards for learners who have barriers to learning. The educators are however concerned about the learners who cannot even respond to the lowest assessment standards. The quotes below confirm the above-mentioned:

"Yes, in terms of that SIAS because I know that this one, if this one is, he is having barriers I know how to assess him. I will go to the lower assessment standards. (FG 1)"
There was evidence during observations that educators apply lower assessment standards for learners experiencing barriers:

   Now, I don’t know about these learners who can’t cope whether……..even we use the lowest assessment standards but they can’t, they cannot do those assessment standards, they cannot do anything in the class. (FG 1)

One aspect of adaptation and differentiation that participants seem to have grasped is the allocation of sufficient time for learners who experience barriers to learning to complete their tasks. Participants indicate that they no longer rush learners with barriers to learning to finish the tasks in a particular period of time. Instead, they leave them to continue with their work at their own pace, as described by one participant:

   At least now learners who experience problems, I give them enough time, let us say, I’m giving them certain tasks to do, I don’t rush them, I leave them and continue with others whilst they are doing their work at their own pace. (INDV 2)

This aspect was demonstrated during observations, however not well managed and eventually learners do not get to complete their tasks. During observations the ability of educators to give learners experiencing barriers enough time and simplifying learner tasks was demonstrated.

During the training the trainers explained the purpose of support in the SIAS process. The educators were then familiarised with Section 4 of the SNA that includes the Action Plan for Additional Support Provision and Monitoring. The form was then completed by the DBST in consultation with a representative from the ILST.

The purpose of the form is to provide information on what the school is currently able to provide, what the school will need to be supported in, and what the school does not have available at that particular stage. In compiling the Action Plan the details of curriculum differentiation, devices, environmental access, staff and training needs are recorded. Most important is that the form must be updated throughout the year during each consultation session of the ILST or monitoring visit of the DBST (DoE, 2008b).

The findings indicated that the training sensitised educators for their role in the support of learners. They now seem to understand that they have a responsibility to provide support to learners in the teaching and learning process. With reference to research by (Mashau, Steyn, Van der Walt and Wolhuter 2008), this might indicate that educators realized that they are already providing support in their day-to-day classroom practices and only need to sharpen
these competencies. Educators in this study also seemed to have had some competencies prior to the training, as suggested by Magare (2008).

In terms of practising the competencies, the findings confirmed, as indicated by Paterson (2007), that educators’ competence to support learners in their classroom entails acknowledging the individual needs of the learners and designing instructions that will be meaningful for all learners. The findings however revealed that limited time is available in a lesson delivery. Time is often insufficient to adequately support learners experiencing barriers in the classroom in the ways in which educators planned to do (Engelbrecht et al, 2003). The educators emphasised that the provision of individualised support demands more time. Evidently educators then spend a lot of time supporting individual learners while neglecting others in a classroom (Engelbrecht et al, 2001). Evidence points to the inability of the training to empower educators to manage their teaching time for equitable support provision.

The provision of support for learners who experience severe barriers to learning is based on an individual support plan that is developed once it is evident that a learner is vulnerable and at risk. The individual support plan hence forms the basis for the educator’s planning to accommodate learners who experience severe barriers to learning. Educators apparently understand that support begins with the accommodation of the learner in the lesson plan (DoE, 2005c, DoE, 2008b). However, they need to be able to develop a differentiated lesson plan which includes an individual support plan. Janney and Snell (2006) explain that individualised adaptations comprise the accommodations and modifications that are part of a learner’s individual support. A differentiated lesson planning determines the variations in mode of delivery and assessment process to accommodate learners experiencing barriers to learning (DoE, 2005b). However, Broderick et al. (2005) recommend that a responsive lesson that differentiates instruction for all students from the onset should be planned, instead of modifying one for disabled students.

The training failed to demonstrate that in the compilation of the action plan during the recording of details of curriculum differentiation, how a differentiated lesson plan can be developed. Lack of in-depth content in the development of a differentiated lesson plan and appropriate professional training can only leave educators demanding more training, hence they are not fully empowered.

4.4.1.4 Shifting responsibility for support

Shifting responsibility for support refers to the notion of participants to hold other stakeholders, and in particular the district-based support team in their region, responsible for
the lack of support provided for learners. When asked about their readiness to provide support to learners after the training, it was evident that some participants do not feel equipped to support learners, while others immediately turn the focus to the role of the DBST in their region and blame them for a lack of support - as indicated in the statements below:

........from there after identifying them, the problem is we are not ready to assess them, the barrier that they are ........, so most of the learners we have identified their barriers but they have not yet been supported and given that assistance that they can cope  (INDV 9)

…this thing of DBST that is not giving us support even the ILST of the school, but she is trying, let me tell you there are some few pupils who are already placed in different……through our ILST and our ILST was fighting a lot with the DBST up there because they were doing nothing, so from the ILST we go to the DBST but sometimes you don’t get support from them but there at school we are trying through , we don’t have time but at least we trying, now time and again we have meetings and then we are come up with our problems and then the chairperson take them up. The problem is the placing of learners, it’s a long process, today we are still stuck with learners who are supposed to be placed at Ikalafeng, they tell us of age and what and what, so that learner just still in the classroom. ( FG 1)

The support, because the DBST does not come to our school regularly; they stay away for a long time and by the time they come there is a list of all those learners and when are they going to attend to them?  (INDV 4)

The training provided clear guidelines for understanding the role of the DBSTs as it relates to the SIAS process, since the DBSTs facilitates the implementation of the SIAS process. The guidelines gave an overview of the roles of district based support teams with regard to the management of the SIAS process as a measure to establish a support system. The roles as summarised in the training material (DoE, 2008b), include the planning, support and provision to schools, teachers and learners and monitoring support provision in a monitoring and consultative way. It is stressed in the document that SIAS strategy is an official process which is one of the core functions of the DBST.

All support staff in the DBST, including curriculum and institutional managers, human resource planning and development coordinators, social workers, therapists, psychologists and other health professionals, are provided for in the guidelines.

In this study it became evident that educators ascribed their inability to effectively implement the training to a lack of adequate support provided by the district based support team. The
educators perceived regular monitoring and evaluation of their performance in the implementation as critical (DoE, 2004a), and reported that the DBST failed to comply with these expectations. It is important to note that educators seemed very interested in developing more interactive relations with the DBST. It was furthermore evident that they wanted these relations to translate into regular visits and partnering in the development of an action plan. The action plan should reflect scheduled engagements between the school and the teams. The finding thus indicated, as suggested in research by Engelbrecht et al. (2003), that the implementation of inclusive education policies might require consistent monitoring and guidance. This might be even more relevant in Full-Service Schools due to the challenges that educators face in these contexts in relation to the implementation of inclusive education.

Contrary to the expectations of educators, the interaction envisioned between the school and the DBST, as indicated in the SIAS strategy as prescribed at stage 3 of the process, merely entails the completion of SNA: Section 3a and 3b, Assessment for Support Requirements and School Request Form for Additional Support (DoE, 2008b). The engagement between the school and the DBST are thus limited by these prescriptions. Any attempts at engagement outside these prescripts are considered as defeating the spirit of the implementation strategy. It is apparent then that the DBSTs only engage with the educators in a very formal, mechanistic way that seems to frustrate the educators. What caused concern is that there seemed to be no progress regarding support for educators, despite indications in research by Engelbrecht et al, done in 2003, that the state of support for educators was inadequate, if not absent.

In view of the above, it seems evident that the training did not sufficiently highlight the role of the educators in providing support for learners. This inevitably leads to a lack of understanding of how they fit into the support process and resulted in the scapegoating of the DBST. The situation is further perpetuated by the dehumanising manner in which the SIAS process has been implemented without consideration for educators’ input, perhaps in the form of narratives about the ways in which they support, or through the sharing of ideas.

### 4.4.1.5 Changed attitudes towards learners

Participants in this study reported that prior to the training they apparently did not understand the behaviour of learners who experience barriers to learning. The training has however allowed them to adopt a different attitude towards learners against whom they would have discriminated in the past. Flowing from the training, participants pointed out that they are now more open towards learners with behaviour problems and they don’t discriminate against learners in the same way that they did prior to the training, by labelling and calling learners
by ‘funny’ names. They have instead realised that every learner is unique. This is how one participant reports this shift in attitude towards the learners:

I think we are able to accommodate every learner, we don't discriminate now like in the past we used to call learners by names, we notice that every learner is unique, so we must learn his/her needs.  

(INDV 2)

Evident during the observations was, educators taking effort to accommodate diverse learner needs. Educators have shown greater sensitivity towards learners experiencing barriers in their classrooms.

And at least from this SIAS education we know that no learner should be discriminated, they are all equal in the classroom whereas in that education we used to take them in the next class and teach them aside, so we know that we don't discriminate.  

(INDV 2)

The change in attitude seems to relate to the feeling of empathy towards learners experiencing barriers and the understanding that all learners must participate in learning and teaching environment without being discriminated against. The following quotes illustrate the above:

So I learnt that I should have empathy, treat learners who have problems at home. I call the learner and find out what is the problem, if maybe is not feeling well or somehow.  

(INDV 2)

I think I like that all learners must participate in the learning and teaching, they must participate well, they must be able to take part …  

(INDV 2)

Evident during the observations was, educators taking effort to accommodate diverse learner needs.

The attitudes of educators regarding inclusion of learners in mainstream education have received a lot of attention in research (Hay, Smit & Paulsen, 2001). The training therefore emphasised that educators’ attitudes in the implementation of the SIAS process are crucial to maximise the participation of all learners in the curriculum and minimize barriers to learning. Educators need a change in attitude, in behaviour and teaching methods (DoE, 2008b).

The involvement of educators in the implementation of inclusive education implies that they should be open and willing to engage in sound observation, interviews and consultation, reflection, formative actions, previous records and should also be grounded in the curriculum. All these strategies should be explored in partnership with the parents/caregivers, and as far as possible should also involve the learners. It implies that in their understanding of the
diverse needs of learners, educators must take care not to promote exclusionary practices by labelling learners who are identified for additional support, but to display a non-judgemental attitude.

To effectively address diversity in the classroom, the educator must consider individual past experiences, learning styles, and preferences, develop questions and activities that are aimed at different levels of ability, and modify expectations for some learners, including adapting objectives or outcomes, providing opportunities for a variety of participation levels such as individual, pair and small group activities. In addition, they need to give learners choices in determining what methods they use for gathering and synthesizing information in demonstrating their understanding of the concept, accepting that individual methods are of equal value. Their evaluation of learners should be based on individual objectives and progress. The findings indicated that the training yielded positive change in educators’ attitudes towards learners who experience behavioural barriers to learning. The educators reported before the training, that in the past, they often used derogatory labels for learners with behavioural barriers. According to Broderick et al (2005), the labelling of people implies a lack of understanding of the other person’s contexts, due to unwillingness to investigate the underlying contextual causes of such disability. The training seemed to facilitate a willingness to be more open towards learners’ contexts, which in turn facilitated a better understanding of those learners with behavioural problems.

It was also evident in the findings that educators developed feelings of empathy, acceptance and understanding which helped them to change their attitudes towards the learners experiencing barriers to learning, thereby confirming findings of research by Engelbrecht et al (2003). The training together with the expectations’ suggested in the *Norms and Standards for Educators*, that educators should mediate learning and fulfil a pastoral role, probably contributed to a change in attitude towards learners who experience behavioural problems.

The change in attitudes manifests in educators refraining from discriminatory practices and being more accommodative of diverse learning barriers. However, the change in attitudes alone cannot guarantee the achievement of expected outcomes in pursuit of learners’ full learning potential.

### 4.4.1.6 Resistance to inclusion

Resistance to inclusion indicates the unwillingness of educators to accept that they should accommodate learners who experience barriers to learning in their classes, even though it challenges their comfort zones. Resistance is evident in the ways some educators argue for the separation of learners who might cause trouble or need extra time, since according to the
educators they hamper other learners because they need additional time. Apparently the educators want things to return to the old ways before inclusion since inclusion, according to some of them, does not work. The following statements serve as evidence of the nature and extent of the resistance to inclusion:

Yes it does work, but not so much, sometimes with some learners it is possible however with others it is not especially learners from T, if it was possible I would ask the Principal not to admit learners from T (a centre for street children). (INDV 7)

This thing is now new. How about these learners with barriers should have their own class, so that one can teach freely without wasting other’s time. (INDV 8)

So I think if may be we have some period that those students, someone with remedial then you put those children that you see that these children need thorough remedial then you put them in that class for that time, so after you have remedied those learners give them back to ……. (INDV 9)

I would suggest that not to, OK, we put all these learners in the same class but there must be sometimes when these learners are taken out of the class and be placed or at any period you take others to that learning area and then you leave those in the and then somebody will come and do something with those who can’t cope. (INDV 9)

I think I could not mix them, I’ll have to separate them, the one with disabilities may be they can have their own school there, like Ikalafeng, not to mix with others. (INDV 9)

With me but not with the learners, because there are so many teaching aids and it is a waste of time, some learners are not grasping so that is why I am using the old didactics. (INDV 8)

As I have mentioned in the beginning, these learners are not the same, you are likely to waste time on an individual learner, as I have only one learner in my classroom who is experiencing barriers. I am supposed to, even when I am exhausted, attend to this learner after school - still the learner does not grasp. (INDV 8)

There is a number of things that you see is positive although you cannot apply it but if you read it and you see it when you are doing, you see that those are the positive thing, so the inclusion, to include all the learners at this moment I don’t see it working. (INDV 9)

The educators at the schools that were selected to be converted into Full-Service Schools were not involved in the decision of the department to convert some schools into such
centres. Neither were they consulted in terms of their needs as these relate to the implementation of inclusive education in a full service school. The way in which the training was presented and organised might also have confirmed that the implementation of inclusive education is not negotiable.

In view of the above, the findings indicate that some educators vehemently resist inclusion and unwittingly despise involvement in its training, including the training on SIAS and ILP. This came as no surprise. The resistance seemed present in various degrees. In some instances the participants doubtfully support inclusion. In other instances though, strong resistance is shown. Blatant resistance was evident in the refusal to implement the training (Engelbrecht et al, 2006). It is important to notice that the blatant resistance came from a participant who had thirty-three years of experience in teaching and was on the brink of retirement. The other participants who showed resistance are in their eighteenth, and close to twentieth year in teaching. The findings hence confirmed research by Gilmore, Campbell and Cuskelly (2003) who found that educators become less positive with increasing years of classroom experience. It should however be considered that all the educators involved in the research have not been trained in inclusive education and learner support. They have worked mainly in the previous dispensation where special schools accommodated the learners who were privileged by the system, whilst learners who were disadvantaged by the system were either included by default and expected to cope, or excluded completely from the school system.

Another possible reason for resistance might be the argument held by the educators in this study that learners experiencing barriers to learning should be taught in separate settings. Abosi (2000) also found that many educators had expressed reservations about the integration of people with disabilities despite the advantages. The preference is substantiated by perceptions that inclusion of learners experiencing barriers to learning into mainstream classrooms is a waste of time for other learners (Engelbrecht et al, 2003). They argue that adaptations in the modes of curriculum delivery and the provision of individualised support for learners who experience barriers to learning delay the process of teaching and are tantamount to neglecting other learners. However, Janney and Snell (2006), in support of inclusive education, state that achieving the goal of inclusive education in ensuring that learners with disabilities become full members of their school and classroom groups, is most feasible when classmates with and without disabilities engage in shared learning activities and know how to relate and interact successfully with one another. This should be the basis for educators’ perceptions as they relate to the implementation of inclusive education in their classrooms. In view of the resistance still displayed by educators after the training had been
completed it seems that the training fell short in transforming the perceptions educators hold about the implementation of inclusive education.

4.4.2 THEME 2: Concerns about the training

Concerns about the training refer to the shortcomings experienced during the training which have a bearing on the effectiveness of the implementation of the training. The following aspects have been identified as the limitations in the training.

4.4.2.1 Lack of consideration for trainees

Lack of consideration for trainees refers to the insensitivity towards the educators’ programme and workload in the planning of the training schedule.

It is apparent that training which is scheduled for the afternoon poses serious challenges for the participants. The participants clearly indicate that they are really tired in the afternoons after a full day at school. They request that this should be taken into consideration during the planning. They propose that the training should commence in the morning since they then have the energy for grasping and internalising the training. The statements below confirm the above:

*Refrain from scheduling training in the afternoon as by that time we are exhausted.*
*(INDV 7)*

*No, I think in the afternoon we are a little bit tired, I think if they use time in the morning, our minds are still fresh.* *(INDV 2)*

The training presented to educators since the advent of a new educational dispensation seems to have adopted a top-down approach (Robinson & Soudien 2009). Trainees were presented with masses of documentation. The content was then explained with very limited time allowed for interaction and without considering the knowledge and needs of the trainees. The nature of the presentations hence inhibits active engagement in the form of discussions and reflections on the experiences of the trainees. The situation was compounded by the fact that the training took place in the afternoon after the educators had attended to the learners for the whole day. Fatigue therefore also played a significant role in educators’ active engagement. Although the trainers attempted to allow questions, the time provided did not allow it. As a result, the training seemed to lack depth, hence concurring with the findings of research conducted seven years ago by Engelbrecht et al (2003). The participants apparently acquired some knowledge about various aspects of the SIAS process.
as indicated in research by Moats and Lyon (1993), who found that educators often report that they are given a smattering of everything and nothing in depth.

The lack of in-depth discussions in the training, as a result of monologues by presenters, is detrimental to a reciprocal process of learning (Angelis, Stylianou & Gibbs, 2006). The findings clearly reported that educators returned from the training with many questions unanswered and some uncertainty. Questions asked for clarification were not adequately responded to, which resulted in uncertainty about many aspects of implementation. As a result educators continue to demand more training, possibly as a way to deal with their own anxieties that flow from the effect of the inadequate training of full-service school personnel.

Although the time of day allocated to the training is selected in the wake of The Quality Teaching and Learning Campaign (DoENW, 2010b) directive from the Department of Education, training sessions at school level should not interrupt contact time with learners. The directive emphasises the effective use of contact time with learners as highlighted in the State of the Nation Address by the President of the Republic of South Africa. It should however be noted that the above concern not only proves failure of the trainers to be sensitive to the needs of the trainees but also indicates the lack of consideration for physical, emotional and cultural conditions of the trainees. This issue of training time warrants thorough debate in light of the plethora of policy changes in Basic Education.

### 4.4.2.2 Engagement with the trainers

Engagement with the trainers refers to the opportunities for interactive discussions between the trainers and the participants. The participants indicated that they have had no opportunity to meaningfully interact with the trainers. As a result they go away from the training with many unanswered questions and lack of clarity about certain aspects of the implementation. One participant expresses her concern as follows:

> If these people, the trainee (trainers) can come again because there are many things that I as an individual want to ask them, like learners who have such a problem, how can you assist this learner. (INDV 1)

The limited engagements are ascribed to the fact that there is not sufficient time allocated for the training. The training offered was brief and as a result they are not ready for the implementation of inclusive education in the full-service school context. They insisted that they need more training. The following statements clearly support the above:
time was too short, it was too little, because the things that we must do in class when you look at the training, the training was too little, we didn’t have enough training, may be if we got that training we could do something else…… (INDV 9)

Concerning the training of SIAS and development, enough time was not given, so teachers are not yet ready with what we are supposed to do as we are still fumbling not knowing how to include those learners with special needs in our class especially when it comes to lesson planning, we still don’t know how to go about because when I concentrate on those learners who are not basically needs, those ones are suffering, so I don’t know how to include them in my planning we still don’t know how to go about … (FG 1)

The fact that there is not sufficient time allocated for the training is evident in the preceding discussions on the considerations for the trainees. Angelides et al (2006) warn that learning is life-long, not only for teachers but also for the trainers of teachers, thus it is important for an interactive engagement between the trainers and the trainees as it encourages learning from one another.

However, the data evidently point out that the training offered to educators was brief and lacked in-depth content. Swart et al. (2003) have found in their research that the kind of training model educators are exposed to is not detailed and lacks in-depth content. They refer to this model as a “micro-oven” training or “one-shot” workshop, which they term a “one-size-fits all model of training”. Engelbrecht et al. (2003) similarly found out in their research the training offered to educators was inadequate and fragmented, and they also warn that this kind of training will have undesirable lasting effects in the teaching practice of the teachers.

As a result educators in this study remain not ready for the implementation of inclusive education in the full-service school context as they insist that they want more training.

### 4.4.2.3 Practical applications during training

Practical application of the training refers to the elucidation of the theoretical content through demonstrations or modelling of real life situations.

Participants reported that during the training the facilitators apparently gave them questions where they have to find answers from the teachers’ guide. They expressed their frustrations with the current strategies since it makes them feel insecure. They indicated that they had expected to be trained in a more practical manner. Their frustrations are evident in the following statements:
The participants indicated that they need to observe practical demonstrations on how differentiated lessons can be presented to learners in a classroom in which diverse learner needs must be addressed and accommodated. They suggested that micro-teaching lessons in a real classroom of learners, or video footage should be used to demonstrate the application of theory.

The following quotes below illustrate this:

You know what the training was good, well organized but there are many problems we encountered, at least they could have organized a class of learners to show us how to go about, they didn’t do that practically, so just read from the books, we don’t know how to go about. (FG 1)

I would say, maybe sometimes in the training, the trainers should have a small group of learners to demonstrate when they deal with aspects. At least have a group of learners to demonstrate with them. (INDV 7)

Yes, let it be done practically with the kids because they do it with other teachers and we can read and answer for ourselves we don’t know when we come to the class with those learners what are they going to do, if they can take the learners and do it practically. (FG 1)

What should be done differently is, if they can do it in what we have done when we were trained as the teachers in micro-teaching lesson, they should have, if they can do it in what we have done when we were trained as the teachers in micro-teaching lesson, they should have may be gone to a class and bring the video so that we can may be critic and see what is right, what is wrong from that so that we can have a clear picture of what might happen in a class if you have different learners in a classroom situation because recently the workshop that we went through of sign language, we have seen that in a full-service school we have to deal with different learners even the blind learners those who could have deemed to be in a class so they should bring us a model of that classroom situation in a form of a micro-teaching session lesson. (INDV 11)
It became evident that the participants apparently expect the trainers to extend the training to their classrooms and show to them how to implement the SIAS process, as stated by one participant:

*.... those people who are giving us training, they could have come to our classes and demonstrate to us how to go about with adaptation. Now, it seems they expect us to give the lessons and then use the adaptation method which we do not know. (INDV 12)*

The training, as already indicated involved presentations that included explanation of statements and concepts as they appear in the SIAS documents that the participants received in advance. The training took a formal presentation approach, rather than a practical approach in its mode of delivery and the content, thereby presenting little engagement and dialogue between attendants and facilitators.

The findings indicated that educators expected the training to maintain a much more practical approach. A more practical approach apparently entails practical demonstrations on the implementation of the different phases of the SIAS process. Participants particularly indicated a need for the demonstration of adaptation and differentiation. They would have preferred some kind of demonstration of how it is conducted in a classroom context. They suggested that the micro–teaching model where lessons apparently depict real classroom situations through video footages could have been utilised to demonstrate the application of theory.

Evidently the training did not support the educators to present the content to the real life situations where they have to implement the SIAS process. Moats and Lyon (1993) compare this approach to a lecture which does not model and demonstrate teaching practices in applied settings. It implies that the educators did not transfer the knowledge to their practice, since the impact of the training can only be assessed through practical application of how teaching and learning are taking place in the classroom (Robinson & Soudien, 2009). In the process the educators in this study seemed discouraged rather than enabled for the implementation of the SIAS process in their classrooms. The training therefore missed to provide the educators with a range of opportunities to gain insight into their own practice.

4.4.2.4 **Continuation of support**

The continuation of support implies on-going supportive engagements between the educators and the departmental officials who are supposed to monitor and evaluate progress made after the training.
It is evident that the participants in this study expect on-going support. They want the Education Departmental to engage with them in a more active way. They suggest that they be monitored in their classrooms after they have completed the training. They expect feedback about their progress regarding the implementation of the SIAS process during the monitoring. One participant described these expectations as follows:

You cannot place educators on courses without monitoring them. When I talk in terms of monitoring I mean the type of monitoring that is practical in the sense that they are supposed to come. What I see the department is doing is that they do come in the process but the participation the active participation between educators and the Department officials should be in such a way that the teachers should be aware of is he on the right path..........(FG 2)

They furthermore indicated that they expect the district based support team to come together with educators at the school to support them in the development of a programme of action that will ensure that there are regular visits and on-going support provided from the DBST. They complained about the practice of the DBST of delaying their visits to the schools and indicate that referrals of learners piled up as a result of the delays. The following quotes confirm the above:

The DBST can have their own programme together with us here at the school, let’s sit down and talk, discuss our programme so that when to meet or if they feel like they will come to our school whenever we have problems now the problems will be much more, so I think the programme, it will work much easy with us. (INDV 4)

If there can be monitoring may be, the DBST must come regularly to observe, to find out whether we are doing the right thing. (FG 2)

The DBST visited us once in 2007, the whole of last year we didn’t see the DBST. (FG 1)

The support, because the DBST does not come to our school regularly, they stay for a long time and by the time they come there is a list of all those learners and when are they going to attend to them? (INDV 4)

.......... our ILST was fighting a lot with the DBST up there because they were doing nothing, so from the ILST we go to the DBST but sometimes you don’t get support from them but at least we trying, now time and again we have meetings and then we come up with our problems and then the chairperson take them up. The problem is placing of learners, it is a long process. (FG 1)
Participants concede that the monitoring done by departmental officials after the training, needs to be practical and interactive. They also indicated that they want the officials to focus on areas in which they still need guidance. The officials should preferably refrain from negative reporting and focus on guiding the educators towards the effective implementation of the SIAS process. One participant states:

> I mean the kind of monitoring that is practical, …they do come in the process but the participation, the active participation between the educators and Departmental officials should be in such a way that the teachers should be aware if they are on the right path. I am saying constant monitoring that is practical, Meneer can I take you along let us go to the classroom and see, not negative comments. (FG 2)

> I think when they come, I should start and they observe and then they show me, no this part and this part you can do it like this, so that I can excel with these learners, we are here to help these learners, it will be good for me, I must do, they observe then they help. (FG 2)

Support in the training of SIAS relates to the completion of SNA: Section 4, Action Plan for Additional Support Provision and Monitoring which is completed by the DBST in consultation with a representative from the ILST, as already indicated in paragraph 1.3. The purpose of this form is to obtain information on what the school is currently able to provide, what the school will need in order to provide support and what the school does not have available at the specific stage (DoE, 2008b) to support particular learners who experience severe barriers to learning.

Despite the emphasis in the explanation of the forms on support as an activity focused on the learner, it seemed as if the educators interpreted support as the provision of a support network for them as educators. The findings suggest that the educators in this study expected on-going and more active support from the DBST. They also seemed to expect monitoring of the implementation of the training to take place in earnest immediately after the training. It was furthermore evident that educators expected the DBST to come to the school and, with the educators, develop an action plan that will ensure regular visits and on-going direct interaction.

It is interesting to note that the kind of support educators expected from the DBST in these particular findings relates to monitoring of the implementation of the training and the collective development of an action plan. In their study, Robinson and Soudien (2009) have found that whilst these training programmes conclude with identification of monitoring,
evaluation and support structures and teachers making arrangements for a common plan of action, which have not been done systematically in the country.

Educators feel very strongly that identification of monitoring, evaluation and support structures should be the starting point of every training programme as these structures seem to fade away when the training is concluded and never effectively materialise. They are concerned that they do not receive necessary and adequate support through these structures after the training. Training often stops where educators want it to start.

Monitoring the implementation of the training is however not listed as a role of the DBST. Clearly the DBST only monitors provisioning of support after learners who are in need of addition support have been identified. The training indicated that as the process unfolds, the DBST in consultation with the ILST and the educator directly involved with such a learner will complete the necessary documentation. The educator referred to here will be the educator/s who is/are directly involved with the learner. The ILST serves as the link between the DBST and the school. Nowhere in the training is it provided that the DBST will engage with educators in the development of the action plan. It is clearly stated that the SNA: Section 4, Action Plan for Additional Support Provision and Monitoring is completed by the DBST in consultation with the representative of the ILST (DoE, 2008b).

However, the contention amongst educators in this study is based on what they perceive the role of the DBST in the implementation of the training should be. They prefer regular visits from the DBST, which, according to them has to translate into the evaluation and assessment of their performance in the application of the training. They also contend that such evaluation should provide regular feedbacks on their performance. An interesting observation in these findings becomes a concern regarding the knowledge of the educators about who constitutes the DBST. The concern comes in the wake of the findings that educators prefer regular visits by the DBST. Clearly such a demand is oblivious of the reality that a district-based support team forms a large group of personnel who certainly have other equally important roles outside the DBST to fulfil. The finding thus indicated that the roles of the DBST might still not be clear to educators; they therefore tend to evaluate the work of the DSTBs according to their own expectations.

4.4.3. THEME 3: Challenges in the implementation of the training.

Challenges in the implementation of the training as a main theme refers to the aspects of the implementations that make it difficult for the educators to effectively implement the training that they have received as it relates to screening, identification, assessment and support and the development of inclusive learning programmes.
**4.4.3.1 Time constraints**

Time constraints refer to the limitations posed by the actual amount of time that is made available on the timetable for a single lesson.

It is evident from the data that the participants experience that the fact that they are expected to provide individual support to learners who experience barriers to learning, demands that educators have to shift their attention between the learner or learners who experience barriers and the other learners in the class. They indicate that it is time consuming and interferes with the teaching process. Due to the limited time allocated for a lesson they also find it hard to implement aspects of the training effectively in their respective classrooms. They furthermore find it almost impossible to provide individual support. The statement below serves as evidence of the above:

*It is demanding more time from the educator, because in this screening you have to help learners individually that is really wasting other learners’ time, unless there are other methods that can be used or other time that can be used to help those who are identified through screening.* (INDV 1)

*They are delaying the process of teaching because of we attend them individually.* (FG 2)

*As I mentioned, most time is needed for those who are the struggling group, because in most time you use flashcards, you use other methods that can make them to understand what you are trying to teach for that time, because really these learners are having problems.* (INDV 1)

*We are not clear how to involve the learners so that there be differentiation and adaptation in the classroom because the number of learners in the class surely you can’t concentrate on may be two or five learners at a time because you are having 30 minutes and in that 30 minutes you are going to present only what you have in a class and then there’s no time to go back and to get those learners who cannot read who cannot……….. To go and remedy the ……. so you don’t have that time.* (INDV 9)

The participants suggested that the time-table is changed to allow flexibility in terms of the time allocated to a lesson period. They also suggest that teachers must be allowed flexi-time to ensure that they need not follow the time-table stringently. They suspect that this would enable them to support learners experiencing barriers to learning. One participant states it as follows:
And then about the time, so should the Department allow us to change the time-table, so that every subject, there must not be a rigid time-table. Every lesson must get 3 period and teacher given a time of 3 periods in a class and then 3 periods at another class, so we must not be sitting on the time-table. (FG 2)

The developing of inclusive learning programmes provides flexibility to the National Curriculum Statement (DoE, 2005d). Flexibility is a driver for the differentiation of learning programmes, work schedules and lesson plans in order to cater for the individual needs of learners. Because inclusion is centrally a curriculum issue, learning, teaching and assessment strategies must be differentiated or adapted to meet the individual needs of all learners. However, differentiation in the National Curriculum Statement should not be viewed as creating a new or alternative curriculum to the NCS (DoE, 2005d). Within the NCS, there are several components that are flexible enough to allow for differentiation.

These components include a long list of flexible features, however, for the purpose of this study; focus will be directed towards those features that have direct impact on the discussion on time constraints. The training indicated that more time can be provided for assessment and execution of a task; that in a lesson plan time allocation can range from a single activity up to a term’s teaching or more if necessary, depending on the needs of the learner, and that time allocation and weightings regarding learning outcomes and learning programmes should vary according to the learner’s needs.

The findings revealed that limited time available in a lesson to adequately support learners who experience barriers to learning in the classroom poses a serious challenge in terms of the application of a differentiated and adapted lessons. Educators tend to spend a lot of time supporting individual learners, and thus involuntarily neglect others in a classroom (Engelbrecht et al, 2001). Based on the findings it can be argued that educators are not sufficiently empowered to manage their teaching time in the classroom contexts where real life challenges occur. The findings therefore concur with a study by Robinson and Soudien (2009), who concluded that training programmes fail to understand how to involve teachers in relation to and with consideration of their actual teaching conditions. However, because provision is made that more time can be provided for execution of a task, the training failed to empower educators in this regard.

4.4.3.2 Discrepancy regarding assessment of learners

Discrepancy regarding assessment of learners refers to the discrepancy between assessment as applied in the classroom and assessment as applied in the exams. Participants in this study indicated that they are expected to adapt and differentiate the ways
in which they assess learners who experience barriers to learning during lessons. They however experienced that when it comes to the writing of external examinations, no provision was made for these learners. The final examination question paper was not adapted and learners who experience barriers to learning were compelled to write the same paper as the learners who do not experience barriers. The following quotes below confirm this:

*I am worried when they write a final examination; they write the same question paper now that is my difficulty. I never received a question paper of a slow learner from the Department.* (INDV 5)

*I would say that what is transpiring is the issue of differentiation and adaptation, I think we are experiencing a problem in terms of that, may be it is also countering why we are unable to pay individual attention to specific learners because at the end of the year we have a common schedule that does not cater for assessment that had undergone adaptation and differentiation.* (INDV 13)

~~~~~~~~~~~~~so they say we must write an examination every quarter and ~~~~~~~~so they are not catering for those learners, they are catering for mainstream.  (FG 2)

Participants also raised concerns with regard to the marking schedule that goes hand in hand with the examination paper. They indicated that the marking schedule does not have any indications of how to differentiate between learners in mainstream schools and learners in Full-Service Schools. They suggest that the matter should be attended to and that an official from the department be tasked with compiling an adapted marking schedule. One participant states:

*Yes, the schedule, it goes hand in hand with examination, the schedule it’s only made to accommodate learners of mainstream, so it needs to be adjusted to accommodate learners with special needs in relation to full-service school. Let one official who is compiling the schedule be involved in making that there should be part for differentiation and adaptation.* (FG 2)

The important finding is that educators adapt their assessment techniques throughout the year, however at the end of the year during the writing of an external final examination no provision in the Common Task Assessment (DoENW, 2006b) is made for the same learners. The document on the *Provincial Guidelines on Assessment in the FET and GET Band as it relates to Barriers to Learning* (DoENW, 2004a) provides guidelines for adaptive and alternative approaches to all assessment conducted in the GET and FET.
Although this finding rather points to the shortcoming of the policy to re-align educational strategies across all bands as they relate to adaptive and alternative approaches to assessment, it certainly influences the practice of educators who work in Full-Service Schools. If the training had been aimed at equipping the educators for practice, these discrepancies should have been addressed. On the other hand educators need to be encouraged to take the initiative in influencing policies that hamper their practice.

4.4.3.3 Availability of human resources

The availability of human resources refers to access to teacher-assistants that could support the educators in the implementation of the training. It seems evident that the limited availability of human resources poses particular challenges. The educators indicate that they have to do everything because they do not have any assistants in the class that can help them with learners who need individual attention. A major problem seems to arise when they have a learner who is confined to a wheelchair or when a learner does not feel well. Educators suggest the appointment of teacher-assistants who can help them with these learners. The statement below confirms the above:

But there is part …when you are busy teaching the other learners, want to go to the toilet you must accompany him or her then leave others in the class with no one in the class when you come back they have already forgotten what you have said you must start afresh. (FG 1)

Just like today I spent the whole of the time outside, three of my kids in the class were ill, vomiting, running stomach, short breath, the class was suffering, I was washing a blanket. (FG 1)

And I think that they must include helpers in the classrooms for learners who have problems, physical problems because some others when they have to go to toilet they struggle, so I can’t leave my classroom and go with the learner to a toilet and the other learners remaining in the classroom. (INDV 2)

Participants clearly also expressed the need for someone who will follow up on their recommendation to parents and ensure that learners who are referred to special schools are admitted to such institutions of learning as they consider it very important that the child should be at an institution of learning despite his/her disability. One participant states:

We don’t have a person who can do fieldwork and make some follow-up that we should visit the parents and check whether where is the child because what is important is the child should be at a learning institution whether he is disabled or not. (FG 2)
The training clearly outlined the guidelines for the ILSTs, educators, parents and the DBSTs with respect to human resource capacity development to ensure the accommodation of the diversity of learners in their communities. The guidelines with the focus of maximising self-sufficiency by building capacity at the site where teaching and learning occur, clearly indicates that extra adult help may be needed to enable learners to follow the curriculum (DoE, 1998). In view of these directions, Engelbrecht et al. (2003) indicate that class assistants could work under the direction of a teacher to provide additional assistance, thereby increasing the accommodation of all learners. The value of class assistants is confirmed by research done in the United Kingdom where almost every class has teacher-aides (Alston, 2008; Farrell, 2001).

However, in the South African context the employment of class assistants is limited to specialised centres of learning. It is evident from evaluation reports that the role of the assistants has been characterised by a lack of clear definition, service conditions and accreditation (DoE, 1998).

The educators in this study raised concerns regarding the lack of provision for the employment of class assistants in their school (Landsberg, 2005). They maintain that such services would reduce their workload and enhance their flexibility in the effective provision of additional support for learners with severe barriers to learning. Their expectations are confirmed by Landsberg, (2005), who argue that assistants play an important role in supporting educators who have to accommodate learners with diverse needs. Farrell (2001) also concurs, stating that learning support assistants can contribute to make inclusion effective for a whole range of pupils with SEN. In the absence of such services, educators contend that providing additional support becomes cumbersome. They find it very difficult to manage their classrooms amidst the challenges to provide support for learners who have special needs without neglecting the rest of the learners, which results in disciplinary problems.

The training seemed to have awakened an awareness of the value that class assistants might add to the provision of support for learners who experience barriers to learning. The consequences of working without assistants have however not been addressed during the training, which evidently leaves the educators frustrated with regard to the provision of assistance.

4.4.3.4 Access to physical resources and assistive devices

Access to resources and assistive devices is critical to the effective implementation of the training. The participants, however, indicated that they do not have sufficient access to
resources and assistive devices. They blame the Department for not providing the necessary resources. They also seem frustrated with the fact that they have been trained to use certain devices but the devices are not made available to them after the training. The statements below confirm the above:

I think if the Department can help them give them resources and help the teachers who are teaching with them because they are complaining more especially the Grade 1’s where there are so many learners who are disabled there, they are complaining because it sees as if Department is not following. They must support teachers. (INDV 10)

And then the resources in our school we don’t have enough resources maybe if we can be trained to use those referable, maybe like learners who cannot see well, who cannot hear well which teaching aid can be used to assess them, so we don’t have those, the only thing that we have is just the chart, we don’t get these materials which we can assess those learners. (INDV 9)

During the training educators were alerted to the fact that in Stage 3 of the SIAS process the physical resources and assistive devices needed to provide support to learners who experience severe barriers to learning could be identified. According to the training these resources and devices will be made available to schools, primarily located within the classroom, school, home or local community. Physical or material support which cannot be accessed at the level of the school becomes the responsibility of the DBST. They should assist schools in accessing such support through a formal application by the school.

The educators in this study reported that they had not been provided with physical resources and assistant devices despite being trained in the usage of certain assistant devices. *The Guidelines for Full Service and Inclusive Schools* (DoE, 2009b), supports that staff (educators and everyone else who is directly involved in handling the equipments) should be trained in proper use of the devices. The training did not empower the educators to obtain the physical resources and assistive devices through the prescripts of the SIAS process. If educators are trained to incorporate such resources and devices without having access to the aforementioned, it might only add to the frustrations that they already experience in relation to the implementation of inclusive education. The question is whether the procedure as outlined in the SIAS process is contributing to the restraints relating to access and how that could be addressed to facilitate more efficient support in Full-Service Schools?
4.5 Sustainable support for learners

Sustainable support for learners refers to the provision of continued support for the learners who experience barriers to learning throughout their school career. Concern is expressed by one educator about promoting learners to another grade without knowing how they are going to cope with their prevailing problems. Particular concern is expressed about learners who need to go to secondary schools. The statement below confirms:

*It is not the only problem, the other problem is learners who are experiencing learning problems right now, who have been in my class since last year and are still having problems and I don’t know what I’m going to do with them because they are not progressing.* (FG 2)

Another educator who shares this concern suggests that educators who are competent to deal with learners who experience barriers to learning should move with the learners to the next grade. She states:

*Is it not wise for us to move maybe with the whole class, so that we can deal with those group, the struggling group, because the struggling group in many times their ages are high and the learner has a problem, as an individual, the other teacher has not that tactics, techniques that I’m having to deal or to help those learners with certain problems, now the thing is with us here you have to stay for years in the same grade, maybe if the system can change. This teacher in grade 1 must move with his learners up to grade 3 maybe something can take place, it will be a change for us and maybe the grade 4 of those years will be outstanding.* (INDV 1)

A hallmark of inclusive education is an on-going effort to find effective ways to ensure full learner participation in the curriculum activities. Full learner participation is realised through continuous and sustainable individualized learner support. The nature of support provided should be more in the form of programmes with set time frames which will be regularly reviewed to determine their effectiveness and appropriateness.

The findings indicated that educators have expressed concerns with regards to promotion of learners to the next grade particularly learners exiting intermediate phase to FET phase where inclusive education is still not prevalent in terms of the roll-out plan of implementation. The roll-out plan stipulates that the implementation of inclusive education will be phased in on an incremental basis from foundation phase (DoE, 2005b). In line with the Education White Paper 6 (DoE, 2001) policy imperatives, all children have the potential to learn within all bands of education, and require support. During the training it was therefore emphasised
that the needs of all learners should be addressed in an undivided education system to facilitate maximum participation in the education system as a whole.

The findings indicated that educators in the General Education and Training band adapt assessment techniques to accommodate learners experiencing barriers to learning throughout the GET phases. However, it does not apply in the FET phases. Secondary schools are currently not ready to adequately provide for diverse learner needs. Research by Paterson (2007) confirms that research on teaching and assessment of students with learning difficulties in secondary classrooms has been conducted. As a result learners exiting the primary schools apparently suffer due to lack of consistency in support provision. The lack of continuation of support into the FET phase is perceived to nullify the support provision efforts initiated at the GET phase once these learners proceed to the FET phase.

However, as indicated in the preceding discussions, learners who have been identified to experience barriers to learning during the foundation phase should continue to be provided for throughout their schooling career. This is made possible when learners are accompanied by their learner profiles as they progress to subsequent phases in their schooling career. With reference to the learner profile, adequate provision of support should be continued without any hassles.

### 4.4.3.6 Lack of parental involvement

Lack of parental involvement refers to the unwillingness of parents to respond to the requests of educators, and/or to support their children. It implies the absence of parents and an inability to accept their responsibility for their children.

The participants indicated that the lack of parental involvement implies that they often do not receive the information that they need to understand the support needs of the learners. Parents apparently withhold certain information about their children from the teachers in instances where the information is crucial in the development of their children. One participant states:

> Sometimes you find that the learner is not progressing and you call the parent, parents withhold certain information. They don’t give enough of the learner’s background, so this makes it to have problems and they don’t participate if you call them, some of them don’t participate. (INDV 2)

Another problem that relates to the lack of parental involvement seems to be the fact that parents do not respond positively when they are requested to attend a discussion about the
barriers their children experience. They do however indicate that there are a few parents who respond positively to their request.

The quotes below confirm this:

*My problem is that on the children who’ve got barriers, there are many problems coming from those kids some of them especially coming to the parents when you need the parents to discuss those problems with children, some of them they don’t even come or do anything but at least some they respond.* (INDV 3)

*.........., right now I have a learner I don’t know what to say, what is his problem because he does not cope and I can’t identify what real problem is because the parent does not participate.* (FG 2)

One participant relates the lack of parental involvement to the low levels of literacy in their community and suggests that parents need to be guided regarding the latest developments in education and how it involves them. Another participant suggested that the lack of parental involvement could be ascribed to the hectic schedule maintained by some parents. On the one hand these parents are required to participate in their children’s education and on the other hand they are expected to fulfil their work commitments. A third participant indicated that the lack of parental involvement might be ascribed to the fact some Departmental officials, who are not familiar with the parents’ mother tongue, cannot explain the concepts relating to the barriers experienced by their children properly. They suggest that officials should be able to address the parents’ concerns in their mother tongue.

The following quotes serves as evidence of the above:

*Parents need to be carried along, parents due to illiteracy in most cases they need to be carried along ...* (FG 2)

*Other parents are positive but they are not effective because you remember that our parents are labourers, they are working and they don’t have sufficient time. Most parents that you will find effective are those parents that are not working but those who are working, really it’s cumbersome to them, they need to be taken along.* (FG 2)

*I think the role that can be played by the Department is, we should use the language, sometimes our specialists are more white and parents are becoming not to open to them because of language barrier. If we can have some people who are in the position to talk the language that the parents can talk.* (FG 2)
Another problem that relates to the lack of parental involvement is the referrals of learners for treatment at health institutions. Financial constraints seem to contribute to the disregarding of appointments as indicated by one participant:

*To add on that one, finance is one problem, they will honour the first one but the second, third they won’t honour and then the excuse will be I don’t have finance to go there. (FG 2)*

One participant suggested that the Department of Education should provide the school with a school vehicle and employ somebody to carry out such duties and ensure that learners' appointments with health specialists are honoured, particularly at the full-service school.

*If the Department can give a full service school a vehicle and may be employs somebody who can be tasked to make sure that those learners do visit the particular specialist in hospital. (FG 2)*

The participants also complained that parents did not submit health records after their visits to the health institutions.

*Few of the parents are positive, majority are not positive because when it comes to taking the child to special treatment like hospital where they have to be attended, some parents don’t honour the appointments and some do honour the appointments but they don’t come back with written information of the records of what was observed so that the school should be aware of. (FG 2)*

Participants have pointed out in this study that parents of the learners with disabilities are apparently under the impression that when they enrol their children at a full-service school their children will be cured of their impairment, even when it is explained that such process will need a specialist, and that there are procedures that have to be followed in that regard. Parents then become disillusioned when the school is not living up to their expectations and the child is not cured. Participants have also pointed out that apparently parents also have a strong belief in their customs which prevent them from allowing their children to go for an operation, even after having been advised that the child’s ailment can only be rectified through an operation; instead they prefer that the child remains with the ailment. This is how one participant puts it:

*I realised that some of the parents’ understanding is that when a child comes to school in a position that he is, we are going to cure the child, they are of the opinion and if that is not coming in when we are coming with what we have already indicated that there’s a procedure to be followed whereby you have to take the child from point A to B then*
some of our parents become disillusioned. And some of them are hampered by customs, you have a situation whereby a parent refuses a child to undergo an operation, they rather believe that we should leave the child as he was. (FG 2)

The data also indicate that parents find it hard to cooperate when their children are referred to a special school. The participants indicate that when they recommend placement in a special school they often receive no response from the parents. In some instances they will take the child out of the school to stay at home as indicated below:

You will find that as a school you refer parents to a special school then the parents will not take the child to a special school of which we took the trouble that the child should get a place to a particular school, that is one negative part of the parents’ involvement, because ultimately when you contact the parents you will not get a response where the child is and possibly that the child is at home not attending school. (FG 2)

The SIAS process involves parents from stage 1, which involves the completion of SNA: Section 1. In this section parents/caregivers provide information which provides an overall picture of who the child is, what his/her experience has been before arriving at the school, what his/her family and home circumstances are, and what his/her strengths, weaknesses and interests are (DoE, 2008b). This involvement continues with the completion of a diagnostic profile for a child who is ascertained to be at risk during admission. Parents will then be assisted by the ILST and health professionals if necessary.

In view of the above it is evident that the SIAS strategy overhauls the current process of identifying, assessing and enrolling learners in schools which, according to Farrell (2001), denied parents the right to be part of the support process. The strategy thus acknowledges the central role played by parents in the support process and shows respect for parents as informed role players in the assessment and future development of their children (DoE, 2005c). The training emphasized that acknowledging the pivotal role of parents/caregivers in education is a key factor in the early identification of barriers. Involvement of parents/caregivers throughout the SIAS strategy is consistent with a learner-centred approach to teaching and learning and is compulsory (DoE, 2008b). Parents/caregivers’ observations and comments can assist educators in finding the exact nature of the barrier that a learner experiences. In response to the introduction of the strategy, Gordon (2003) reports being heartened to see that parental rights, which were largely absent, have now been acknowledged.

Yet the findings indicated that parental involvement does not realize as expected. The lack of involvement apparently manifests in parents withholding certain crucial information about
their children from the educators as indicated in research done by Engelbrecht et al. (2003). Parents also reported to the educators that they find it difficult to access the services of health professionals to whom they are referred for the completion of the sections of the application forms that apply to learners who experience severe barriers to learning. In instances where parents succeeded in engaging with the health professional in this regard, they often fail to submit whatever records they have received from the health professional to the school. According to Mmotlane, Winnaar, and Wa Kivilu, (2009), it should be noted that providing information about their children in an environment where teachers have constantly proved to be discourteous towards parents, is a daunting task for parents. The training therefore needs to address the educators’ attitudes towards parents. Educators furthermore reported that parents tend to disrespect appointments made to discuss the support of their children. The educators were of the opinion that these tendencies might relate to the low levels of literacy among the parents who might perceive themselves as inferior to educators. Parents’ failure to turn up for discussion sessions with the educators on the support adversely impacts on the development of the support package, and has negative implications for the implementation of the strategy.

It seems evident then that the training should empower educators to actively involve parents with consideration for the various challenges that parents face in supporting their children with severe barriers to learning. At this stage the educators are merely informed about the procedures that they should adhere to without consideration for the practical challenges that parent involvement holds for them in the contexts in which they perform their duties as educators. It also seems important to find ways to enhance direct collaboration with health professionals to obtain information. Otherwise, when it is withheld by parents, the educators will not have access to information that is crucial to the development of the learner.

4.6 Conclusion

The discussions of the findings have been reported with reference to the themes and sub-themes that have emerged from the data. These findings are clearly central to the research aims and objectives. The experiences of educators with their training in the implementation of inclusive education in Full-Service Schools have been clearly defined and their readiness to implement the training is a positive step towards addressing barriers to learning and development. In the next chapter possible training techniques and teacher development strategies will be recommended to enhance the implementation of inclusive education in South Africa.
5.1 Introduction

In this chapter the summary of findings and recommendations are presented. These findings will be discussed in relation to the research aim of *exploring educators’ experiences regarding the training for the implementation of inclusive education in a full service school*.

In accordance with the above research aim, the research question, *How did educators experience the training for the implementation of inclusive education in a Full Service school* is addressed. Furthermore the chapter will outline key findings, recommendations for practice and for further research, and limitations to this study.

5.2 Key findings of the study

The study of educators’ experience of the training for the implementation of inclusive education will be discussed with reference to two sets of key findings:

The first set of key findings refers to the readiness to implement certain content in the training. In terms of readiness for screening and identification, as described in the SIAS process, the findings indicate that educators realise the value of screening and identification as ways to gain insight into the learners’ problems and support needs. Educators furthermore recognise the value of using the learner profile as a measure to screen and identify the potential risk factors that learners experience. Educators assert that they can screen and identify barriers to learning. The assertions apparently refer to the assessments that they apply in their teaching practice to identify learners who experience scholastic barriers to learning through assessment measures. Based on these perceptions of screening and identification, it is evident that the educators do not clearly grasp what screening and identification entails.

The educators’ misunderstanding regarding screening and identification is further demonstrated by references to aspects such as lesson planning and preparation, differentiation of a lesson, and giving learners enough time to complete their tasks to indicate the problems they face in terms of application of screening and identification in their
classrooms. Lesson planning and preparation, differentiation of a lesson and giving learners enough time in the SIAS process are rather described as measures of providing support and do not relate in any way to screening and identification during the admission of learners.

Based on the findings, educators also do not seem to understand that screening and identification is closely linked to the admission processes DoE (2005c). The admission process is aimed at the development of a proper learner profile from the day the learner enters either in Grade R (DoE, 2008b) or when referred to the school. The learner profile becomes prominent in the sense that it indicates the initial risk factors. Involvement in the admission process will enable educators to identify the vulnerability of the learners to barriers to learning and enhance early intervention.

In this study the educators did not even refer to admission of learners when they reflected about screening and identification. Lack of reference to admission of learners is indicative of the misunderstanding displayed by educators in the implementation of the screening and identification processes. The educators’ claim that they can screen and identify learners experiencing barriers to learning when they were probably not even involved with the admission of learners is therefore questioned.

Their readiness for assessment is blurred by a misunderstanding of what assessment in the SIAS strategy entails. As opposed to the assessment in the context of teaching and learning that encompasses the evaluation and monitoring of the progress learners make in achieving the set standards as prescribed, Assessment in terms of the SIAS strategy refers to formal review of the information provided in Stages 1 and 2 which will ensure that informed decisions are made about the level of support needed and the type of support package required (DoE, 2008b). Educators in this study repeatedly expressed difficulties with the implementation of this level of assessment as explained during the training. The confusion lies in the particular interpretation of assessment. The confusion regarding screening and identification evokes serious concern about the readiness of the educators, since the processes form the basis for the implementation of the SIAS process in Full-Service Schools. The questionable state of readiness to screen and identify can therefore be ascribed to their misunderstanding of the screening and identification processes of the SIAS strategy.

The reference to the difficulties seemingly relates to the fact that the educators understood assessment as part of their curricular duties as described by their role as assessors (Landsberg et al, 2005). This understanding is not wrong but may diminish the SIAS understanding of assessment as it relates to the level of support needed and the type of support package required for the learner identified to have additional support needs.
The findings indicated that the training sensitized educators for their role in the support of learners. They now seem to understand that they have a responsibility to provide support to learners in the teaching and learning process. In their readiness for support, educators have shown greater awareness of their roles and responsibilities to provide support. This greater readiness was demonstrated in the positive attitudes they have shown towards learners experiencing barriers to learning. However, they remain challenged with differentiation and adaptation as measures of providing support in the learning and teaching process.

Educators blame the District Based Support Team for inadequate support they experience. Due to this perceived lack of support from the District, evidence of resistance to the implementation of inclusive education was detected in the interviews with educators. The findings indicated that educators have expressed concerns with regard to Secondary schools which are currently not ready to adequately provide for diverse learner needs. As a result learners exiting the primary schools apparently suffer, owing to lack of consistency in support provision. The roll-out plan stipulates that the implementation of inclusive education will be phased in on an incremental basis from foundation phase. Evidence points to the possibility that implementation on an incremental basis has apparently not reached the Further Education and Training sector. However, the promotion of learners identified to be experiencing barriers in the subsequent phases is on-going. Such promotion becomes detrimental at the level of FET phase when the learner is not going to be provided for, as a result of inconsistency in support provision.

Lack of parental involvement implies the absence of parents and their inability to accept their responsibility for their children. The findings indicated that parental involvement does not realise as expected. The lack of involvement of parents apparently manifests in parents withholding certain crucial information about their children, parents often failing to submit whatever records they have received from the health professional to the school and failing to turn up for discussion sessions with the educators on the support package of the learners. All of the above findings adversely impact on the development of the support package of the learners, and has negative implications for the implementation of the strategy.

In the following paragraphs, key findings related to the dynamics of the training process are discussed. Certain weaknesses were found in the training process that affect the educators’ readiness for implementation of inclusive education in the Full Service school. training. The findings reveal that there has been lack of consideration for trainees in the planning of the training programme. Lack of consideration for trainees manifested in the time of the day the training takes place: the training took place in the afternoon when educators had had contact with the learners during the day. In the afternoon educators were tired and could not
internalize the training. As a result educators were not able to engage meaningfully with the trainers.

The lack of engagement with the trainers due to fatigue was aggravated by the fact that the training took the form of monologues about the process. These monologues or lectures lacked in-depth discussion. Owing to this nature of the training, the training became largely theoretical and lacked practice.

Lack of practical applications and demonstrations during the training seem detrimental to the effective implementation of the training, judging from the participants’ frustrations about the lack of practical demonstrations which they had expected from the training. Educators evidently expected that the concepts would be enlightened through demonstrations. Educators indicated that as a result of the limited references to practice they had gone away from the training without clarity on important aspects of the implementation of inclusive education such as differentiation and adaptation.

The concern was raised on the lack of continued support the educators after the training. This concern comes in the wake of apparent inefficiency regarding the training, experienced by educators. They had expected to be monitored and evaluated on the progress they were making during the implementation. The monitoring and evaluation of progress should translate into on-going supportive engagements between educators and the trainees. Lack thereof poses serious implementation challenges.

Further challenges evolve around time constraints. Time constraints imply the limitations experienced with regards to the actual amount of time that is made available on the timetable for a single lesson. The actual amount of time available for a single lesson ranges from 30 to 45 minutes a period. Educators contended that they find it almost impossible to provide individual support to learners who experience barriers to learning within such time provision. They indicated that providing individual support to learners demands that educators shift their attention between the learners who experience barriers and the other learners in the class. However, due to the limited time allocated for lesson, educators find it hard to implement aspects of the training effectively in their respective classrooms. It is interesting to note that a suggestion was made that the time-table should be changed to allow flexibility of the time allocated to a lesson. However, such provision has always existed in the National Curriculum Statement through the development of Inclusive Learning Programmes (DoE, 2005d). The development of Inclusive Learning Programmes provides that more time can be provided for assessment and execution of a task, that a lesson plan time allocation can range from a single activity up to a term’s teaching or more if necessary, depending on the needs of the learner, and that time allocation and weightings regarding learning outcomes
and learning programmes should vary according to the learner’s needs. Educators need to be familiarized with above-mentioned provisions in the differentiation of learning programmes.

Discrepancies between the explanations of differentiation and assessment have been identified in this study. The discrepancy manifests in the adaptation and differentiation of assessment strategies which educators apply in their classrooms during the year. However, during writing of external examinations at the end of the year, the final examination question paper is not adapted and differentiated to accommodate learners experiencing barriers to learning. Therefore learners experiencing barriers to learning are compelled to write the same paper as learners who do not experience barriers to learning.

Another aspect of the training dynamics involves the lack of availability of human resources. Lack of availability of human resources refers to lack of access to teacher-assistants. Educators value the services of teacher-assistants in supporting them to implement the training. Research by Alston (2008) and Farrell (2001) done in the United Kingdom, confirm the value of class assistants. Equally Engelbrecht et al. (2003), supports that class assistants could work under the direction of a teacher to provide additional assistance, thereby increasing the accommodation of all learners. In that way capacity will be built at the site where teaching and learning take place.

This capacity can also be translated into access to physical resources and assistive devices. Although the training has indicated that these resources and devices will be made available to schools, teachers reported that they do not have sufficient access to resources and assistive devices.

Based on these findings, indications are given on how certain aspects could be better dealt with in future. Therefore I proceed by suggesting recommendations for future practice regarding the specific focus of this research.

5.3 Recommendations for practice.

This study revealed that educators’ readiness to implement the SIAS strategy is questionable. It means that they may display a misguided sense of readiness for full and meaningful implementation of the SIAS strategy. The general doubt that this study casts on the educators’ readiness for successful implementation of the SIAS strategy warrants recommendations for improvement on specific aspects of the training with reference to both the content and the training dynamics.
Firstly, I recommend that proper attention should be paid to the time of the day training takes place. Evidently afternoon training sessions pose serious challenges for internalizing of the training outcomes. Educators may not be as cognitively receptive, critically engaging and responsive in the afternoons. The Department of Education should seriously consider striking a balance between effective contact time with learners and the value of developing educators for effective implementation of changes in the education policy arena.

Secondly, it is recommended that a pre-training assessment of trainee needs is made. The findings clearly indicated that an apparent absence of pre-training assessment may have led to some of the mistakes made in the training. In light of the above, certain needs and expectations of the trainees were not met, thus leaving participants with many questions unanswered.

Thirdly, I strongly recommend that the training sessions be designed to include theory and practice is. A much more practical approach with practical demonstrations should be considered in future training programmes. In addition to this it is also recommended that trainers should be thoroughly trained before training the trainees, equally their training should also include both theory and practice. The training should also include the enhancement of skills that enable the trainers to facilitate reflective sessions between trainers and trainees. The participants indicated that they had no opportunity to meaningfully interact with the trainers. The limited engagements are ascribed to the fact that insufficient time is allocated for the training. The data indicate that the period of training was brief and lacked in-depth engagement with content by trainers and trainees, echoing Swart et al (2002).

Fourthly it is recommended that policy planners and developers should seriously reconsider the tendency to develop policies with political symbolism as leading tenets (Jansen, 2001). Such policy planners and developers should rather spend more energy in designing implementation strategies which can easily translate into sessions for the new policy.

In the fifth place, I recommend that issues that need to be addressed include educators’ evident positive change in attitudes towards learners experiencing barriers to learning. These new positive attitudes towards learners experiencing barriers to learning should be considered for further training in inclusive education.

A sixth recommendation emphasizes that resistance to inclusive education should be addressed and, where appropriate, be confronted. There needs to be a deconstruction of power relations, as it is found in respective roles and responsibilities, as one way of dealing with resistance. Such deconstruction can take the simple format of opening discussion around the balance of power between trainers and trainees. Trainers can be honest and
indicate all the power positions they hold, for instance, in terms of knowledge about the subject, the power to write good or bad reports about a group of trainees, the power to institute subsequent visits which may be punitive and compliance-driven or supportive and reflexive-implementation driven.

A seventh recommendation entails that the tendency to shift responsibility for support should be addressed. Educators need to be supported to internalize their roles and responsibilities with regard to support provision. They need to understand that providing support to learners in teaching and learning process is fundamental to their employment positions.

Recommendation number eight is that confusion around the concepts of screening, identification, assessment and support should be eliminated. This could mean that, for SIAS to succeed, a new process or distinction needs to be drawn between the inclusive education conceptualizations of screening, identification, assessment and support as opposed to the general curriculum conceptualizations of screening, identification, assessment and support.

Finally, I recommend that a debate can also be started about the value that such confusion holds for a return to the philosophical origins of inclusive education. Educators’ confusion between the inclusive education notions of screening, identification, assessment and support, and the curriculum notions of screening, identification, assessment and support is probably superficial. The superficiality of such fine distinctions lies therein that inclusive education is a broad system-wide response which therefore necessitates helpful conflations of the various concepts of screening, identification, assessment and support with inclusive education policy and curriculum implementation. In summary, this means that educators are pointing out that attempts to distinguish inclusive education from general curriculum delivery are futile. Inclusive education can rather be seen to strengthen the curriculum by highlighting the caring aspects inherent in the curriculum changes experienced over the years of the democratic dispensation.

Further recommendations for future research are made in the following section.

5.4 Recommendations for future research

In this section recommendations regarding research methodology issues and under-explored conceptual issues which can be important for further research are presented.

I recommend that quantitative studies should be undertaken to extract new findings about the readiness of full-service schools for implementation of inclusive education. This study was
done from a qualitative framework and I argue that a *quantitative* approach may enhance research into this aspect of inclusive education.

I further recommend that pre-entry activities should be performed before any data collection commences in future research projects. Such pre-entry activities can for instance establish potential participants’ perceptions about training agencies such as the Department of Education. Pre-entry activities may also sensitize the researcher to power relations which may potentially weaken or strengthen the research process. The findings of such pre-entry activities can furthermore be used to design training which is sensitive to the needs of trainees and their educational environment.

Another recommendation is that pre-training measurements can be developed to obtain significant indications of educators’ perceptions about the topic of the training. These measurements will enable the trainers to assess the level of understanding of the trainees with regard to the topic of the training. They will also serve as pre-training evaluation of the expectations of the trainees regarding the training.

I also recommend that post-training measurements can be developed to obtain indications of the true impact that the training had. These measurements will serve to gauge whether the training has met the expectations of the trainees and identify areas of further training emerging from the same topic of the training.

In the following section I discuss some of the limitations apparent in this study.

### 5.5 Limitations of the research

In this section I indicate certain limitations which may impact on the extent to which the findings can be generalized. These limitations are discussed in two broad foci: the limitations imposed by the choice of population, and certain methodological weaknesses.

The school under investigation is located in a semi-urban area of the North-West province. It enrolls predominantly African learners. The findings can therefore not be easily generalized to other populations in other contexts.

Another limitation concerns the location of the participants in one full service school in the North West Province. This could mean that the experiences of participants regarding the training were influenced by their school context. As a result, the findings of this study cannot be accepted to be representative of the general teacher population in mainstream schools.
Certain shortcomings in the methodology may have implications for the kinds of and depth of results. As no pre-training measurements were taken of participants’ perceptions and skills, a limited understanding of the impact of the training on educators’ perceptions may have been gained. Similarly, the absence of pre-entry activities provided limited understanding of existing reasons for some of the findings like the resistance to inclusion.

The dual role of the researcher which refers to the employment position of the researcher as an Education Specialist serving the participants’ school, can be considered to be a limitation. As member of the District-Based Support Team, the researcher also acted as a trainer of the staff of the participating school. In that sense limitations could be imposed on the trustworthiness of the data collected because, for example, some educators may have tried to impress the researcher by saying only positive things about the training and the trainer.

5.6 Conclusion

In this research, the experiences of educators regarding the training for the implementation of inclusive education in a Full Service school were investigated. The study clearly indicated that educator training for the implementation of inclusive education in the Full-Service Schools should be revisited. A significant part of the findings related to issues regarding training. Particular weaknesses in the training process and structure were identified which contributed to the other finding that educators are not ready for meaningful implementation of inclusive education their context. As a result of these findings certain recommendations were made for practice and further research.

In conclusion, this research contributes to a corpus of knowledge about the unfolding process of the implementation of the policy of inclusive education in South Africa. On the positive side the findings showed a growing positive attitude of educators towards learners with barriers to learning, and indicates a movement away from discriminatory practices, towards the direction of an acceptance of responsibility for support to all learners. However, many challenges still need to be addressed before inclusive education is fully realized in South Africa. The grounding of the training in practice whilst acknowledging educators’ professional competencies certainly are amongst these challenges.
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ANNEXURES E:
EXAMPLES OF DATA ANALYSIS
1.

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS TRANSCRIPTS

PARTICIPANT NO 1: Foundation Phase

RESEARCHER: Could you please briefly tell us what has been your experience with regard to the training that was offered by the Department of Education in terms of the development of Inclusive Learning Programmes and the SIAS Strategy.

PARTICIPANT: In this process, I as an individual, I've experienced many problems is it regarding whereby some of the problems I can deal with but other problems are so difficult that I can not, so maybe I will get some help from you Mr. Roberts.

RESEARCHER: And perhaps what problems have you experienced in terms of training?

PARTICIPANT: The training was really successful. I could understand all what the trainers were dealing with.

RESEARCHER: Now are you telling me that emanating from the training you are confident that you will be able to apply everything that you got training on, in your classroom.

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

RESEARCHER: And perhaps with SIAS training, what do you personally think are problems that could hinder the process or the strategy of SIAS to be successfully implemented in our schools?

PARTICIPANT: It is demanding more time from the educator, because in this Screening you have to help learners individually that is really wasting other learners' time, unless there are other methods that can be used or other time that can be used to help those who are identified through Screening.

RESEARCHER: Would that be all? The demand that it puts on educators in terms of their time would that be all, or anything again on the SIAS Strategy.

PARTICIPANT: As I mentioned, most time is needed for those who are the struggling explain group, because in most time you use flashcards, you use other methods that can make them to understand what you are trying to teach for that time, because really these learners are having problems.

RESEARCHER: Now, the other thing would be, if you were given a chance to change
anything in the whole training that was provided to you, what is it that you would want to see done differently?

PARTICIPANT: You know the training that were offered by the, those people, the Sisonke Group, the training was too little, if may be the too little time for the training training was supposed to be 2 weeks because we only attended that course for a week, the training was, the time for training is too limited.

RESEARCHER: Is that all that you would change if you had an opportunity?

PARTICIPANT: If these people, the trainee (trainers) can come again because there are many things that I as an individual want to ask them, like learners who have such a problem, how can you assist this learner and when the year ended, this learner must be taken to the next grade with that problem. Is it not wise for us to move maybe with the whole class, so that we can deal with those group, the struggling group, because the struggling group in many times their ages are high and the learner has a problem, as an individual, the other teacher has not that tactics, techniques that I’m having to deal or to help those learners with certain problems, now the thing is with us here you have to stay for years in the same grade, may be if the system can change. This teacher in grade 1 must move with his learners up to grade 3 may be something can take place, it will be a change for us and may be the grade 4 of those years will be outstanding. Is what I’m thinking.

RESEARCHER: But generally, would you say that emanating from all the training that intend to advocate for Inclusive Education. Do you think you have been capacitated through those training?

PARTICIPANT: Yes!

RESEARCHER: And what? Perhaps what is your strong points that emanate from those trainings, that you or aspect that you have been able to successfully apply in your classroom.

PARTICIPANT: I can screen, I can screen, I can help those learners and at the end of the day I can see progress, that is why I’m saying that course really have helped me a lot.

RESEARCHER: Would that be all?

PARTICIPANT: I think so.
RESEARCHER: Now let me take this time to thank you very much for this short interview and like I said, like I’ve mentioned earlier on, the product or the culmination of this will be brought to your attention before released. Thank you so much.

PARTICIPANT NO 2. Grade One
Female

RESEARCHER: How did you experience the training that was offered to you by the Department of Education in either SIAS and the development of Inclusive Learning Programmes.

PARTICIPANT: I think it was alright, but there are still some problems which one encounters in the classroom.

RESEARCHER: Perhaps what are such problems?

PARTICIPANT: Like as I mentioned, the planning and preparation, how to go about in planning a lesson to help those learners with special needs. Differentiation, let me say lesson differentiation. I’m still experiencing a problem.

RESEARCHER: And perhaps would this only be the problem you experiencing currently?

PARTICIPANT: It is not the only problem, the other problem is learners who are experiencing learning problems right now, who have been in my class since last year and are still having problem and I don’t know what I’m going to do with them because they are not progressing.

RESEARCHER: And perhaps, what do you think could be the solution to these problems that you are experiencing currently?

PARTICIPANT: Sometimes you find that the learner is not progressing and you call the parent, parents withheld (withhold) certain information. They don’t give enough of the learners’ background, so this makes it to have problems and they don’t participate if you call them, some of them don’t participate.

RESEARCHER: And on the problem of planning and preparation or generally on lesson differentiation, what do you think could be done to assist you?

PARTICIPANT: I think the DBST could help, like they have promised, you know, to rely on DBST for support.
come, we are still waiting.

RESEARCHER: Now besides these two problems, generally with regard to the training that was offered to you, what would you think would be your strengths in terms of applying what you have been given into your class?

PARTICIPANT: At least now learners who experience problems, I give them enough time, let us say, I'm giving them certain tasks to do, I don't rush them, I leave them and continue with the others whilst they are doing their work at their own pace.

RESEARCHER: Would that be the only thing you regard as your strength?

PARTICIPANT: So I learnt that I should have empathy, treat learners who have problems at home. I call the learner and find out what is the problem, if maybe be is not feeling well or somehow.

RESEARCHER: And what would be your weakness besides planning and preparation and parents not taking part and learners not progressing. What would also be your other weakness in terms of what has been trained on and application in the classroom?

PARTICIPANT: Some of my weakness is how to teach those learners, let me say, learners who can't, who don't know how to help themselves, let me say going to the toilet is my weakness, I don't know how to go about may be to look that child to go alone to the toilet.

RESEARCHER: And would that be all from your side. All this that you have mentioned would they be all what you can say about the whole training?

PARTICIPANT: And I think that they must include helpers in the classrooms for learners who have problems, physical problems because some others when they have to go to toilet they struggle, so I can't leave my classroom and go with the learner to a toilet and the other learners remaining in the classroom.

RESEARCHER: SIAS is the strategy to identify and support, from the training on SIAS can you say now that you are equipped to address every barrier that the children may experience?

PARTICIPANT: I can not say I'm equipped, right now I have a learner I don't know what to say, what is his problem because he does not cope and I can't Not capable of transferring training to practice.
identify what really problem is because the parent does not participate. I can't say I can now.

RESEARCHER: Surely that gives you a headache, that you are not able to identify what the learner is experiencing.

PARTICIPANT: Very much, because I want to help this poor child but I don't know how to start now because I don't know the exact background of the learner because when we go to the profile, the profile has nothing.

Follow-up: And in terms of SIAS the profile is the one that is supposed to lead you.

RESEARCHER: Now generally, if you had a chance in all the training that you have received, to change something, what would it be in terms of how the training is structured, the time that you were given, the materials. What would you suggest that it be done differently.

PARTICIPANT: I think, I like that all learners must participate in the learning and teaching, they must participate well, they must be able to take part, meaning that necessary resources must be available.

RESEARCHER: How would you relate that to the training that you have received on SIAS? The aim of Inclusive Education is to get all learners participate in the same environment, the training on SIAS alone gives us guidelines in terms of being able to identify and give support eventually where a learner experiences a particular barrier. Now what I'm trying to find from you is, In terms of training the 3 days that you got from the training, What other things do you think could be changed in order to make the training more effective to teachers?

PARTICIPANT: I think they must make examples using the learners, practical examples, they must use the learners.

RESEARCHER: Would that be the only thing you can change if you were given a chance?

PARTICIPANT: I think the trainers also, they must keep on reviving us, more workshops must be held so that we could master all those.

RESEARCHER: And if they hold workshops often, should they take the same shape that they are taking – 3 days after 2 o'clock to 3 o’clock

PARTICIPANT: No, I think in the afternoon we are a little bit tired, I think if they use
the time in the morning our minds are still fresh.

RESEARCHER: Generally with the training, what is it that you find very positive, as far as you are concerned?

PARTICIPANT: I think we are able to accommodate every learner, we don’t discriminate now like in the past we used to call learners by names, we notice that every learner is unique, so we must learn his or her needs.

PARTICIPANT NO 3 Foundation Phase
Grade 2
Female

RESEARCHER: Could you tell us, what has been your experiences in terms of the training that you have been offered by the Department of Education?

PARTICIPANT: The training was good but the problem is I am not still, I am not yet clear about the whole situation because my problem is especially coming to the children who have got barriers. Firstly it seems we need more training because I am not clear about that, that is why in most cases I am not using the ........ I am still on the old didactic teaching and I saw that by applying according to me and some points there........ . When I combine them, I can have now a little bit of light where I am going about that especially coming to ........ assessment. I am still not clear about the assessment because in the class I’ve got many children close to thirty two, so I can’t attend individual children because if sometimes I’m busy with this slow learners or these children who’ve got barriers, I’m still having a problem with ones because I don’t have an assistant in my class.

RESEARCHER: Now having said that, if you were given a chance to change some other things in the training, because you said that you still need more training to be able to effectively accommodate these other learners who are experiencing barriers to learning, what is it that you would change if you were given a chance to change anything in terms of the training that you were offered? What would you change, what is it that you would do differently from the training that you’ve been receiving?

PARTICIPANT: I’m not clear about...........

RESEARCHER: You are not clear; look you had a training and still, you still feel personally that you still need more training because you still have, experiencing problems in terms of accommodating all learners in your classroom and the Department will say but we have given a training
may be from their training there are other problems that you may have
picked up that have also resulted in you not been able to apply what
they have trained you about in your classroom and what is that?

PARTICIPANT: My problem is that on the children who’ve got barriers, there are many
problems coming from those kids some of them especially coming to
the parents when you need the parents to discuss those problems with
children, some of them they don’t even come or do anything but at
least some they respond.

RESEARCHER: Now, the current or the recent training with SIAS, what are your
experiences of that training? This one that was given recently.

PARTICIPANT: On that training at least I’ve gained something because somehow I can
identify children with problems and I can sometimes see that when I
follow the programme according to some of the children at least I can
see some light from that.

RESEARCHER: So you are saying to me that with the training on SIAS, you feel very
much confident that you are able to apply it in your classroom
situation.

PARTICIPANT: If they only can assist us with the overcrowded,...........

RESEARCHER: Generally...... with regard to the training that you received what do
you feel now after these training are your strongest points?

PARTICIPANT: I feel strong because I can manage to come up with to help those kids
according to their behaviours and plus minus I’ve got three who that I
can see a progress today out of six in my class.

RESEARCHER: Would this be your only strength, that is, you are now able to address
barriers that learners are experiencing, would it be the only strength
that you have found from the training and then what do you see as still
that weaknesses, your weaknesses after having been trained, you still
have these other problems but what are your general weaknesses even
after having been trained.

PARTICIPANT: Coming to my weaknesses its about especially assessment.

RESEARCHER: And what about it?

PARTICIPANT: If they can train us again about to assess, about assessing these learners
with barriers.
8.

RESEARCHER: Because they are speaking about assessment standard differentiation, is that where your problem is?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

RESEARCHER: Ok, to differentiate assessment standards.

RESEARCHER: And may be the last question, generally would you say as an individual educator at Nanogang school that the training that you’ve received on inclusive education has made you a better person and how has that happened?

PARTICIPANT: Because it has happened to improve where my weakness may be so I can now, I can see where I am going now.

RESEARCHER: In terms of applying methods in a classroom?

PARTICIPANT: Ok.

**PARTICIPANT NO 4**

**Foundation Phase**

**Grade 3**

**Female**

RESEARCHER: Please explain to me or briefly tell me how did you experience the training that you received from the Department in terms of development of Inclusive Learning Programmes and SIAS.

PARTICIPANT: Mr Roberts, what I have learnt is that we are having a inclusive learners in the classroom so but we don’t have specific learning plan for them so we are using the very same plan as the learners who don’t have barriers and sometimes I have to attend to a learner with barriers, think about a class of 35 if I attend to this learner, what about the remaining 34 so it makes it difficult for me to cope with this SIAS because at the end of the day there’s nothing that I have achieved and one other thing, every year there’s this learner in the class who have barriers and yet the very same thing it rotates again starting from the beginning until up to the end of the year so when it comes to progression report I can’t get those children to be progressed to the next grade because they didn’t achieve so my problem is should I keep on to retain or to let them pass because of age because if they have so many years at the end of that phase they must leave that phase so that’s my main worry.

RESEARCHER: But, tell me the training of SIAS and the training of ILP has it been
able to assist you in terms of equipping you with new strategy that you’ll apply in classroom for those particular learners you have mentioned.

PARTICIPANT: If I was supposed to teach only those learners it would be something different but now my point is there are those learners with barriers and this learners without barriers so you see my argument, so if may be I was just concentrating on this learners with barriers this SIAS will be helpful to me.

RESEARCHER: So basically you are saying that whilst SIAS and the ILP training have assisted you to a certain extend you still don’t feel very confident to accommodate learners with barriers.

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

RESEARCHER: And perhaps what do you think should be done?

PARTICIPANT: I think more workshops should take place and let these workshops not take only minutes or hours, let them .......... learners and experiment with them so that we can be able to do the very same thing in class, so when we are at the workshops they’ll just say page 34, page 12 thereafter group yourselves, we are the learners by then, I understand but the learners don’t understand and I am very unable to deliver to the learners because the learners were not in the workshop.

RESEARCHER: So let me come back to SIAS, look you have mentioned that you would need more workshops and that learners should be used in the workshops, there should be some practicality happening in the workshop. Now both those workshops that you have received, what do you think has been after having been work shopped or trained what has been your strengths or your strong points from those workshops?

PARTICIPANT: My strong point, I can identify learners with barriers the minute he comes in my class, I can see this one or may be after some few class works I am able to identify him. Identification is very important.

RESEARCHER: The other thing, would you say the identification of these learners is the only strong point from the training. Is that the only thing that you feel very confident with from the training.

PARTICIPANT: (Yes, till so far I can say so, I don’t want to lie.)

RESEARCHER: Ok, the other thing is the weaknesses perhaps look, you’ve got the
training but you still feel that you need more training, more training on what?

PARTICIPANT: After identifying these learners what must I do?

RESEARCHER: The support. responsibility for support shifted to the DBST?

PARTICIPANT: The support, because the DBST does not come to our school regularly; they stay for a long time and by the time they come there is a list of all those learners and when are they going to attend to them?

RESEARCHER: Now you have raised the very critical aspect of the DBST, what do you think should be the programme of the DBST in order to be able to effectively assist you here at the school? Except that they should come, you know, quite often what else do you think they should do the DBST?

PARTICIPANT: The DBST can have their own programme together with us here at school, let’s sit down and talk, discuss our programme so that when to meet or if they feel like they will come to our school whenever we have problems now the problems will be much more, so I think the programme it will work much easy with us.

RESEARCHER: Now lastly, the last question, generally with these training do you perhaps fell that you are empowered by this training to be able to go to class without any hindrance without any problems to apply what you have been given in the training and apply it without any problems in your classroom. Do you feel confident?

PARTICIPANT: No!

Intermediate Phase

PARTICIPANT: No. Grade 4 Female

RESEARCHER: What have been your experiences personally, how did you experience those training including this training that we had recently on SIAS?

PARTICIPANT: My plea is that we should be provided with the preparation of the lesson, I am not sure what I am doing is correct, I want to be provided with an example of the planning of the lesson.

RESEARCHER: Ok, would that be all, would preparation of the lesson be the only thing you request?
PARTICIPANT: And different assessment.

RESEARCHER: Different assessment techniques.

RESEARCHER: Now the training you received on development of Inclusive Learning Programmes was intended for you to be able to differentiate the curriculum and differentiate your teaching strategies like you have mentioned right now, that you would want more training on differentiation of assessment standards. Do you, what is you experience, what have you learnt from there and what is it that you are able to apply since the training?

PARTICIPANT: What I didn't apply is the, to identify the children with barriers, I can identify them.

RESEARCHER: So you are able to identify children with barriers?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

RESEARCHER: But are you able to after having identified them in terms of SIAS you must also provide support. Are you able to provide support?

PARTICIPANT: Yes, I am able to provide support but in certain instance not all. I am not clear of what I am doing, what I want to be done again is to observing somebody doing that in the classroom with the children not with the teachers because we are having problems with the learners not the teachers. I want to see it practically.

RESEARCHER: Now, meaning in terms of practical meaning right now you suggest that what you would change from the way training was given would be to have learners here and people should make examples that are practical. Now in terms of the same training, what would also be one thing that you would want to see happening with the training except for the fact that they should bring learners into the class and they should do it practically, what is another thing you think they should do?

PARTICIPANT: The facilitators. That was the only thing I want to see. blame?

RESEARCHER: That you would want to see them doing things practically? Now tell me, the other important aspect of SIAS was to equip you to be able to identify and assess the barriers that learners are experiencing and eventually give support. How far are you equipped along those lines? Ok you said you are able to identify and able to assess but your area of problem was your support now how far since the training, how
far are you able to do the SIAS in the classroom except only to identify in terms of assessing the nature of the barrier that the learner is experiencing?

PARTICIPANT: I am able to group learners according to their ability.

RESEARCHER: And then after grouping them?

PARTICIPANT: After grouping them I realize how much help do they need so I do the lesson, I give them little work or easier work that suite their ability.

RESEARCHER: Ok, you downgrade, that is what we call downgrading of activities, but does it really work for you in a classroom?

PARTICIPANT: Yes, it does work.

RESEARCHER: And perhaps can you tell me if you say it works for you what other improvements have you realized since applying this method?

PARTICIPANT: I realize that the work becomes too much for me because of the learners in a classroom so I have to attend to those slow ones and then.....

RESEARCHER: The other objective of the training was for teachers to be able to be confident to apply what they have learnt from the training into their respective classrooms. Tell me about your confidence since you have been trained, how much confident are you?

PARTICIPANT: I am confident because the little that I have grasp I see that learners are progressing, those slow ones are progressing and the ones with barriers are becoming better.

RESEARCHER: And becoming better would mean that they able to meet other assessment standards?

PARTICIPANT: Yes, they are able but I’m worried when they rite a final examination, they write the same question paper now that is my difficulty.

RESEARCHER: Learners are writing the same question paper all over the country?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

RESEARCHER: So your worry would be, if they are writing the same question paper. What do you worry about?

confusion into individual — group support.
PARTICIPANT: The slow ones can not……..

RESEARCHER: That the slow ones are not going to be ………, and let me quickly ask, when is this going to happen, the writing of the same question paper from this year or has it been happening…….? 

PARTICIPANT: It has been happening, I never received a question paper of a slow learner from the Department. 

RESEARCHER: Ok, it means children have been long writing the same question paper. It means for the passed years they’ve been writing the same question paper and your worry is that if they write the same question paper the slow ones will fall behind. What do you think should happen specifically on this one? 

PARTICIPANT: To my opinion, I think they must be special schools for these ones and their question paper and when they pass their question paper they must be brought to the school that fits them and we don’t have that school. Fss?.

RESEARCHER: Now may be this one will be the last question and now the whole training all these training that we’ve got from Sisonke Consortium you remember at Ikalafeng school and this training that was provided by the District office here. If you were given a chance to change anything in that training what would that be to say that this I think should have been done this and this way, this one, this one, what should, what would that be, specifically with the training, the materials, the trainers themselves? 

PARTICIPANT: I think the materials should be changed and there must be a special school where these children will end up, where they can get certificates and get work. 

PARTICIPANT NO 6 Foundation Phase
Grade 3
Female

RESEARCHER: Thank you so much for turning up for this interview. What are your experiences, what have you experienced during the trainings that you have received from the Department of Education on Inclusive Education? How did you feel? Do you feel they have assisted you anyway in a classroom or they have equipped you with other skills that you did not have before?
PARTICIPANT: They have assisted me and especially when coming to identifying children with special needs but my only problem is to meet those of special needs most of that time, they are delaying the process of teaching because of we attend them individually.

RESEARCHER: Now, you said that you are able to identify these learners and your problem is that of accommodating them in a classroom, same classroom is problematic in a sense that they are delaying those others. Now having said that, remember the training on Inclusive Learning Programmes was mainly meant to empower you as an educator to differentiate curriculum, teaching strategies and assessment. Would you say you are able to do that in classroom and how do you do it?

PARTICIPANT: Assessment is a very difficult..........., trying to gossip, some of those of special needs just attend doing nothing in class even if you reassess them it seems as if you have nothing to them, those who don’t have problems.

RESEARCHER: For those that are having problems, did you ever try some differentiation in terms of your teaching strategies and how did you feel about it?

PARTICIPANT: If you try other method of differentiation other kids who can perform well also take advantage of those ones and want to be the same as those ones at the end of the day all of them in the class, I don’t understand, I don’t understand then you are having a problem because they see that you are having, you are spending more time with that ones and those with special needs their work is a little bit simpler than theirs.

RESEARCHER: Would you say that has not been assisting you, you know when you are trying to differentiate these other learners would take advantage, so it does not assist you at all. Would you say, you feel still you not assisted? Now the training on SIAS was meant to equip educators to be able to identify barriers, to assess the barrier, not assessment as in test and all that, and eventually support the learner who is experiencing the barrier. How have you been able to do that from the training?

PARTICIPANT: What you call it, the training on SIAS, there is nothing wrong with SIAS, there is nothing wrong with SIAS, the only thing that gives me problem is in class, identification, assessment and support, no problem about that, but the delaying process of teaching, they could have said we must take this one and put them one side even if we are not allowed to do that according to the White Paper. Is it true?
RESEARCHER: That you are not allowed to separate learners, yes the policy does not allow. So you find that on its own as a barrier, to say look you can identify, you can support but because of the fact that policy does not allow you to separate learners, now find problems there, and perhaps what do you think should be done with regard to that?

PARTICIPANT: I have been asking the support staff, do you call them support staff, to come and help, we have been calling them but no one have ever attend to us even the planning that we have, it does not include them all because there are some, like special need........., say what do you we call that, special need.

RESEARCHER: Differentiation of a lesson plan. The differentiation of a lesson plan is also difficult because it does not include all learners?

PARTICIPANT: and they promised us they will give us the relevant planning, but until today. Is it 2 years, neh? We have been trying with our own knowledge.

RESEARCHER: Perhaps who promised you to give you the relevant planning?

PARTICIPANT: The support staff.

RESEARCHER: The DBST

PARTICIPANT: The DBST

RESEARCHER: and how do you see them, what can you say about the DBST?

PARTICIPANT: (They are not supporting.) Blame.

RESEARCHER: They are not supporting you. You feel that the DBST is not supporting you and why are saying so?

PARTICIPANT: We have been calling them so many times and they did not turn up.

RESEARCHER: Now let’s go back to the training on SIAS, because SIAS was intended to equip you with skills to support learners, those that are experiencing barriers to learning. Can you say now after the training that you have been able to support those learners, and what methods have you applied, how have you gone about it in your classroom, if you give me an example of a learner in you classroom who has this particular barrier and you have been able to support him.
PARTICIPANT: Like I'm having, I'm having one learner in my class, it is so difficult for her to write, but now I can see there's a little bit progress because I've started with her writing from the slate, do you call it a slate? After that I write in the book and he copies what I've written there, and I always give her homework to do and she does it, now at least you can read, you can read what she has written, even if it is not so clear. And the other learner can't read but having a picture in front of him, he can tell you what is happening in this picture and what he sees and what is wrong with the picture but coming to writing is very difficult for him. The very same learner, when I ask questions in the class he can answer, he answer well but the only thing is when coming to writing.

RESEARCHER: So there is an improvement on the learner?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

RESEARCHER: Now, generally, considering the skills that you had earlier on before the training and the skills that you have acquired after the training, how would you define the training, would you say, what would you say about the training, that you have been equipped now or you still feel that there are other things that need to be done, and perhaps what are those things?

PARTICIPANT: That is a difficult question

RESEARCHER: Look you had the training……

PARTICIPANT: Let me just say re-training.

RESEARCHER: Specifically on what, or should they do the whole training?

PARTICIPANT: When coming to those children special needs and the one who are not special needs, let them just come and show me how to go about these ones and those ones in class so that the delay of these one must not be so……

RESEARCHER: So you want, if I hear you clearly you say, they must do it with the learners.

PARTICIPANT: Practically.

RESEARCHER: If you were given a chance to change anything with regard to the training, anything, in terms of the materials used for the training, the trainers themselves, the time, duration of the training.
PARTICIPANT: The duration is too short. The \textit{nature of the training}

RESEARCHER: Is it the only thing that you would change?

PARTICIPANT: Resources, resources they are using.

RESEARCHER: What about them?

PARTICIPANT: The one they are using when training us, \textit{not the ones they have given to us}. They must use resources that will show us how to go about in the class, meaning that let me say, if they train us they must take us as children in the class with special needs, others with special needs, others without special needs and show us how to go about using those resources like teaching aids for those who have special needs, teaching aids for those who are in the middle and teaching aids for those who are . . . . .

RESEARCHER: Would duration of the training and resources only be your problem. Would they be the only things that you can change? You didn’t have any problems with trainers themselves, in terms of their knowledge of the aspects that they were training on?

PARTICIPANT: No!

RESEARCHER: Finally, the last question, tell me about your confidence after the training, would you be confident to go into your classroom and say I am a well equipped teacher now and I can apply everything that I’ve been trained about.

PARTICIPANT: Yes, after been trained again. After the re-training I’m sure, \textit{but for now I’m confident}.

RESEARCHER: Do you think your confidence is bearing some fruit in the classroom?

PARTICIPANT: Yes, because I like being with those with special needs but the only is I’m not so well equipped about them.

RESEARCHER: What do you see as the problems in your classroom that makes it difficult for you to apply the skills that you have acquired from the training? What are those problems that you see in your classroom in trying to apply those skills that you’ve acquired?

PARTICIPANT: As I have already told you, I have no problems, the only problem is \textit{mixing the kids, teaching them all, eish, it’s a problem to me}. 

\textit{resistance}.
RESEARCHER: Now, I've heard you talking about mixing, accommodating learners with and learners without in the same class but you don't have a problem of learning and teaching support materials, you don't have a problem of space in a classroom, you don't have a problem of........

PARTICIPANT: The class is full.

RESEARCHER: So you are having other problems?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

RESEARCHER: What are those problems that makes it difficult for you to be effective in a classroom?

PARTICIPANT: *practical implementation*

Teacher to child ratio. Teacher-learner ratio

RESEARCHER: What about it?

PARTICIPANT: After identifying those with special needs, others need more time as I've heard at the ......, they put it that you can get that one child equals to two or three that with the special needs, now it's a problem.

RESEARCHER: The teacher-learner ratio and you also said something about space, you were saying.....

PARTICIPANT: Space yes, if we speak about teacher-leaner ratio it also affects space.

RESEARCHER: Any other problems, perhaps the last one?

PARTICIPANT: Resources.

RESEARCHER: You are talking about here...... What kind of resources are you talking about here?

PARTICIPANT: Like teaching aids.

RESEARCHER: You don't have enough of them. And what else, teaching aids and........?

PARTICIPANT: The only thing I'm worried about is the planning.

RESEARCHER: Lesson planning. And here what is the problem with the lesson planning?
PARTICIPANT: The planning we are using now, its only for those who can……

RESEARCHER: Is there any other thing that you want to say perhaps with the training?

PARTICIPANT: Come and support us DBST including you.

RESEARCHER: Is that all?

PARTICIPANT: Who is the lady from Sisonke?

RESEARCHER: Marin

PARTICIPANT: Since she promised us to bring a report back the time she was doing observation in class.

RESEARCHER: So you are still awaiting the report.

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

PARTICIPANT NO 7 Grade 4 Female

RESEARCHER: What would you say about your experiences of the training that you got from the Department of Education particularly those that are related to Inclusive Education.

PARTICIPANT: According to me and my experience, if they could do the training at least once a quarter, so that all of us can grasp.

RESEARCHER: May be the next question immediately be, what do you think is the problem with the duration of the training you got?

PARTICIPANT: Sometimes people forget, in order for us to constantly remember……

RESEARCHER: So you are saying the duration of this training that you got since 2006 is very short. Would that be your only experience of the training?

PARTICIPANT: Although the training is so helpful for us in order to provide for these learners however it is so difficult to.

RESEARCHER: Now the other thing would be, the training that you received was aimed at assisting you to be able to differentiate the curriculum and
differentiate your teaching strategies and also differentiate your assessment standards, would you say you are able to do all those things currently?

PARTICIPANT: Currently I think I am able to.

RESEARCHER: To differentiate the teaching strategies, the assessment standards and your curriculum. What problems do you experience perhaps in trying to differentiate those things?

PARTICIPANT: The problem.......

RESEARCHER: That you are encountering when you are differentiating.

PARTICIPANT: I don't know how to put it. The problem could be to differentiate, how to put it.......

RESEARCHER: Look, the training was saying if you differentiate your curriculum, then it will mean that you must differentiate your lesson plan, to accommodate all learners in your classroom, it will also mean you must differentiate your work schedule, it will also mean you must differentiate your assessment standards. Have you been able to do that from the training?

PARTICIPANT: Sometimes, not consistently.

RESEARCHER: But does it work out for you to differentiate all those, curriculum, strategies and methods. Does it workout for you?

PARTICIPANT: Not so much.

RESEARCHER: What problems do you perhaps experience in terms of trying to differentiate? Where are areas of problems?

PARTICIPANT: Problems arise from ......, I consult different books.

RESEARCHER: By books you mean your textbooks?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

RESEARCHER: What grade is that?

PARTICIPANT: Grade 4, but one tries his/her level best in spite of that.
RESEARCHER: So you are saying your learning and teaching support materials (textbooks) are not user-friendly for differentiation?

PARTICIPANT: Yes, sometimes.

RESEARCHER: The other question would be, the training you received on SIAS, Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support; what is your experience of that training. What would you say about it. How did it help you. What other skills have you gained from that training?

PARTICIPANT: Other skills will be, if a child suffers from hearing loss you are able to identify such learner. You are able to identify learners experiencing barriers.

RESEARCHER: The last (S) in the SIAS strategy stands for Support. Because you are able to identify them are you also able to adequately support them in a classroom?

PARTICIPANT: Yes, I am trying.

RESEARCHER: How have you been doing it?

PARTICIPANT: I have one child in my classroom who beats other children, who is probably abnormal and he can move from the back where he seats and come forward to beat the other learners in front, he beats other learners more especially when the teacher is not there in the classroom. I have managed to move the learner from the back, he is currently sitting in the front of the classroom isolated from the others and ever since he is alright. He buys a newspaper from his lunch money and cut out soccer pictures from it and he has created a file where he puts the pictures. He probably likes sports.

RESEARCHER: And you have been able to handle his disability.

PARTICIPANT: Of course with him I have been able to.

RESEARCHER: Do you feel that after the training you are very confident to apply what you have been receiving from the training into your classroom and does it work?

PARTICIPANT: Yes it does work, but not so much, sometimes with some learners it is possible however with others it is not especially learners from Thakaneng, if it was possible I would ask the Principal not to admit learners from Thakaneng.
RESEARCHER: Besides the problems you have raised, generally are you able to apply what you have been given in the classroom?

PARTICIPANT: Yes, I am trying to. I can’t say I can.

RESEARCHER: What other problems are you experiencing in your classroom as you are trying to apply……?

PARTICIPANT: Behaviour of learners resulting from the fact that corporal punishment is abolished, especially boys, with girls is better.

RESEARCHER: And except for behaviour, any other problems?

PARTICIPANT: Learning problems, there is a general problem regarding reading, however the Principal arranged that every morning we do reading with the learners although we have changed the time to 13h30.

RESEARCHER: You are not experiencing any problems with regard learning teaching support materials, the spacing in the classroom, the parents, you don’t experience problems along those lines?

PARTICIPANT: When I call parents they turn up except some don’t however their response has always been positive.

RESEARCHER: With learning teaching support materials, spacing in your classroom, the number of learners in your classroom?

PARTICIPANT: I am having 31 learners in my classroom and I am at least able to handle learners, they are few, and regarding spacing there’s a plenty.

RESEARCHER: If you were given a chance with regard to training, to change anything in those trainings, what would you suggest is being done differently?

PARTICIPANT: I would say, maybe sometimes in the training, the trainers should have a small group of learners to demonstrate when they deal with aspects. At least have a group of learners to demonstrate with them.

RESEARCHER: The other thing you would change?

PARTICIPANT: Refrain from scheduling training in the afternoon as by that time we are exhausted.

RESEARCHER: Other things that you would change. You said something about the practicality of the training and you also spoke about training in the
afternoon. Your overall view of the training, did it help you feel you are confident, you can go to class and do whatever they have required you to do or do you think that there are other problems that make it difficult for you to apply that what you have been trained on?

PARTICIPANT: You know what, before the training that was attended at Rustenburg, we used to perceive the training offered by Sisonke Consortium as the best but since the training in Rustenburg, the Principal mentioned that the training differ. I wish they could train all of us on the new training.

RESEARCHER: What are your experiences with the training on Inclusive Learning Programmes and the new training on Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support, how do you feel about them.

PARTICIPANT: I don’t feel comfortable.

RESEARCHER: Maybe why?

PARTICIPANT: You see this group reading, some learners are not able to communicate with others, they fear to speak to talk, they don’t have facts, some learners just write can’t answer questions.

RESEARCHER: As a result of group reading. The training that was given to you was intended to empower you as a teacher, to be able to differentiate the curriculum, and differentiate your teaching strategies and your assessment standards, thus far do you think the training has achieved its aim with you in the classroom.

PARTICIPANT: With me but not with the learners, because there are so many teaching aids and it is a waste of time, some learners are not grasping so that is why I am using the old didactics.

RESEARCHER: But are you still able to differentiate your curriculum to cater for these learners who are experiencing barriers in the classroom?

PARTICIPANT: No.

RESEARCHER: And perhaps what are problem areas? Why are you not able to even after training able to differentiate?

PARTICIPANT: As I have mentioned in the beginning, these learners are not the same, you are likely to waste time on an individual learner, as I have only one
learner in my classroom who is experiencing barriers. I am supposed
to even when I am exhausted attend to this learner after school still the
learner does not grasp.

RESEARCHER: So you are saying that you find it a waste of time for other learners if
you have to attend to this particular learner with problems but how
have you been trying to accommodate him in the classroom?

PARTICIPANT: As I have said I’m not using it, I’m using it only when it is class visit.

RESEARCHER: Using what?

PARTICIPANT: This SIAS what….., what……., making some teaching aids what…..,what…. Lot of paper work, teachers. I am not using it really.

RESEARCHER: Seeing that even after training you still find it difficult to apply what
you have been trained about in the classroom. How have you been
keeping on in a classroom in order to make sure that every learner
participates optimally in the classroom including this other one.

PARTICIPANT: It does not work Meneer, that is why I said I am not using it.

RESEARCHER: So you are not differentiating?

PARTICIPANT: No.

RESEARCHER: The main aim of the SIAS training was to equip educators to be able to
Screen, Identify barriers, Assess the barrier and eventually give
support. After the training do you see yourself equipped?

PARTICIPANT: I am not equipped but I have tried to use it, but in the class we were
usually doing that, screening learners, we didn’t know it is Screening
and what, but we were doing it but not so as pushy as one of SIAS.
And the thing is, we are forced to do it. consideration for

RESEARCHER: Your school is a Full-Service School according to EWP 6, and you are
going to be expected to teach learners with barriers hence the training,
if you are saying that you have been doing identifying and screening of
barriers long before, after training do you think you have gained other
skills in terms of doing it because you have been doing it before, do
you think you have gained something after training?

PARTICIPANT: Yes for me I have gained not for the learners.
RESEARCHER: You have gained knowledge for yourself but are you able to apply it?

PARTICIPANT: No.

RESEARCHER: If you were given a chance particularly with regard to these trainings, what is it that you would change in terms of the whole training, if you were given a chance to change something, what is it that you would do differently?

PARTICIPANT: According to screening?

RESEARCHER: Screening, differentiation and all that, what is it that you think you would change and do it differently?

PARTICIPANT: This thing is now new. How about these learners with barriers should have their own class, so that one can teach freely without wasting other's time.

RESEARCHER: Learners with barriers should be classified as a homogenous group with their barriers? What is another thing that you would change with regard to the training, the time that is given for training, the trainers themselves, the materials that they use, do you find materials very user-friendly, do you find people who are training very equipped with the knowledge.

PARTICIPANT: No, the trainers also are not fully trained. Time of the training is too short, you can't grasp everything in 3-4 days.

RESEARCHER: How much time do you suggest that it should be given to training?

PARTICIPANT: Every quarter.

RESEARCHER: There must be quarterly training.

PARTICIPANT NO 9

Intermediate Phase
Grade 5
Female

RESEARCHER: What would you say are your experiences of the training, the whole training that you received from Department of Education?

PARTICIPANT: I will say the training was not well presented, there are somethings that we are not sure of like when you say the differentiation and adaptation, we are not clear how to involve the learners so that there be
differentiation and adaptation in the classroom because the number of learners in the class surely you can’t concentrate on may be two or five learners at a time because you are having 30 minutes and in that 30 minutes you are going to present only what you have in a class and then there’s no time to go back and to get those learners who can not read who can not ......... To go and remedy the ...... so you don’t have that time. So I think if may be we have some period that those students, someone with remedial then you put those children that you see that these children need thorough remedial then you put them in that class for that time, so after you have remedied those learners give them back to ........, then there are some learners who can not even write their names but they are in Grade 4, 5 due to the age, they have been postponed from Grade 1 up to Grade 5 due to the age, so when you come to Grade 5 you’ll find that now the demand is more so that learner totally can’t cope in the class, so may be if there were something like handwork or something that those learners should be some period that they are doing handwork or they are doing woodwork or something that will keep them in school and they enjoy the and be interested in school because they don’t enjoy nothing because in class they can’t cope so they disturb other children because now if you take their book and look at their book from the start to the end you’ve got not , not, not so this discourages the learners so may be if we can do otherwise.

RESEARCHER: Now, what I hear from you is that, one area of problem is differentiation in order to accommodate all learners in the classroom and you remember the training on I.L.P Inclusive Learning Programmes was intended to empower teachers to be able to differentiate, now what would you suggest that should be done, what would you suggest that we do things differently?

PARTICIPANT: I would suggest that not to, ok we put all these learners in the same class but there must be sometimes when these learners are taken out of the class and be placed or at any period you take others to that learning area and then you leave those in the and then somebody will come and do something with those who can’t cope. I should think that may be like in De Wilge the curriculum is simple and then from there after the curriculum, there are those some period where the learners will do, some will do electricity, some will do something. I think if we have that in our school, that would help the learners, because most of our learners are not that, learners who must be placed in Ikalafeng, they are the learners who may be .... something outside they can’t cope may be is .... differences or something there..... so they are normal kids and they can take instruction but only when it comes to writing and reading they can’t do that.
RESEARCHER: Let's go to the training on SIAS, do you personally feel that you are equipped as an educator in a classroom to identify barriers, to assess them and also to give relevant support?

PARTICIPANT: With identification process I've got some information from my study, I can identify that this learner is not ready for that learning may be the, you see that the learner can't, is not ready to write the shape of the letters and then you see that the learner may be when we started he was not ready for writing, he can't write in the lines so we can identify those learners that this learner is due to this problem that he can't do this so through my idea I can at least identify those learners and then from there after identifying them, the problem is we are not ready to assess them, the barrier that they are ....... so most of the learners we have identified their barriers but they have not yet been supported and given that assistance that they can cope.

RESEARCHER: Now if you were given a chance to change anything in the training that you received, anything from the materials that are used, the trainers themselves, the time that is given for training, anything what would you change?

PARTICIPANT: I should prefer that, that time was too short, it was too little, because the things that we must do in class when you look at the training, the training was too little, we didn't have enough training, may be if we got that training we could do something else, and then again when it comes to those learners who may be, who can not talk or see or those who are deaf and dump, so to cope in our school I should think we are not yet ready to pick those learners in our schools, they must be taken elsewhere where they can be assisted other way round. And then the resources in our school we don't have enough resources may be if we can be trained to use those referable, may be like learners who can not see well, who can not hear well which teaching aid can be used to assess them, so we don't have those, the only thing that we have is just the chart, we don't get these materials which we can assess those learners.

RESEARCHER: You have raised a number of issues that are very pertinent, now I want to know, may be this will be the last question, what would you, if you were given a chance to develop a training on inclusive education on SIAS on ILP, what is it that you would change and do differently?

PARTICIPANT: In the first place, I think the curriculum, the curriculum for those learners is too, so they can, if they can be simplified, and then the learner should be, immediately when they come to school, they should be,
when they are registered there, they should be, everything should be registered, and this learner has this impaired and this one and this one, so when the teacher is taking the that child to the class, he must know really that I'm going to deal with the learner who has this and this, so that by the time we were at the course they did not raise that, that the child should be, when they are admitted, they should all, everything should be put on the table that this learner has this and this and this, so if all the teachers should be trained to deal with these learners.

RESEARCHER: Now, the last question, may be the most least one. What do you think were your positive aspects of the training in spite of these problems?

PARTICIPANT: My positive aspect will be, at least we have that knowledge of how to deal with the learners differently although we can not do it as we want but at least we've got the knowledge and at least we are aware what is happening with different learners and different .........., the changes how can we change may be the prep (lesson preparation) for the learner who is not qualifying for that learner so we can do number of preps at one time to accommodate all those learners so this is what we have learnt from that SIAS.

RESEARCHER: Other skills that you have received that you are able now to use in your classroom from the training?

PARTICIPANT: Is that skill of identifying the learners, of assisting them, of supporting them how to deal with the deaf learners, how can you identify a learner who is short-sighted or........

RESEARCHER: Anything you want to tell me about the training.

PARTICIPANT: There is a number of things that you see is positive although you can not apply it but if you read it and you see it when you are doing .........., you see that those are the positive thing, so the inclusion, to include all the learners at this moment I don't see it working.

PARTICIPANT NO 10  
Senior Phase  
Grade 7  
Female  

RESEARCHER: Your experiences of the training you received from Department of Education.

PARTICIPANT: The training is not enough.

RESEARCHER: What other aspects did you find not positive aspects of the training for yourself seeing that you are new and all that you had was this little
PARTICIPANT: I think the one of combining the learners which are right and the one which are not right, I don't think it is right, because they are disturbing you most of the time in the middle of the lesson you have to stop and .......you know.

RESEARCHER: But, what other things perhaps that would you tell me in terms of identifying and screening disabilities and seeking support to help these learners. What would you say about that? Do you find it feasible also?

PARTICIPANT: I think screening is like when you are looking for their profiles and all those things, I think it is good that one because you can not teach a learner whereas you don’t have information about her, you don’t know nothing about .......what is happening about her and you also have to support her.

RESEARCHER: If you were given a chance, in that small period of time you have received training what would you change with the whole training, the two days that you, look you were sitting here and saying that this one is not going to happen, what are the aspects that you think should be change totally and perhaps as you are saying them, relate them with the problems that you are also having in your classroom.

PARTICIPANT: I think I could not mix them, I'll have to separate them, the one with disabilities may be they can have their own school there, like Ilkalafeng, not to mix with others.

RESEARCHER: Any other thing that you would change and perhaps if you are answering also consider your classroom that with inclusion of these learners who are experiencing barriers, do you have enough space in your classroom, do you have relevant learning and teaching support materials, do you, you know a lot of number of things.

PARTICIPANT: Learning materials I can say, to me is not enough, the space is enough in some other classes not most of the classes like not in one class we are rotating in other classes learners are too much then like myself I’m in Grade 7 space is enough for them and not so much students who are not, who are disabled.

RESEARCHER: Now lastly, what would you recommend that be done, there was a training and your school is a full-service school, you are expected to include those learners unfortunately but what do you think would be an advice to the Department.
PARTICIPANT: I think if the Department can help them give them resources and help the teachers who are teaching with them because they are complaining more especially the Grade 1’s where there are so many learners who are disabled there, they are complaining because it seems as if Department is not following. They must support teachers.

RESEARCHER: Anything you want to tell with regard to the training in particular.

PARTICIPANT: To me, may be I need enough training if I can have training may be I’ll have to implement that class because I didn’t …………when I came here.

PARTICIPANT NO 11 School Management Team Male

RESEARCHER: What have been your experiences of the trainings that you received in line with inclusive education?

PARTICIPANT: The experience of inclusive education, the main focus was on the adaptation in the classroom situation, that is what I noticed in connection with the NCS, that we should degrade a lesson, we should plan a lesson in such a way that it covers individual learner in a classroom.

RESEARCHER: And did you perhaps find it something that you are able to apply in your classroom?

PARTICIPANT: Adaptation was not so well explained because what I’ve noticed is that if you have to evaluate learners with two different sections you have to go and set different set of questions that one for the learners who’s got the problem in learning and those learners who are in the mainstream that is a problem because if you have to set questions for both of learners and you must put it in your teacher’s profile of which is not possible.

RESEARCHER: Now the other thing would be what would you think should have been done by the trainers?

PARTICIPANT: Concerning adaptation they should have shown us clearly, they should have demonstrated to us that this is how you do adaptation in the classroom because at the moment there is no set rules or there is no clear guidelines as how to conduct such a lesson or such evaluation in a classroom situation.

RESEARCHER: By demonstration you are saying they should have it practically. And
then with regard the recent SIAS training, what would you say have assisted you in the whole training of SIAS and bettered you as an educator in the classroom?

PARTICIPANT: I would say the word pictures when we identify the screening of the learners the word pictures that one gave us idea as how one can go on and although they came with the SNA 1 but they said it is still what we have trained in Sesonke training, they said it is more or less the same but the word pictures were clearly defined but using the SNA.

RESEARCHER: Now from that training, would you say that you are more equipped as an educator and you are able to screen, identify and assess and also support learners.

PARTICIPANT: Ja, I can do it.

RESEARCHER: So it is easier for you to do that.

PARTICIPANT: Ja, for me to apply that process it is simple.

RESEARCHER: If you were given a chance to change anything in the training both the training you received from Sisonke and the training from the Department of Education, what is it that you would suggest that it be done differently?

PARTICIPANT: What should be done differently is, if they can do it in what we have done when we were trained as the teachers in micro-teaching lesson, they should have, if they can do it in what we have done when we were trained as the teachers in micro-teaching lesson, they should have may be gone to a class and bring the video so that we can may be critic and see what is right, what is wrong from that so that we can have a clear picture of what might happen in a class if you have different learners in a classroom situation because recently the workshop that we went through of sign language, we have seen that in a full-service school we have to deal with different learners even the blind learners those who could have deemed to be in a class so they should bring us a model of that classroom situation in a form of a micro-teaching session lesson.

RESEARCHER: Would that be all that you would want to change?

PARTICIPANT: Yes and an example of lessons that how do we integrate the two, the mainstream education and the adaptation part of it in our lesson because in the classroom when you are teaching majority in our school we focus more in the mainstream and we help there and there after
normal classroom lesson then it is then that we can try to help the learners in order to try to get a better understanding of what was taught in the class.

RESEARCHER: Now considering the physical resources, learning and teaching support materials and quite a number of class sizes, would you find the two trainings very practicable in the classroom?

PARTICIPANT: Concerning the classroom situation, in our school we have big numbers of learners in a class and when one sees that in a classroom situation like that one cannot practically do it fully.

RESEARCHER: As a result of number of learners in a class! And then considering learning and teaching support materials and any other resources. Do you think the two trainings are also possible to be implemented in a classroom, learning support materials, teaching aids and all that, that is right.

PARTICIPANT: The workshop of SIAS and the Department, they didn’t, they said what we have learnt in RNCS is a continuation of what can be done in a classroom, what we should do just have to degrade the, downgrade the lesson, so that it suits those learners who are very slow in the class, so , in other words there’s no additional teaching aids, you have to use the normal textbook that you have in a classroom, there’s no other textbook that ……… you how to deal with a specific learner who’s having a particular problem like a learner who is very slow, like may be function at a certain level, we don’t have a clear guide.

RESEARCHER: Lastly anything you would perhaps want to contribute in terms of the training.

PARTICIPANT: In terms of the training that we, concerning the screening, at the school we are not aware of how to identify a person who is not able to, who has a problem of hard of hearing. Sometimes when you teach you are very surprised to see that the learner wants always to see your facial expression, is what I have learnt and I’ve tend to notice that in the classroom. Then I will make individual question and try to look at learners performance in the classroom, why did you get this marks and what is your problem, although it takes time that the learner becomes open and tell you as a teacher that I can not hear properly but it takes time but ultimately he will tell you when you persist.

PARTICIPANT NO: 12 Senior Phase
Grade 7
Female
RESEARCHER: With the training that you received from Sisonke Consortium in line with Inclusive Education White Paper 6 and the training that you received recently on SIAS, that is Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support. How do you, what is your experience of those training, How would you rate the training?

PARTICIPANT: Concerning the training I received at Sisonke and Department of Education, it was fruitful for me but in the class I experience some difficulties because the learners we have, these learners of Full-Service School, so they .......with difficulties I can not attend them as individuals because the time I have to attend to those with problems the other learners even if I can give them some work to do so that in the meantime I'm really busy, they finish up their work and then they'll start to make noise. That's how I feel.

RESEARCHER: The other thing is, because that will also involve adapting your methods of teaching, from these two training have you been able to adapt your methods of teaching.

PARTICIPANT: Well, concerning the methods of teaching, I am trying my level best to reach all the learners because I teach according to their levels, those who are slow, I try to accommodate them by repeating the lesson may be twice or thrice although the high achievers are going to be bored because when you revise the lesson for the second time that other child already knows the answers and I can not exclude them.

RESEARCHER: Now, the other thing, having pointed out that the high achievers easily get bored as you repeat the lesson from the training itself what do you think that could have been done perhaps to support you as an educator in a classroom in an enhancement of adaptation of the strategies.

PARTICIPANT: Well, the adaptation itself for us educators is difficult for us because the method that we have done at our training schools, they did not teach us the adaptation, so we did this adaptation in a short space of time, so for me they could have done the course at least twice or thrice not once-off and then there must be a follow-up, those people who are giving us training, they could have come to our classes and demonstrate to us how to go about with the adaptation. Now, it seems they expect us to give the lessons and then use the adaptation method which we do not know.

RESEARCHER: So you are suggesting that the trainers could have done it practically in the classrooms.
PARTICIPANT: They must come down to our classrooms, the learners are there, they must do that thing, we should see that grouping isn’t it even if they can not take the learners out of others but they must show us how to pay attention to those learners.

RESEARCHER: Now, may be this is the second last question, if you were given a chance to change anything in the training the whole training of Sisonke and the training of the Department, what would you suggest that it be done differently in the whole training, what would you change and put this here and remove this, do this instead of this one in the training.

PARTICIPANT: In the training itself, the Department could have firstly took the SMT’s from the schools and the Principals, then they train them properly after training those, they come to us, when they go to our classes may be as class visits, he or she must be able to help me as a Post Level 1 teacher, now we are all the same isn’t it, the SMT, the Principal, the educators we are the same..........

RESEARCHER: That is one thing you would change, the second thing perhaps?

PARTICIPANT: The second thing that they could have done, these learners, other learners are from the mainstream as you can..........., now these learners of the mainstream, there must be a class or one well-trained teacher in each school and then this one well-trained teacher must teach two or three learning areas with those slow learners, meaning that her subject or timetable, the subject must not be 1-50 as we are, he or she must have less periods so that he pays more attention to these learners, he teaches them at their own pace because of the adaptation, we must just see to finish that these other learners get enough education, we can not let them suffer because of these other learners.

RESEARCHER: Now, I think that will be the end of our interview and thank you so much for turning up.

PARTICIPANT NO: 13

Principa
Male

RESEARCHER: How as a Principal of the school and as an individual educator in a classroom, how have you experienced the training that was offered by the Department of Education and Sisonke Consortium?

PARTICIPANT: Whether you can say that the training enables one to realize certain learners with special needs in other words learners that can not be able to keep like ordinary learners in a mainstream, however what transpires is that we’ve got overpopulated classrooms and this does not allows us
to pay individual attention to these learners.

RESEARCHER: Now if you were asked to change anything in the training that you have received what is it that you would change and what would you replace it with?

PARTICIPANT: I would say that what is transpiring is the issue of differentiation and adaptation, I think we are experiencing a problem in terms of that, may be it is also counteracting why we are unable to pay individual attention to specific learners because at the end of the year we have a common schedule that does not cater for assessment that has undergone adaptation and differentiation.

RESEARCHER: Would that be the only thing you would change in the whole training?

PARTICIPANT: In terms as well as the learner-ratio's, the learner ratio's in particular Full Service School, in the sense that programme is new to educators and that have been used to teaching one mainstream of education now they are being placed in a situation whereby they need to change their method of teaching even environment that is not conducive to implement the new method.

RESEARCHER: Now with regard to SIAS, the training, the objective of the training was to support educators in terms of their identification, assessment and eventually support that should be given to learners, what have you experienced with regard to the SIAS?

PARTICIPANT: The level of support that is supposed to be given to the teachers themselves in the sense that, I think that this is a new structure of system, I think that constant, regular visit is supposed to be given to teachers as well as regular motivation in terms of the educators, to show that they are not alone in their frustration however because the Department being broadly stretched this is unable to happen.

RESEARCHER: So that poses a big problem?

PARTICIPANT: Yes, it poses a big problem in the sense that a teacher will get support may be once per year and then it ends there and the teacher somewhere somehow looses his way on the way because what he is doing in a classroom is not regularly monitored by Departmental officials.

RESEARCHER: Now, may be the last question, considering all the two trainings, that we have received from the Department and Sisonke Consortium, what do you think are major problems in terms of applying what you have
PARTICIPANT: I would think that the evaluation of educators whether they are doing the right thing after training or not by specialist, by people who know what is supposed to be done because the interpretation of ourselves being just ordinary educators, we are unable to give that really that support that is necessary in classrooms.

RESEARCHER: And perhaps, having identified those problems what would you say are the positive contributions of the training except that you have mentioned that as it is right now, you are able to identify learners with special needs, what other contributions or positive contributions that come out from the training?

PARTICIPANT: The identification itself I think it's a positive issue out of the whole of this programme in the sense that we are more becoming aware of the learner special needs, we are more being able to identify what is happening with our learners.

RESEARCHER: Anything perhaps you want to say from your side?

PARTICIPANT: In terms of the money that has been allocated to a Full Service School, I would say that we would really, really emphasize that we need assistance, guidance on what items are supposed to be bought for the school and how to go about using the allocation to benefit learners.

RESEARCHER: Would that be all you want to say?

PARTICIPANT: And the reconsideration of post provisioning and post establishment in Full Service School, as well as resourcing the school with support staff and the advocacy campaign, it should be intensified, there should be forums to inform educators themselves, to inform other departmental, let say all departmental officials as well as other ordinary schools about the role played by Full Service Schools.

RESEARCHER: Thank you so much, thank you.
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TRANSCRIPTS FOR FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS

RESEARCHER: How did you experience your training in terms of the development of the Inclusive Learning Programmes and the Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support, remember the training that you were given by the Department of Education?

PARTICIPANT: FOUNDATION PHASE

Concerning the training of SIAS and development, enough time was not given, so teachers are not yet ready with what we are supposed to do as we are still fumbling not knowing how to include those learners with special needs in our class especially when it comes to lesson planning, we still don’t know how to go about because when I concentrate on those learners who are not basically needs, those ones are suffering, so I don’t know how to include them in my planning and my teaching sometimes whereas I’m saying we are not clear on that but we are trying, we are not just sitting, we are at least, something, we are doing something, so if enough time can be given, so that teachers should be well trained, may be, I think that’s all I can say.

RESEARCHER: And perhaps, except for the lesson planning, what other specific problems do you encounter with the training, except for lesson planning?

PARTICIPANT: FOUNDATION PHASE

You know what Mr, the training was good, well organized but there are many problems we encountered, at least they could have organized a class of learners to show us how to go about, they didn’t do that practically, so just read from the books, we don’t know how to go about.

RESEARCHER: Would that be the only problems perhaps?

PARTICIPANT: It waste other learners time because we usually concentrate on the three we’ve got in class to give her or him work and those are suffering, they are making noise when they are through with their work.

PARTICIPANT: Yes, let it be done practically with the kids because they do it with other teachers and we can read and answer for ourselves we don’t know when we come to the class with those learners what are they going to do, if they can take the learners and do it practically.
RESEARCHER: Having said all this, do you still feel from the training you are able to differentiate the curriculum to accommodate these other learners or your teaching strategies and your assessment standards, how about you know, differentiating curriculum, teaching strategies and your assessment standards.

PARTICIPANT: FOUNDATION PHASE

I think we are trying because some of the learners who are slow like we are trying to give them simple activities which means the lowest assessment standards while we proceed with those who can progress well so even don’t put it practically on the planning but at least we do something ......

PARTICIPANT: We just use our discretion how to go about.

RESEARCHER: So are you telling us that the training then made you aware of the fact that you can do certain things ....... that you don’t always know how exactly?

PARTICIPANT: We don’t know if we are on the right track but we are trying, we do our utmost best but we don’t know.

RESEARCHER: Ok, so you don’t have feedback on whether you are on the right track, you learn something now that you don’t.......?

PARTICIPANT: If there can be monitoring may be, the DBST must come regularly to observe, to find out whether we are doing the right............

PARTICIPANT: The DBST visited us once in 2007, the whole of last year we didn’t see the DBST. What is their function with us because we have to get help from them, they have to monitor us and you know what I’m speaking on Foundation Phase, I ‘m doing Grade R this year, on the 06th and 7th we had the training, the training was training the Grade R’s on Inclusive, you know the facilitators, they just give us questions we have to elaborate, we have to get answers from the books, I don’t know, I thought may be they were to training us doing the thing for us, they give us activities with books, we have to read for ourselves, questions, we have to look for questions in the teacher’s guide, you know I know, we are trying to do what is required from us, we don’t know whether we are on the right track, are we doing the right thing?
RESEARCHER: You said that you had questions and you were to find the answers yourselves in some kind of a manual and then you get the answers and sort of, talking in general and then you came back and you not sure you are right.

PARTICIPANT: We are a group, we have to give feedback.

RESEARCHER: But you don’t really know is it something that is ...........

PARTICIPANT: Just like at Ikageng, we were grouped given work, go and solve this problem, then you choose one from the group, she will or he will represent this group, we find it this way this way, just like that.

RESEARCHER: .............orientation. So you are saying that you feel very strong about the way presentations are made in the training. So what would you change, what would you do different if you were given a chance. What would you suggest should be done except the fact that you need, you know, training you want to have practicality, we must experience, stress practicality, now with the whole style of giving you manuals and going aside and forming groups, what do you think should be done differently?

PARTICIPANT: May be, like that gentleman, he is staying right in Johannesburg, he is not going to come back to all the representatives, I was the only one from Nanogang and one from Tshepo, the two schools represent the whole schools in Ikageng other schools were from Carltonville, Leeudoringstad and one-one per school, you see, I have to that one of Tshepo and do something because the lady is also teaching Grade R and from my knowledge if this learner is having a problem I have to think for myself to give that learner simple activities so that this one can be boosted to be the same as the other, that’s how I understand.

RESEARCHER: So what I get from Mam here is that, there is no much feedback that you get from whoever is presenting the training. Now, like I asked perhaps what do you think, without having feedback, what other support do you need as educators in your classrooms?

PARTICIPANT: Demonstration.

RESEARCHER: Demonstration during the training.

PARTICIPANT: Demonstration in the class, even our planning is not correct. We example of a differentiated planning lesson planning and what? ....about the demonstration and planning and what?
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RESEARCHER: Would that be all. I’m getting a feeling that you are saying demonstration, feedback, monitoring, would these only be the problems that you are experiencing with the training of inclusive education?

PARTICIPANT: Resources

RESEARCHER: And what about resources, you are having.........

PARTICIPANT: Like in my class, I’ve got 40 learners and some are learners with special needs, so I don’t know how am I going to attend these one who need extra help, I must attend to the other ones, so I need there must be somebody who can help these other ones while I proceed with those ones.

RESEARCHER: And I think you would bear with me that SIAS also stresses that what you are saying, that eventually after having screened the learner, identified the barrier and assessing the barrier, you have to give support and perhaps from the training what other problems have you encountered with regard to applying SIAS in your classrooms. Look it is screening, you identify, assess the barrier and then you give support, where did you perhaps had the problems with the SIAS strategy?

PARTICIPANT: Support, sometimes learners are screened and necessary procedures are followed but we still have those learners in our classrooms for 3 years, it’s a problem, you don’t know, I’m going forward or I’m going.......  

PARTICIPANT: At the end of it they should automatically..........because of age and they know nothing, so support, we need support.

RESEARCHER: So that is another area, I think we are talking another area of policy that, the policy says learner should not stay for a particular time in a phase, so you are struggling, as an educator you are struggling with this particular learner and you have to promote this learner also because of his age, those are some of the problems, or perhaps let’s come on a positive side. From the training, I don’t think the training was so bad that you can throw it through out the window, from the training what positive aspects did you come across?

PARTICIPANT: We are able to identify the learners with problems, we can identify and select that the learner has the ear problem or social problem.

RESEARCHER: Identifying, the other positive aspect Mam can we hear from you? She was not part of the training.
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PARTICIPANT: No.

RESEARCHER: Ok, so is it only identifying, you are able to identify, I think there should be more of the things, look, inclusive education is the new concept you must have learnt so many things from it whilst there is this bad side but surely you must have learnt these other good things about it.

PARTICIPANT: Assessment also, we can at least assess.

RESEARCHER: You can assess. Assess learners according to SIAS or assess in terms of because anyway you would assess.

PARTICIPANT: Yes, in terms of that SIAS because I know that this one, if this one is, he is having barriers I know how to assess him. I will go to the lower assessment standards.

RESEARCHER: That’s differentiating assessment standards, thank you so much and then the other thing. It also means different strategies……… the assessment standards and using different ways.

RESEARCHER: Thank you, that’s differentiating, and perhaps let’s hear something about differentiating the curriculum itself because look, if you assess you assess what you have given out to learners and that comes from the curriculum, with the curriculum what would be your strengths or what can you say about differentiating the curriculum?

PARTICIPANT: The old curriculum or usual.

RESEARCHER: Anything that you provide in the classroom, the curriculum you are using in the classroom, are you not able to, look for instance the assessment standards says a learner must be able to read from 1 to 20, let’s say for an example but being a teacher in the classroom you realize that this learner who is experiencing particular barriers in the classroom can not learn from 1 to 20, what d you do as an educator?

PARTICIPANT: May be I’m in Grade 1 I’ll go to assessment standard for Grade R, go to the lowest one.

RESEARCHER: Thank you so much, that’s exactly assessment standards differentiation. Any other thing perhaps on Learning Programmes and SIAS, any other thing, may be that we as we were making presentations we did not take into consideration or the presenters did not take into consideration on SIAS and Inclusive Learning Programmes, any other thing you want to
say about that.

PARTICIPANT: Now, I don't know about these learners who can't cope whether......even we use the lowest assessment standards but they can't, can not do those assessment standards, they can not do anything in the class.

RESEARCHER: What did they say about it in the training? Guidance regarding that, but how then do you deal with them, surely you must be having those learners in your classrooms for the period you are having them, how do you deal with them?

PARTICIPANT: Yes, that's why we say we deal with them and then at the end of the year the policy says this period for this learner is over. And that is why we have drop-outs. At the end of the primary phase, learner have to go to may be high school and the learner knows nothing.

RESEARCHER: Now how, for the training the other level of support is the ILST, remember from the classroom it is the ILST, how have you been able to engage your ILST on barriers that you experience in your classroom?

PARTICIPANT: Mr Roberts, just as Mam Mogapi has quoted this thing of DBST that is not giving us support even the ILST of the school, but she is trying, let me tell you there are some few pupils who are already placed in different......through our ILST and our ILST was fighting a lot with the DBST up there because they were doing nothing, so from the ILST we go to the DBST but sometimes you don't get support from them but there at school we are trying through, we don't have time but at least we trying, now time and again we have meetings and then we are come up with our problems and then the chairperson take them up. The problem is the placing of learners, it's a long process, today we are still stuck with learners who are supposed to be placed at Ikalafe, they tell us of age and what and what, so that learner just still in the classroom.

RESEARCHER: So you are saying, you know, you don't receive enough support from the DBST and you are sure that your ILST is reporting cases to the DBST, and perhaps.........Now with regard to, look, you have told us that you are able to identify, you are able to lower your assessment standards which I think you are doing the best out of that I want to congratulate you, but the other thing is, do you feel confident about applying what you have learnt from the training into your classroom?
PARTICIPANT: Not yet.

PARTICIPANT: Not 100%

PARTICIPANT: But at least we are trying, we are trying

RESEARCHER: At least what aspects are you trying from the training, what is it that you can do from the training except identifying except downgrading your assessment standards and except those ........ What other aspects from the training are you able to apply in your classrooms? Remember we understand that this is the whole new concept for you.

PARTICIPANT: Let me say that we, ........ for learners who have social problems like they may be who can not cope due to hunger, we give them food in the morning at least we do practice that.

PARTICIPANT: And at least from this SIAS education we know that no learner should be discriminated, they are all equal in the classroom whereas in that education we used to take them in the next class and teach them aside, so we know that we don’t discriminate.

PARTICIPANT: And we have noticed that we are not only educators; we are nurses, we are social workers.

RESEARCHER: So it is true that from the training you’ve also acquired other competencies, things that you would not do earlier on, you know, before the training.

RESEARCHER: I think, you have touched on, the fact that ...... what will you then suggest; that it will be interesting for me to hear a little bit more of what you, how would you say ........if you think of people coming into your class, how do you envisage this, how do you see it happening........ may be give a demonstration at a training site, have smaller groups and demonstrate or should they come into your class with combination of things?

PARTICIPANT: I think they must come, to know, they must come ........ practical.

RESEARCHER: As an individual in your class and give you support there?

PARTICIPANT: Yes!

RESEARCHER: Would you combine this thing with the group training, would you have a group training and then individual follow-up?
PARTICIPANT: I think when they come, I should start and they observe and then they show me, no this part and this part you can do it like this, so that I can excel with these learners, we are here to help these learners, it will be good for me, I must do they observe then they help. Yes.

RESEARCHER: So very individualized approach almost, something like may be you look at the video where they show you how the teacher does it, would that be ..........you ant to make some recommendations coming from you as teachers.

PARTICIPANT: It can also work, at least something.

PARTICIPANT: But there is part ............ when you are busy teaching the other learners, want to go to the toilet you must accompany him or her then leave others in the class with no one in the class when you come back they have already forgotten what you have said you must start afresh.

RESEARCHER: So you have very practical questions and needs and that must come down from that training to very practical.

RESEARCHER: I think thee she touched on the availability of the teacher assistants, now without teacher assistants how are you coping as it is right now?

PARTICIPANT: Sometimes you ask the other one, the other one to accompany this, is the waste of time.

RESEARCHER: So you are asking learners to accompany each other to the toilet?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

PARTICIPANT: If you are too busy.

RESEARCHER: But at least it is working.

PARTICIPANT: At the time they fight, they come back crying, this one did this to me, this one ......

PARTICIPANT: This one closed the door for us.

PARTICIPANT: Hey Mr Roberts it is just too much.

PARTICIPANT: Just like today I spent the whole of the time outside, three of my kids in the class were ill, vomiting, running stomach, short breath, the class was suffering, I was washing a blanket.
PARTICIPANT: Is sick bay, classroom, sick bay.........

RESEARCHER: What I find interesting is that you also said it really changed from, you’ve I think mounts to experience of about 10 years plus, it really gradually changed the situation because a lot of the learners was already included by default as we call it, so I think this whole thing of inclusion it was not as if all the kids were somewhere and suddenly they are all in here but somehow you seem to have coped earlier, was it because you ignored it like you said Mam, may be you just talk to me about that was that, what happened 10 years ago.

PARTICIPANT: We isolate them.

PARTICIPANT: We were isolating them.

PARTICIPANT: I continue with those who are able to ........

PARTICIPANT: I will see them next year, you go on with these who are fast you know these five they will repeat next year.

PARTICIPANT: We used to separate them.

PARTICIPANT: They were host in one class, now we call it ITC, IC

PARTICIPANT: And I think it is best.

RESEARCHER: So you would sent them in one class. Children, did they change, you see a change in the kind of kid that you have in front of you, the environment, is there changes there, is it more difficult to deal with the children?

PARTICIPANT: It is not so much difficult.

RESEARCHER: It is merely because you have known individual child that you could........?

RESEARCHER: Now finally would you propose that we perhaps from your experiences of your situation in your classroom and the situation in your training and situation that you are unfortunately, that you find yourselves in, would you suggest that we go back to the ITC training, what is it Individual Teaching Class, is it the better model than the inclusive education model that we are, that you have learnt about, please lets talk about that.
PARTICIPANT: No, I don’t think so because other learners now, start to label those in the ITC, they are crazy, they are abnormal or what, so it is better when they are..........

PARTICIPANT: It is better when they are mixed.

RESEARCHER: Although even mixing them has its own problems.

PARTICIPANT: And those who can’t, at least they can........

RESEARCHER: Be assisted by this........