

Implementation of inclusive education

by

Dominica Ntombiyenkosi Zulu

Durban
March 2007

Implementation of inclusive education

by

Dominica Ntombiyenkosi Zulu

PTD (Gqikazi College; FDE (UNISA)
BA and B.Ed. (UNIZUL)

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

In the

Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education

of the

Faculty of Education

at the

University of Zululand

UNIVERSITY OF ZULULAND
LIBRARY

Study leader: Prof M S Vos
KwaDlangezwa
March 2007

Accession No.....
Date.....

DECLARATION

I declare that this dissertation "*The implementation of inclusive education*" represents my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.



D.N. ZULU (Mrs)
DURBAN
March 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to the following:

- God, for giving me wisdom, strength and fortitude to accomplish this study.
- Prof M S Vos, for her guidance, support, motivation and supervision in my endeavour to prepare and complete this study.
- My husband, Bonginkosi, for his patience, understanding and constant motivation and support.
- My only daughter, Xolile, who endured deprivation of motherly love, support and motivation.
- All my family members and friends for their continued encouragement and support during the course of my study.
- Mrs Val van Rooyen for her patience in typing this dissertation.
- Dr M M Spruyt, who edited this dissertation.
- My mentor and circuit manager, Dr G N Msimango, for encouraging me not to give up but to continue with my study.
- The library staff of the University of Zululand, UNISA, and the University of KwaZulu-Natal for their assistance in obtaining books and journals required for the research.

- The library staff of the University of Zululand, UNISA, and the University of KwaZulu-Natal for their assistance in obtaining books and journals required for the research.
- All the primary school educators in the KwaMashu Circuit who sacrificed their time in the completion of the questionnaires.
- My staff members at Mandosi Intermediate school for their support and encouragement.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to:

- My only daughter, **XOLILE NONTHUTHUZEKO MKHIZE**; and
- My husband, **BONGINKOSI HERBERT ZULU**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

ORIENTATION

	PAGE
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM	2
1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	3
1.4 ELUCIDATION OF CONCEPTS	4
1.4.1 Gender	4
1.4.2 Education	4
1.4.3 Inclusive education	5
1.4.4 Special education	6
1.4.5 Educator	6
1.4.6 Learners with special educational needs (LSEN)	7
1.4.7 Full service (mainstream school)	7
1.4.8 District support team	8
1.4.9 Special schools	8
1.5 AIMS OF THE STUDY	9
1.6 METHOD OF RESEARCH	9
1.7 FURTHER COURSE OF STUDY	9
1.8 SUMMARY	10

CHAPTER 2**AN HISTORICAL REVIEW OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION**

	PAGE
2.1 INTRODUCTION	11
2.2 OTHER COUNTRIES	11
2.3 SOUTH AFRICA	15
2.4 INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON INCLUSIVE EDUCATION	17
2.5 THE ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD)	18
2.6 INTERNATIONAL SPECIAL EDUCATION CONGRESS 2000 (ISEC)	20
2.7 SUMMARY	22

CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW

	PAGE
3.1 INTRODUCTION	24
3.2 TRAINING	25
3.2.1 Strategies to train and support educators	25
3.2.2 Capacity building	27
3.2.3 Professional training / In-service training	29
3.3 SUPPORT	30
3.3.1 District support team	30
3.3.2 Support from other schools	32
3.3.3 School assessment team	32
3.4 BARRIERS TO EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION	33
3.4.1 Lack of support	34
3.4.2 Lack of resources	35
3.4.3 Special schools as resource centres	37
3.4.4 Educators' perceptions	39
3.4.5 Attitude of educators	40
3.4.6 Educators' experience teaching LSEN	42
3.4.7 Post-provision for inclusive education	43
3.5 SUMMARY	44

CHAPTER 4

PLANNING OF THE EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

	PAGE
4.1 INTRODUCTION	45
4.2 PREPARATION FOR THE RESEARCH	45
4.2.1 Permission	45
4.2.2 Selection of respondents	46
4.3 THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT	46
4.3.1 Quantitative research	46
4.3.2 The questionnaire as research instrument	47
4.3.3 Construction of a questionnaire	49
4.3.4 Characteristics of a good questionnaire	49
4.3.5 Advantages and disadvantages of the questionnaire	51
4.3.6 Validity and reliability of the questionnaire	54
4.4 PILOT STUDY	58
4.5 ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE	59
4.6 THE PROCESSING OF THE DATA	60
4.7 LIMITATION OF THE INVESTIGATION	61
4.8 SUMMARY	61

CHAPTER 5

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE RESEARCH DATA

	PAGE
5.1 INTRODUCTION	62
5.2 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS	62
5.2.1 Gender of the respondents	63
5.2.2 Age of respondents	64
5.2.3 Qualifications	65
5.2.4 Years of service as an educator	66
5.2.5 Post level of respondents	67
5.2.6 Type of post	67
5.2.7 Employer	68
5.2.8 Type of school	68
5.2.9 Successful implementation of inclusive education	69
5.2.10 Educators' perceptions of inclusive education	75
6 SUMMARY	79

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

	PAGE
6.1 INTRODUCTION	81
6.2 SUMMARY	81
6.2.1 Statement of the problem	81
6.2.2 An historical overview of inclusive education	81
6.2.3 Literature review: implementation of inclusive education	83
6.2.4 Planning of the research	85
6.2.5 Presentation and analysis of research data	85
6.3 FINDINGS	86
6.3.1 Findings from the literature review	86
6.3.2 Findings from the empirical study	86
6.4 RECOMMENDATIONS	88
6.4.1 Pre-service and in-service training	88
6.4.2 Support for educators	90
6.4.3 Further research	92
6.5 SHORTCOMINGS	93
6.6 FINAL REMARKS	93
LIST OF SOURCES	94
APPENDICES	105

LIST OF TABLES	PAGE
Table 1 Frequency distribution according to the gender of respondents	63
Table 2 Frequency distribution according to the age of the respondents	64
Table 3 Frequency distribution according to the qualifications of the respondents	65
Table 4 Frequency distribution according to respondents' years of completed service as educators	66
Table 5 Frequency distribution according to the post level of the respondents	67
Table 6 Frequency distribution according to the type of post held by the respondents	67
Table 7 Frequency distribution according to the employer of respondents	68
Table 8 Frequency distribution according to the type of school respondents teach at	68
Table 9 Frequency distribution according to the facilities/strategies required for successful implementation of inclusive education	69

LIST OF TABLES (*continued*)**PAGE**

Table 10	Frequency distribution according to the educators' perceptions of inclusive education	75
----------	---	----

SUMMARY

The aim of this investigation was to establish educators' perceptions of the implementation of inclusive education.

From the literature study it emerges that inclusive education constitutes a challenge to the education system in South Africa, in particular to mainstream educators. Successful implementation of inclusive education requires educators to have a positive attitude, be flexible and critical, creative and innovative in their approach to teaching and learning. Educators are expected to have the necessary knowledge, skills, competencies and support to accommodate a wide range of diversity among learners in an inclusive classroom. They must be able to select appropriate teaching strategies to achieve specific outcomes. Effective inclusion will only stay a dream if educators do not have the necessary training, support systems and appropriate resources.

For the purpose of the empirical investigation a self-structured questionnaire, to be completed by educators from primary schools, was utilised. The data obtained from the completed questionnaires were analysed and commented on by means of descriptive statistics.

In conclusion a summary was presented on the findings of the literature review and empirical investigation and the following are some of the recommendations that were made:

- Opportunities for in-service training regarding inclusive education must be made available to mainstream educators.
- The Department of Education must provide adequate support to educators concerning all aspects of inclusive education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

ORIENTATION

	PAGE
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM	2
1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	3
1.4 ELUCIDATION OF CONCEPTS	4
1.4.1 Gender	4
1.4.2 Education	4
1.4.3 Inclusive education	5
1.4.4 Special education	6
1.4.5 Educator	6
1.4.6 Learners with special educational needs (LSEN)	7
1.4.7 Full service (mainstream school)	7
1.4.8 District support team	8
1.4.9 Special schools	8
1.5 AIMS OF THE STUDY	9
1.6 METHOD OF RESEARCH	9
1.7 FURTHER COURSE OF STUDY	9
1.8 SUMMARY	10

CHAPTER 1

ORIENTATION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The predominant objective of any education system is one of providing quality education for all learners in order to enable them to realise their full potential, thereby enabling them to contribute and to participate in society. During the last two decades international policy development has turned the focus on providing quality education for all learners, including learners with special educational needs (LSEN) within the mainstream of education, thereby removing the stigma and stereotyping of learners with barriers to learning (Prinsloo, 2001:344).

According to Section 29 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, "Everyone has the right to basic education, including adult basic education and further education, which the state, through reasonable measures must make progressively and accessible" (RSA, 1996:29). This commits the State to the achievement of quality and non-discrimination, and above all protects all learners including those who are disabled or who have special learning needs (DoE, 2002:247).

The Department of Education therefore finds itself faced with the challenge to promote effective learning among all learners, irrespective of race, gender and disability within the education system. There is a commitment to establish a seamless and inclusive educational and training system as a part of constitution responsibility to build an inclusive society (DoE, 2001:6).

The implementation of inclusive education is a complex and multifaceted issue that will have to be planned with meticulous detail. Determining the level of preparedness of educators will therefore play a major role in successful planning of the implementation of inclusive education (Hay, 2001:214).

1.2 ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM

The envisaged inclusive education system as portrayed in the "Quality Education for All" report (DoE, 1997:9) as well as the Draft White Paper on Special Needs Education (DoE, 2000:10), The Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS) and the Education White Paper No. 6 (2001) have come into effect in 2004. Although the expected legislation represents a major step forward in the transformation and democratisation of the South African education system, it is often asked whether educators in class are prepared and ready to implement inclusive education effectively (DoE, 2001:14).

According to Fisher (2005:63) there is reason to extend research beyond special education for evidence of the success of inclusive education as inclusion is not really present or authentic or effective unless it is developed as a whole school reform effort. Fullan (1992:11) advocates that if schools and educators are to make a difference, then "making a difference must be explicitly recast in the broader social and moral terms. It must be seen that one cannot make a difference at the interpersonal level unless the problem and solution are enlarged to encompass the conditions that surround teaching. Without this attitude and broader dimension the best of educators will end up moral martyrs. In belief care must be linked to a broader, social public purpose."

The effective implementation of inclusive education depends on high quality professional preparation of educators at pre- and in-service level to equip

them for, and update their knowledge in meeting the needs of a diverse classroom population (Thomson, 1998:10).

The major obstacles that hamper the effective implementation of inclusive education are (Thomson, 1998:11):

- Lack of training for mainstream educators.
- Large classes.
- Negative attitudes of educators.
- Examination orientated education system.
- Lack of support services.
- Lack of parental involvement.
- Lack of clear national policies.

According to Hay (2001:213) the average educator is apparently neither prepared nor ready to teach learners with special educational needs in a mainstream class. Mainstream educators are rarely equipped, skilled or qualified to deal with diversity of learners who are experiencing barriers to learning in these large classes (Schoeman, 1997:3).

1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In essence the problem to be investigated in this study will focus on the following:

- What are the problems experienced with the implementation of inclusive education?
- How do educators perceive the implementation of inclusive education?

1.4 ELUCIDATION OF CONCEPTS

This study on the implementation of inclusive education will cover a wide spectrum of concepts. To ensure a clear understanding of the problem to be investigated it is deemed necessary to explain the following concepts.

1.4.1 Gender

In this study all references to any gender include references to the other gender.

1.4.2 Education

Education is the process of acquiring knowledge and understanding (Adam & Gilmour, 1999:292). According to Cowie (1995:385) education is a system of training and instruction, especially of children and young people in schools and colleges, and is designed to give knowledge and develop skills.

Education is a process in which the practice of education is involved: where a responsible adult leads, helps, supports and accompanies a child to self-actualisation and ultimate adulthood (Van den Aardweg & Van den Aardweg, 1990:71). According to Van Rensburg, Landman and Bodenstein (1994:366) education in its pedagogic form, may be defined as the conscious, purposive intervention by an adult in the life of a non-adult to bring him to independence. Education as pedagogic assistance is the positive influencing of a non-adult by an adult, with the specific purpose of effecting changes of significant value. Du Toit and Kruger (1994:5) say that education refers to the help and support which the child receives from an adult with a view to attaining adulthood.

1.4.3 Inclusive education

According to Barley (1998:4) inclusive education is the placement of learners with special educational needs in a mainstream school with "normal" learners;

- following the same curriculum at the same time and pace;
- in a way which makes learners feel no different from the others; and
- in age-appropriate order to prepare learners for productive lives as full members of the society

In its national study of inclusive education done in 1994, the National Centre on Inclusive Education and Restructuring (NCERT) defines inclusive education as provision to all learners, including those with significant disabilities, equitable opportunities to receive effective educational services with needed supplemental aids and support services, in age-appropriate order to prepare learners for productive lives as full members of the society (Daniels & Philips, 2000:13). According to Spafford (1998:136) schools should embrace a nurturing and supportive environment in order to meet the social, emotional, academic and psychological needs of all learners, educators and participants in the learning experience.

Inclusive education, according to the Department of Education (DoE, 2002:94) is about:

- Recognising and respecting the differences among all learners and building on the similarities.

- Supporting all learners, educators and the system as a whole so that the full range of learning needs can be met.
- Focusing on overcoming barriers to learning in the system. The focus should be on those structures and processes at all levels of the system that prevents learners from achieving success.

1.4.4 **Special education**

Ysseldyk and Algozzine (2000:7) describe special education as an instruction designed for learners with disabilities but with gifts and talents, who also have learning needs. Some of these learners have difficulty to learn in a regular classroom but they need special education to master certain skills to reach their full potential in school.

Hallahan and Kauffman (2000:12) refer to special education as especially designed instruction that meets the unusual needs of exceptional learners, and for whom special material, teaching techniques or equipment and facilities may be required.

1.4.5 **Educator**

An educator is one who educates, who takes the responsibility of leading the child to adulthood. Rowntree (1990:79) says the primary educators are the parents who from the earliest moments of the child's life are involved in his education. While the parents retain this responsibility, the secondary educators (school teachers and other concerned adults) supplement the primary educator's efforts as they together purposefully lead the child in every aspect of his becoming and through each stage of development.

Full service schools are mainstream education institutions that will be equipped and supported to provide for the full range of learning needs amongst all learners by the Department of Education (RNCS, 2003:2).

1.4.8 **District support team**

A group of professional and paraprofessionals that provide ongoing support and assistance to special needs learners in the regular classroom, and to their educators (RNCS, 2003:2).

A district support team is the core support provider at district levels, including the following (DoE, 2002:98-99):

- Special learner and educator support personnel currently employed in the Department of Education at district, regional or provincial level. This includes a psychologist, therapist, remedial learning support teacher, special needs specialist (e.g. relating to specific disabilities) and other health and welfare professionals employed by the Department of Education.
- Curriculum specialist who provides general and specific curriculum support to educators and education institutions.

1.4.9 **Special schools**

A special school is designed and equipped specifically to meet the special educational needs of the category of learners attending, namely children with physical impairments and learning difficulties (Good, 1999:548). According to Page and Thomas (1987:319) a special school refers to a school for children who through physical or mental handicap are not able to benefit from education in a normal school. According to Rowntree

A professional educator (pedagogue) is a scientifically schooled educator practising education on a post-scientific level; he chooses education as an occupation and a vocation. Van den Aardweg and Van den Aardweg (1990:73) state that an educator is concerned with the educand as a totality and not simply with the teaching and learning of a specific subject or subjects. An educator is more than a mere teacher of a subject but seeks to impart to the child qualities which will enable him to reach responsible adulthood successfully.

1.4.6 Learners with special educational needs (LSEN)

According to Engelbrecht and Kriegler (1996:4) the term “learner with special educational needs” is used as a broad term to refer to all learners in need of educational support. This includes learners whose special educational needs arise from intrinsic factors such as disabilities, as well as extrinsic (social, structure and systemic) factors. Learners with special educational needs refer to children who cannot be educated in ordinary classes, usually those who are mentally or physically handicapped, or who are experiencing unusual learning difficulties or are presenting emotional or behavioural problems (Rowntree, 1990:291).

1.4.7 Full service school (mainstream school)

A full service school, college, further and higher education institution is first and foremost a mainstream education institution, which provides quality education to all learners and students through flexibility, and meeting the full range of learning needs in an equitable manner. They are the institutions that endeavour to transform themselves, proactively addressing learners to learning and increasing participation of their learners and educators. They strive to achieve success, equity, quantity and social justice in education (DoE, 2002:4).

(1990:219) a special school is for children who need special educational help because of some mental or physical handicap or emotional disturbance.

1.5 AIMS OF THE STUDY

The aims of this study are:

- To pursue a study of relevant literature pertaining to the implementation of an inclusive education system.
- To undertake an empirical investigation into educators' perceptions of the implementation of inclusive education
- To formulate recommendations in order to support educators in the effective implementation of inclusive education.

1.6 METHOD OF RESEARCH

Research with regard to this study will be conducted as follows:

- An overview of available, relevant literature in order to base the study on an accountable theoretical base.
- An empirical survey comprising a self-structured questionnaire to be answered by educators.

1.7 FURTHER COURSE OF STUDY

Chapter two will deal with an historical overview of inclusive education.

Chapter three will focus on a literature review on the implementation of inclusive education.

The planning of the research will be outlined in chapter four.

The analysis of the research data will be presented in chapter five.

Chapter six will comprise a summary, findings and recommendations.

1.8 SUMMARY

An exposition of the problem, statement of the problem, and aims of the study were given in this chapter. The method of research was explained and concepts were elucidated. Lastly the further course of this study has been set.

CHAPTER 2

AN HISTORICAL REVIEW OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

	PAGE
2.1 INTRODUCTION	11
2.2 OTHER COUNTRIES	11
2.3 SOUTH AFRICA	15
2.4 INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON INCLUSIVE EDUCATION	17
2.5 THE ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD)	18
2.6 INTERNATIONAL SPECIAL EDUCATION CONGRESS 2000 (ISEC)	20
2.7 SUMMARY	22

CHAPTER 2

AN HISTORICAL REVIEW OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

For decades special schools have been pivotal to the education of learners with special educational needs. In quite a number of Western countries educators and administrators have put a great deal of effort into the development of a thorough and widely accepted system of special schools. Because of the unusual, special instruction provided in these schools many function as separate, independent schools. Since the 1920s the separate system for special education has been enlarged and refined (Hegarty, Meijer & Pijl, 1997:1).

This separate education system for learners with special educational needs (LSEN), however, has gradually changed. Knowledge, expertise and facilities are still of importance to the education of learners with special educational needs, but the segregation of these learners is now perceived as unacceptable (Strangvik, 1997:39). The prevailing view is that they should be educated together with their peers in a regular education setting. The consequence is that the separate education system (regular and special schools) will disappear and be replaced by a single education system that includes a wide range of learners. In such an inclusive system all learners attend the same school (Hegarty, Meijer & Pijl, 1997:2).

2.2 OTHER COUNTRIES

In recent years inclusion has risen to prominence on the international education agenda (Sebba & Ainscow, 1996:6). In developed countries such as the United Kingdom (UK), Scandinavia and the United States of America

(USA), the process of industrialisation was accompanied by the rise of mass education systems, frequently having their origins in local and charitable initiatives but rapidly being taken over and rationalised by the state (Vlachou, 1997:51). Sooner or later these systems had to confront the issue of what sort of education, if any to provide for learners with disabilities. In many countries, the same sort of local and charitable initiatives that has promoted *regular education* had also been responsible for the establishment of a *strictly limited range of special education* (Dyson & Forlin, 1999:24).

Although the inclusive education movement is now an international phenomenon, it has its origins in the relatively rich developed countries, that had already applied both extensive and sophisticated regular and special education systems. According to Dyson and Forlin (1999:25) in the 1960s a number of Scandinavian countries shifted the emphasis of their educational provision for learners with disabilities from separate special schools to what has come to be known as "integration", i.e. the placement of such learners in *regular schools*. They were followed in the 1970s by countries such as the USA and the UK, and later Italy and Spain.

In Denmark initial educator training, which is exclusively given in colleges and not at universities, covers wide-ranging pedagogical and psychological subjects (Robinson, 1997:29). However, little attention is given to special needs. This means that most newly trained educators have little or no knowledge of the needs of handicapped learners, though students may choose it as part of their final exam.

There are several in-service training programmes and special courses on offer, mainly organised by the Royal Danish School for Further Education Studies in Copenhagen. In-service training offers educators a choice of specialising in (Evans, 1997:145):

The Canadian legal and policy framework increasingly encourages, and in many cases requires, the instruction of learners with special needs in regular educational classrooms alongside their non-disabled peers. All educational funding in Canada comes directly from the provincial government and there is no local taxation for educational purposes. This approach was implemented twenty-five years ago to achieve fiscal equity throughout the province (Strangvik, 1997:61).

The Ministry of Education has provided funds for "special education" or learner services by providing a grant based on the total learner population of the district. District leadership is responsible for creating an inclusive school system by programmes and policies. They develop new programmes and monitor the implementation process. With this leadership in place, schools are able to establish the basis for an organisational culture, based on collaboration and problem-solving that facilitates the creation of inclusive schools (Gilbreath & Moore, 1998:59).

The Canadian Department of Education have an important component, known as the District-based learner services team, a competent district-based educators' team acting as collaborative consultants, who provide constructive leadership and support for principals, educators and other staff (Charlton & David, 1993:31).

They also provide additional support and facilitate access to additional resources as required by schools. District level consultants and specialists such as psychologists, speech and language pathologists assist the inclusive education process (Porter, 1997:73).

2.3 SOUTH AFRICA

The South African Constitution (Act No. 108 of 1996) founded the democratic state and common citizenship on the values of human dignity, the achievement of equality and advancement of human rights and freedom (Section 1a). These values summon all South Africans to be a human and caring society, not for the few, but for all. In this century all South Africans have a special responsibility to implement those values and to ensure that all learners, with and without disabilities, pursue their learning potential to the fullest (DoE, 2001:11).

In October 1996, the Ministry of Education appointed the National Commission of Special Needs in Education and Training (NCSNET) 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 in South Africa (DoE, 2001:5).

The NCSNET and NCSS were to advise the Minister of Education on the following (Engelbrecht & Green, 1999:16):

- The immediate and long-term national and provincial needs and strategies for education of learners with special needs in education.
- The support structures required by the Minister of Education, departments of education or any other relevant authority for implementation of strategies.
- The training of personnel for special education and education support services.

- The implication of the policy of mainstreaming for general education and strategies for marketing the policy to communities.
- The organisation, governance and funding of schools providing education for learners with special educational needs.
- An implementation plan to effect the above.
- Guidelines for the involvement of international agencies and their interaction on provincial and local level.

The Outcomes Based Education (OBE) curriculum has been introduced in South Africa to facilitate the transformation of the education system in general. OBE is a useful vehicle for implementation of inclusive education. One of the features of OBE is that it is concerned with "establishing the conditions and opportunities within the system that enable and encourage all learners to achieve those essential outcomes" (DoE, 2002:10).

"Special" education as it existed within the special education model has ceased to exist in terms of the major theoretical framework, assumptions, practices and tools. Thinking and practices related to special schools, full-service schools, district-based support teams, Further Education and Training, General Education and Training, Higher Education, Early Childhood and Adult Basic Education, curriculum and assessment as well as general provision is influenced by White Paper 6: Building an Inclusive Education and Training System (DoE, 2001:17).

In other words, an attempt has been made to align the traditional philosophy, structures and practices with the philosophy, structures and practices with the framework of thinking articulated by the Education White Paper 6 (DoE, 2002:11).

- Specific difficulties, i.e. children with language, speech or hearing disabilities.
- Combined difficulties, i.e. children with problems related to personality, development and social circumstances.

Sweden has several strategies for reforming regular education so that teaching adapts more to the needs of diverse learners. These strategies include, *inter alia*, the following (Strangvik, 1997:42):

- Additional resources were used to divide classes. This allowed more time for individual teaching, but there was no sign of any radical change of classroom practices.
- Additional resources were used for a second educator in the classroom or for assistants. Educators were given special training which was frequently based on the traditional school model, a training model that seems to be symmetrical to a segregated and categorised special education system and far less oriented towards solving education needs in a regular school setting.
- Vast resources were used for educational and psychological provision for educational and psychological provision for educators and learners in their classrooms, however, these provisions were too often oriented towards placement decisions rather than contributing to the educational programme of the individual child.

According to Porter (1997:68-70) debate and discussion concerning the education of students with disabilities is very much alive among educators in Canada. Traditional methods and service systems are under increasing pressure to accommodate demands for more equity and more inclusion.

Inclusion is not simply about reconstructing provision for learners with disabilities, but is a means of extending educational opportunities to a wide range of marginalised groups, who may historically have had little or no access to schooling (Dyson & Forlin, 1999:32). This issue is not one that is of particular significance in developed countries where the integration and inclusion movements had their origins. These countries have sophisticated and well resourced regular education systems, which have effectively included a large majority of learners. Inclusion in these circumstances is principally an issue of provision for learners with disabilities. The situation in less developed countries is significantly different. There are significant numbers of learners who have no effective access to education. Learners with disabilities are amongst those who are excluded from education (Ndawi & Perusuh, 1998:32).

2.4 INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

There have been two significant developments, internationally in the education of learners with disabilities. The first development is the integration movement of the 1960s and later transformation of this into the "inclusion" movement. The second development is that the inclusive education movement has become internationalised (Ndawi & Perusuh, 1998:36).

To a certain extent, it is legitimate to see the emergence of inclusive education in all countries as a part of the same "global agenda" in the social context. Some commentators have pointed out that developing countries face some different social and educational issues from long-industrialised countries and do so in a very different cultural context (Kisanji, 1998:58). It is at least arguable that for countries with comprehensive and sophisticated special education systems, the issue of inclusion is regardless of the rhetoric of restructuring it is essentially one of the relocation of learners,

resources and expertise into quality comprehensive and sophisticated regular education systems. However, for countries without such systems the issue of inclusion is essentially one of extension and development, such that the limited educational provision already available can begin to include wider ranges of learners (Vlachou, 1997:14).

2.5 THE ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD)

Between 1990 and 1993 most of the twenty-four member countries of the OECD *provided reports on the education of children with special needs and produced accounts of a total of sixty-four studies of good practice relating to the teaching of these children in regular schools* (Labon, 1997:82).

Reports compiled in recent years by member countries of the OECD are rich sources of information relating to the success or otherwise of inclusive *education programmes for children with special educational needs*. The key issues are presented in three clusters (Labon, 1997:96):

(1) Resources available within regular schools

One key issue concerning resources is that of the time needed to introduce innovative programmes and to sustain them. Time is needed for identification of the children to be involved, for consultation among professionals and parents, for assessment of educators' attitudes and skills, for target-setting to define that which can be achieved, for implementation of the inclusive programmes and training and for evaluation of the work being undertaken. Another key issue is that of the skills involved. It is essential that educators engaged in the programmes are able to differentiate their teaching sufficiently well; to provide effective teaching for learners of

different levels of ability in the same class settings, and to do adjustment in a few subjects (Mittler & Sinason, 1996:98).

(2) Aspects of school organisation

There are several key issues concerning school organisation. For inclusive education to be effective, provision needs to be staged in a continuum, so that children with special educational needs can be helped through various combinations of within-class support, withdrawal group work and individual tuition (Robinson, 1997:65). Provision of this kind can be coordinated through the implementation of a whole-school policy for special needs, whereby all staff agrees to share in the responsibilities involved. According to Sebba and Ainscow (1996:28) as more children with special needs are integrated into regular schools, an important feature of the programme is a constructive approach to handling the reduction in the numbers enrolled in special schools. This includes utilising the existing skills of the educators employed there and help them adjust to new roles. The regular schools' support systems are required to ensure that the educator concerned develops and sustain the attitudes and skills required for effective working. Effective school organisation may extend across schools, with the regular and special schools in a region collaborating to provide a cooperative network of provision and training (Labon, 1997:87-93).

(3) Factors external to schools

Issues relevant to successful inclusive education extend well beyond the schools themselves. Programmes are more likely to thrive if they are supported by public opinion, and reports provided by OECD member countries include several examples of good practices in parental and community involvement. While inclusive education programmes need not be expensive, funding mechanisms at local, regional and national levels

need to be such as to encourage a shift of emphasis towards special educational provision to regular schools and to facilitate the extra staffing and training required there (Mittler & Sinason, 1996:23).

2.6 INTERNATIONAL SPECIAL EDUCATION CONGRESS 2000 (ISEC)

In accordance with the international trend of providing quality education for all learners within the mainstream of education; (It is clear that within the overall international and national movements a number of groups remain vulnerable not just children with disabilities but also those others who, for a variety of reasons, experience barriers to learning within existing arrangements (Kisanje, 1998:69).

During the International Special Education Congress 2000 (ISEC) held in Manchester in July 2000 and which was attended by 500 delegates from all over the world, the following groups of learners were identified (Engelbrecht, Green, Naicker, & Engelbrecht, 1999:5)

- Learners who are already enrolled in education but for a variety of reasons do not achieve adequately.
- Those who are not enrolled in schools but who could participate if more schools were available or were responsive to the diversity of learners in their communities.
- Learners with more severe impairments who have a need for some form of additional support.

During the ISEC Congress the following realities came to light (Dyson & Forlin, 1999:30-32):

- A decade of international policy documents such as the UN Convention on the Rights of the child and UNESCO's.
- The Salamanca Statement, which has seen encouraging developments in many parts of the world (UNESCO, 1994:59):
 - Developed and developing countries have accepted educational approaches that have facilitated movement towards more inclusive forms of education, and intensive attempts have been made to identify the barriers to learning and development.
 - The various international policy documents disseminated during the 1990s placed considerable emphasis on the rights of all children and young people to have equal access to education.
- In spite all the laudable policies, the operationalisation of inclusive education is hampered by many problems. Some of the most important problems that were debated and questioned are the following (Lipsky & Gartner, 1997:55):
 - Inclusive policies have not been able to protect individual rights adequately.
 - Marginalised and excluded voices are not heard.
 - The way in which learners with disabilities experience inclusion and exclusion in education have not been satisfactorily determined.
 - Parents and community groups are not making adequate and responsible contributions to the process of inclusive education, especially in developing countries.

- The implication of changing professional roles for teacher education has not been determined.
 - Ways in which special schools can promote inclusion should be utilised.
 - Ways in which specialised teaching techniques can contribute to overcome barriers to learning should be utilised.
 - What forms of classroom practise can respond to pupil diversity?
 - Which organisational conditions hamper the development of inclusive practice?
 - How can pressures to exclude be overcome?
 - What are the barriers to development?
 - Does inclusive education benefit all children in school?
 - How do we evaluate the effectiveness of inclusive education?
- The long list of problems is a clear indication of challenges that face educators, policy-makers, parents and communities in the implementation of inclusive education.

2.7 SUMMARY

This chapter dealt with an historical of inclusive education in developing countries and developed countries as well as inclusive education in South Africa.

In the following chapter certain aspects concerning the implementation of inclusive education will be discussed.

CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW

	PAGE
3.1 INTRODUCTION	24
3.2 TRAINING	25
3.2.1 Strategies to train and support educators	25
3.2.2 Capacity building	27
3.2.3 Professional training / In-service training	29
3.3 SUPPORT	30
3.3.1 District support team	30
3.3.2 Support from other schools	32
3.3.3 School assessment team	32
3.4 BARRIERS TO EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION	33
3.4.1 Lack of support	34
3.4.2 Lack of resources	35
3.4.3 Special schools as resource centres	37
3.4.4 Educators' perceptions	39
3.4.5 Attitude of educators	40
3.4.6 Educators' experience teaching LSEN	42
3.4.7 Post-provision for inclusive education	43
3.5 SUMMARY	44

CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The increasing challenges to schools if they want to make a difference and be fit for the demands of the future are to examine what they are offering their learners, how it is offered and whether it meets the needs of all learners and the public (Charlton & David, 1993:3).

The new South African Constitution emphasises respect for the rights of all, with particular emphasis on the recognition of diversity. This implies an inclusive approach to education in the sense that all learners are entitled to appropriate education in an inclusive supportive learning environment. The new curriculum with its outcomes-based approach is well suited to inclusion (Prinsloo, 2001:344). In line with the Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS) and White Paper 6 any educational practice should be consistent with the following (PGSES, 2003:1):

- All learners can learn, given the necessary support.
- OBE is learner paced and learner based.
- Schools should create conditions for learners to succeed.
- Support for learners should be based on the level of support needed for overcoming individual barriers to learning and development rather than on categorisation of learners according to their abilities or disabilities.

3.2 TRAINING

According to Van den Aardweg and Van den Aardweg (1990:234) training refers to learning under guidance and supervision to perform a specific skill. Training offers great personal satisfaction to a person, enhances self-perception, and widens knowledge. In the inclusive education situation relevant training improves educators' ability to assist LSEN. It also gives the educator a greater awareness of the complexity of issues in inclusion.

3.2.1 Strategies to train and support educators

During the last four years much research has been done in South Africa by education departments of universities in order to develop models and programmes that would empower educators with knowledge and skills to direct the transformation of the schools and to establish inclusive education (Prinsloo, 2001:34). During the period July 2000 to June 2001 two models were developed at UNISA and the University of Pretoria to motivate and empower educators with the main focus on educators in service. These models can also be incorporated in the curriculum of educator training centres and can offer valuable support to educators in an attempt to empower them to implement inclusive education effectively and successfully. The following are the models developed by UNISA and the University of Pretoria (Prinsloo, 2001:34):

(1) The Weeks model

A model for educators to assist learners with behavioural problems in the classroom was developed by F.H. Weeks. This model for educators is based on a problem-solving approach. The model accentuates the impact of intrinsic and extrinsic factors relating to the behaviour of learners. The main focus is on addressing unmet needs of love and security, responsibility, new experience, praise and recognition. These are unmet needs that cause behavioural problems. The model offers a step-by-step process for

assisting and understanding learners with special educational needs. The different components of the process consist of the following (Weeks, 2000:493):

- Identification of the learner with behavioural problems.
- Analysis of the behavioural problems to determine which are unmet within which relationships.
- Planning of the outcomes of the process; understanding and assistance in short- and long-term.
- Altering the triggers activating negative behavioural patterns.
- Altering the setting / situation in which the behaviour is occurring, etc.

The aim of the model is to empower the educator, parents and all other significant role players in the child's life-world, to assist and understand children in terms of their unmet needs that cause negative self-concept formation and behavioural problems. The model is embedded within the ecological system theory with a strong focus on reciprocal impact of interactions *via* relationships on the behaviour of learners (Weeks, 2000:492).

(2) The "At Risk Disk"

The "At Risk Disk" is an available instrument in the empowerment of educators to meet the needs of all learners in their classrooms. The research to develop this instrument was initiated by the realisation that many educators in the country lack the skills to understand the nature of their learners' difficulties and to adopt the instruction task and material in support of their learning.

Bouwer and Du Toit (2000:247) refer to the following facts as the main cause of learning barriers:

- Poverty, malnutrition, inadequate medical facilities, pre-natal infections and infections during early childhood are some of the risk factors that cause a high incidence of disability amongst children in developing countries.
- Owing to these high risk factors intellectual disability and specific learning disability are highly prevalent, especially in under-resourced schools in South Africa.
- Intellectual disability and specific learning disability are not always easily distinguishable with the result that educators handle these problems ineffectively.
- A need exists for a user-friendly, effective instrument for educators which would help them to distinguish between intellectual and specific learning disabilities and which would indicate the direction of effective support for learning.

3.2.2 **Capacity building**

When educators are asked to change their ways of thinking or working, they may tend to feel inadequate, insecure or frustrated (Briton, 2003:62). They may feel the need for training, information and support. One of the crucial steps towards the successful implementation of inclusive education is to plan ongoing in-service training accompanied by regular assessment of type and content of capacity building needed (DoE, 2002:62).

District support teams are in a key position to provide training and support for schools (Engelbrecht, Green, Naicker & Engelbrecht, 1999:54). Schools are encouraged to develop their own plan for ongoing development, based

on the demands of their particular context. It is strongly recommended that the needs and the focus of development are prioritised so that the goals to be achieved can remain realistic. According to Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:37) capacity building as a part of the transformation process takes time and all stakeholders will need time to put in practice new skills so as to master them. Institution development requires a review and reflection of current policies, practices and culture and staff training as well as awareness raising and training of various stakeholders. It should be based on the following (DoE, 2002:62):

- Development activities must be set in the context of whole school improvement in order to achieve the goal of quality education for all learners. The programmes should aim to develop skills enabling the personnel to make the institution responsive to a diversity of learners.
- Education training colleges and other agencies working with educators and individual schools should network to maximise resources utilisation.
- Staff training should ensure portability of qualifications, multi-skills sustainability, addressing of functional barriers and optimum use of human resources.
- Staff development needs to aim at facilitating and moving schools towards becoming inclusive for all learners.
- Training should focus on overcoming barriers to learning and development, and should be undertaken within current initiatives so that issues related to “barriers” will form an integral part of any staff training, e.g. curriculum training should be directly linked with addressing barriers in a diversity of population.

According to White Paper 6 on inclusive education ((DoE, 2001:49-50) the Department of Education will require that all curriculum development,

assessment and instructional development programmes should make a special effort to address teaching and learning requirements of diverse learning needs. They should address barriers to learning needs that arise from language and medium of learning and instruction, teaching style and pace, timeframes for completion of curriculum, learning support materials and equipment, and assessment methods and techniques.

District support teams and institutional support teams at institutional level will be required to provide curriculum, assessment and instructional support for educators in the form of illustrative learning programmes, learner support materials and equipment, assessment instruments and professional support for school educators.

The 80 hours annual in-service education training requirement of the government in respect of educators will be structured in such a manner that they include requirements to complete the courses to policies and programmes put forward in White Paper 6 on inclusive education (DoE, 2001:51).

3.2.3 Professional training / In-service training

According to Engelbrecht and Swart (2001:259) a lack of appropriate professional training, particularly where educators are required to implement new practices with inadequate ongoing training in order to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse learner population, is a source of stress. In the experience of the researchers in many instances inclusion has occurred without an understanding of the implications for educators who have much of the responsibility for implementing new policies.

The general attitude of the participants in the study towards inclusive education conducted by Bothma and Gravett (2000:203), appeared to be negative. Educators argued that specific types of persons choose to work with LSEN. With the new dispensation ordinary educators are now

challenged with the task to accommodate diversity and to prevent and address barriers to learning and development. The participants felt that they had neither the training nor the ability to work with LSEN. From a special educator's point of view it appears that inclusive education shows a vacuum in the training of mainstream schools' educators which will have to be filled with compulsory training in special education. The theory of inclusive education emphasises the importance of sufficient support for educators and learners in mainstream schools. Knowledge and skills should equip educators to deal with learners who are experiencing barriers to learning (Engelbrecht & Hall, 1999:230).

3.3 SUPPORT

Educators are desperately in need of support from all stakeholders in order to implement the inclusive education process effectively (RNCS, 2003:6).

According to Engelbrecht, Green, Naicker and Engelbrecht (1999:52) the aims and principles of support provision must reflect a commitment to an *integrated approach which draw on all relevant sources to understand and address the barriers to learning.*

3.3.1 District support team

A district support team is a group of professionals and paraprofessionals at district level that provide ongoing support and assistance to the special needs of the LSEN in regular classes. The core support provider at district level includes (DoE, 2002:98):

- Specialist learner and educator support personnel currently employed in the Department of Education at district, regional or provincial levels, psychologists, therapists, remedial learning support educators, special needs specialists (e.g. relating to specific disabilities) and other health and welfare professionals employed by the Department of Education).

- Curriculum specialists who provide general and specific curriculum support to educators and education institutions.
- Institutional / management develop specialists who provide support to education institutions.
- Administrative experts who provide administrative and financial management support to educators in the institutions from special schools.

Within each district the designated district's directors would act as a leader of the district based support team, with the major responsibility for providing leadership and management to the team, with particular focus on coordination and collaboration to ensure holistic and integrated support provision to education institutions (DoE, 2002:98-99). The new policy on inclusive education (White Paper 6) says that the key purpose and function of district based support teams are (DoE, 2002:102):

- To support all learners, educators and the system as a whole so that the full range of learning needs can be met.
- To assist educators in institutions in creating greater flexibility in their teaching methods and the assessment of learning.
- To provide illustrative learning programmes, learning support material and assessment instruments. To evaluate programmes, diagnose their effectiveness and suggest modifications through supporting teaching, learning and management, they will build the capacity of schools, early childhood and adult basic education and training centres, colleges and higher education institutions to recognise and address severe learning difficulties and accommodate a range of learning needs.

- To provide direct intervention programmes to learners in a range of settings or serve as consultant-mentors to school management teams, classroom educators and school governing bodies.

3.3.2 **Support from other schools**

Full-service schools are mainstream education institutions that will be equipped and supported to provide for the full range of learning needs among all learners (RNCS, 2003:2). Full-service schools are essentially conceived as one of the strategies to build an inclusive education and training system. Full-service schools and institutions have a specific role in catering also for learners who require moderate levels of support.

The core of the support within the full-service schools is based on the idea of site based support. This could be structured around the school management team, principal educators and site based support team. This interaction has to be facilitated in an organised manner, as a site based support team needs to coordinate all services available so that support can be provided for both educators and learners. Full-service schools are encouraged to develop resource centres for educators and learners (DoE, 2002:44-45).

3.3.3 **School assessment team**

A school assessment team is formed by educators from special schools, professional experts and mainstream educators from that particular school, and are responsible for (PGSES, 2003:4):

- Determining which learners should have access to adaptive methods of assessment.
- Completing and submitting the necessary application forms to the District support teams with all relevant documentation attached.

- Determining the materials and practical arrangements to be made.
- Monitoring and reporting of the process.
- Ensuring that all decisions made by the school teams regarding adaptive methods of assessment are included in the learner' profile which accompany tem throughout their school careers.
- The logistical arrangements at the school level for the application of adaptations in the continuous assessment throughout the year regarding the following:
 - The assessment task should be audio taped.
 - Enlargement of print of assessment tasks.
 - Supply of assertive devices or special equipment.
 - Availability of separate and suitable venue, etc.

3.4 BARRIERS TO EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Inclusive education in South Africa is a constitutional imperative and the inclusive policy reflects the views of the majority of South Africans. However, the actual implementation of inclusive education will not be easy since education is generally a conservative enterprise and barriers to the effective implementation thereof is virtually unavoidable (Engelbrecht, Green, Naicker & Engelbrecht, 1990:12).

3.4.1 Lack of support

An educator's need for support is related to the need to share information, experiences and problems with others in similar circumstances. Knowledge and skills on a cognitive level have to be attended to and followed through

with sufficient support. Engelbrecht & Hall (1999:232) identify the following needs for support:

- Information on the motive for the change to inclusive education and the practical implementation involved.
- Information on the possible role of special schools and full-service schools in the future.
- A vision, mission and plan of action for the implementation of inclusion.
- In-service training that focuses on the learner centred nature of academic, social and emotional support programmes for learners who are experiencing barriers to learning in mainstream schools.
- Teaching strategies based on the individual's total level of functioning.
- Training on collaboration and teamwork.
- Information pertaining to practical consideration in distributing certain resources and insight into the financial support to schools.

The above needs of educators can be regarded as symptoms of natural resistance to change but can provide a serious challenge to development of a culture learning and teaching where quality inclusive education becomes a reality (Engelbrecht, Green, Naicker & Engelbrecht, 1999:55).

There is also a lack of support from parents. Parents should become more involved in the education of children. This involvement could include insight into the process, participation in decision-making and information on educational issues. Collaboration between parents and educators could improve parents' understanding of the movement towards inclusion and can influence views more positively. Parents who respect diversity are willing to

become involved and can sway a community (Engelbrecht & Hall, 1999:231).

3.4.2 Lack of resources

For the short to medium term, that is for the first five years, a three-pronged approach to funding is proposed, with new conditional grants from the national government, funding from the line budgets of provincial departments and donor funds constituting the chief sources of funding. The funding approach will separate personnel and non-personnel and distribution through the post-provisioning process, while the school funding norms will govern the generation and distribution of non-personnel resources (DoE, 2001:19).

The Department of Education will access learner support material through (PGSES, 2003:7):

- Norms and standards for financial allocations to the schools and departmental catalogues of recommended material.
- Collection of magazine, newspapers and other reusable objects.
- Specialists in different learning areas who select books that can be used as learner support material.

The following guidelines should be followed by schools when selecting learner support materials (PGSES, 2003:7):

- Be in line with the current educational policy and curriculum.
- Be appropriate to age and grade.
- Ensure quality and durability of learner support material.
- Check learner friendly layout and design.

- Ensure affordable price for learner support materials.
- Use learner friendly language.
- Content should be adequate and OBE compliant.
- Should not discriminate against gender, race, inclusively and religion, etc.
- Learning activities should stimulate real life situations.
- Integration with other learning areas.
- Assessment should address the outcomes.

According to Engelbrecht and Hall (1999:23) inclusion seems to be unacceptable at present for a large number of special schools' educators. To a large extent this can be attributed to a lack of knowledge on the benefits of inclusion. The most acceptable option for placement seems to be a progressive move towards inclusion, as learners who are experiencing barriers to learning are being effectively equipped and educators prepared for change.

The right of all learners to be educated, the right of educators to choose where they want to teach and the consideration of an educator's needs seem to be important for the successful implementation of inclusive education. The fact that educators generally felt that the needs of LSEN will be better met in specialised separate education facilities is also reflected in most of the other categories. Examples of these are that educators felt that they were not trained to cope with LSEN, which their schools did not have facilities or equipment needed by these learners and that upgrading all schools would be far more costly than building a few schools to cope with all the needs (Bothma & Gravett, 2000:202). An issue in the successful implementation of inclusive education seems to be the availability of financial resources. The practical considerations regarding the distribution of certain resources and financial obligations contribute to a predominantly negative feeling towards inclusive education (Davidoff & Lazarus, 1997:39).

3.4.3 Special schools as resource centres

Special schools as resource centres can create conditions for inclusion through school based change and school improvement. Addressing barriers to learning and participation is at the heart of school based change and school improvement. In implementing inclusive policies together with district based support teams, the aim should be to identify the key aspects of whole school development with which to engage (DoE, 2002:30). The key functions and role for special schools will be (DoE, 2002:33):

- To provide education provision for learners with diverse needs who require high levels of support.
- To assist in the development of learning materials for learners with disabilities and those experiencing barriers in mainstream schools.
- To develop a strategic plan to ensure that maximum use is made of existing physical and human resources (e.g. technical workshops, therapeutic and early intervention services, and counselling services).
- To develop a strategic plan to reduce the number of learners who require a low level of support, and to use current staff to support learners and educators in mainstream schools.
- To motivate to the Department of Education for additional staff and resources and develop information sharing initiatives which could inform norms and standards that are being developed for inclusive education.
- To develop a catalogue and data base of educational resources in the community to make them useful for educators in mainstream and full-service schools.

- To develop a flexible pattern of placement of certain learners with disabilities depending on the support required.
- Play a role in professional development of educators in mainstream schools.
- Contribute to the process as resource schools to provide a network of support to mainstream schools in collaboration with other community based support structures.
- Provide curriculum support, including assessment, specialised teaching methodologies and use of specialised equipment, to educators and learners in mainstream schools who have to meet the needs of learners with disabilities, for example, those learners who need adaptive methods of assessments such as amanuensis and Braille.
- Assist in the ongoing evaluation and monitoring of learners with disabilities in mainstream schools.
- Provide therapeutic support to learners with disabilities in mainstream schools.
- Provide support to educators in curriculum assessment for learners with diverse needs.
- Work collaboratively with District based support teams and full-service schools to build a network of support at district level.

3.4.4 Educators' perceptions

According to Sekular and Blake (1990:8) a perception is each individual's personal theory of reality, a kind of knowledge gathering process that defines one's view of the world. Carrington (1999:258) maintains that

perceptions are what guide a person's thinking actions. Educators' perceptions regarding inclusion of LSEN in a mainstream class may affect the degree to which these educators carry out their teaching duties. Evans (1997:45) says the perceptions that educators have about teaching learners with different learning needs and perceptions about their roles and responsibilities in meeting these needs, may hinder the progress of inclusive education. Educators who believe that learners with special educational needs may become useful members of society are more prepared to integrate them in the mainstream than educators who have negative perceptions about inclusion.

In research done internationally by Lipsky and Gartner (1997:783) it was found that educators in mainstream schools that have not been trained to teach LSEN tend to have negative perceptions towards inclusion. Lack of adequate knowledge to teach LSEN in mainstream classrooms affects the educators' perceptions towards inclusive education negatively (Davies & Green, 1998:97). According to Coates (1989:534) mainstream educators with little or no experience of teaching LSEN are likely to have negative perceptions of inclusion

In a research study to investigate educators' perceptions in an inclusive classroom conducted by Engelbrecht, Swart and Eloff (2001:258) it was found that most educators have negative perceptions towards LSEN. The following reasons were given for educators' negative perceptions.

- Learners with special educational needs demand more time.
- Individual attention to LSEN in large classes is not possible.
- Teaching LSEN needs more patience.
- Lack of adequate support systems.
- Speech and communication problems of LSEN.
- LSEN often display inappropriate social behaviour.

Cecil and Forman (1990:256) say that educators' perceptions of potential stressors in the work environment and the role of coping skills are major sources of negative perceptions towards the successful implementation of inclusive education. According to Sethosa (2001:347) educators perceive inclusion negatively because:

- They experience difficult to identify LSEN.
- The learners with special educational needs have to pass through the same hierarchy of stages of development but at a lower place than the average "normal" child.
- LSEN fall behind the average learner in academic achievement.
- Mainstream educators have little knowledge and fewer skills to handle LSEN.

Baker (1993:216) claims that educators in an inclusive education setting have negative perceptions towards LSEN due to having less special training in working with learners with impairments (disabilities) as well as the required support.

3.4.5 **Attitude of educators**

According to Bothma and Gravett (2000:200), the National Education Policy stipulates that all learners irrespective of race, gender, class, religion, disability, culture or sexual preferences have the right to access a learning environment, in a single system of education that values, respects and accommodates diversity. In international literature it is reported that the attitudes of teachers play a primary role in the successful implementation of an inclusive educational policy. The policy requires that educators should have a positive attitude towards inclusion, have to accept LSEN and assist them in learning. A lot of educators, however, have a negative attitude

towards inclusion and LSEN. A review of the literature on educator attitudes towards inclusion shows that there are numerous variables which may influence these attitudes (Engelbrecht, Eloff & Newmark, 1997:82). An important reason why teachers' attitudes may be negative is that educators often feel that they are obliged to implement policies (in the case of inclusion) about which they were not properly consulted.

Furthermore, educators do not have a clear understanding of the demands of the changes they must implement and often lack adequate time to prepare for the implementation. Many educators lack confidence in their own abilities to teach learners with diverse needs, they fear failure and are concerned about the needs of regular learners in their classes. Moreover, educators' attitudes are also influenced by past experience of teaching diverse learners, availability and provision of sufficient support and resources, the burden of any additional educator's responsibility and the amount of time required of educators to address the needs of diversity of learners (Bothma & Gravett, 2000:201).

Opponents of "full inclusion" are concerned that unequivocal full inclusion would eliminate all special education placement options with the continuum of alternative services. They suggest that some services can be most effectively and efficiently delivered in special settings. Only by providing a range of placement options can one hope to provide optional instructional settings and systems that best meet the individual student's learning needs, styles and interest (Cultta & Tompkins, 1999:38).

In a study surveying the beliefs and attitudes regarding the inclusion of all students in special programmes in a mid-sized Colorado school district in the USA, results indicated that 49 percent of the educators who responded "disagree" or "strongly disagree" that inclusion is the best way to meet the needs of all students, and that inclusion requires far more and increased cooperation among regular and special educators (Cultta & Tompkins, 1999:40).

3.4.6 Educators' experience teaching LSEN

Educators need adequate experience to teach LSEN. This is not always the case, as educators have no or little experience of LSEN (Bothma & Gravett, 2000:201). Despite an increase in the number of learners with special needs included into mainstream classes in South Africa in recent years, educators' experience of inclusive education is limited. Neither is this lack of experience counterbalanced by an increase in the feeling of professional competency. Lack of effective in-service or pre-service training regarding implementation of inclusion and special education needs, reinforces the high level of stress associated with adapting the curriculum to meet the learners' needs and sustaining an effective learning environment for all in the classroom. The separate general and special education have not provided educators with the necessary training and experience to develop the skills and dispositions to handle diversity (Engelbrecht & Swart, 2001:256).

According to Sebba and Ainscow (1996:15) regular classroom educators, who, by necessity, must become more involved with LSEN as a result of inclusion, do not see themselves as having the skills for adapting instruction and content that meets the needs of regular learners, but rather as inadequate for the instructional needs of learners with even mild disabilities. Vlachou (1997:21) says there is concern that regular class educators may not have the skills to provide one-to-one instruction and small group instruction for learners with special needs. Realistically, full integration of students with severe disabilities has not been realised in most public schools. It appears that general education programmes in many public schools are not organised or prepared to serve students with special needs (Robinson, 1997:81). Classroom educators have not been adequately trained to provide instruction to students with a variety of disabilities and educators' preparation programmes have few, if any, requirements regarding integrated inclusive classrooms. Most important educators seem

to agree that there are considerable difficulties in (Cultta & Tompkins, 1999:40):

- (1) Establishing working relationships or collaboration with regular educators on the aims, goals and sequences of teaching.
- (2) Sharing an understanding of the role of the special educators and the level of support the special education educators should provide in the regular classroom.

3.4.7 Post-provision for inclusive education

In respect of staffing, the objectives of the post-provisioning strategy is to allocate posts in accordance with the actual educational support needs of the learners concerned and not, as in the case currently, on the basis of category or disability. The revised resourcing model will create a dedicated pool of posts for the educational support system (DoE, 2001:77).

The result of a survey conducted by Bothma and Gravett (2000:200) indicated that an issue that seemed to bear importance for the participants were the large class size and that they felt that schools were understaffed. They generally felt that having to cope with the normal day-to-day problems in these large classes was nearly more than they were able to do. The concern aired was that an impaired learner demanded so much more attention, yet no allowance was made for this by the Department of Education in the prescribed class sizes. Some of the participants felt that inclusion could work if the class sizes were smaller.

According to Engelbrecht and Hall (1999:231) educators' emotional disposition and attitudes in mainstream schools, together with their training and skills, have practical implications for learners who are experiencing barriers to learning. Factors such as the number of learners in a class, the academic pressure and standards of schools influence the amount of time

and attention an educator can afford to a learner who is experiencing barriers to learning in the mainstream schools. Learners experiencing barriers to learning place high demands on educators. The educators have high expectations of the way they deal with these learners' demands.

3.5 SUMMARY

The effective implementation of inclusive education will not be an easy process since education is generally a conservative enterprise. It must be seen as something to be fought for, instead of assuming that it will become a reality without hard work. The rationale for such a position is associated with the difficulty related to reversing established notions of teaching and learning that have been inherited from a very conservative system of education.

Inclusive education constitutes a challenge to the education system in South Africa, in particular to the mainstream educators. The successful implementation of inclusive education requires educators to have a positive attitude to change, to be flexible, creative, and innovative in their approach to teaching and learning. Mainstream educators are expected to have the necessary knowledge, skills, competencies and support systems to accommodate learners with special educational needs (LSEN). For effective inclusion educators must be able to select appropriate teaching methods to achieve specific outcomes.

In the next chapter the methods followed in the empirical research will be explained.

CHAPTER 4

PLANNING OF THE EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

	PAGE
4.1 INTRODUCTION	45
4.2 PREPARATION FOR THE RESEARCH	45
4.2.1 <i>Permission</i>	45
4.2.2 Selection of respondents	46
4.3 THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT	46
4.3.1 Quantitative research	46
4.3.2 The questionnaire as research instrument	47
4.3.3 Construction of a questionnaire	49
4.3.4 Characteristics of a good questionnaire	49
4.3.5 Advantages and disadvantages of the questionnaire	51
4.3.6 <i>Validity and reliability of the questionnaire</i>	54
4.4 PILOT STUDY	58
4.5 ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE	59
4.6 THE PROCESSING OF THE DATA	60
4.7 LIMITATION OF THE INVESTIGATION	61
4.8 SUMMARY	61

CHAPTER 4

PLANNING OF THE EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the preceding chapter the implementation of inclusive education was described by means of a literature research. The literature study has revealed that the implementation process of inclusive education is in South African schools still in its initial stages and beleaguered with problems. This chapter will focus on the planning of the empirical research.

4.2 PREPARATION FOR THE RESEARCH

4.2.1 Permission

With the aim of administering the questionnaire to educators in Primary Schools in the Pinetown District who have introduced the inclusive education process, it was required to first request permission from the KZN Department of Education and Culture. A letter to ask permission was drafted (Appendix B) and directed to the KwaMashu Circuit Manager, being the area where the research sample would be selected from.

A copy of the questionnaire (Appendix A) was sent with the letter requesting permission (Appendix B). After permission was granted by the Chief Education Manager for the intended research to be undertaken (Appendix C) the researcher visited the principals of the randomly selected schools with the letter of approval in order to ask their permission to administer the questionnaire to the primary school educators.

4.2.2 Selection of respondents

Twenty schools were randomly selected from the list of schools in the KwaMashu Circuit in the Pinetown District. The circuit comprises rural and semi-urban areas. From the 20 schools a random sample of 200 educators (10 from each school) was selected with a total of 200 questionnaires distributed.

4.3 THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

4.3.1 Quantitative research

The purpose of a research design is to provide the most valid and accurate answers possible to research questions. Quantification has been defined as a numerical method of described observation of materials or characteristics. When a defined portion of the material or characteristic is used as a standard for measuring any sample, a valid and precise method of data description is provided (Best & Kahn, 1993:160).

Meuman (2000:16) says that a quantitative style measures objective facts, and focus on variables and reliability. In many cases, the subject statistical analysis and the researcher are detached. It can thus be stated that where information is required by a first time researcher, quantitative data collection and analysis seem to be the most suitable method. The researcher selected the quantitative approach because:

- it is more formalised,
- is better controlled,
- has a range that is more exactly defined; and
- uses methods relatively close to the physical sciences.

4.3.2 The questionnaire as research instrument

According to Labovits and Hagedon (1989:72) the questionnaire is an instrument comprising a series of questions that are filled in by the respondent himself. It may be handed out to him at work or school or it may be mailed to him at home.

The questionnaire is a research instrument with a specific job to do (Wilson & Bynner, 1989:56). A questionnaire is a set of questions which is completed by respondents in respect of a research project. The questions can be open or closed with an option to respond either "yes" or "no". A questionnaire can contain statements on which respondents are requested to react. The basic objective of such a questionnaire is to obtain facts and opinions about a phenomenon from people who are informed on the particular issue (De Vos, 2001:172).

A questionnaire is a set of questions dealing with some topic or related group of topics given to selected groups of individuals for the purpose of gathering data on a problem under consideration. The questionnaire is a prepared question form submitted to certain persons (respondents) with a view to obtaining information. A well-designed questionnaire can boost the reliability and validity of the data to acceptable tolerances (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997:42).

It therefore stands to reason that questionnaire design does not take place in a vacuum. According to Dane (1990:315) the length of individual questions, the number of response options, as well as the format and wording of questions are determined by the following:

- The choice of the subject to be researched.
- The aim of the research.

- The size of the research sample.
- The method of data collection.
- The analysis of the data.

Against this background the researcher can now look at the principles that determine whether a questionnaire is well-designed. It is thus necessary to draw a distinction between questionnaire content, question format, question order, type of questions, formulation of questions and validity and reliability of questions.

4.3.3 **Construction of a questionnaire**

According to De Vos (2001:172-173) questionnaire design is an activity that should not take place in isolation. The researcher should consult and seek advice from specialists and colleagues at all times during the construction of the questionnaire. Questions to be taken up in the questionnaire should be tested on people to eliminate possible errors. A questionnaire appears correct to the researcher when it is written down but can be interpreted differently when asked to another person. Mouton (1996:61) says there should be no hesitation in changing questions several times before the final formulation whilst keeping the original purpose in mind.

According to Huysamen (1989:12) the most important point to be taken into account in questionnaire design is that it takes time and effort and that the questionnaire will be re-drafted a number of times before being finalised. A researcher must then ensure that adequate time is budgeted for the construction and preliminary testing of the questionnaire. All these were taken into consideration by the researcher during the designing of the questionnaire for this investigation.

An important aim in the construction of the questionnaire for this investigation was to present the questions as simple and straightforward as possible. To be well understood by all respondents, the researcher further aimed to avoid ambiguity, vagueness, bias, prejudice and technical language in the questions. The aim of the questionnaire (Appendix A) was to obtain information regarding educators' perceptions of the implementation of inclusive education. The questions were formulated to establish educator responses with regard to the following:

- Successful implementation of inclusive education.
- Educators' perceptions of inclusive education.

The questionnaire was subdivided into the following sections:

- Section one, which dealt with the biographical of the respondent.
- Section two and three of the questionnaire consisted of closed-ended questions. The respondents were requested to indicate their opinion to statements pertaining to educators' perceptions of the implement action of inclusive education.

The educators had to state their view concerning the latter in three ways, namely agree, disagree and uncertain.

4.3.4 Characteristics of a good questionnaire

Schnetler (1993:23) says that throughout the construction of the questionnaire the researcher had to consider the characteristics of a good questionnaire in order to meet the requirements necessary for the research instrument to be reliable. The characteristics of a good questionnaire that

were considered by the researcher are, according to Norval (1990:60) and Best and Kahn (1993:191-239), *inter alia*, the following:

- It has to deal with a significant topic, one the respondent will recognise as important enough to warrant spending his or her time on.
- The significance should be clearly and carefully stated on the questionnaire and in the accompanying letter.
- It must seek only that information which cannot be obtained from other sources.
- It must be as short as possible, but long enough to get essential data. Long questionnaires frequently find their way into the wastepaper basket.
- Questionnaires should be attractive in appearance, neatly arranged and clearly duplicated or printed.
- Directions for a good questionnaire must be clear and complete and important terms clearly defined.
- Each question has to deal with a single concept and should be worded as simply and straightforwardly as possible.
- Different categories should provide an opportunity for easy, accurate and unambiguous responses.
- Objectively formulated questions with no leading suggestions should render the desired responses. Leading questions are just as inappropriate in a questionnaire as they are in a court of law.

Questions should be presented in the proper psychological order, proceeding from general to more specific and sensitive responses. An orderly grouping helps respondents to organise their own thinking so that their answers are logical and objective. It is preferable to present questions that create a favourable attitude first, before proceeding to those that are more intimate and delicate in nature. Annoying or embarrassing questions should be avoided if possible.

4.3.5 **Advantages and disadvantages of the questionnaire**

Data can be gathered by means of a structured questionnaire in, *inter alia*, the following ways: a written questionnaire that is mailed, delivered, handed out or personal interviews (De Vos, 2001:172). Each mode has specific advantages and disadvantages which the researcher needs to evaluate for their suitability to the research question and the specific target population being studied, as well as relative cost. The researcher used the written questionnaire as research instrument taking into consideration the following advantages:

(1) **Advantages of the written questionnaire**

The written questionnaire as a research instrument to obtain information data has the following advantages (Sarantakos, 1988:224-225; Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995:110; Cooper, 1989:10):

- They permit a respondent a sufficient amount of time to consider answers before responding.
- Questionnaires can be given to many people simultaneously, that is to say where the target population can be reached.

- Affordability is the primary advantage of written questionnaires because it is the least expensive means of data gathering.
- A questionnaire permits anonymity. If it is arranged such that responses are given anonymously, this will increase the researcher's chances of receiving responses which genuinely present a person's belief, feelings, opinions or perception.
- Written questionnaires preclude possible interview bias. The way the interviewer asks the questions and even the interviewer's general appearance or interaction may influence a respondent's answers. Such bias can be completely eliminated with a written questionnaire.
- They provide greater uniformity across measurement situations than do interviews. Each person responds to exactly the same questions because standard instructions are given to the respondents.
- Generally data provided by questionnaires can be more easily analysed and interpreted than the data obtained from verbal responses.
- A respondent may answer questions of personal or embarrassing nature more willingly and frankly on a questionnaire than in a face-to-face situation with an interviewer who may be a complete stranger. In some cases it may happen that respondents report less than expected and make critical comments in a mailed questionnaire.
- Questionnaire design is relatively easy if the set guidelines are followed.
- Respondents can complete the questionnaire in their own time and in a more relaxed atmosphere.

- The administering of the questionnaire and coding, analysis and interpretation of data can be done without any special training.

(2) Disadvantages of the questionnaire

The researcher is also aware of the fact that the written questionnaire has important disadvantages. According to Van den Aardweg and Van den Aardweg (1998:190) and Sarantakos (1988:225) the disadvantages of the questionnaire are, *inter alia*, the following:

- People are generally better able to express their views verbally.
- The mailed questionnaire does not make provision for obtaining the views of more than one person at a time. It requires uninfluenced views of one person only.
- Questions can be answered only when they are sufficiently easy and straightforward to be understood with the given instructions or definitions.
- Answers to written questionnaires must be seen as final. Re-checking of responses cannot be done. There is no chance of investigating beyond the given answer for a classification of ambiguous answers. If respondents are unwilling to answer certain questions nothing can be done about it because the mailed questionnaire is essentially inflexible.
- Written questionnaires do not allow the researcher to correct misunderstandings or answer questions that the respondents may have. Respondents might answer questions incorrectly or not at all due to confusion or misinterpretation.

- In a written questionnaire the respondent examines all the questions at the same time before answering them and the answers to different questions can therefore not be treated as “independent”.
- Researchers are unable to control the context of question answering, and specifically, the presence of other people. Respondents may ask friends or family members to examine the questionnaire or comment on their answers, causing bias if the respondent’s own private opinions are desired.

4.3.6 **Validity and reliability of the questionnaire**

There are two concepts that are of critical importance in understanding the issue of measurement in social science research, namely validity and reliability (Hawitt & Cramer, 2001:34). According to Best and Kahn (1993:242) (1993:242) all too rarely do questionnaire designers deal consciously with the degree of validity and reliability of their instrument. This is one of the reasons why so many questionnaires are lacking in these qualities. It must be recognised, however, that questionnaires, unlike psychological tests and inventories, have a very limited purpose. They are often one time data gathering devices with a very short life, administered to a limited population. There are ways, however, to improve both validity and reliability of the questionnaire.

Basic to the validity of a questionnaire is asking the right questions, phrased in the best unambiguous way. In other words, do the items sample a significant aspect of the purpose of the investigation? The meaning of all terms must be clearly defined so that they have the same meaning to all respondents (Best & Kahn, 1993:160).

Hawitt and Cramer (2001:34-35) mention the fact that although reliability and validity are two different characteristics of measurement, they “shade into each other”. They are two ends of a continuum but at points in the middle it is difficult to distinguish between them. Validity and reliability are especially important in educational research because most of the measurements attempted in this area are obtained indirectly. Researchers can never guarantee that an educational or psychological measuring instrument measure precisely and independently what it is intended to measure (Best & Kahn, 1993:208). It is essential, therefore, to assess the validity and reliability of these instruments. Researchers must have a general knowledge as to what validity and reliability are and how one goes about validating a research instrument and establishing its reliability.

(1) Validity of the questionnaire

Validity means the ability to produce findings that are in agreement with theoretical or conceptual values, in other words to produce accurate results and to measure what is supposed to be measured (Huysamen, 1989:3).

Best and Kahn (1989:219) and Sarantakos (1988:79) distinguish between three types of validity:

- **Content validity**, where content and cognitive processes included can be measured. Topics, skills and abilities should be prepared and items from each category randomly drawn.
- **Criterion validity**, which refers to the relationship between scores on a measuring instrument and an independent variable (criterion), believed to measure directly the behaviour or characteristics in question. The criterion should be relevant, reliable and free from bias and contamination.

- **Construct validity**, where the extent to which the test measures a specific trait or construct is concerned, for example intelligence, reasoning ability, attitudes, etc.

The validity of the questionnaire indicates how worthwhile a measure is likely to be in a given situation. According to Mouton (1996:86) validity shows whether the instruction is reflecting the true story, or at least the research instrument is one that has demonstrated that it detects some "real" ability, attitude or prevailing situation that the researcher can identify and characterise. If the ability or attitude is itself stable, and if a respondent's answers to the items are not affected by other unpredictable factors, then each administration of the instrument should yield essentially the same result (Best & Kahn, 1993:218). The validity of the questionnaire as a research instrument reflects the sureness with which conclusions can be drawn.

The researcher employed the questionnaire as an indirect method to measure educators' perceptions on the implementation of inclusive education. One is never sure that the questionnaire devised will actually measure what it is supposed to measure, because items in the interpretations of the results obtained the researcher is convinced that the questionnaire to a great extent, did measure that which it was designed for.

(2) Reliability of the questionnaire

According to Sarantakos (1988:83) reliability refers to the ability of an instrument to produce consistent results, while reliability is equivalent to consistency. Thus a method is reliable if it produces the same results wherever it is repeated, even by other researchers. Reliability is also characterised by precision and objectivity. Without precision and objectivity reliability cannot be achieved (Schnetler, 1993:71).

Best and Kahn (1993:217) distinguishes between the following types of reliability:

- **Test-retest reliability** estimated by comparing two or more repeated administrations of the measuring instrument. This gives an indication of the dependability of the results on another occasion.
- **Internal consistency reliability** – this indicates how well the test items measure the same thing.
- **Split-half reliability** – by correlating the results obtained from two halves of the same measuring instrument, one can calculate the split-half reliability.

Mulder (1989:209) says in essence, reliability refers to consistency, but consistency does not guarantee truthfulness. The reliability of the question is no proof that the answer given reflects the respondent's true feelings. A demonstration of reliability is necessary but not conclusive evidence that an instrument is valid. According to Van Rensburg, Landman and Bodenstein (1994:512) reliability refers to the extent to which measurement results are free of unpredicted kinds of error. When the questionnaire is used as an empirical research instrument there is no specific method, for example the "test-retest" method, to determine the reliability of the questionnaire. Therefore, it will be difficult to establish to what extent the answers of the respondents were reliable. The researcher, however, believes that the questionnaires in this investigation were completed with the necessary honesty and sincerity required to render the maximum possible reliability. Frankness in responding to questions was made possible by the anonymity of the questionnaire. In the coding of the responses to the questions it was evident that questionnaires were completed with the necessary dedication.

4.4 PILOT STUDY

Plug, Meyer, Louw and Gouws (1991:116) say a pilot study is a small-scale replica and rehearsal of the main study. Pilot studies are concerned with administrative and organisational problems related to the whole study and the respondents (Sarantakos, 1988:293). For the purpose of the pilot study in this research project ten educators were selected from amongst the researcher's colleagues and educator friends. The pilot study is a preliminary or "trial run" investigation using similar questions and similar subjects as in the final survey.

Best and Kahn (1993:323) say the basic purpose of a pilot study is to determine how the design of the subsequent study can be improved and to identify flaws in the measuring instrument. A pilot study gives the researcher an idea of what the method will actually look like in operation and what effect (intended or not) it is likely to have. In other words, by generating many of the practical problems that will ultimately arise, a pilot study enables the researcher to avert these problems by changing procedures, instructions and questions.

The number of participants in the pilot study or group is normally smaller than the number scheduled to take part in the final survey. Participants in the pilot study and sample for the final study must be selected from the same target population. According to Sarantakos (1988:293) the following are the purposes of the pilot study, and these were also the aim of the researcher in this survey:

- To estimate the cost duration of the main study and test the effectiveness of its organisation.
- To test the research method and instrument and their suitability.

- To show whether the sampling frame is adequate.
- To estimate the level of response and form of dropout.
- To gain information about how diverse or homogeneous the survey population is.
- To familiarise researchers with the research environment in which the research is to take place.
- Feedbacks from other persons involved made the study possible and led to important improvements in the main study.
- Questions and instructions that were misinterpreted were reformulated.

Through the use of the pilot study as “pre-test” the researcher was satisfied that the questions asked complied adequately with the requirements of the study.

4.5 ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

If properly administered the questionnaire is the best available instrument for obtaining information from widespread sources or a large group simultaneously. The researcher personally delivered the questionnaires to the selected schools as the KwaMashu Circuit, Pinetown District and collected them again after completion. This method of administration facilitated a high return rate. A good return rate of 75% was obtained with 150 questionnaires completed and collected out of 200 distributed.

4.6 THE PROCESSING OF THE DATA

Once data was collected, it had to be captured in a format which would permit analysis. This involved the careful coding of the 150 questionnaires completed by the randomly selected educators. The coded data was subsequently transferred onto a computer spreadsheet using the Excel programme. The coded data was analysed using the same by means of descriptive statistics.

(1) Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics serves to describe and summarise observations (Best & Kahn, 1993:106). Frequency tables, histograms and polygons are used in forming impressions about the distribution of data. According to Mulder (1989:25) frequency distribution is a method to organise data obtained from questionnaires to simplify statistical analysis. A frequency table provides the following information:

- It indicates how many times a particular response appears on the completed questionnaires.
- It provides percentages that reflect the number of responses to certain questions in the relation to the total number of responses.
- The arithmetic means (average) can be calculated by adding all the scores and dividing it by the number of scores.

4.7 LIMITATION OF THE INVESTIGATION

This investigation was constrained by a number of factors. The following are likely factors that might have influenced the reliability and validity of the questionnaire:

- Although anonymity was required in the questionnaire the possibility exists that, because of their cautiousness, the respondents might not have been frank and truthful in their responses.
- The sensitive nature of items in the questionnaire might have elicited false or misleading responses and influenced the reliability of the result.
- The formulation of the questions in English, which is not the mother-tongue of the most respondents, might have resulted in the misinterpretation of questions which could have elicited incorrect responses.
- To restrict the investigation to manageable proportions, the researcher limited the study to educators of schools which are easily accessible.

4.8 SUMMARY

In this chapter the planning and design of the empirical research was discussed and a comprehensive description of the questionnaire as research instrument was given. In the following chapter the data obtained from the completed questionnaires will be presented and analysed.

CHAPTER 5

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE RESEARCH DATA

	PAGE
5.1 INTRODUCTION	62
5.2 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS	62
5.2.1 Gender of the respondents	63
5.2.2 Age of respondents	64
5.2.3 Qualifications	65
5.2.4 Years of service as an educator	66
5.2.5 Post level of respondents	67
5.2.6 Type of post	67
5.2.7 Employer	68
5.2.8 Type of school	68
5.2.9 Successful implementation of inclusive education	69
5.2.10 Educators' perceptions of inclusive education	75
6 SUMMARY	79

CHAPTER 5

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE RESEARCH DATA

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the data that was collected from the completed questionnaires will be analysed, findings will be interpreted and some comments will be presented. The data comprises the biographical information of the respondents (primary school educators) and their perceptions of the implementation of inclusive education in primary schools. One hundred and fifty questionnaires completed by primary school educators were used in the analyses.

5.2 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

According to Van den Aardweg and Van den Aardweg (1990:59) the descriptive method in research seek to describe the situation as it is, thus there is no intervention on the part of the researcher and therefore no control. In the education situation descriptive research generally seeks to describe the natural process of development of the child in settings such as the family and the school and his relationship with parents, educators and peers, and interprets the given facts. Bless and Higson-Smith (1995:42) states that the purpose of research is to gain insight into a situation, phenomenon, community or person. Van Rensburg, Landman and Bodenstein (1994:335) maintain that descriptive studies do not set out with the idea of testing hypotheses about relationships, but want to find the distribution of variables. In this study homothetic descriptive research was employed with the aim of describing primary school educators' perceptions pertaining to the implementation of inclusive education. The researcher was

primarily concerned with the nature and degree of existing situations in primary schools.

5.2.1 Gender of the respondents

Table 1 Frequency distribution according to the gender of respondents

Gender		Frequency	%
1	Male	15	10%
2	Female	135	90%
TOTAL		150	100%

According to Table 1 the majority of respondents (90%) in the research sample are female educators. Statistical data of the Department of Education indicates that seventy percent (70%) of the teaching staff at schools are females (Chetty, 2004:95). Possible reasons for the findings in Table 1 are the following:

- The research sample involved only primary schools (cf. 5.2.8) that tend to appoint more female than male educators.
- A female educator represents a motherly figure and is more acceptable by younger children as *in loco parentis*.
- Female educators view teaching as an occupation that affords them time after school to attend to household chores.

5.2.2 Age of respondents

Table 2 Frequency distribution according to the age of the respondents

Age group		Frequency	%
1	20 – 25 years	2	1%
2	26 – 30 years	12	8%
3	31 – 35 years	41	27%
4	36 – 40 years	42	28%
5	41 – 45 years	28	19%
6	36 – 50 years	17	11%
7	51 – 55 years	7	5%
8	56 – 60 years	1	1%
TOTAL		150	100%

Table 2 shows that more than half (55%) of the respondents in the research sample are in the age group 31-40 years. The majority of respondents (64%) are younger than 40 years and that means they have more to offer in terms of energy and productivity.

Educators can make a difference in the lives of individual learners by their active efforts to adapt learning environments in creative ways for inclusion. The possibility also exists that the younger the educator the longer he may stay in the education profession and thus gain more experience in inclusive education.

5.2.3 Qualifications

Table 3 Frequency distribution according to the qualifications of the respondents

Qualifications		Frequency	%
1	Degree and diploma or certificate	36	24%
2	Diplomas and certificates only	114	76%
TOTAL		150	100%

From Table 3 it emerges that the minority (24%) of the respondents in the research sample possess academic and professional qualifications, which are by many perceived as being better qualified for the teaching profession. However, the finding that most (76%) of the respondents have diplomas and certificates may be because they are teaching in primary schools. The contents (*curricula*) of teaching diplomas and certificates are more practical than theoretically orientated courses and therefore more appropriate for teaching younger primary school children. In order to be an effective educator a person should have obtained the most suitable qualification. Doorlag (1995:30) says that adequately qualified educators do not experience as many difficulties to meet the demands made on them in an inclusive class.

5.2.4 Years of service as an educator

Table 4 Frequency distribution according to respondents' years of completed service as educators

	Completed years of service	Frequency	%
1	0 – 5 years	38	26%
2	6 – 10 years	27	18%
3	11 – 15 years	37	25%
4	16 – 20 years	23	15%
5	21 – 25 years	18	12%
6	26 – 30 years	5	3%
7	30 years and more	2	1%
TOTAL		150	100%

Table 4 reveals that more than a quarter of the respondents (26%) in the research sample have less than 5 years' teaching experience. Experience together with adequate training is needed for the responsibilities and the demands imposed on educators (Briton, 2003:24). The more experience and training an educator has the more confidence and expertise he will have acquired to be an effective educator. Chetty (2004:631) maintains that continuous professional development and experience are prerequisites for educators to keep up with the rapid pace of change in knowledge, advancement of technology and increasing demands (e.g. inclusive education) imposed upon educators.

5.2.5 Post level of respondents

Table 5 Frequency distribution according to the post level of the respondents

Post Level		Frequency	%
1	Principal	2	1%
2	Deputy principal	4	3%
3	HOD	25	17%
4	Educator (Post Level 1)	119	79%
TOTAL		150	100%

The findings in Table 5 were expected and are in accordance with the post structures in schools. Generally level one educators comprise a little over seventy percent (70%) of the teaching personnel in schools (DoE, 2002:2).

5.2.6 Type of post

Table 6 Frequency distribution according to the type of post held by the respondents

Type of post		Frequency	%
1	Permanent	132	88%
2	Temporary	18	12%
TOTAL		150	100%

According to frequency distribution in Table 6 most of the educators (88%) that partook in the research are in permanent posts.

Educators who are appointed on the permanent staff may have the following advantages (DoE, 1999:12):

- They are entitled to a housing subsidy which enables them to purchase a house or flat.

- They enjoy job security.
- They are better able to provide for retirement as they are contributors to a pension fund.
- They can join a medical aid benefit to which the employer contributes a percentage of the monthly premium.

5.2.7 Employer

Table 7 Frequency distribution according to the employer of respondents

Employer		Frequency	%
1	Department of Education	149	99%
2	Governing Body	1	1%
TOTAL		150	100%

Table 7 shows that the majority (99%) of the participants in the research are employed by the Department of Education. This was expected findings since school governing bodies depend on departmental support for human resources due to financial constraints they have in African schools.

5.2.8 Type of school

Table 8 Frequency distribution according to the type of school respondents teach at

Type of school		Frequency	%
1	Junior Primary	38	26%
2	Senior Primary	0	0%
3	Combined Primary	112	74%
TOTAL		150	100%

According to Table 8 most of the respondents (74%) are teaching in Combined Primary Schools and only 26% are teaching in Junior Primary Schools.

5.2.9 Successful implementation of inclusive education

Table 9 Frequency distribution according to the facilities / strategies required for successful implementation of inclusive education

The following facilities / strategies for the successful implementation of inclusion are available at my school:		Agree	Disagree	Uncertain	TOTAL
2.1	An assessment team to evaluate LSEN for special teaching methods.	63 42%	74 49%	13 9%	150 100%
2.2	A record of LSEN to help educators with the identification of a specific impairment.	69 46%	65 43%	16 1%	150 100%
2.3	A school-based support team to assist educators with LSEN.	78 52%	57 38%	15 10%	150 100%
2.4	In-service training opportunities for mainstream educators to better cope with LSEN.	73 49%	51 34%	26 17%	150 100%
2.5	Sufficient funds for resources to facilitate effective teaching of LSEN.	44 29%	82 55%	24 16%	150 100%
2.6	Opportunities for networking between special schools' educators and mainstream educators.	70 47%	51 34%	29 19%	150 100%
2.7	A school governing body that actively supports inclusive education.	68 45%	53 35%	29 20%	150 100%
2.8	A management team with sufficient knowledge to implement inclusive education.	64 42%	46 31%	40 27%	150 100%
2.9	A policy to eliminate discriminating attitudes toward LSEN.	68 45%	46 31%	36 24%	150 100%
2.10	Special life-skills programmes for the integration of LSEN in mainstream classes.	56 37%	57 38%	37 25%	150 100%
2.11	District Support Team to assist the school with inclusion problems.	71 47%	41 28%	38 25%	150 100%
2.12	Sufficient funding from the department to restructure mainstream classes to accommodate LSEN.	35 25%	69 46%	44 25%	150 100%
2.13	Easy access facilities to school buildings for physically impaired learners.	42 28%	88 59%	19 13%	150 100%
2.14	Procedures to deal with harassment of LSEN.	57 38%	63 42%	29 20%	150 100%
2.15	Educational support services for parents with LSEN.	58 39%	67 44%	25 17%	150 100%

From the responses in Table 9 it is evident that the facilities and/or strategies needed for the successful implementation of inclusive education are not available at the schools in the research sample.

According to Engelbrecht, Green, Naicker and Engelbrecht (1999:49) an inclusive school environment should have all the requirements (psychosocial, physical, etc.) to foster the personal, academic and professional development of all its learners.

Assessment team (2.1): Most of the respondents (49%) in the research sample indicated that their school does not have an assessment team to evaluate LSEN for special teaching methods. According to the PGSES (2003:4) every school should have a special assessment team for the evaluation of LSEN. If the services of an assessment team are not available the following might not effectively take place (PGSES, 2003:5):

- The correct identification of LSEN.
- Changing of teaching methods if necessary.
- Implementation of adaptive methods of assessment.
- Therapeutic intervention (e.g. speech therapy).

Record of LSEN (2.2): Less than half of the respondents (46%) from the participants in the research indicated that a record of LSEN learners is available to them. However, of concern are the more than forty percent (43%) of the respondents who indicated that their school does not have such records. According to Conner (1991:99) it is not to say that a standardised form of record-keeping is absolutely necessary, but frameworks for LSEN records would be helpful.

A school-based support team (2.3): Although most of the respondents (52%) agreed that their schools have a school-based support team to assist educators with LSEN, nearly half (48%) disagreed. This finding possibly means that a number of educators in inclusive classrooms do not have access to assistance with LSEN when needed. The NCSNET / NCESS report has conceptualised a school-based support team comprising mainly educators in the school itself and where possible and appropriate, parents and learners (Engelbrecht, Green, Naicker & Engelbrecht, 1999:54). The major function of a school support team would be to understand and identify barriers to inclusion and then develop and implement an action plan to address these barriers.

In-service training (2.4): The larger percentage of the respondents (49%) said that they have received in-service training to better cope with LSEN. Thirty-four percent (34%) of the respondents indicated that no in-service training was available to them while 17% were uncertain about in-service training. This finding means that more than half (51%) of the respondents in the research sample have to special and/or additional training to assist them in the implementation of inclusive education.

Funds for resources (2.5): The majority of respondents (71%) disagreed with the statement that their school has sufficient funds for resources to facilitate effective teaching of LSEN. According to Engelbrecht and Hall (1999:231) one of the main issues in the successful implementation of inclusive education seems to be the availability of financial resources. The majority of the schools lack financial support from the Department of Education. The department has, however, promised new conditional grants from the line budgets of provincial education departments and donor funds to constitute the main chief source of funding in the first eight years of the implementation of inclusive education (DoE, 2001:43).

Networking (2.6): Less than fifty percent of the respondents (47%) said that opportunities for networking between special schools' educators and mainstream educators exist. Educators from special schools and the mainstream schools have to share information, resources and ideas in order to implement inclusive education effectively. This seems necessary because many mainstream educators lack sufficient experience in educating LSEN (DoE, 2001:21).

Supportive school governing body (2.7): The normal link between schools, parents and the wider community is the school governing body and it is required to take important decisions to ensure that schools run smoothly. Although no legal guidelines are provided concerning the role of school governing bodies on inclusive education it is important that a subcommittee clearly defines its role and functions in supporting inclusion. Less than half of the respondents (45%) in the research sample agreed that the school governing body actively supports inclusive education. Thirty-five percent (35%) responded negatively and 20% were uncertain. This would possibly suggest that most school governing bodies are not supportive of inclusion.

Knowledgeable management team (2.8) Less than fifty percent (42%) of respondents agreed that their school management have sufficient knowledge to implement inclusive education. This suggests that less than half of the educators in the research sample receive support from their SMTs due to possible lack of knowledge and skills in inclusive education.

A policy to eliminate discrimination (2.9): The larger percentage of the respondents (45%) said that the school have a policy to eliminate discriminating attitudes towards LSEN, while nearly a third (31%) disagreed and twenty four percent (24%) were uncertain. Prinsloo (2001:344) points

out that the learner with special educational needs is vulnerable to discrimination in a class with "normal" learners.

Special life-skills programmes (2.10): Thirty-eight percent (38%) of participants in the research disagreed while twenty-five percent (25%) were uncertain as to whether special life-skills programmes are available for the integration of LSEN in classes. This suggests that learners with special education needs are taught in the same method and use the same material and resources as normal learners in life skills programmes. Programmes are not static and educators may change the contents and strategies and apply them in other ways if the learners have not achieved their learning outcomes (Booyesen, 2004:55).

A District Support Team (2.11): Although nearly half of the respondents (47%) agreed that a district support team is available 28% disagreed and 25% were uncertain. The primary function of a DST is to evaluate programmes, diagnose their effectiveness and suggest modifications and to build capacity for the school (DoE, 2001:28-29).

Departmental funding (2.12): The larger percentage (46%) of the participants disagreed, while 29% were uncertain whether the Department of Education provides sufficient funding to restructure mainstream classes to accommodate LSEN. This means that the possibility exists most of the schools do not receive sufficient funds to restructure their classes to accommodate LSEN. An issue in the successful implementation of inclusive education seems to be the availability of financial resources. The practical considerations regarding the distribution of certain resources and financial obligations contribute to a predominantly negative feeling towards inclusive education (Engelbrecht & Hall, 999:213).

Easy access (2.13): Most of the respondents (59%) indicated that LSEN (e.g. physically impaired learners) do not have easy access to facilities in the school building to accommodate physically impaired learners. According to the NCSNET / NCESS Report, schools have to develop barriers-free teaching and learning environments, which accommodate the diverse needs of the learning population and enable all learners to move around freely (Daniels & Philips, 2000:49-50). Major physical dimensions have to be changed to remove barriers to learners with disabilities.

Procedures to deal with harassment (2.14): From the responses it appears that forty-two percent (42%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement that there is a procedure in place to deal with harassment of LSEN. This suggests that there might be a violation of human rights in most schools. LSEN learners are especially vulnerable to harassment by the “normal” school population.

Support service for parents (2.15): Most of the respondents (44%) said that their schools do not have educational support services for parents with LSEN. According to Engelbrecht, Green, Naicker and Engelbrecht (1999:177) parents’ organisations for LSEN such as PACSEN (Parents’ Association for Children with Special Educational Needs) can offer self-empowerment programmes for children with disabilities in rural and disadvantaged areas. Such organisations can be:

- Useful resources for facilitating mutual support for parents; and
- Putting parents in touch with other parents who can provide the much needed peer group support.

5.2.10 Educators' perceptions of inclusive education

Table 10 Frequency distribution according to the educators' perceptions of inclusive education

In the mainstream class inclusive of LSEN:		Agree	Disagree	Uncertain	TOTAL
3.1	I must set an example in accepting LSEN learners.	132 88%	10 7%	9 5%	150 100%
3.2	It is necessary to change my teaching methods.	136 91%	8 5%	9 4%	150 100%
3.3	I experience difficulties in meeting the needs of the diversity of learners.	107 72%	23 15%	20 13%	150 100%
3.4	More time is needed to meet the needs of LSEN.	142 95%	8 5%	2 1%	150 100%
3.5	I need more (special) training to assist LSEN.	142 95%	5 3%	3 2%	150 100%
3.6	Networking with educators in similar circumstances is necessary.	143 95%	4 3%	3 2%	150 100%
3.7	The large number of learners in the class makes individual attention difficult.	138 93%	5 3%	7 4%	150 100%
3.8	I need help from remedial educators.	137 91%	10 7%	3 2%	150 100%
3.9	I experience negative feelings towards LSEN.	38 26%	92 61%	20 13%	150 100%
3.10	Unacceptable behaviour of LSEN must not be overlooked.	121 81%	20 13%	9 6%	150 100%
3.11	I must be careful not to discriminate against LSEN.	143 96%	5 3%	2 1%	150 100%
3.12	Teaching LSEN needs more tolerance (patience).	143 96%	3 2%	2 1%	150 100%
3.13	More effort is required to better understand LSEN.	146 97%	4 3%	0 0%	150 100%
3.14	More parental involvement is required.	139 93%	7 4%	4 3%	150 100%
3.15	LSEN should follow an adapted curriculum.	127 85%	10 7%	13 8%	150 100%

In Table 10 the majority of the respondents agreed with the statements regarding their perceptions of inclusive education. The educator's emotional disposition and perceptions in mainstream schools, together with

their training and skills, have practical implications for learners who experience barriers to learning.

Factors such as the number of learners in the class, academic pressure and standards at the school, influence the amount of time and attention an educator can afford to a learner who is experiencing barriers to learning in a mainstream school (Hall, 1999:231). The above finding is substantiated by the response to the following questions in Table 10:

An exemplary figure (3.1): The majority of respondents (88%) in the research sample agreed that they must set an example to accept LSEN in the mainstream class. From this finding the deduction can be made that most of the educators have made a paradigm shift towards inclusion of LSEN, and they have a positive attitude toward the LSEN (Hay, 2001:213).

According to Briton (2003:59) successful inclusive education expects mainstream educators to accept LSEN like any other normal child. The inclusive classroom should foster acceptance, tolerance and caring in all learners.

Teaching methods (3.2): A large percentage (91%) of the participants in the research said that it is necessary to change their teaching methods to accommodate LSEN learners in the mainstream classes. It can thus be concluded that the effective implementation of inclusion depends on a high quality of professional preparation of educators as pre- and in-service level to equip them for and update their teaching methods to meet LSEN needs in a diverse classroom population (Hay, 2001:214).

Needs of the diversity of learners (3.3): More than seventy percent (72%) of respondents agreed that they experience difficulties in meeting the needs

of the diversity of learners. This might arise from the following (Naicker, 1999:49, 52-53):

- Large classes, where individual attention is not always possible.
- Inadequate knowledge about the special needs of the learners.
- Lack of skills and training in teaching LSEN.
- Insufficient facilities, infrastructure and assertive devices.
- Lack of resources and support.

Time spent with LSEN (3.4) The majority of respondents (94%) agreed that they need more time to meet the needs of LSEN in their classrooms. The concept of expanded opportunities is a mechanism that is able to meet the needs of diverse learning rates and styles.

Time could be adjusted for faster and slower learners on the basis of the following (Naicker, 1999:62):

- Direct support provided to the learner.
- The amount of time the system allows for the learners to learn.
- Learners' eligibility to the time allocated to learn different curriculum concepts.

Training (3.5): More than ninety percent (95%) of the respondents in the research agreed that they need more (special) training to assist LSEN in their classrooms. The theory of inclusive education emphasises the importance of training for educators to meet the special needs of learners in mainstream schools. Educators need to be well equipped with knowledge and skills to deal with LSEN in the mainstream class (Engelbrecht & Hall, 1999:230).

Networking (3.6): Ninety-five percent (95%) of respondents agreed that they need to network with educators from special schools and full-service schools to share information, experience and problems (Engelbrecht & Hall, 1999:232). According to White Paper 6 (DoE, 2001:21) the new roles for special schools is to provide particular expertise and support, especially professional support in curriculum, assessment and instruction.

Number of learners in class (3.7): The majority of respondents (93%) agreed that the large number of learners in their classes make individual attention difficult. This suggests that educators are facing challenges to effectively implement inclusive education in their classes due to the educator-learner proportion which is $\pm 50:1$ or more in most South African schools (Naicker, 1999:52).

Remedial help (3.8) Most of the respondents (91%) agreed that they need help from remedial educators in order to adequately teach LSEN. Mainstream educators with LSEN in their classes need the following support (PGSES, 2003:3):

- Professional support, e.g. curriculum, assessment and instructional.
- Curriculum support, e.g. curriculum adaptation and classroom management.
- Learning and teaching material support, e.g. Braille, audio visual material.

Parental involvement (3.14): The majority of respondents (85%) agreed that parents must be involved in the teaching process of their LSEN children. Parents are the most important figures in their children's lives.

Educators and parents have to develop partnerships in order to help one another in the teaching and learning process of LSEN (Donald, 1998:248).

As outsiders, parents know their children better and are able to inform the educators about their children's learning problems. They can help educators to understand their children better, give advice about individual behaviour, contribute to the design and implementation of joint learning support strategies and help with homework such as learning exercises and other activities. If educators would permit them, parents could be a source of information and support (Dyson & Forlin, 1999:122).

Adapted curriculum (3.15): The majority of respondents agreed that LSEN should follow on adapted curriculum in order to learn according to their own pace. The deduction can be made that educators implement the principles of OBE and RNCS, which emphasises curriculum adaptation. A differentiated curriculum makes it possible to accommodate a range of learning styles, place and interest (PGSES, 2003:01).

6 SUMMARY

In this chapter the researcher's aim was to give some order to the range of information provided by the educators in their responses to the questions in the questionnaire. Some of the data collected were of a democratic nature which enables the researcher to construct a broad profile of the sample selected for the investigation. The data collected that dealt with the implementation of inclusive education were organised in frequency tables to simplify the statistical analysis thereof. The frequency of the responses to the questions were interpreted and commented on.

The last chapter of the study will consist of a summary of the literature study and the empirical investigation with findings from both on which certain recommendations will be made.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

	PAGE
6.1 INTRODUCTION	81
6.2 SUMMARY	81
6.2.1 Statement of the problem	81
6.2.2 An historical overview of inclusive education	81
6.2.3 Literature review: implementation of inclusive education	83
6.2.4 Planning of the research	85
6.2.5 Presentation and analysis of research data	85
6.3 FINDINGS	86
6.3.1 Findings from the literature review	86
6.3.2 Findings from the empirical study	86
6.4 RECOMMENDATIONS	88
6.4.1 Pre-service and in-service training	88
6.4.2 Support for educators	90
6.4.3 Further research	92
6.5 SHORTCOMINGS	93
6.6 FINAL REMARKS	93
LIST OF SOURCES	94
APPENDICES	105

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

In this final chapter a summary of the previous chapters will be given. This will be followed by findings from the literature review and empirical research, recommendations and criticism that emanates from the study, and a final remark.

6.2 SUMMARY

6.2.1 Statement of the problem

The problem addressed in this study concerned the educators' perceptions of the implementation of inclusive education in mainstream schools. Special educational needs, problems, difficulties, uncertainties and adjustments were identified as some of the problems that hamper the successful implementation of inclusive education in mainstream schools. Mainstream educators generally felt that they are not adequately trained nor do they have the necessary skills or knowledge to meet the special educational needs of LSEN in their classrooms. Educators' negative perceptions on inclusive education are caused by their feelings of incompetence, lack of resources and the lack of sufficient professional support to assist them to implement inclusive education effectively.

6.2.2 An historical overview of inclusive education

In recent years inclusive education has risen to prominence on the international education agenda. Although the rise of inclusion has been

rapid, it is however, possible to trace a set of long-term historical developments in education of which inclusion is simply the latest to manifest. Inclusive education seems to have arisen from two interrelated but nonetheless distinct processes, namely a reconstruction of notions of disability and wide, social economic and educational developments which are not tied specifically to disability but are more concerned with the role of education in contemporary societies.

In developed countries the process of industrialisation was accompanied by the rise of mass education systems. These systems had to confront the issue of what sort of education, if any, to provide for learners with disabilities. In many countries local and charitable initiatives had been responsible for the establishment of a strictly limited range of special education. Over time, these local initiatives were gradually taken over by the state and developed into a more comprehensive system, in much the same way as had happened in respect of regular education. As a result of this takeover most industrialised countries had a separate special education system that provided for many, if not all, learners with disabilities by the middle of the twentieth century. History thus shows that inclusive education has its origin in relatively rich developed countries that had already applied both extensive and sophisticated regular and special education systems.

In recent years there have been two significant developments internationally in the education of learners with disabilities: first, the integration movement of the 1960s and later, the transformation of this into the "inclusion" movement. The first movement can, however, be seen as a limited attempt to accommodate and support learners with disabilities in regular schools, which remained essentially unchanged. Inclusion is taken to indicate a more through going commitment to create regular schools, which are inherently capable of educating all learners. After these two movements the next development is that the inclusive education movement has become

internationalised. The creation of inclusive schools has come to seem a promising way forward to countries which have hitherto developed less-than-comprehensive special education systems.

Developing countries, however, face somewhat different social and educational issues from the long-industrialised countries and do so in a very different context. For countries with comprehensive and sophisticated special education systems, the issue of inclusion is, regardless of the rhetoric of restructuring, essentially one of the relocation of learners, resources and expertise into an equally comprehensive and sophisticated regular education system. For developing countries without such systems, however, the issue of inclusion is essentially one of extension and development, such that the limited educational provision already available can begin to include a wider range of learners. For a country like South Africa, with its unique history, both sets of issues are likely to be relevant.

6.2.3 **Literature review: implementation of inclusive education**

The review of relevant literature revealed that educators are the agents for change in the formal education of the child. It can thus be said that the successful implementation of inclusive education is largely dependent on the educators in the classroom. However, before the educators can play such a role they need to develop an understanding of why the change is necessary. For the successful implementation of inclusive education educators have to understand the paradigm shift that is associated with a change from teaching in a mainstream class to teaching in an inclusive class. Educators must realise the value of such a change.

Educators' perceptions, attitudes, experience and preparedness concerning inclusion play a vital role in the effectiveness of inclusive education. They are required to rethink their roles, construct new knowledge and acquire

new skills and competencies. For inclusion to be successful educators in the mainstream classroom have to change the following:

- Attitudes towards inclusive education.
- Perceptions of what inclusion entail.
- Preparedness for teaching LSEN.
- Teaching and assessment methods.

The literature indicated that in reality many educators are struggling to come to grips with the associated additional demands of inclusion against the backdrop of “change overload” from which educators are suffering at the moment. Changes seem to come from “the top” with little consideration for the educators’ situation in the classroom. It is therefore not surprising that mainstream educators generally express negative attitudes towards inclusion due to the following:

- Large number of learners in classes.
- Not adequately trained to assist LSEN.
- Lack of relevant knowledge about LSEN.
- Inadequate or no support systems.
- Lack of necessary skills and competencies to deal with LSEN.

The training, knowledge, skills and competencies required for the effective implementation of inclusive education are substantially different from that of mainstream education. The competencies required to teach in an inclusive setting involve being able to adapt curricular content and teaching methods to assist the learners with special education needs. Successful inclusion also means working in collaboration with colleagues, parents and the broader community.

6.2.4 Planning of the research

This study utilised a structured questionnaire that was administered by the researcher in order to establish educators' perceptions on the implementation of inclusive education. The information sought was not available from any other source and had to be acquired directly from the respondents by means of a questionnaire.

With the aim of questioning the mainstream educators about their perceptions on the implementation of inclusive education, random sampling was done in African Primary Schools in the KwaMashu Circuit (Pinetown District) in KwaZulu-Natal. The aim of the questionnaires was to obtain information regarding educators' perceptions on the implementation of inclusive education.

6.2.5 Presentation and analysis of research data

The purpose of chapter 5 was to discuss the data collected from the questionnaires completed by 150 primary school educators and to offer comments and interpretations of the findings. At the outset an explanation and description was provided as to the methods employed in the categorisation of the responses and the analyses of the data. This was followed by calculating the data in frequencies and percentages, known as relative frequency distribution. This was done in order to clarify the presentation of data in that it indicates the proportion of the total number of cases which were observed for a particular question. The findings from the frequency table were interpreted and commented on.

6.3 FINDINGS

6.3.1 Findings from the literature review

From the available and relevant literature it was found that the success of inclusive education largely depends on the educators. Educators are central to the success of inclusion as it places the major responsibility for meeting the special educational needs on the shoulders of mainstream educators. Educators need to be prepared in terms of the following for the successful implementation of inclusive education:

Educators need appropriate and professional training with adequate ongoing training. (cf. 3.2.1)

In-service training must be available to mainstream educators to empower them with the necessary knowledge. Skills and competencies required to teach in inclusive classroom skills. (cf. 3.2.2)

Educators need to be positive in terms of their attitudes, perceptions and beliefs towards LSEN and inclusive education. (cf. 3.4.4)

Adequate support must be available to assist mainstream educators in meeting the challenges that present themselves in the inclusive classroom. Educators need support from their principals, colleagues, special educators, remedial educators, school-based support teams and district support teams. (cf. 3.3)

6.3.2 Findings from the empirical study

From the empirical study the following information was obtained:

The larger percentage of respondents that participated in the research indicated that the following are available at their schools for the implementation of inclusive education. (cf. 5.2.9)

- A school-based support team (52%).
- In-service training opportunities (49%).
- Opportunities for networking (47%).
- A district support team (47%).

The majority of respondents (88%) agreed that they must set an example in accepting LSEN learners in the mainstream classroom. (cf. 3.1)

More than ninety percent (91%) of the participants in the research said that it is necessary for them to change their teaching methods to teach a LSEN in an inclusive class. (cf. 3.2)

According to 95% of the respondents they need more time and special training to meet the special needs of the LSEN as well as networking with educators in similar circumstances. (cf. 3.4; 3.5; 3.6)

Ninety-one percent (91%) of the research sample indicated that they need help from remedial educators to assist them with the learners with special educational needs in their class. (cf. 3.8)

The majority of respondents (96%) said that they must be careful not to discriminate against LSEN. (cf. 3.11)

According to 97% of the participants in the research they have to put in more effort to better understand learners with special education needs. (cf. 3.13)

6.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

6.4.1 Pre-service and in-service training

(1) Motivation

From the findings of the literature review and the empirical investigation it is evident that mainstream educators need to change to implement inclusive education effectively. Most of the educators in the research sample feel that they do not have sufficient knowledge of inclusive education. (cf. 5.2.10; 3.5) The lack of adequate knowledge and appropriate skills cause educators to have negative attitudes and misconceptions concerning the implementation of inclusive education. (cf. 3.4.5)

An important requirement, which became apparent from the literature study (cf. 3.1), is that educators should be involved from the beginning of the process by participating in decision-making. The significance of asking educators' opinion and input on inclusion of LSEN before such change is implemented needs to be stressed. When educators have had a part in the decision-making about inclusive education they will be more inclined to accept and implement it. Being involved in the decision-making about a new programme also minimises negative attitudes and incorrect perceptions.

It is important that the department of education, universities, the school and the community should establish collaborative ventures in comprehensive in-service training to support educators in teaching LSEN. Through effective in-service training programmes, a community and its educators can team up to create an inclusive learning environment. A school climate conducive of inclusion has the ability to respond to the self-identified needs of educators, parents and learners with special educational needs.

(2) Recommendation

In order to better prepare educators for the implantation of inclusive education the following recommendations are made:

Pre-service training

- Courses to address the special needs of LSEN should form part of the curriculum at institutions that train educators.

In-service training

In-service training programmes should address, *inter alia*, the following:

- The ability of educators to identify and assess all disabling conditions.
- Educators' awareness of how to make the classroom and the curriculum adaptable as well as how to effect changes in their teaching and assessment methods to assist LSEN.
- Educators' preparedness and knowledge in cooperative approaches to meet the special needs of learners.
- Knowledge about community and government agencies which can provide assistance to families with LSEN.
- Information of where and who to turn to in order to receive advice and assistance concerning the teaching of learners with special educational needs.

- The inculcating of positive attitudes towards LSEN.
- To instil in educators an understanding that they are responsible for all learners, regardless of their abilities.
- In-service training programmes should include the following in their content:
 - * Coaching
 - * Collaborative
 - * Group problem-solving
 - * Demonstration of therapeutic techniques and materials.
 - * Discussions of case studies
 - * Different teaching methods
 - * Understanding and managing change
 - * Counselling methods

6.4.2 **Support for educators**

(1) **Motivation**

The responsibility of adapting classrooms to accommodate the learning needs of all learners have fallen mostly on the educators. They have to deal with complex dilemmas both in and out the classroom in the process of delivering the learning material in a way which is relevant to the diverse needs of learners. (cf. 5.2.10; 3.3) Educators in an inclusive class most of the time are in need of concrete advice on handling difficult situations to enable them to cope. This often leaves the educator in a situation where trial and error strategies lead to more confusion, conflict and stress. Exhausted and anxious educators are unlikely to adapt to change effectively

and this has negative implications for the successful implementation of inclusive education. (cf. 3.4)

Support for educators in their increasingly demanding roles is vital. Many educators feel that they do not have sufficient training, experience and support to meet many of the challenges presented by learners in an inclusive classroom. (cf. 3.3)

Based on the literature study and the scientific obtained data from the empirical investigation it is evident that educators in the change to inclusive education are in need of increased support. Without adequate support for educators inclusion will remain a theory and will not be put in practice in South African schools, regardless of how many laws are made.

(2) Recommendation

The following recommendations are made with regard to support for mainstream educators in an inclusive classroom:

Classes should be smaller. The ideal educator-learner ratio is 1:30. This can be achieved by increasing the post-provisioning norm in a school, thus increasing the number of educators in a school.

School principals should organise and deploy or redeploy educators effectively and schedule necessary time for educators to do their planning and to learn new skills.

The school environment should be one of collaboration in inclusive education which offers the opportunity for capitalising on the diverse and specialised knowledge of educators and enables schools to provide quality learning support for all their learners.

- Governing bodies must stay informed as to the latest policies which support inclusive education.
- A school support team, comprising mainly educators of the school itself, must be established. The support team should be coordinated by a staff member who has received specialised training.
- A district support team must be available to provide support to schools and other learning sites. This team will consist of a core of education support personnel with the competencies to fulfil their role in the schools in the district, as well as a network of support resources in the area concerned.

6.4.3 **Further research**

(1) **Motivation**

As South Africa is in the early stages of implementing inclusive education, the role of educators have been recognised as one of the critical features for the effective implementation of inclusive education in mainstream schools. It is generally assumed that educators who have a negative perception would reject LSEN in their classes.

(2) **Recommendations**

Further research of a quantitative and qualitative nature must be undertaken with the aim of developing well-planned strategies to equip mainstream educators to cope with a diversity of learners in an inclusive class.

6.5 SHORTCOMINGS

Criticism that emanates from this study includes the following:

- The possibility exists that educators' perceptions regarding the implementation of inclusive education have been drawn from the media.
- The educators' responses to the questionnaire on how they perceive the implementation of inclusive education could have been rooted in political judgements.
- Although anonymity was required in the questionnaire the possibility exists that, because of the educators' cautiousness, they might not have been frank and truthful in their responses.
- The sensitive nature of items in the questionnaire might have elicited false or misleading responses and influenced the reliability of the results.

6.6 FINAL REMARKS

This study reported on research on educators' perceptions of the implementation of inclusive education. It can be concluded that there are some impediments that hamper the effective implementation of inclusive education in South Africa. If these impediments are not intentionally addressed, they could become critical barriers to the successful implementation of the policy of inclusive education.

LIST OF SOURCES

- ADAM, B. & GILMOUR, J.D. 1999. The new wine in an old skin: certification and changes in South African education. Paper presented at the Port St Johns conference on inclusive education on 22 June 1999.
- BAKER, M. 1993. *Thinking through the curriculum*. London: Blackwell.
- BARLEY, J. 1998. *Medical and psychological models*. London: Routledge.
- BEST, J.W. & KAHN, S.V. 1993. *Research in education*. Randburg: Landman & Bodenstein.
- BLESS, C. & HIGSON-SMITH, C. 1995. *Fundamentals of social research methods: an African perspective*. Cape Town: Juta
- BOOYSEN, M.I. 2004. *Perspectives on learning difficulties: international concerns and South African approaches*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- BOTHMA, M. & GRAVETT, S. 2000. The attitude of primary school teachers towards inclusive education. *South African Journal of Education*, 20(3):200-203.
- BOUWER, A.C. & DU TOIT, L.D. 2000 . The At Risk Disk: differential identification of intellectual and specific learning disability by teacher-teams in regular schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 20(3):214-247.
- BRITON, L. 2003. *Special education and social interests*. London: Croom Helm.

BYNNER, J. & WILSON, M. 1989. *Research methods in education and social science*. New Jersey: Open University.

CARE, A. 1990. *Involvement in learning of low-achieving student*. London: Blackwell.

CARRINGTON, S. 1999. *Radical analysis of special education*. London: Falmer.

CECIL, M.A. & FORMAN, S.E. 1990. Effects of stress in occupation training and co-worker support groups on teachers' stress. *Journal of School Psychology*, 28:105-118.

CHARLTON, T. & DAVID, K. 1993. *Ensuring schools are fit for the future: managing misbehaviour in schools*. London: Routledge.

CHETTY, C. 2004. *The effect of distress on educator efficacy*. KwaDlangezwa: University of Zululand. (D.Ed thesis)

CONNER, C. 1991. *Assessment and testing in the primary school*. London: Falmer.

COATES, R.D. 1989. The regular education initiative and opinions of regular classroom teachers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 22(9):532-536.

COOPER, H.M. 1989. *Integrating research*. London: Croom Helm.

COWIE, B.C. 1995. *Advanced learner's dictionary of current English*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

CULTTA, R.A. & TOMPKINS, J.R. 1999. *Fundamentals of special education schools*. London: Routledge.

DANE, F.C. 1990. *Research methods*. California: Brooke.

DANIELS, H. & PHILIPS, G. 2000. *Inclusive education. Special education reformed*. London: Kegan.

DAVIDOFF, S. & LAZARUS, S. 1997. *The learning school: an organization development approach*. Cape Town: Juta.

DAVIES, J. & GREEN, L. 1998. Mainstream teachers' attitudes to the mainstreaming of learners with special educational needs in primary classrooms: a Western Cape study. *South African Journal of Education*, 18(2):97-102.

DE VOS, A.S. 2001. *Research at grass roots*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

DoE (Department of Education). 1997. *Quality education for all: overcoming barriers to learning and development*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

DoE (Department of Education). 1999. Consultative paper No. 1 on special education: building on the Inclusive education and training system. Pretoria: Government Printer.

DoE (Department of Education). 2000. Draft white paper on special needs education: building an Inclusive education and training system. Pretoria: Government Printer.

DoE (Department of Education). 2001. White paper 6: building an inclusive education and training system. Pretoria: Government Printer.

DoE (Department of Education). 2002. Draft guidelines for the implementation of inclusive education. Pretoria: Government Printer.

DoE (Department of Education). 2003. Guidelines on the implementation of inclusive education. Pietermaritzburg: Government Printer.

DONALD, D. 1997. *Educational psychology in social context and special needs in South Africa*. London: Oxford University Press.

DOORLAG, H. 1995. *Teaching special students in the mainstream*. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.

DU TOIT, S.J. & KRUGER, N. 1994. *The child: an educational perspective*. Durban: Butterworths.

DYSON, E. & FORLIN, D. 1999. *An international perspective on inclusion*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

ENGELBRECHT, P. 1999. *A theoretical framework for inclusive education. Draft guidelines for the implementation of inclusive education*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

ENGELBRECHT, P.; ELOFF, I & NEWMARK R. 1997. Support in inclusive education. *South African Journal of Education*, 17:51-84.

ENGELBRECHT, P., GREEN, L. & NAICKER, S.M. 1997. Inclusive schooling: the South African experience. Paper presented at conference on Inclusive Schooling: Brisbane, Australia 1 November 1997.

ENGELBRECHT, P.; GREEN, L.; NAICKER, S. & ENGELBRECHT, L. 1999. *Inclusive education in action in South Africa*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

ENGELBRECHT, P. & HALL, R. 1999. The possible role of special schools in inclusive education. *South African Journal of Education*, 10(3):203-234.

ENGELBRECHT, P. & KRIEGLER, S.M. 1995. Study Unit 3: classroom management in educational management. Tutorial letter ONB453-H104/95, Pretoria: UNISA.

ENGELBRECHT, P. & KRIEGLER, S.M. 1996. *A theoretical framework for inclusive education*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

ENGELBRECHT, P.; SWART, E. & ELOFF, I. 2001. Stress and coping skills of teachers with a learner with Down's syndrome in an inclusive classroom. *South African Journal of Education*, 21(4):254-259.

EVANS, P. 1997. *Structuring curriculum for pupils with learning difficulties*. London & New York: Global Agenda.

FISHER, D. 2005. Manual for Workshop conducted on inclusive education for the Foundation Phase Educators on 8 April 2005 in Durban: Pietermaritzburg: Department of Education.

FULLAN, M.G. 1992. *Understanding teaching development*. New York: Teaching College Press.

GILBREATH, D. & MOORE, C. 1998. *Educating students with disabilities in general education classrooms: a summary of research*. Oregon: Western Regional Resource Centre.

GODDARD, W. & MELVILLE, S. 2001. *Research Methodology*. Cape Town: Juta.

GOOD, C.V. 1999. *Dictionary of education*. London: McGraw-Hill.

HAGEDON, R. & LABOVITZ, S. 1989. *Introduction to social research*. McGraw-Hill.

HALL, R. 1999. *Formal support in inclusion in action in South Africa*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

HALLAHAN, D.P. & KAUFFMAN, J.M. 2000. *Exceptional learners, introduction to special education*. Virginia: University Press.

HAWITT, L. & CRAMER, D. 2001. Education for all: an approach to accommodate diversity. *Educare*, 28:1 and 2:10-24.

HAY, J.F. 2001. Teachers' preparedness for inclusive education. *South African Journal of Education*, 21(4): 213-218.

HEGARTY, B.; MEIJER, C. & PIJIL, S.J. 1999. *Inclusive education: Global Agenda*, London: T.J. Press.

HUYSAMEN, G.K. 1989. *Introductory statistics and research design*. Cape Town: Academica.

KISANJI, J. 1998. The march towards inclusive education in non-Western countries: retracing the steps. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2(1):55-72.

KRUGER, A.G. 1995. Study unit 3: classroom management in Education Management. Tutorial letter ONB453-H/104/195. Pretoria: UNISA.

LABON, D. 1997. *Integration developments in member countries of the OECD*. New York: Global Agenda.

LABOVITZ, S. & HAGEDON, R. 1998. *Introduction to social research*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

LEWIS, R.B. & DOORLAG, D.H. 1995. *Teaching special students in the mainstream* 4ed. Columbus: Ohio Menill.

LIPSKY, D.K. & GARTNER, A. 1997. *Inclusion and school reform: transforming America's classrooms*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks.

McMILLAN, J.M. & SCHUMACHER, S. 1997. *Research in education: a conceptual introduction*. New York: Harper Collins.

MEUMEN, L.W. 2000. *Social research method*. London: Allyn & Bacon.

MEYER, P. 2003. *Identification of learning difficulties*. Pinetown: Pinetown Printers.

MITLER, P.C.; SINASON, M. 1996. Special needs education: an international perspective. *British Journal of Special Education*, 22(3):105-108.

MOUTON, J. 1996. *Understanding social research*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

MULDER, J.C. 1989. *Statistical techniques in education*. Pretoria: Haum.

NAICKER, S. 1999. *Inclusive education in South Africa, in Inclusive Education in action in South Africa*, edited by P. Engelbrecht; L. Green; S. Naicker & L. Engelbrecht. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

NDAWI, C. & PERUSUH, S. 1998. *An international perspective on inclusion*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

NORVAL, A.J. 1990. *Ondersoek na navorsingsmetodologie*. Pretoria: RGN.

PAGE, T.G. & THOMAS, J.B. 1987. *Interactive learning: consultation and collaboration in a special program*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

PGSES. (Psychology and Special Education Service) 2003. *Inclusive education guidelines for school managers*. Durban: Government Printers.

PLUG, C.; MEYER, W.F.; LOUW, D.A. & GOUWS, L.A. 1991. *Psigologie woordeboek*. Johannesburg, Lexicon.

PORTER, G.L. 1997. *Critical elements for inclusive school*. London: Routledge.

PRINSLOO, E. 2001. Working towards inclusive education in SA classrooms. *South African Journal of Education* 21(3): 344-345.

RNCS (REVISED NATIONAL CURRICULUM STATEMENT). 2003. *Workshop manual for school management teams*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

ROBINSON, P. 1997. *Literacy, numeracy and economic performance*. London: Centre for Economic Performance.

RSA (Republic of South Africa) 1996. Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. Pretoria: Government Printer

ROWNTREE, D. 1990. A dictionary of education. Pretoria: Harper & Row.

SARANTAKOS, S. 1988. *Social research*. Sydney: Palgrave Publishers.

SCHNETLER, J. (ed.) 1993. *Survey methods and practice*. Pretoria: HSRC.

SCHOEMAN, M. 1997. School for all: 17 new approaches to what school is about. Lecture presented at the Teacher Information Seminar of the Gauteng Department of Education and Down's syndrome Association of SA in Pretoria

SCHUMACHER, J.B. & MEILLON, D.C. 1993. Towards the development of an intervention model for the learning – disabled adolescent. University of Kansas Institute. *Exceptional Education*. 3(4):45-71.

SEBBA, J. & AINSCOW, M. 1996. International developments in inclusive schooling. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 26(1):5-18.

SETHOSA M.F. 2001. Assisting teachers to support mildly intellectually disabled learners in the foundation phase in accordance with the policy of inclusion. Pretoria: UNISA. (DEd thesis)

SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLS ACT, Act No. 84 of 1996. *Government Gazette of the Republic of South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

SPAFFORD, C.S. 1998. *The cyclopaedic education dictionary*. New York: Delmar Publishers.

STRANGVIK, G. 1997. *Beyond schooling. International inclusive education policy perspective*. London: Global Agenda.

TERRY, P.G. & THOMAS, J.B. 1997. *International Dictionary of Education*. London: Nichols Publishing.

THOMSON, G.O.B. 1998. *Inclusive education: a sulphating paradigm*. Paper presented at the conference "Towards inclusive education in South Africa". Stellenbosch 6-8 April 1998.

UNESCO (UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION). 1994. *Final report on the world conference on special needs education*. Paris: UNESCO.

VAN DEN AARDWEG, E.M. & VAN DEN AARDWEG, E.D. 1990. *Dictionary of empirical education / educational psychology*. Pretoria: E & E Enterprises.

VAN RENSBURG, C.J.J.; LANDMAN, W.A. & BODENSTEIN, H.C. 1994. *Basic concepts in education*. Halfway House: Orion.

VLACHOU, A.D. 1997. *Struggles for inclusive education: an ethnographic study*. Buckingham, Open University Press.

WEEKS, F.H. 2000. *Behaviour problems in classrooms: a model for teachers to assist learners with unmet emotional needs*. Pretoria: UNISA.

WILSON, M. & BYNNER, J. 1989. *Research method in education and social science*. New York: Open University.

YSSELDYKE, J.E. & ALGOZZINE, J.E. 2000. *Special education, practical approach for teachers*. London: Longman.

ANNEXURE 'A'

Questionnaire

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

QUESTIONNAIRE

*Implementation
of
inclusive education*

Mrs D N Zulu
November 2004

Dear Educator

QUESTIONNAIRE: IMPLEMENTATION OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

At present I am engaged in a research project towards my MEd (Master in Education) degree at the University of Zululand under the guidance of Proff. G. Urbani and M S Vos. The research is concerned with the *Implementation of inclusive education*

I have taken the liberty of writing to you, as one of the selected respondents, in order to seek your assistance in acquiring information about your experiences relating to the research.

CONFIDENTIALITY

All information will be regarded as **CONFIDENTIAL**, and no personal details of any educator/respondent will be mentioned in the findings, nor will any of the results be related to any particular educator or school.

We deeply appreciate your co-operation.

Yours sincerely

.....
Mrs D N Zulu

.....
Date

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE RESPONDENT

1. Please read through each statement carefully **before** giving your opinion.
2. Please make sure that you do not **omit** a question, or skip any page.
3. Please be totally **frank** when giving your opinion.
4. Please **do not** discuss statements with anyone.
5. Please **return** the questionnaire after completion.

Kindly answer **all the questions** by supplying the requested information in writing, or by making a cross (X) in the appropriate block.

1.5 My post level is:

	Code
Principal	1
Deputy principal	2
HOD	3
Educator (level 1)	4

1.6 Type of post held by me:

	Code
Permanent	1
Temporary	2
Part time	3

1.7 My employer is:

	Code
Department of Education	1
Governing body	2

1.8 My school is classified as:

	Code
Junior primary	1
Senior primary school	2
Combined primary school	3

LSEN = Learners with special educational needs

SECTION TWO: SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

		Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
	The following facilities/strategies for successful inclusion are available at my school:			
2.1	An assessment team to evaluate LSEN for special teaching methods			
2.2	A record of LSEN to help educators with the identification of a specific impairment			
2.3	A school-based support team to assist educators with LSEN			
2.4	In-service training opportunities for mainstream educators to better cope with LSEN			
2.5	Sufficient funds for resources to facilitate effective teaching of LSEN			
2.6	Opportunities for networking between special education and mainstream educators			
2.7	A school governing body that actively supports inclusive education			
2.8	A management team with sufficient knowledge to implement inclusive education			
2.9	A policy to eliminate discriminating attitudes toward LSEN			
2.10	Special life-skills programmes for the integration of LSEN in mainstream classes			
2.11	A District Support Team to assist the school with inclusion problems			
2.12	Sufficient funding from the department to restructure mainstream classes to accommodate LSEN			
2.13	Easy access facilities to school buildings for physically impaired learners			
2.14	Procedures to deal with harassment of LSEN			
2.15	Educational support services for parents with LSEN			

SECTION THREE: EDUCATORS PERCEPTIONS OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

		Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
	In the mainstream class inclusive of LSEN:			
3.1	I must set an example in accepting LSEN learners			
3.2	It is necessary to change my teaching methods.			
3.3	I experience difficulties in meeting the needs of the diversity of learners.			
3.4	More time is needed to meet the needs of LSEN.			
3.5	I need more (special) training to assist LSEN.			
3.6	Networking with educators in similar circumstances is necessary.			
3.7	The number of learners in the class makes individual attention difficult.			
3.8	I need help from remedial educators.			
3.9	I experience negative feelings towards LSEN.			
3.10	Unacceptable behaviour of LSEN must not be overlooked.			
3.11	I must be careful not to discriminate against LSEN.			
3.12	Teaching LSEN needs more tolerance (patience).			
3.13	More effort is required to better understand LSEN.			
3.14	More parental involvement is required.			
3.15	LSEN should follow an adapted curriculum.			

ANNEXURE 'B'

**Letter seeking permission to conduct
research**

<i>Address: 62 Nordic Court</i>	P O Box 93098	<i>Tel: (031) 306 8450</i>
<i>57 Broad Street</i>	Inanda	<i>Cell: 072 456 4764</i>
<i>Durban</i>	4310	<i>Work: (031) 518 7217</i>
<i>4001</i>		

November 04 2004

The Circuit Manager: Dr G N Msimango
KwaMashu Circuit
Private Bag X018
KwaMASHU

Dear Dr Msimango

PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

At present I am engaged in a research project towards my MEd. (Master in Education) degree at the University of Zululand (Umlazi Campus) under the guidance of Prof. M S Vos.

The research is concerned with Educators' Perceptions of the Implementation of Inclusive Education. For the purpose of research a questionnaire was developed, which I need to administer to educators in Junior Primary schools. A copy of the questionnaire is enclosed for your inspection and it should not take more than 15 minutes to complete. All information obtained from the questionnaires will be dealt with in the strict confidence, and anonymity is assured.

I kindly request your written permission to administer the questionnaire to your Junior Primary schools in the KwaMashu Circuit.

Yours truly

D N ZULU (Mrs)

ANNEXURE 'C'

**Letter from the Department of
Education granting permission to
conduct research**



PROVINCE OF KWAZULU-NATAL
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
UMNYANGO WEMFUNDO

COASTAL CLUSTER : PINETOWN DISTRICT
MAFUKUZELA-GANDHI CIRCUIT

Address	<i>A186-7 Musa Road</i>	Private Bag	<i>X018</i>	Telephone	<i>031-5031177</i>
Ikheli	<i>KWAMASHU</i>	Isikhwama sePosi	<i>KWAMASHU</i>	Ucingo	<i>031-5031177</i>
Adres	<i>4360</i>	Privaatsak	<i>4360</i>	Toll Free No.	<i>0800 360691</i>
				Fax	<i>031-5031178</i>
Enquiries		Reference		Date	
Imibuzo		Inkomba		Usuku	

MRS DN ZULU
PRINCIPAL
MANDOSI SCHOOL

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

PERMISSION GRANTED FOR RESEARCH

Permission is hereby granted to Mrs DN Zulu to conduct research in the KwaMashu Circuit Schools.

MR MS MAJOLA
FOR CIRCUIT MANAGER