The understanding and practice of inclusive education in a
Jewish community school in South Africa

By

Adrienne Meltz

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment

of the requirements of the degree of

PhD

University of Pretoria

Education Management and Policy Studies

2013

Abstract

This qualitative study, pursued within a one–site case study, explores the understanding and implementation of inclusive education in an independent Jewish community school in Johannesburg, South Africa nineteen years post democracy. It analyses the phenomenon of inclusion in a school with a community ethos of care and belonging whose context is by definition exclusionary on grounds of a particular social category, religion. Because of its exclusionary agenda the school can be paradoxically positioned as inclusive on grounds of strong communal values. The school however, struggles with difference and diversity of a certain kind, despite its purportedly strong communal spirit and strong religious culture. This study set out to probe how stakeholders understood inclusive education in an attempt to explain how this influenced their practice of inclusive education.

Lewin's theory of Planned Change and four belief systems were utilized to examine the understanding and practice of stakeholders at the school. The study suggested that the four belief systems influenced the way in which inclusive education was both understood and practised in this school. The study argued for the recognition of the importance of different belief systems in the implementation of inclusion in South Africa.

The main research question which guided the study was:

How has inclusive education policy been implemented in a mono-cultural community school in South Africa, with the three sub–questions being:

1. How do the various school stakeholders understand the concept of inclusion and what are their attitudes towards inclusion?
2. How is inclusive education managed at class, school and community level?
3. To what extent do their attitudes and understandings influence their practice of inclusive education?

It was conducted within an interpretative/constructivist research paradigm and utilized a case study design. It relied on qualitative methods of data generation such as insider interviews, personal accounts and document analysis. The participants were drawn from four stakeholder groups, namely, teachers, parents, middle managers and top managers.

The descriptions of the stakeholders' understandings that emerged in this study highlighted how belief systems determined the action towards inclusive education and how despite the school being a community school, the community discourse did not prevail in the actions towards inclusive education, it was the individual beliefs which vied for dominance which determined inclusive action. This resulted in a qualified and fragmented inclusion and in some cases exclusion. The findings were linked to Lewin's planned approach to change including field theoretical and group dynamic theories. The study concluded that the four belief systems influenced the way in which inclusive education was both understood and practised in this school and the study argued for the recognition of the importance of different belief systems in the implementation of inclusion in South Africa.

Key words
South Africa, Jewish community school, inclusive education, Lewin's Theory, special needs, disability, beliefs, faith–based, conditional inclusion, qualitative research, insider interviews, document analysis, case study, interpretative/constructivist.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 Introduction

Inclusiveness is no new idea – it involves an ideology that liberates people from their own prejudices and short-sightedness. In the process, other people are therefore also freed from the imprisonment of their prejudices and everyone is included in a liberated community. The road to this kind of freedom might be a long one, but each step brings us closer.

(Landsberg 2005:v)

1.1 Purpose statement

Prior to democracy in 1994, the dominant discourse in South African education was the medical deficit model. This deficit model regarded the individual as needing to be cured outside of the regular education system. Deficiencies of the system were ignored and those operating it were vindicated of all responsibility, thus attaching the cause of deficiency to the individual and not the system (Naicker, 2006).

This model borrows terminology and practices from the medical domain to diagnose children's limitations against developmental and functional norms. The proponents of this model diagnose, label and treat in order to fix or cure identified children (Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009).

Subscribers of this model view normality or 'ablesim' as being the perfect body and agree that deviation away from ableness results in disability and a diminished human state. They have a collective belief that impairment is inherently negative and if not ameliorated, cured or eliminated, should be silenced (Kumari Campbell, 2008:151).

These social reactions to impairment resulting from the methodical exclusion of disability from schools and other social environments, produces a cycle of normality, difference and procedures to cure which are strengthened by the dual system of special education and regular education (Hamre & Oyler, 2004).

Education strengthens these practices by the building of special schools, the training of special teachers, and making the disabled the objects of endless testing and measurement. Because education works on the principle of normalisation, it includes in as much as it excludes. The belief in a 'common referent' or norm against which disability is measured (Graham & Slee, 2008:281) pervades education and concurrently limits a range of possibilities for inclusive education (Slee, 2001).

With democracy in South Africa came a shift in ideological thinking from the medical deficit model to the social model based on principles of social justice. One of the guiding principles of this model and in direct contrast to the medical model of diagnosis, blame and cure, is the principle that attitudes, values and beliefs in society cause disability, and therefore society needs to be treated and cured (Johnstone, 2001, Oliver, 1996 in Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009). By incorporating the principles of social justice, this model sees education as the catalyst for overcoming the prejudicial attitudes by society towards people with impairments (Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009). According to Winzer & Mazurek, (2010) this model is the chief principle upon which inclusion is founded and says Guzman Johannesen (2010) is about action taken to ensure that equity in education and freedom from discrimination are achieved.

It is this type of mind-set contends Schugurensky, (2010) that is capable of producing a society, which places high value on human dignity. Similarly the study suggested that one's mind-set influences action and in this case, the practice of inclusive education.

In education the social model is operationalized by means of inclusive schooling (Winzer & Mazurek, 2010) and more broadly views education as a vehicle to overcome prejudicial attitudes towards disabled people in society (Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009). Education, within this model, would comprise very different practices from those provided within the medical deficit model and would need to undergo a significant change in principles and practices when providing for disabled children. Curriculum approaches, classroom management, and the ethos of all stakeholders would have to change in order to rupture current stereotypical and

discriminating attitudes. Advocates of the social model envisage an environment where segregated schooling would be replaced with schools which are accessible and provide the space and the structures for participation for all (Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009).

The above models provide the substance for the argument that the discourse one adopts carries powerful messages for practice. For example, a medical deficit viewpoint, views understandings of inclusion entrenched in normative discourses promoting tolerance rather than inclusion. The social model instead argues that disabilities and difficulties should not lessen equal access and participation in education and society and contends that through inclusive education equity in education and society could be achieved.

Returning to South Africa, inclusive education became a possibility after the first democratic elections in 1994, when the Bill of Rights provided expectations for it. The elections in South Africa coincided with the Salamanca Statement and the guiding principles of this document, produced under the auspices of UNESCO in 1994, spoke to the prevailing philosophy in South Africa, that schools should accommodate all children despite their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic or other circumstances (Greyling, 2009). South Africa faced the challenge to change from past unsatisfactory and separatist educational experiences (Nel, Muller, Hugo, Helldin, Backmann, Dwyer & Skarlind, 2011) to the development of an inclusive education system (DoE 2001).

In order to address this challenge the Ministry appointed a National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training (NCSNET) and a National Committee on Education Support Services (NCESS) in October 1996. Their joint findings resulted in a recommendation that the South African education system promote education for all and foster the development of inclusive and supportive centres of learning. And so in 2001, Education White Paper 6: Special Education: Building an inclusive education and training system (WP6) arose (DoE, 2001).

The paper outlines six principles which highlight capacity building, leadership, collaboration, support through several services, provision and access, curriculum assessment and quality assurance, advocacy and appropriate and adequate funding support (Pather, 2007).

The White Paper also emphasises that all learners can learn and are entitled to support. It suggests that education structures could meet the needs of all learners, acknowledging and respecting their differences by changing attitudes and environments to maximize the participation of all of them (Hay & Beyers, 2011).

Yet despite WP6 inclusive education practice is not happening consistently or at all in South Africa and Pather (2011) argues that the tensions between the beliefs of those with the individual-deficit mind-set and those with the social mind-set are evident in the challenge of policy translating into practice.

Currently, both the above discourses are still playing out in South African education with some children included in, while others excluded from, mainstream education. Inclusion appears to be practised in pockets within South Africa and as Basson (2011) found even within the same school different degrees of inclusion were being practised. He concluded that teachers' inclusive practices were likely to be sustained in a short to medium period as teachers employed practices they have learnt. They would then revert back and draw on personal practices entrenched in their teaching repertoire.

One can argue that the belief of exclusion had become so entrenched in the national psyche and many South African teachers, who are currently teaching, were trained in and began their teaching careers within a paradigm that held fast to the idea of the correctness of exclusion. Similarly, Pather (2007) found that mainstream teachers and especially those who were born and brought up in a context which centred on two separate systems of education, assumed that disabled learners were better provided for in special schools.

It therefore appears that the eradication of apartheid did not mean the end of conservatism in education. This resulted in inhibited growth of a shared inclusive school philosophy (Engelbrecht, Oswald & Forlin, 2006).

However, in some communities, there is evidence of an unrestrained shared inclusive school philosophy and Pather, (2011:1114) believes it is feasible that in these cases there is an understanding of inclusion which 'is value-based and about community, rights, compassion, belonging and respect'. He found that in a certain community disability was accepted without tedious red tape on background. Furthermore, this community school had reported never having excluded a learner on the grounds of non-payment of school fees.

In this community peer and family support was evident, as for example transport arrangements which involved a lift club as opposed to a special needs bus. Community support was further noted when addressing the needs of learners with physical disabilities by means of make-shift concrete ramps, specially modified toilets and concreted assembly areas. Most significantly, there was evidence of an understanding of inclusion which was based on community values of belonging and respect (Pather, 2011).

Walton (2011:243) too emphasised the role of the community in supporting inclusion. She referred specifically to schools in poor areas which were characterised by "Ubuntu" in spite of the fact that they had very limited resources. "Ubuntu" is the African philosophy of being that says, 'I am because we are, or I am fully human in relationship with others', and emphasises co–operation and sharing of resources.

It seems that in some cases a community has the power to influence the practice of inclusion. This study enters the debate by exploring the implementation of inclusive education in a community school. The question to ask is why was implementation difficult in a school where one would assume inclusion would be a natural occurrence.

This is a case study of the understanding and implementation of inclusive education at an independent Jewish community school in Johannesburg, South Africa. It explored

the many challenges and complications constraining the implementation of inclusive education and the concurrent motivations which further its aims.

The study proposed that in order to understand the community school's (hereafter referred to as the School) position regarding inclusive education, it was necessary to determine the understanding of the various stakeholders regarding inclusive education, as their understanding is regarded as a powerful influence on their practice of it. The purpose of this study was to explore, describe and analyse how the inclusive education policy had been understood and implemented at the School. It was argued that forces in the form of individual and group norms entrenched in community culture generate discourses. These discourses guide an individual's thinking and understanding of the meaning of inclusive education.

My central proposition was that the stakeholders' beliefs guided and modelled their understanding and the consequent implementation of inclusive education. I argued that there were four conflicting beliefs or discourses which vied for dominance of inclusive practice. Inclusive practice met with resistance from those stakeholders whose belief systems comprised balance and resources and separate education. Alternatively, inclusion met with acceptance and impetus from those stakeholders whose belief systems favoured equality and human rights. The study argued further that at this site of struggle, a fragmented and conditional practice of inclusive education was evident and where inclusion was practiced, it was maintained by individuals with a passion for social justice.

1.2 Research questions

The study focused on the following research questions.

How has inclusive education policy been implemented in a mono-cultural community school in South Africa?

The research sub-questions are:
- How do the various school stakeholders understand the concept of inclusion and what are their attitudes towards inclusion?

- How is inclusive education managed at class, school and community level?
- To what extent do attitudes and understandings influence practice of inclusive education?

1.3 Methodology

These questions were explored within an intepretative/constructivist research paradigm. This paradigm assumes a relativist ontology that suggests there are multiple realities and that the researcher and participant cocreate these realities and understandings in the natural world (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). I have chosen qualitative research because when studying a complex phenomenon such as inclusive education it is necessary to examine its characteristics through the eyes of the individual. In other words, qualitative research lends itself to the understanding of the subjective world of human experience. Cohen, Manion & Morrison, (2000) believe that each individual's reality is multi-layered and requires interpretation. The strategy used was a case study and the method of collecting data were insider interviews, personal accounts and document analysis.

The aim of the methodology of this thesis was to elicit the discourses in ways that give appropriate attention to each without muting any one discourse. It was also interested in the forces which pushed and pulled towards or away from this type of education. This was investigated by drawing out the various stakeholders' responses, understandings and experiences.

1.4 Rationale

I have worked as the Head of Academic Support at the School for 7 years. During this time I was frequently confronted by management and teacher negativity, demanding parents, and prejudiced and marginalized learners. It seemed many stakeholders regarded the learners who experienced barriers to learning with apprehension, fear, anger and resentment. They seemed excessively concerned about the possible consequences these children could have on the resources and the academic results at the School. Conversely there were stakeholders who embraced all learners and

focused on quality teaching for all. It appeared that stakeholders were divided in their thinking and feelings towards inclusive education.

It was these issues as well as my personal journey which motivated this study. I was formerly employed in a so–called Model C school in apartheid South Africa. There I was exposed to the horrors of an unjust and discriminatory educational system. This experience shaped my belief that access to equal and quality education must be provided to all. In addition, my experience of being white, middle-class, able and included into the 'centre' without tenure shaped my compassion for 'others' (Graham & Slee, 2008:279).

As my own subjective reality is inextricably interwoven within the research context, it is important that I make transparent my own beliefs of inclusive education. Like the prominent assumption in Education White Paper 6: Special Education: Building an inclusive education and training system (WP6) (DoE, 2001), I too believe that all learners can learn and all learners need support, albeit for some it might only be at specific stages in their schooling career, while others would need more intensive support. I believe inclusion is a means to remove barriers, improve outcomes and eradicate discrimination and that it is possible to achieve if all stakeholders assume the responsibility and commit to develop programmes in schools which account for human variation. However I want to acknowledge that within the context of this thesis and when talking about inclusion, I will be referring only to the learners who needed intensive academic support, as it was these learners who were targeted as bringing down standards and tipping the balance of excellence at the School. Furthermore, it seemed to be a perception by some stakeholders that inclusion is about children who need intensive support.

My observations at the School led me to a number of critical questions. How could I understand a situation where stakeholders responded so differently to and thought so differently about education? How were these contending responses and conceptions to be understood and explained specifically in a community school which had an exclusionary agenda, religion, as well as an inclusive agenda, communal values?

This led me to an exploration of the literature on inclusive education and I found that while there was some literature on the implementation of inclusive policy in state schools, there was very little literature on independent schools (Engelbrecht 2006, Gous 2009) and no literature which explores its understanding and implementation in a faith-based community school. Furthermore, according to Herman (2004), there is no critical analysis of Jewish education in South Africa.

This study therefore examined the responses of stakeholders to determine the extent to which the discourse of inclusiveness complements the community discourse, and the extent of the challenges which stand in the way of the community school including learners who experience barriers. The knowledge gained will inform educational research of the understanding and practice of inclusive education, while greater conceptual clarity will inform teachers that this educational policy could be the healing relationship between an exclusive past and the ultimate goal for social justice (Artiles, Harris-Murri & Rostenberg, 2006).

Besides allowing me to reflect on and share my understanding of the concepts and practices of inclusive education in a Jewish community school, this study provides the reader with a deeper understanding of it and of aspects of Lewin's Theory of Planned Change as a conceptual framework.

1.5 The limits of the research

This is a qualitative case study of the stakeholders' understandings of inclusive education in a Jewish community school. By virtue of its nature this study does not allow for the evidence produced to be generalized. Cohen et al (2000) argue that case study results may only be generalizable to readers who see their purpose. Also, they may present bias as they are not open to cross-checking. The research took place over a period of ten months. It could therefore not provide more than a glimpse of how practice could influence change.

Another limitation was being an 'insider' I am well known to the participants and my opinions on my research topic are acknowledged. Because it is well known that I feel

strongly about my subject and am involved on all levels, this might have affected the information they chose to give me.

In addition, the power relations between the participants and me need to be made clear. Because of my position in the organization, I have the authority to accept supported children into the School. For some, this generated high emotions and in these cases there was a strained relationship with them which also affected some of the friendships.

Insiderness brought about the dilemma of what I had to tell participants before and after the fact and how I would use the incidental data gathered in the staffroom or on campus. Incidental data which I received through casual chats identified the difference between what encompasses research and what encompasses voyeurism. Yet while insiderness is a limitation, it is also a strength.

As I was on middle management at the School as well as part of the community at the time of this study, I have a personal knowledge of the school and its stakeholders. Also, my perspective and position in the School placed me in a subjective and emotional position, as, my beliefs and values have dominated the change process.

Another limitation, regarded by Brannick & Cochlan, (2007:70) as 'loyalty tugs', is my loyalty to my school and community: so I needed to be aware of interpreting and presenting the data without bias. Through reflexivity I was constantly aware of the strengths and limits of my preunderstanding and as Brannick & Cochlan (2007) suggest, I needed to be aware of both my roles as researcher and insider and the demands they each made on me.

1.6 Organization of the thesis

This thesis is made up of seven chapters, a reference list and appendices. It is organized in the following manner.

Chapter two presents a literature review which will examine the terminology and relevant discourses in the inclusive education domain. This will be followed by an

international perspective, an investigation into inclusive education in South Africa pre and post 1994, and the history of the Jewish community in Johannesburg. The literature review indicates not only that there are misconceptions in the global and local understandings of inclusive education, but that these misconceptions are based on certain assumptions and thus result in insidious exclusions.

Chapter three provides a theoretical framework. Lewin's Theory of Planned Changed serves as the basis for uncovering the characteristics and significance of forces which play a role in the stakeholders' understanding of inclusive education and its ensuing implementation. This theory proposes that the stability of human behaviour is supported by a force-field with driving and restraining forces which are attached to group norms. For change to occur the force-field needs to be transformed and the restraining forces must be removed (Schein, 1996). I show how the identified four belief systems were the forces which influenced the understanding and implementation of this kind of education at the School.

Chapter four is an exposition of the framework for the research design and methodology. I provide information on the data collection processes, the instruments including interviews, document analysis and personal accounts which were used for collecting the data, the method of purposive sampling which was used for selection of participants, and the procedures followed. Information is provided on a qualitative, interpretative/constructivist case study and descriptions of reliability and credibility are provided in this chapter.

Chapter five analyses the history of inclusion at the School from the 1980s until the present, and provides the context of the case study. Furthermore it indicates growth points in the development of inclusive education at the School and provides the backdrop to allow the reader to understand how and why different aspects of this type of education were practised.

In Chapter six I analyse and interpret the data collected, by relating the narrative of the four discourses following the stories of a number of insider stakeholders.

Chapter seven answers the research questions and conforms to the approach that the individual belief systems are dominant over group beliefs in their practice of inclusive education. It theorises why inclusive education at the School was either not practised or was practised but in a fragmented and conditional manner. It explains the findings in the light of the theoretical framework in Chapter 3, and examines how the four discourses vie for dominance in the implementation of this form of education.

I conclude with the implications and suggestions of my thesis for the implementation and understanding of inclusive education in the broader South African educational community, the way forward for the School and recommendations for future research. I further reflect on my personal and academic journey and challenges that this thesis presented.

Chapter 2 Literature review

2.1 Introduction

I begin the literature review by looking at the conceptions, terminology, and relevant discourses in the domain of inclusive education. This will be followed by an international perspective on this policy of inclusive education, an investigation into it in South Africa pre and post 1994, and a brief history of the Jewish community in South Africa. This literature review will form the background to the study which foregrounds the conceptions, terminology and relevant discourses which impact on the understanding and implementation of inclusive education in a Jewish community school in South Africa.

Beginning in the early 1980's across many nations, dialogues and reflections turned from special education to inclusive education. Conversations around this education and ideas of equity and opportunity for all students moved into the global spotlight and developed into powerful dialogues of change (Winzer & Mazurek, 2010).

South Africa's transformation to a democratic country in 1994, as well as the international inclusion movement embodied in the Salamanca Statement were the catalysts that moved South Africa into the global inclusive education debate. Like Slee (2001) I assert that the general concept of inclusive education is accepted worldwide. Yet while it in principle became the proposed solution to structural inequity, in practice systems were unprepared to meet the many challenges and responsibilities which it brought (Winzer & Mazurek, 2010).

With 'the evolution of inclusive practices' globally and locally, its implementation was confronted with tensions, contradictions and difficulties. It is obvious, therefore that the system is enormously contentious (Hodkinson, 2005:17).

One of the contentious issues is the question of meaning. Inclusion has multiple meanings that range from children who experience barriers merely being placed in

schools, to the change of the philosophy, principles and practices of total educational systems (Artiles, Harris–Murri & Rostenberg, 2006).

Various challenging discourses produce diverse meanings and understandings of inclusive education (Dunne, 2008). These numerous meanings which seem to compete with each other protect the status quo instead of propelling change (Graham & Slee, 2008). Although I am not using discourse analysis as a research approach, I aim to locate the discourses around inclusion with the understanding that statements within discourses do not so much describe as 'produce understandings, knowledge and subject positions' (Dunne, 2008:5). In my study I make the assumption that the discourses adopted affect the meaning and practice of inclusive education. I will examine the understanding of inclusion within the framework of dominant discourses.

As I continued to read about inclusive education I was, like van Rooyen & Le Grange (2003:15) 'flung into a field of contested meaning' and became particularly interested in the role that individuals' understandings of its meanings play in its implementation. Slee (2001) holds the view that meaning is determined by a theoretical or ideological outlook, personal experiences and limitations. Similarly, the assumption in this study is that individuals or groups construct and shape meaning and understanding determined by forces which impact on their personal backgrounds either driving them to or restraining them from change and so I conclude the literature review with a brief introduction to Lewin's Theory of Planned Change, the theoretical framework used to view this phenomenon.

2.2 Conceptions and terminology of inclusion

There is no clear conceptualisation of inclusion. This 'complex and multi-faceted' concept means different things to different people (Hodkinson, 2005:27). Therefore, inclusion itself is not the problem: it is instead the consequences of the way an individual or group might apply meaning to the word (Hansen, 2012). In fact, says Slee (2001), it is meaning produced by language which is inclusion's chief adversary.
This section is designed to present an overview of the current conceptions of inclusive education. I use the medical deficit model and social model to frame and illustrate its

different conceptions. These two models or discourses provide a general conception of inclusive education, which can lead to an understanding of how it is interpreted.

2.2.1 Medical deficit model

This model, also called the psycho medical model, the individual tragedy model, or the deficit model, borrows terminology and practices from the medical domain to diagnose children's limitations against developmental and functional norms. The proponents of this model have a need to diagnose, label and treat in order to fix or cure identified children (Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009). The subjects, disabled children, then require a procedural solution to cure or fix them. This requires segregating them to specialized institutions, where the defective person is denied any possibilities for learning or becoming an active citizen (Slee, 2001) until the defect is cured or remediated as close as possible to the norm.

Subscribers of this model view normality or 'ablesim' as being the perfect body and agree with the suggestion that deviation away from ableness results in disability and a diminished human state. They have a collective belief that impairment is inherently negative and if not ameliorated, cured or eliminated, should be silenced (Kumari Campbell, 2008:151).

Silence and ignorance are social reactions to impairment resulting from the methodical exclusion of disability from schools and other social environments (Hamre & Oyler, 2004). This is explained by the following. Society views disability as associated with deficiency, and the ideal subject is used as the model to compare the lack of physical, psychological and/or neurological characteristics. Once compared and categorized, the deficit is controlled and regulated through structural and institutional procedures (Soudien & Baxen, 2006). It is at this point that marginalization occurs and the cycle of normality, difference and procedures to cure, is perpetuated. This cycle is then strengthened by the dual system of special education and regular education (Hamre & Oyler, 2004).

In the domain of education these social practices and conventions are expressed by the building of special schools, the training of special teachers, and making the

disabled the objects of endless testing and measurement. Because education works on the principle of normalisation, it includes in as much as it excludes. Normalisation defines groups, classes and structures in their ideal forms and relative to them, other communities, groups and individuals are identified and differences located. As a result there is a perception that certain groups lack access to certain provisions and are pinpointed for special inclusion processes which it is believed will overcome their exclusion (Sayad & Soudien, 2003). The belief in a 'common referent' or norm against which disability is measured (Graham & Slee, 2008:281) pervades education, reverses the naturalness of diversity, and concurrently limits a range of possibilities for inclusive education (Slee, 2001).

The norm with its 'parasitic effect' (Graham & Slee, 2008:281) has transmitted itself into a powerful host, the domain of knowledge production. It leeches onto this domain, enters society through the mediums of research, beliefs and policy, and is responsible for the production of 'target groups' of inclusion subjects dependent on specific action to ensure their inclusion (Dyson, 1999:47). The target group's relationship to the norm is dependent upon the boundaries set by the norm and in this superficial inclusive environment, shaped by education and society, is found the centre from which domains of interiority and exteriority are derived (Graham & Slee, 2008:281).

The 'fictional' centre (Graham & Slee 2008:279) is a space into which certain groups are brought. It is in the centre where powerful normative domains are constructed which protect it and define the exterior which it has categorized. Normative discourses which produce the subjects and objects through language, confirm a socially constructed desirable normal subject residing in the centre and define deficit conceptualisations of the other than normal object who resides in the margins waiting to be normalized (Graham & Slee, 2008).

This created 'dominant and desirable' space gives automatic access to the included and evokes an image of less able learners as they wait passively or aggressively for their qualified access. Normative conceptions in the centre weaken inclusion and strengthen segregation and special education (Porteus, 2003:14).

Conceptions of the centre are manifested and epitomized in classrooms in a school. With their general and special education provision and normative aspects, differences are highlighted and reinforced. Disabled children have to fit into the space constructed for them by normative, imperious and dominant discourses. Furthermore, the reproduction of unequal social spaces such as an inflexible curriculum and the standards agenda present limited opportunities for accessing the curriculum. This then renders the child liable to having to meet some pre-established norm rather than being the recipient of a differentiated or heterogeneous approach (Ngcobo & Muthukrishna, 2011) and their mismatch to educational standards reinforces the educational sector's cautious decision for including them in the first place (Sayad & Soudien, 2003).

In the classroom space, discourses of normalizing and homogenizing become visible, inclusion is smothered and prejudice and discrimination are perpetuated. This results in an 'illusory interiority' (Graham & Slee, 2008:285) a detained inclusion, where the concepts of normality, mainstream, natural and majority, ensure that inclusion for some children is merely a symbol as they continue to lead a marginal existence (Ngcobo & Muthukrishna, 2011).

Conceiving of a school as being the site of many incidents of diagnosis and remediation, one would envision a school which subscribes to a medical model as one which would see itself as neutral while viewing the children, who it perceives cannot learn, as flawed. Supporters of the view that it is the schools that are defective and not the children, subscribe to the social model of inclusion (Brantlinger, 1997).

2.2.2 Social model

The 1970's saw the emergence of a new theoretical framework for conceptualising disability, that is the social model of disability. Informed by Gabel & Peters (2004) evidence of this model is thriving in international declarations and conventions, in legislation, disability studies and research and in the drive for inclusive education at schools.

One of the guiding principles of this model and in direct contrast to the medical model of diagnosis, blame and cure, is the principle that attitudes, values and beliefs in

society cause disability, and therefore society needs to be treated and cured. (Johnstone, 2001, Oliver, 1996 in Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009). By incorporating the principles of social justice, this model sees education as the catalyst for overcoming the prejudicial attitudes by society towards people with impairments (Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009). What follows in the next paragraph is a brief overview of the meaning of social justice in education as the background to the social model.

If we agree with Winzer & Mazurek, (2010) that inclusion is about providing educational rights for all, then the chief principle upon which inclusion is founded is social justice, which is about ethics. It is about action taken to ensure that equity in education and freedom from discrimination are achieved (Guzman Johannessen, 2010).

Schugurensky (2010) defines a social justice society as a society which aspires to the principles of equity and solidarity, which values and understands differences and which places high value on human dignity. And from Artiles et al's (2006) point of view inclusive education is the means to achieve social justice for students with disabilities.

The social model implies a conceptual shift from the way society views people with disabilities and their place in society (Winzer & Mazurek, 2010). Its central tenet implies that it is the actions of society which disable because of a lack of supportive structures and accountability (Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009).

In education the social model is operationalized by means of inclusive schooling (Winzer & Mazurek, 2010). Moreover this model sees education as a vehicle to overcome prejudicial attitudes towards disabled people in society and to execute responsibility to adapt or change its structures to accommodate disabled children rather than the other way around (Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009).

Education, within this model, would comprise very different practices from those provided within the medical deficit model. Education systems would need to undergo a significant change in principles and practices when providing for disabled children. Curriculum approaches, classroom management, and the ethos of all stakeholders

would have to change in order to rupture current stereotypical and discriminating attitudes. Advocates of the social model envisage an environment where segregated schooling would be replaced with schools which are accessible and provide the space and the structures for participation for all (Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009).

However, there are some who believe this model provides too simplistic an explanation for such a complex issue. In addition, with its single, unitary solutions it does not provide a complete conceptualisation of disability (Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009).

To sum up the above section, the argument is that understandings of inclusion embedded in normative discourses convey powerful messages about what is acceptable and desirable and the converse and what is valued and what is not. These messages of normalizing are based on principles of special education and produce their own social practices (Soudien & Baxen, 2006). The kind of social practices, according to Hodkinson (2005), which are established on the principles of the medical deficit model lead to the continuation of integrative practices which promote tolerance rather than inclusion.

Moreover, social practices only include children who are seen to have special education needs and disabilities. Inclusion therefore is conceptualised as a 'fragmented' relationship between certain identified and labelled children and mainstream schools (Hodkinson, 2005:19), where merely a lumping together of children with disabilities as a homogenous group serves only to accentuate their difference and perpetuate their marginalization. The concept of a social model instead determines that disabilities and difficulties do not lessen the right to equal access and participation in education and society (Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009).

In sum it is apparent that the understanding of the concept of inclusive education differs from person to person, and so it's meaning and resultant practice will depend on the socio-political context and history. It seems that it is not the commitment to inclusiveness that is problematic but the interpretation of the term and the actions it promotes.

If inclusion is used 'differently in different contexts, if it is expressed with different emphasis and is implemented with different practices, it seems critical that the concepts are clarified before the ideal of an inclusive society can be realized' (Walton, 2006:6).

So for inclusive education to become a vehicle for equality and social justice, professionals will need to think seriously about the ideologies which frame their educational preferences. They will need to make explicit the beliefs that predetermine best inclusive education practice that all children belong in socially comprehensive classrooms. They will need to understand that the onus is on those adults to alter the children's status and view them as individuals who benefit from settings other than separatist settings (Brantlinger,1997).

The most significant influences on the concept and understanding of inclusive education are prejudice and discrimination in the form of teachers' attitudes (Agbenyega, 2007). Hansen (2012) makes the point that excluding a child from the classroom happens because of the meaning and effect the teacher applies to the disability and not because of the disability itself. The teacher's decision is based on his[1] personal experiences and direct contact with diversity and background, not on the disability of the child. He believes that for the benefit of inclusion, it is necessary to determine how the teacher understands pedagogy and diversity by focusing on the teacher's professional self-concept. The next section will examine teachers' attitudes to and conceptions of inclusive education.

2.2.3 Teachers' conceptions of inclusive education.

From the previous section it seems clear that the medical and social models impact on the discourses that inform understandings of teaching and learning (Grenier, 2010). Disability is viewed differently in each of these models. In the medical model it is viewed as a way to detect problems, whereas in the social model it is viewed as human variation. The proponents of the social model do not deny impairments and limitations, but their vocabulary does not include good and bad when relating to

---

[1] For the purposes of this study I will only refer to his but will be applicable to both genders.

impairments. In addition they concern themselves with addressing institutions whose practices and policies serve to marginalize some children (Lalvani, 2013).

It is appropriate at this time to repeat that these two perspectives, the social and medical models, subscribe to competing guidelines for inclusive practice. I have termed them parallel models because of the divide which is produced and amplified by their meaning of inclusive education and the consequent polarisation of their practices. This section interrogates teachers' conceptualizations of inclusive education, their underlying assumptions, beliefs and subsequent practices, and more importantly where they position themselves in these parallel models. This section also provides literature which reports on the possibilities for teachers to change in their model preferences.

Inclusive education is demonstrated in the classroom, and as classrooms become more heterogeneous, teachers are faced with greater challenges. Perold, Louw & Kleynhans (2010) say that this is so especially in South Africa where inclusive education is entrenched in the human rights philosophy within the constitution. This has resulted in teachers having to cope with more children with diverse difficulties than ever before in their classrooms. These difficulties and differences have called into question teachers' inclinations towards disability and inclusive education.

Globally, inclusion and its opposite, exclusion have infiltrated all communities and Hansen (2012), argues that it is quite reasonable to posit that there is no limit to inclusion itself, only limits caused by teachers' individual beliefs. Teachers do not enter the profession as tabulae rasae. They come with their own understandings, passions, perspectives and experiences and then build on these aspects to form the moral and ideological arguments which guide their practices. When faced with any situation, especially a challenging one, they return to their beliefs as reference points (Hamre & Oyler, 2004). In other words, teachers have a tendency to act in a particular manner under specific circumstances and this tendency is based on a belief system which is predictive of future actions (Villegas, 2007).

As a consequence of the efficient exclusion of people with disabiities from society, very few people entering the teaching profession have grown up in a community that integrates people with disabilities. So unless they have a family member with a disability or have chosen to study special education, we presume they have had little or no relationship with disabled people, and moreover have grown up seeing disability as pathology (Hamre & Oyler, 2004).

2.2.4 Teachers' understanding of inclusive education in accord with a medical model

Lalvani (2013:18), holds the view that most teachers support inclusive education in theory and see it as a benefit for learners. However, in reality, the presence of certain beliefs presents barriers and renders inclusion unrealistic for many learners with disabiities. One such belief is that inclusion as a place is a 'privilege' to which only a few learners, who do not conform to the norm, could have entrée. Factors which influence this conditional acceptance are based on the types of disabilities, cognitive abilities, functioning level and behaviour of learners, and indicate a view of intelligence as biologically based (Lalvani, 2013:18).

Teachers who support this view believe the burden is on the learner to keep up with the class, the alternative being removal from the peer-group. Furthermore, they atttibute the unsuccessful or successful experiences of inclusive education to biological determinants of learners' development and certain influences such as the understanding of learners' attentions spans and their inability to work independently or to access the curriculum. These factors would determine either general classroom placement or a preferred placement in separate environments. The belief is that such division, for those who are unable to keep up, is the only way for those learners to maximize their learning. By removing learners to self-contained environments indicates regular class teachers' lack of approach to seek strategies to increase access for the learner. This 'earned membership' method of understanding signposts a failure to acknowledge that the impact of sociocultural attitudes, reactions and structures, like rigid curricula, could very well be the offender rather than the child's innate propensities (Lalvani, 2013:19).

Another conceptual understanding of inclusive education is that teachers view it as a 'compromise', a toss-up between social-emotional developments and the learning of academic content. This implies an understanding that inclusive education has a negative affect for disabled learners in the form of a loss of individualized education and differentiated instruction, which is only delivered by professional experts in self-contained settings (Lalvani, 2013:20).

The rejection of a heterogeneous or differentiated approach to pedagogy by general education teachers determines that learners face exclusion physically or psychically from mainstream classes This understanding also points to the belief that special education teachers are more qualified, more trained and therefore more successful than general education teachers in teaching children who have been identified with barriers to learning (Slee, 2001).

While the chant of the medical model propronents continues as they pay more attention to the labels of the struggling learner rather than to curricula and pedagogy, it appears that in their separate settings a different organization of curricula and pedagogy is being used by special educators. Special educators make use of differentiation techniques and strategies more frequently in self-contained settings than do general teachers in the general classroom (Blecker & Boakes, 2010).

It seems then that teachers' conceptions of difference are not only limited to the learners and there is the sense that general education teachers believe that their special education colleagues differ from them, not only in their methodology, but in terms of their dispositions and personal characteristcs as well. Dispositions such as patience, kindness and the ability to cope with extreme difficulties in their jobs are features they believe are unique to the special educator (Lalvani, 2013). This dual way of thinking says Brantlinger (1997), confirms a special education mind-set and medical deficit approach.

A medical deficit approach comes with its own discourses. One such discourse is the comparative discourse. Teachers compare well-behaved learners to learners who present challenging behaviours. These terms are indications that there is an expected

norm to which certain learners are being compared, and they then become the problem. The usage of words such as "them" then become a function of othering some learners. This discourse can be taken to mean that the classroom is a space where differences are not accepted (Orsati & Causton-Theoharis, 2012). In this vein it seems that not to conform is perceived by some teachers to be problematic (Hodkinson & Devarakonda, 2011) and their continued intent is for all learners to strive towards the norm in their classrooms.

Agbenyega, (2007) affirms this approach as contradictory to the philosophy of inclusion. However, not all teachers subsribe to the above view. Hodkinson (2006) theorizes that some teachers equate inclusion to a context of respecting and valuing the individual child. This group places high value on and a positive regard for group differences.

2.2.5 Teachers' conceptions of disability and equitable education and democracy.

Noticeably different to the medical model is inclusion as 'social justice' (Lalvani, 2013:21). The main theoretical and empirical criterion of this model, called the social model, proposes that reduced function and the experience of disability are conditional on environmental, social and cultural factors (Reindal, 2008).

Lalvani (2013) suggests that teachers who hold this view believe that inclusion has influential implications for all children with or without disabilities and more broadly for societies as a whole. Thus this view comes with the conviction that all learners, with few exceptions, can benefit from inclusion. The important difference in teachers' with this perspective extends to children's learning, cognitive development and schooling results, as being situated in sociocultural contexts such as accessible resources, nutrition, medical care, parenting styles and opportunities for early learning. Their beliefs extend to inequities in society rather than genetic endowments. So where both biological and environmental factors are acknowleged, predominance in this regard is given to environmental influences.

Teachers who are social model advocates discard intelligence as only genetically determined, and rather attribute inconsistency in results to inequities in societies and

inflexible assessment practices. Similarly they take responsibility to reach each learner without focusing on impairments and see themselves as collaborators in the learning process. The primary concern of this model is how inclusion can play a role in broad social change and how oppression of marginalized groups can finally be abolished (Lalvani, 2011).

Practically, social justice supporters for example, might act in ways that give all learners access to knowledge by setting high performance goals for all learners and holding them accountable for their learning. This way of understanding demonstrates the implementation of an enriched curriculum that challenges every learner, and furthermore provides materials that are relevant to learners' lives as well as varied instructional strategies to accommodate differences to ensure that all learners have access to and are able to participate in learning activies. In these cirumstances the learners are lauded and rewarded, the purpose of this approach being to create a classroom culture which is inclusive (Villegas, 2007).

The above sections have justified how teachers' understandings of inclusive education can be located in either the social or medical model. This justification, however, fails to reflect the significance of teachers' experiences on changes of their views and attitudes (Grenier, 2010).

2.2.6 Possibilities for change

Interestingly, Boling, (2007) found that teachers' conceptions, especially those which were negative or resistant to children with barriers to learning, changed over time. In a study she noted how a teacher candidate's conceptions of including children with special needs evolved by experiencing classroom teaching practice and developing an understanding of the role of the teacher in an inclusive classroom. Like Agbenyega (2007), who believes the critical barrier to equality in education for all is negative attitude and prejudice, Boling (2007) uncovered some negative conceptions which impacted on the success of inclusive education. There was a feeling amongst teachers that not only was it not their responsibility to teach children with barriers, but that they lacked understanding of the goals of inclusion and of having a medical deficit approach. Yet she noticed changes of attitude towards inclusive education evolving

with time. Some of the reasons for the change in teachers' attitudes were facing complex situations from their own background, having current experiences of very real situations, and being part of and hearing other peoples' perspectives on diversity.

Other reasons for a change in attitude were found to be the constant and regular acquisition of knowledge and professional growth, as well as being able to witness inclusion strategies in action. For example a teacher who has only a sociological understanding of disability is not able to help in assisting the child with ADHD, nor the child with a reading disability. The teacher needs to be able to view the strategies used. In this way the teacher's repertoire is broadened (Boling, 2007).

Hamre & Oyler (2004) hold the belief that direct experience will point pre-service teachers in a certain direction in terms of how they understand inclusion. Yet their view is that if there is no previous experience then pre-service teachers are guided by their own morals and beliefs. Without direct knowledge, pre–service teachers fall back on their own beliefs when making sense of inclusion.

Change, says Orsati & Causton-Theoharis (2012), is all about building relationships. Relationships with learners empower teachers to see past the labels and the control discourse. Focusing on relationships allows teachers to rethink inclusive education, understand learners' behaviour and try to provide what the learners need. This rethinking leads to a view of inclusive education that values differences and gives status to what they believe was previously counterproductive.

The more teachers gain experience in disability and inclusive education, the more conscious about social justice they become which in turn encourages them to raise others' consciousness. Continued experiences with people with disabilities contribute to a sensitivity to difference and this is personified in their teaching. Furthermore, building a history of teaching learners with disabilities can foster improved inclusive practices (Grenier, 2010). The converse to this is expressed by Hodkinson (2006) in that a major reason for lack of change in teachers's perceptions of inclusive education is the professed lack of support of disabled learners in the classroom.

Yet Grenier (2010:398) argues that merely placing learners with disabilities in general classrooms works to raise consciousness and more socially oriented practices. With additional emphasis on collaborative practices, a discourse of interdependence between teacher and learner will encourage a shift of approach. This collective activity between teacher and learner has the potential to shift medical perceptions to more socially relevant practices. Drawing on these interpretations, change can occur by teachers being involved in observing and acting to emphasize learners' strengths and preferences. The emphasis on these competent social relations 'moves us towards inclusion…promoting an awareness of possibility rather than an adherence to limitations'. This is compatible with Lewin's theory which defines change as learning and involvement (Schein, 1996) and purports that in order to change, people would need to be immersed in the process of understanding and change (Coghlan & Brannick, 2003). I will refer to this theory later when discussing the theoretical framework.

Due to the global emphasis on human rights and social justice culture impacting the development of inclusive classrooms (Dyson & Forlin, 1999), it is essential at this time to consider its trajectory and practice in different schools internationally.

2.3 Practice of inclusive education internationally

2.3.1 A backward trajectory

From the previous arguments it is evident that the understanding of the concept of inclusive education differs from person to person and is dependent on the context and history of the person and which approach informs his understanding. This section takes a chronological approach, examining the emergence of inclusive education internationally. What follows thereafter is a general description of its practice in the context of developed and developing countries worldwide.

Discussions of inclusive education have a long history dating back to the 1960's during the civil rights movements, but it was only in the 1990's at the World Conference on Education for All (EFA), in Jomtein, Thailand, that inclusive thinking was developed. (Hodkinson, 2010). In a massive drive to reduce worldwide illiteracy, it was agreed at

this World Conference, by delegates from 155 countries, as well as representatives from 150 governmental and non-governmental organizations, to make primary education accessible to all children by the end of the decade (UNESCO, 1990). It was here that marginalized children were acknowledged and the world bodies committed to EFA (Miles & Singal, 2010). Despite the fact that the concept of inclusion was not mentioned at this occasion, the conference was ground-breaking for the development of inclusive thinking.

I will now draw attention briefly to some of the international discussions on EFA and inclusive education, for an understanding of their principles. The fundamental principle of both EFA and inclusive education is to address the notion of 'all'. However, their approaches are different.

Miles & Singal (2010) describe these two international agendas as consistent but often parallel in their thinking, with the EFA movement inclined to overlook some marginalized groups of children with special educational needs or disabilities. This influence comes from global perceptions of socially separate groupings of children. The consequence of this thinking, for certain groups, is separate management and marginalization from humanity.

On the other hand, EFA is consistent with inclusive education thinking in that the former acknowledges the perception of education as a basic right and recognizes the new millennium goal which is to ensure that every learner has a primary education by 2015 (Peters, 2007). Also consistent with inclusive education thinking, is education as vitally important for developing countries and for global tolerance (Miles & Singal, 2010).

With its central tenet being a human rights perspective, EFA signified an international commitment to ensure that every child and adult receives good quality basic education. However, EFA disregarded the issue of disability and despite the flagship set up to ensure that disabled learners become more visible and are included in their action plans, there is the danger that disability could further be understood as separate and become an issue for "specialists" (Miles & Singal, 2010).

Inclusive education, on the other hand, with its values and beliefs relating to equality and social justice, has the potential to provide societies with better pedagogy and greater competence which EFA often fails to explore. It has the potential to provide purposeful education for all with a systemic approach and a commitment to values and beliefs. Peters (2007) sums up the discussion with the statement that EFA follows the basic principle that all children must learn, and inclusive education adds to that statement the word "together". Therefore, it is the international aim to align inclusive education and EFA in order to develop sustainable responses to inequities in education (Miles & Singal, 2010).

Supporting EFA and following on from the Jomtien Conference of 1990, the international community conferred again and the result was the development of the Salamanca Statement, possibly the most momentous international document that has ever impacted on inclusive education (Ainscow & Cesar, 2006). The Salamanca conference in 1994 was attended by three hundred participants representing 92 national governments and 25 international organizations. Under the auspices of UNESCO and the Spanish Government, the Salamanca Statement on Principles, Policy and Practice in Special Needs Education, with a Draft Framework for Action (UNESCO, 1994), was drawn up. The draft document recognized the need to work towards including all children, celebrating differences, supporting learning and responding to individual needs. The purpose of this framework was to inform policy and guide action by governments, international organizations and other bodies in the implementation of the Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994).

Clearly the history of separatist thinking in education was the driving force behind the holding of the Salamanca Conference, and it is apparent that only with a clear understanding of the concept of what education for all means in the cultural context in which it arises, will good practice be established. Thinking more intensely about the concept of "all" will enable policy makers to develop clear guidelines for its implementation, while coherent and sustainable policies at national level will determine the extent to which inclusive educational practices are promoted (Miles & Singal, 2010).

After the Salamanca Conference, inclusive education became a global initiative embedded in the concept of human rights and equality. The theory and practice of inclusive education has had wide-reaching effects. It has spread from Europe and America to most international regions and has become integrated in global educational policies and development (Lo Nai-kwai, 2007).

In 2000, the most comprehensive evaluation of international education was concluded at the Dakar Framework for Action, where it was agreed by all present to adopt a World Declaration on Education for All. This established the millennium goal, which by the pledge was made and agreed upon to ensure 'that by 2015 all children, particularly girls, children in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities, have access to and complete free and compulsory primary education of good quality' (UNESCO, 2000 in King, 2007:385). This target safeguarded education as a basic right for all children and promised to provide primary school education for all by 2015. The policy provided hope and incentive for a transformation that was central to achieving inclusive education, especially in the developing world (Armstrong, Armstrong & Spandagou, 2011). EFA also recognized inclusive education as a crucial plan in which to address marginalization and exclusion (Peters 2003). It was clear that the international society had committed itself to realizing the right of all children to education, albeit only at policy level (Peters, 2007).

It is worth noting that it is now 2013 and 19 years since the Salamanca Statement was released. Although the Global Monitoring report denies reliable data, the following estimates provide enough material to create cause for concern. An estimated 25 million children in primary and 75 million in secondary education are excluded from school in sub-Saharan Africa, and in South Asia the figures are, 9 million of primary education age and 109 million at secondary school level. The report estimates that worldwide, 150 million children have disabilities and of those four out of every five live in developing countries. There are more children with moderate to severe disability in low and middle income countries than in rich countries, and many of these children who are regarded as at risk groups are excluded from schools (UNESCO, 2008). Of greater concern says Miles & Singal (2010), is the fact that Global Monitoring Reports fail to address the lack of education for disabled learners. Many of these children are

regarded as at risk groups for exclusion from schools, yet their educational status is ignored by the reports.

With the world witnessing the continuing challenges of children dropping out of school in the wealthier countries to children not having primary education in economically poor countries, to large numbers of marginalized children and vulnerable groups excluded from education, the interest in inclusive education has peaked (Ainscow & Miles, 2008). This has caused the global community to increase its vested interest in ensuring that there is greater access to education which will to reduce poverty, especially in the developing world (Lewin, 2007).

Simultaneously, the practice of special education has moved through its own series of stages in order to respond to disabled learners and those who have learning difficulties in learning. These have ranged from supplements to general education provision, to totally separate provision and finally to the biggest challenge of all, that of inclusive education (Ainscow & Cesar, 2006).

Included in the additions and alterations to special education were changes in its terminology. Terms such as integration to mainstreaming and finally to inclusion, branded special education, and with each name change a paradigm shift became evident. Each expression or term qualified its own practices or principles which applied to the schooling of children with special education needs (Thomazet, 2009).

The next section looks at how countries in the developed world and in the developing world have implemented inclusive education policy and the challenges they face.

2.3.2 Themes of practice globally

From the above trajectory it is apparent that inclusion has become an important policy agenda in both developed and developing countries (Armstrong, Spandagou & Armstrong, 2008). With the world's focus on reforming education as a crucial driver to achieving social integration and cohesion in diverse societies, inclusive education has become a powerful central principle of school and education systems in developed and developing countries (Armstrong et al, 2011). Despite this there have been

differences in practice (Wah, 2010) and general confusion as to how to implement it (Ainscow & Sandill, 2010). This confusion has centred on conceptual unpreparedness, false discourses of disability, differences in defining inclusion and lack of training in heterogeneous teaching methods (Paliokosta & Blandford, 2010).

The next section discusses the literature in developed and developing countries, in order to provide a summary of the practice of inclusive education internationally. A detailed account goes beyond the scope of my study and I will merely provide an overview of current trends in both developed and developing nations of the world.

2.3.3 The developed world

In the countries of Europe, North America and Australasia the discourse of inclusive education has centred around a greater understanding of diversity and the challenge of special education by questioning 'eugenicist' policies and movements which promote segregation, separateness and departmentalization. In its place, disability movements have instead proposed a model of inclusive education which promotes social justice and human rights. It is believed that inclusion conceptualized in this manner could manage disability in the mainstream and diminish failures in education systems (Armstrong et al, 2008:3).

Some European states have instituted laws and policies that ensure all learners have equal access, while others have retained parallel education systems of general and special education. Many countries seem to be in the middle, with parallel systems but at the same time in the process of transformation to a single mainstream system for all learners. Over time schools, however, move backwards and forwards between a two-track and one-track system depending on the groups of teachers, parents and administrators at the time (Ferguson, 2008).

Ferguson (2008) is of the opinion that for the first few years of the 21st century, there was a superfluity of research and writing about inclusive education, and favourable outcomes were seen in the form of the need for less segregation of learners. There was also evidence of a shift away from diagnosing disability towards careful

assessment of the interaction between the learner and his environment (Ferguson, 2008).

In England the emergence of inclusive education in state schools was initiated by the election of the new Labour in 1997 (Hodkinson, 2006) with the Government showing its commitment to inclusive education through Curriculum 2000 which was formulated on the basis of inclusionary principles (Hodkinson, 2010). It seems though that the human rights ideals of the disability movements are being marginalized and even devalued in the rhetoric of policy and definition, and Hodkinson (2010) blames the deficit language of policy which indicates locational inclusion, integration and tolerance rather than, inclusion. Furthermore inclusion appears to relate only to those learners with special educational needs and their liaison with mainstream schools. Even more concerning is the problem of accountability and standards which seems to have found its way into the definition and is the way in which inclusion is being regulated. Vlachou (2004) suggests that it is these themes informing social or educational policy practice that encourage brazen prejudice and discrimination.

Hodinkson (2010) believes that effective inclusion could be hindered by the British Government which is motivated by legislation promoting inspection routine and accountability, ensuring again that schools cannot implement inclusive education principles. He continues, however, that the power lies with the local authority to translate legislation into practice by creating local policy and deciding on funding.

Ainscow & Miles (2008) agree that the local authority can support inclusive values in schools and offer specific processes through which inclusive developments could be encouraged. They report on two practice initiatives in England.

The first study includes the local authority and is entitled the Network. This study involves researchers from universities working with schools and local education authorities, guided by a number questions and including querying which practices can help overcome barriers to participation and learning. The study was motivated by tensions between national policies for standards as determined by benchmark scores

and policies of inclusion. It must be noted that standards and inclusion operate largely in opposition to one another (Ainscow, Booth & Dyson, 2004).

Two interlinked actions were carried out in the study. Firstly, by using existing knowledge and supplementary evidence, developments in inclusive education are fostered and secondly, these developments are scrutinized. The emphasis of the study was on schools having control of the areas of focus and using research collaboratively to address those issues. Each school had selected a team of practitioners to attend local meetings within the network together with the academic staff. All the information gleaned was accessible on a database. This collaborative critical appraisal and understanding provided enormous benefits for the development of thinking and practice in inclusive education. Additionally, it encouraged a deep commitment by teachers to think about their practice and learn more about other schools (Ainscow et al, 2004).

These research activities were guided by the Index for Inclusion which was used as a plan to monitor the research activities. Examples of practice are, schools being helped to analyse test and examination results, teachers acting as critical friends to one another and sharing the difficulties they experience, video recordings shown of lessons held, and collation of the perceptions of learners. The last point ensured that questions were not obscured by a generalized focus on the whole learner body. Constant analysis of the research on participation and achievment results in an increase of deeper theoretical insights into the impact of practitioner research (Ainscow et al, 2004).

The second study reported in England looked at the practice of teachers who had rejected ideas of fixed ability. These teachers rebuffed the notion of inborn intelligence characterising differences in learners. Despite hovering national policies reflecting this assumption, these teachers overlooked threats of inspection and sought to discover how to enhance the capacity of each learner and to initiate an environment where their learning could flourish. The teachers based their practice on the belief that change can lead to improvement in the right conditions. They approached their work with the determination to bring about an improvement and close gaps between their aspirations

for learners and what was essentially happening (Hart, 2003; Hart, Dixon, Drummond & McIntyre, 2004 in Ainscow & Miles, 2008).

Like the above examples, inclusion policy must translate into the classroom; so the last stop on the success of the journey of inclusive education depends on the school and its teachers. Despite the power of the local authorities, their ongoing policy and government enterprises, school cultures can remain dormant in their understanding, acceptance and accommodation of diversity. Paliokosta & Blandford, (2010) make the point that rigid and inflexible beliefs of special education carry connotations which serve as barriers to inclusive education. For example, being stuck in the medical model sees the deficit within the learner becoming the learner's responsibility to adapt to the school and/or the system. This normalizing discourse of categorization and labeling continues to play an important role in the stagnation of inclusive education.

Ainscow (2005) uses Wenger's model (1998) to describe practice that can be changed and sustained in English schools. Wenger's model is one which focuses on learning being as a distinguishing feature of practice. He uses the words community and practice to mean individuals in a community drawing on available resources to further shared goals. This evokes the idea of a social group engaged in the quest for a shared project. He argues that learning in a community can best be explained by the complementary processes of participation and reification (Ainscow, Howes, Farrell & Frankham, 2003).

Firstly, participation in social interactions in a purposeful community can act as a 'lever' of change. These shared experiences help to develop meaning, encourage an inclusion language and define a teacher's practice and understanding in a specific context. Secondly, these communities produce concrete tools such as rules and policies which are put into practice. With constant participation in developing meaning and practice in operationalizing rules, meaning becomes clear. It is within these social processes that meaning is negotiated and change can occur (Ainscow, 2005:110).

Kugelmass (2006), agrees but extends social processes to relationships and guidance. Where schools are successful in implementing inclusive education, they

owe that success to the shared vision of developing relationships and of guidance offered to teachers. This social model she believes offers an invaluable alternative to the defict and medical models.

Thus while inclusive education has been the topic of debate for many years in England, this should be seen as beneficial as it guarantees the continued questioning and analysis of policy and practice regarding disabled learners in the mainstream (Hodkinson, 2010).

If we examine the region of North America, we see that progress has been made and in more countries learners with disabilities are gaining access to mainstream classrooms, schools and curriculum. With the recent reauthorization of Individuals with Disability Education Improvement Act 2004, (IDEA) replacing EFA, disabled learners now have access to environments as well as to the curriculum (Ferguson, 2008). Despite laws this law promulgated in the United States to ensure that all learners are able to attend school and are not excluded on the basis of perceived developmental sensory physical or cognitive limitations, according to Harry & Klinger (2007) there is still evidence of some pathological thinking, and they argue, that where there is still pathological thinking, ambiguous labelling and indiscriminate and stigmatizing effects are caused not by language itself but by the belief system signified by this language.

The shortcoming of the law therefore is that it relies historically on medical model thinking. Learners who in the past received support whether in mainstream classrooms or in separated environments, had to be measured and proof provided that they had a deficit. This presents its own problems, Firstly the medical model is fraught with its own complications as stated earlier and secondly, the historical devaluing of minorities and current disability and placement seem to have become inextricably linked (Harry & Klingner, 2007).

Over the years several circumstances have tarnished the placement process. Some of the reasons for learners having been placed in special education facilities are, lack of learning prior to the learner's referral, inconsistency in policy implementation, poor schooling and learners from poor socioeconomic areas failing and then being placed.

As a result there is a disproportionate placement of some minority groups in special education and certain statistics are quite alarming, for example African American learners are diagnosed with educable mental retardation twice as often as their white peers, and their emotional behavioural disorder is diagnosed as one and a half times that of their white peers. It seems these categories arose because of adminstrative, curricular and instructional decisions rather than as a result of the learner's inherent abilities (Harry & Klinger, 2007).

Also alarming is that, environmental factors are excluded from the diagnostic model, so those living in poor socioeconmic circumstances or with language barriers are less likely to receive the milder label of learning disablity. This means that they do not fit into any of the categories and thus do not receive appropriate support. Furthermore they lose out on benefits given to learners with learning disability (Harry & Klinger, 2007).

The research shows that more stringent labels are pinned onto African Americans, stigmatizing occurs, and learners end up in programs that do not offer the type of support needed. Of late, some postive strides have been made and encouraging change initiatives are under way which challenge the previous model. A three levelled Response to Intervention model (RTI) has been designed which offers quality instruction, ongoing monitoring and intensive intervention support (Harry & Klinger, 2007).

Another initiative, Systemic Change Framework (SCF), has been designed as a coherent framework of change. This framework organizes change for districts, teachers, classrooms, learners, communities and families, in fact for all levels of the education system. Each stakeholder has a responsibility to the change process. The districts organize policy to support schools with flexible resources. Schools then have the responsibility to create space and time for teachers to collaborate, to plan, learn and work together. All this happens while the focus remains that of with inclusive education (Ferguson, 2008).

Schools focusing on this system of reform design engaging, differentiated and meaningful curricula where the emphasis is on the learner. Learning is personalized and communities of learners support and share in each others' learning. In addition teachers' roles are changing, and the boundary between two types of teachers, the special education teachers and the regular classroom teachers, their jargon and assumptions of expertise, is becoming less distinct. Teams are developing which engage in more substantive cooperative work and fewer superficial small quick fixes which merely change rhetoric rather than old assumptions and beliefs. School reform has evolved from teaching to learning, from offering service to providing support, from individual to group practice, and from parent involvement to family (Ferguson, 2008).

Kugelmass (2006), describes a typical reformed school in North America which subscribes to inclusive principles. This school views diversity as natural and acknowledges as its fundamental aim the elimination of social exclusion. The normalizing discourse of categorization and negative labels is absent and there is a tendency for the teachers to show a positive attitude towards inclusion and an unconditional love for the learners. In order to be successfully inclusive, teachers welcome the challenge of devising educational practices to support the individual needs of each child. There is a culture of collegiality and collaboration which appears to be central to their practice. There is also an unyielding quest to understand how they can work within the system and still uphold their inclusive principles. There is an internal agency which resists the dominant ideologies imposed by institutional bureaucracies.

This is in contrast to the findings of Graham & Jahnukainen's (2011) in a school in Canada. They show an increase in diagnoses of learning disabilities and with that a growing move to send in learners to separate systems. This is partly due to policies which are designed to encourage movement from segregated settings to mainstream settings, yet which instead through diagnosis and labelling, determine the movement backwards of learners from mainstream to segregated settings. The forces behind this increase towards segregated settings are a psycho-medical model of understanding disability and policies for funding which categorize learners. In addition, and working in

direct contrast to inclusive education, there is standardized testing which enables and encourages the marketization of schools.

In Australia inclusion has in the main been positive, with legislative support, a greater amount of resources particularly human ones, the introduction of many different programmes to attend to the educational needs of disabled learners, and efforts to improve teacher education programmes at universities. However, there remain a number of flaws, some of which are teachers' negative attitudes and inconsistencies in practice across states and schools (Boyle, Scriven, Durning & Downes, 2011).

Generally the philosophy in Australia is reflective of the ideals in the Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994) with communities, systems and schools taking a positive stance towards inclusive education; while with the passing of the Disabilities Discrimination Act (DDA) in 1992, schools are obliged to accept all learners other than exceptional cases. There are two main practices of inclusive education, one being the offer of a single stream but with a continuum of services, and the other being that all learners belong in the mainstream all of the time (Forlin, 2006).

There has been a reduction of learners attending special schools in Australia, and concomitantly special schools have also reduced in number. With the increased number of disabled learners in the mainstream, schools are hiring more specialist teachers. An Australian innovation aimed at the specialist teachers is Building Inclusive Schools (BIS), which selects learning support co-ordinators to attend professional development classes in their first two years. The support co-ordinator's role is to model effective teaching, assist, guide and provide adequate support for teachers (Forlin, 2006, Boyle et al, 2011).

The Australian research shows that supporting teachers adequately with resources in an inclusive environment is as important as teacher attitudes to inclusion. Because of the belief that it is the teacher at ground level who determines effective inclusive education, the combination of these two factors is highly valued. The understanding that the commitment to inclusion begins with each teacher and how well the teachers are supported is a critical issue. As a result, a greater amount of resources, especially

human resources such as teacher aides, continues to be placed in schools to support children, their families and teachers. Committed health professionals, learning support workers and teachers ensure that these programmes work (Boyle et al, 2011).

One teacher initiative demonstrates a collaborative effort between schools and the local university to develop a model of professional development for teachers. This model, which is an accredited post graduate qualification, is specifically for in-service teachers and supports teacher learning. The aim of the project is to encourage change and a shift in teacher expertise (Deppeler, 2006). Another model, the Quality Teacher Programme (AGQTP), has been allocated extensive funds by the Australian Government (Forlin, 2006).

Australian legislation, the education department and its policies all support inclusive practices. While there is no legal directive for inclusive education, the government has made recommendations for implementing change (Forlin, 2006). School staff members are supported by education departments, learning support units and various state initiated programmes. There is a range of supportive networks in Australia, yet despite these positive aspects, the country is remiss in that inclusion is not implemented consistently by states and territories, nor by all schools and teachers (Boyle et al, 2011). Part of the general difficulty with implementation seems to be the feelings of inadequacy experienced by teachers, as they try to decipher what is prescribed by policy (Paliokosta & Blandford, 2010).

Another challenge Australia faces is teachers' belief that special education support teachers have more expertise and it is their responsibility to attend to difficult or problematic children. Teachers also rely on professionals from outside the school for diagnosis and treatment. This thinking and the disconnected type of support received in schools is in direct contrast to inclusive education principles (Deppeler, 2006).

The research shows, however, that in New South Wales (NSW), efforts to make schools more inclusive have in fact had limited success, including the escalation of enrolments in segregated settings. One reason could be that learners whose results impact negatively on those of the schools as a whole could be viewed as less valued.

As a result learners are assessed according to a pecking order of value and the lowest in the pecking order are therefore moved elsewhere. It seems that NSW uses a gatekeeper system based on the psycho-medical model to diagnose and support its learners. Diagnosis would then secure placement of certain learners in separate settings (Graham & Jahnukainen, 2011).

In sum the international field is riddled with doubts, disputes and contradictions regarding inclusive education, yet efforts are continually being made to provide more effective educational responses for all children. So for an inclusion culture to be present at schools there is likely to be a high level of collaboration and joint problem-solving involving the learners' parents and other community stakeholders at the school. Moreover, schools characterised by such cultures are likely to have organizational structures such as specialist provision, and practices such as participatory teaching and learning. Yet there are those who believe that it is not the particular techniques that are significant but rather collaboration within and between schools and networking across contexts using research evidence to stimulate experimentation.

The idea of inclusion continues to provide opportunities in education to challenge discrimination yet also produces a contest of policies and practices. Despite inclusion rhetoric being the subject of social policy, many sins are masked and the reality for many remains one of exclusion (Armstrong et al, 2011).

2.3.4 The developing world

The journey towards inclusive education in the developing world has been slow and problematic and as has been seen above, its meaning in developing countries is employed in different ways to mean different things. Sometimes it is equated with social justice, or informed by post-colonial policies and characteristics which are shaped and financed by the colonial master (Armstrong et al, 2011). At other times inclusive education is viewed as the panacea for the failure of a country to attend adequately to the educational needs of the majority of its people (Armstrong et al, 2008).

41

Inclusion in developing countries seems to be associated with human rights and the inclusion of socially marginalised groups such as, HIV positive children in parts of Africa, Dalits in the Indian subcontinent and the girl child in many South East Asian countries (Ainscow & Sandill, 2010). Vlachou (2004) argues that all these assertions of rights mean that there was and still is violation of the rights of marginalized groups.

Many, according to Armstrong et al, (2008) see inclusion as a phenomenon that has been transferred from developed countries and merely dumped on developing countries without the sensitivities of context. Yet developments in developing countries and specifically in Swaziland in Southern Africa, all of which have been subject to the impact of colonialism and external consultants, have been powerful in advocating for inclusive education. In this latter specific case the nature of research and development between change agents from developed countries has been able to sustain an inclusive education policy (Pather & Nxumalo, 2012).

Pather & Nxumalo, (2012) cite an example of such a programme, the Erasmus Mundus MA Programme, which considers inclusive education policies and practices in three European countries. This programme emphasises ways to evade neo-colonialist approaches of offloading knowledge by encouraging critical consideration and reflection through its collaborative programmes. A diverse group of students was able to learn from different cultures and professionals from many education arenas, in particular inclusive education. By observing the practice in inclusive schools in the UK, Netherlands and Czech Republic these students developed professional insight and advanced professional knowledge. The lessons learnt resulted in an enhanced understanding of how inclusive education can work in different contexts and that each education system needs to be reflective in devising its own model relevant to its needs and challenges.

The Swaziland government supports an inclusive and integrated education system which is in line with its broader socio-political ethos. However, the government has experienced resistance from practitioners in mainstream and special schools indicating an underlying medical-defict paradigm. With the implementation of the Erasmus Mundus programme and its reflective practice there has been a shift in

attitudes by teachers who feel more confident to respond to disabled learners. The disadvantage of this programme, however, was that it seemed to perpetuate the existing medical model discourse and moreover its structure, although rich in resources, could not be transferred to the Swaziland environment which was limited in its resources (Pather & Nxumalo, 2012).

Not all developments in inclusive education have been as well planned or as successful as the Erasmus Mundus Programme. Aid was often sought from developed countries based on donor policies rather than on a careful study of the needs of the developing country. An example is the Organization of Eastern Carribbean States (OECS) where inclusive education developed randomly and where first world knowledge and policies were present without the educational phenomena being contextualised (Armstrong et al, 2008). Pather & Nxumalo, (2012) believe that the most significant lesson to be learnt here is for the founders of the international programmes to develop an understanding of how inclusive education can work in different contexts rather than building on existing hegemonic views. After all, they say, there is neither a right nor a wrong way to implement inclusive education.

Another factor which impacts negatively in the advancement of inclusion education in some developing countries, also mentioned by Pather & Nxumalo (2012) is that of relating to beliefs regarding disability. In certain cultures, for example Namibia, there are specific beliefs which inform the causes of disability. Disability is attributed to supernatural causes of witchcraft, ancestors or G-d, or improper relationships entered into by the parents. Derogatory names are given to disabled people most of which they symbolize uselessness or inhumanity (Haihambo & Lightfoot, 2010).

Namibia has a national level policy promoting community inclusion and inclusive education. Despite this policy, disabled learners are excluded from school and community life and there is no representation of inclusive education. It seems that with differing cultures there are differing social beliefs and therefore differing views of disability (Haihambo & Lightfoot, 2010).

Armstrong et al (2011) claim that a failure of inclusive education to become a force for educational reform in developing countries is the lack of engagement with the contextual realities, one such reality being the opportunity to 'voice a different experience, a different reality' (Armstrong et al, 2011:37). In Namibia attempts by the international change agents to alter attitudes concerning disability make space for the peoples' voice to be heard. Local understanding and the reality of the social issues must be taken into account (Haihambo & Lightfoot, 2010).

In India too, international intervention to introduce teacher development models could not be sustained or upscaled to national level. The models did, however, achieve a linguistic shift from integration to inclusion although the understanding did not parallel this. It appears in India that inclusion is viewed as a 'Northern' term attached to principles of special education, and serious encounter and engagement with this term in India has not taken place (Singal, 2005:345).

From earlier statistics, it is clear that nearly two thirds of the worlds' disabled people live in Asia and South East Asia (Peters, 2003). In India many children are not in school and the government faces the formidable task of providing wide-spread education to all by 2015 (Singal, 2006). Inclusion in India is not a familiar concept and despite the Indian government pledging affinity to the ideology and practices of inclusive education, the understanding and practice has not filtered down into the classrooms. In fact the terms integration and inclusion are used interchangeably, indicating that there is very little common understanding of the meaning of inclusion. In addition, the scant literature equates inclusion with impairment and therefore overlooks the exclusion of children for other reasons (Hodkinson & Devarakonda, 2009).

A further barrier to the progress of inclusive education in India is the negative attitude of practitioners to the policy. The learner continues to be viewed through a medical model lens where the responsibility of fitting in to the mainstream rests with him/her. Teachers believe that the learner needs to adjust to the standards of the school, meaning that inclusion would depend on academic performance and would be merely one of location. Practitioners believe that if disabled learners are not able to cope in

the mainstream they should be taught in a separate system. It appears then there has been merely a linguistic shift which ignores learners' basic rights to education (Hodkinson & Devarakonda, 2009) and where inclusive education is regarded simply as a separate part of the education system (Singal, 2006).

Armstong et al (2011) said earlier that it is important to understand contextual realities in order to arrive at a 'new understanding' (Hodkinson & Deverokonda, 2011:14). Hodkinson & Deverokonda (2011) agree that if we are to avoid the enforced meanings of global discourses and policy which seek to correct local ideology, we have to question how the local culture understands and receives its language. By way of illustration it is essential to appreciate how teachers in India understand the word inclusion.

Firstly, there is no direct translation in Hindi for the word (Singal, 2006). Secondly, in contrast to Western thinking of pity as 'backwardness', Indian thinking is based on a religious meaning of pity which has been tradionally passed down from generation to generation to reinforce values related to charity and compassion. Therefore pity and compassion, to Indian teachers is a social construct based on karmic principles. So in this instance, pity is not an emotion of contempt but rather a 'fellow-feeling' that concepts of equality lack. This example depicts how the forcing of global discourses upon local cultures without any attempt at understanding their heritage achieves nothing but confusion and obscurity (Hodkinson & Deverokonda 2011:14,15).

Barriers like the above lack of understanding make it difficult to find inclusive education best practice in developing countries. In Latin American countries, however, there are a number of innovative inclusive education programmes in operation. The transition to democratic transformation has resulted in the growth of an awareness of inclusive education and countries like Guatemalo, Honduras and Columbia all have a philosophy and vision of inclusive education; while bilingual, multigrade and intercultural education programmes are present in many schools in these countries (Peters, 2003).

In developing countries an overall picture of how the needs of disabled learners' are addressed is difficult to achieve. However according to reports emanating from individual countries, there is a focus on increasing access, some evidence of teacher training, maximizing system efficiency and resource capacity through community based collaboration (Peters, 2003). In these countries there seems to be a quantitative rather than a qualitative improvement. Access is still a serious problem. Resources matter but so do attitudes, values and culture, with attitudes being as much a barrier to participation as infrastructure (Armstrong et al, 2011).

In sum the main challenge to the advancement of inclusive education in developing countries appears to be the nature of research and collaboration between special needs personnel from developed and developing countries which points often to the disregard of the concepts of equity, social justice and human rights in the specific cultural traditions. Moreover these adopted policies which are so far removed from their social environment become ineffective. Yet, there is evidence of the success of a large number of inclusion projects such as in Swaziland as well as innovative programmes present in some developing countries which can teach others how to overcome these seemingly intractable barriers.

Developing countries have also to confront numerous other challenges and barriers. These include attitudes towards inclusive education, the failure in many countries to effect law and policy, socio-economic factors, environmental barriers such as inaccessible school buildings, language which in certain cases is not the first language of learners, lack of resources, too few teachers trained in curriculum differentiation, lack of organization and governance, an inadequate knowledge base of learners excluded from the system, and little data on how many have impairments. In addition, many of the developing countries subscribe to a medical deficit model of viewing disability. These challenges obstruct the progress of inclusive education in developing countries. While these countries face challenges, there must be movement towards refocusing on human rights, decentralization that involves participation and partnerships for change and intensive teacher training (Peters, 2003).

Within the African context, South Africa with its relatively developed economy is a signatory to both EFA and Salamanca's Millennium Development Goals and as such is committed to inclusive education. The country has a consultative white paper, (WP6), advocating this type education as a right for all those who have been traditionally excluded. South Africa has, however, only recently attained a voice in education equal to that of the international community (Peters, 2007) and has embarked on a journey towards inclusive education. The next section traces this journey.

2.4 Inclusive education in South Africa

2.4.1 Inclusive education in South Africa pre 1994.

Special Education in South Africa was formalized through a series of enactments beginning in 1960 and reserved for white learners. It was only in 1979 that Act 90 was introduced for special education for African children (African refers to disadvantaged Black children distinct from coloured and Indian in the discourse of apartheid in South Africa) (Nkabinde & Rodriguez,1998). Again, only the white special schools were well resourced while Indian special schools were, but to a limited extent. Black children who needed additional support either attended local schools where there was no support, or did not attend school at all (Walton, 2011).

White learners who needed support were privy to a continuum of services ranging from institutions to special schools, remedial classes within mainstream schools or the pullout system This means learners were withdrawn from their mainstream classes during the school day and were remediated in other classes (Pather, 2007). They were sustained by education support services and special needs education, both of which were expensive, and by highly specialized services available to only a limited number of children in urban areas (Muthukrishna & Schoeman, 2000). However, in black schools where the teacher-pupil ratio was high, this practice was not able to be implemented (Pather, 2007, Naicker, 2000).

Remedial classes in mainstream schools were established in White, coloured and Asian school systems, but only for learners of average intelligence (Naicker, 2000).

47

Black learners had virtually no support which resulted in the majority of them being excluded from the system or mainstreamed by default (Pather, 2007).

This was alleviated somewhat by certain humanitarian organizations that provided basic reading and writing education for black learners, as well as training in vocational skills. However, there was a shortage of such facilities for the black majority as most facilities were in the cities, forcing learners to leave home and board in a foreign city without their families (Nkabinde, 1993).

The apartheid ideology did not only symbolize a physical separation but with its principles also determined a segregation in understanding and perception. Naicker (2006) argues that because the apartheid doctrine focused on an absolute understanding of the world and an authoritarian approach, the thinking, teaching and practice of people during that time would be influenced by it. In fact, argues Naicker (2000), teaching practices at the time were informed and fashioned by theories of learning such as fundamental pedagogics, which served apartheid interests. He gives an example of a theory of learning which emphasises innate notions, such as knowledge and which needs facts and drill techniques in order to operationalize it (Naicker, 2006).

In addition, a theory of learning which emphasizes innate notions views disability as impairment or loss, with the disabled learner looked upon as helpless. This deficit model regarded the individual as needing to be cured outside of the regular education system. Deficiencies of the system were ignored and those operating it were vindicated of all responsibility, thus attaching the cause of deficiency to the individual and not the system (Naicker, 2006).

It is important at this point to mention some of the ideologies which existed during the apartheid years, as large numbers of teachers were and still are influenced by functionalism and pedagogics, a sub-branch of functionalism. This paradigm had to do with prediction and control and a belief in a non-democratic system, and it is possible that many teachers are still indoctrinated by this paradigm. In addition the type of thinking to which teachers subscribed was based on Calvinism and Christian National

Education. These accept the assumption that achievement is only realized through obedience and the learner through obedience is an object to be moulded. This fundamental pedagogics paradigm removed any sociological explanations of teaching and learning (Naicker, 2000).

Special education discourses were located within a functionalist paradigm, whereas mentioned earlier, much of the understanding is the belief that problems are located within the learner, giving rise to the pathological notion of the individual being the one who causes the failure. During that period there was an assumption that the system was working and any failure was caused by the learner who was branded with a pathological label (Naicker, 2000). Muthukrishna & Schoeman, (2000), argue that the notion of special educational needs with its language connotations has promoted education legends and prejudices and seems to have been applied to all learners who do not fit into the system.

We noted earlier in the review of the international literature that this model was not limited to South Africa but was prevalent world-wide. It is also reasonable to mention that this was not the only model which guided understanding and implementation of learning. There were those who supported behaviourist learning theory as a preferred model. The principles of this model were based on learned behaviour which becomes habitual as a result of reinforcement. They believed that learners' behaviour could be modified gradually in the direction of the desired behaviour. Once the learner's problem was understood, a strategy was constructed which would fit the level and situation of the learner (Case & Bereiter,1984).

Cognitive learning theories were a response to the behavourist model. Piaget's theory of cognitive development was extremely influential in developing educational policy and teaching. This theory purports to present cognitive development as a progressive reorganization of mental processes dependent on biological maturation and environmental experience. It focuses on different stages of development rather than on the actual act of learning and explains the mechanisms and processes as the child develops into a thinking and reasoning being (McLeod, 2009).

Returning to the schools, in South Africa the education system at the time consisted of schools in the government sector and a small but well established independent or private school sector. The independent schools generally reflected the same issues as the government schools, in that there were both with ordinary and special schools. The difference was that independent schools were often multi-racial (Walton, 2011). Nowadays there are special state schools and independent schools, as well as ordinary schools, all offering varying degrees of support for children with learning difficulties. State schools are funded by the government and are entitled to additional governing body fee payments from parents who can afford them. Independent schools exist with some autonomy in their governance, curriculum and policy, as long as they do not discriminate for example, on the grounds of race for admission, which is a constitutional prerequisite. Education is managed at provincial and national levels by a single Department of Education (DoE) (Walton, 2011).

South Africa has a unique, historical, educational and socio-economic context which distinguishes it from other countries, and therefore the way inclusion is expressed will be different (Walton et al, 2009). In 1994 a welcome shift occurred towards the rejection of a medical deficit model a move instead towards a human rights discourse and the resolve being made to ending segregated education in all forms (Naicker, 2000). What follows is the journey from apartheid's 'fragmented education system' to an inclusive education system with the election of the first democratic government (Walton, 2011:240).

2.4.2 Inclusive education in South Africa post 1994.

Inclusive schools in
South Africa are characterized by ubuntu—the African philosophy
of being that says, "I am because we are, or I am
fully human in relationship with others." This emphasizes
community and cooperation among people and the sharing
of whatever is available.

Walton 2011:243

One of the challenges facing education in post-apartheid South Africa was that in order to realize 'ubuntu' and, human dignity, it had to fulfil the constitutional values of equality and, freedom from discrimination, and it had to be able to provide a basic education to all its learners. With South Africa's policy of inclusive education, the goal of the advancement of human rights was decreed.

It must be noted that each government interprets its policies on inclusive education in terms of its own history, traditions, values and structures (Nel, Müller, Hugo, Helldin, Bäckmann, Dwyer & Skarlind, 2011). Thus in South Africa, because of its history, inclusive education is rooted in a philosophical and ethical position that all children should have educational rights and opportunities. A human rights culture embraced inclusive education as the solution to its past policy of separate education and viewed it as a means to provide a holistic approach to all domains of children's development. It was also the point of reference for broader beliefs such as social values, respect for diversity and social justice (Greyling, 2009).

After the first democratic elections in 1994, the Bill of Rights provided the hope for inclusive education. The elections in South Africa coincided with the Salamanca Statement and the guiding principles of this document, produced under the auspices of UNESCO in 1994, spoke to the prevailing philosophy in South Africa, that schools should accommodate all children despite their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic or other circumstances (Greyling, 2009).

In the early 90's and following the example of the Salamanca Statement, there were various calls for the development of a single inclusive South African education system. WP6 arose from the need to change from past unsatisfactory, educational experiences of learners who experienced special educational needs in mainstream or remedial schools. In the light of the joint findings of the National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training (NCSNET) and the National Committee for Education Support Services (NCESS) in October 1996, there was a recommendation that the South African education system promote education for all and foster the development of inclusive and supportive centres of learning (DoE 2001).

Numerous policy documents, Green papers, White papers and Acts were produced presenting as their rationale the promotion and protection of the rights of disabled people, until July 2001, when after a consultative process, WP6 was launched. WP6 originated from a rights perspective that was conversant with liberal, critical and democratic thinking (Nel et al, 2011).

This paper outlines six principles which highlight capacity building, leadership, collaboration, support through several services, provision and access, curriculum assessment and quality assurance, advocacy and appropriate and adequate funding support (Pather, 2007) and was a response to the disparities and inequalities which still existed from the apartheid policies. WP6 outlined the country's framework for building an inclusive education system envisaging that over a period of 20 years five hundred ordinary primary schools would include learners with moderate to severe support needs (Walton, 2011).

The White Paper also emphasised that all learners can learn and are entitled to support. It suggested that education structures could meet the needs of all learners, acknowledging and respecting their differences in all learners with regard to age, gender, ethnicity, language, socio-economic circumstances and disability by changing attitudes and environments to maximize the participation of all of them (Hay & Beyers, 2011). Since the ushering in of WP6 and in conjunction with provincial, national and international funding organizations, there have been pilot projects on inclusive education in five of the country's most disadvantaged provinces (Pather, 2007).

However, as Hodkinson (2010:61) said earlier, many of the barriers to operational inclusion can be located within the government and the ambiguity of its policies. One particular abstruseness in the then minister's introduction to WP6 is, 'learners with severe disabilities will be accommodated in …special schools, as part of an inclusive system' (DoE, 2001:3). This divisive statement seems out of step with inclusion principles which are based on the constitutional values of equality and freedom from discrimination. This type of ambiguity puts disabled learners in danger of being 'crushed by the weight of political policy' which dominates the inclusive education domain. Like Hodkinson (2010), van Rooyen, Le Grange & Newmark (2004:2) believe

it is necessary to read policy 'deconstructively', and to look at the discourses which dominate.

A prominent discourse in WP6 is the rights discourse, a vital element of democracy which describes the right to basic education and the right to equality. Yet it removes the right to non-discrimination as it excludes people according to their level of support needs, seriousness of disability and barriers to learning (van Rooyen et al, 2004). Again, WP6 is prone to ambiguity and open to various interpretations, as it promises 'human rights and social justice for all learners' (DoE, 2001:5), albeit conditional on the severity of the disability.

Van Rooyen et al, (2004), question whether rights to equal access of learners with disability or high needs of support are being established and who determines what is equal, right and fair. It appears that this discourse in WP6 has the potential to enforce exclusion and leave us with unanswered questions about the recipients of social justice and human rights.

Dissecting WP6 further, one becomes aware of the idea of objectification. Although I am not using discourse analysis I borrow the idea of objectification from discourse analysis when considering parents, teachers and learners in WP6. It appears that they are objectified and do not participate or share in the decision of equality and equity. According to Graham (2005) the practice of objectification of individuals, in this case parents, teachers and learners, serves to place them in spaces in the hierarchy until through repeated suppression they actually begin to accept and know their place.

It seems that the parents, teachers and learners are the objects of dissemination, support movements and managers who apparently take it for granted that they, the staff of the ministry, know their needs (Van Rooyen et al 2004). The ministry '…will put in place a public education programme to inform and educate parents…'. The ministry has also decided that 'educators will need to improve their skills and knowledge and develop new ones' (DoE, 2001:30:18). One must conclude with the idea that teachers are passive recipients of decisions made by others for their professional development. Staying with this notion Walton and Lloyd (2011) note that teachers are the recipients and the 'primary resource for receiving [the] goal of inclusive education' (DOE,

2001:18). Here again is the suggestion that teachers are merely the objects used to achieve the goal of inclusive education.

In the above instance one is left with an image of a sports team, epitomizing teachers, working together and, collaborating to achieve the goals of operational inclusive teaching. However, this is not the case. The problem arises as WP6 depicts the role of teachers as objects who do not own the goal, who are distanced from direct responsibility, and who are merely a resource to be used to achieve the goal. This metaphorical idea of a goal also implies something long term, not an immediate possibility which poses another problem given the current and immediate demands of the educational needs of learners in South Africa (Walton & Lloyd, 2011).

Reviewing WP6's goals we are made aware of 'short-term, medium-term and long-term goals'. The short-term and medium-term goals focus on weaknesses and deficiencies in the current system and the provision of access to children of compulsory school-going age who are not currently accommodated in schools (DoE, 2001:45).

Four years later in 2005 and emerging out of WP6 came a guideline which outlines assistance provided for education institutions by District Based Support Teams (DBST). This guideline repeats the short, medium and long-term goals of WP6. However in terms of progress it describes only 'gradually' reaching the point of providing educational access to all and is still in the process of 'addressing weaknesses in the current system' (DoE, 2005:12).

Returning to WP6, one of the long-term goals is to 'build an… education and training system' (DoE, 2001:45). According to Walton & Lloyd (2011) the notion of building something where there was nothing, for example, 'laying foundations' and 'building institutional capacity' (DoE, 2001:46) sounds appropriate when describing transformation and inclusive education in South Africa. However, the concern raised in this type of thinking is that while this allows us to conceptualise visions of plans and structure linked with community and upliftment, it also conjures up an image of something real, a tangible object, symbolizing inclusion as a thing and not an action.

This rationale suggests a choice of whether to include or not and extends further to a lack of accountability which evokes an image of passivism on the part of the "objects" namely the teachers. The responsibility of inclusion is therefore deflected to the ministry and the classroom then becomes the site of inclusions and exclusions in varying degrees.

Messages of inclusion being a journey and a process arise from an emphasis on long-term goals or twenty year roll out periods which endorse the practice of part or some inclusion. This gives schools permission not only to practise their own interpretation of inclusion and to be recognized as being somewhere on the inclusion continuum, but also to deflect criticism as they excuse themselves for being on the continuum but not far enough to include certain learners (Walton & Lloyd, 2011). This type of language interpretation is characteristic of how 'the uses and abuses of language frame meanings that disable and exclude' (Slee 2001:169).

Permission to exclude is extended further as WP6 presents an education system which embodies the norm 'incorporating' (DOE, 2001:10) and allowing learners with barriers to be welcomed into a space which is the ideal but from which those learners differ (Walton & Lloyd, 2011). This sort of rationale negates 'the naturalness of diversity' (Graham, 2005:7) and encourages the voices of the parents placed in the margins, who may have different beliefs and values. Those parents who are not interested in "a basic education for all", but are more interested in and are permitted to speak out for a quality education with standards and accountability models (van Rooyen et al, 2004).

It seems that the policy in South Africa is punctured with inconsistencies and mutually exclusive statements that marginalize parents of learners with disabilities and question constructs such as democracy, social justice and human rights (Van Rooyen et al, 2004). Furthermore, according to Gous (2009), in WP6 there is an apparent ambiguity as to how inclusive education should be implemented and it is interpreted differently according to the context in which it finds itself. It is important therefore that there be clear specifications of what constitutes full inclusion implementation.

The guideline mentioned earlier which describes the conversion of some state schools to full service schools suggests that 'a fundamental change of principles, cultures and practices' is needed (DoE, 2005:12). Yet it fails to outline what the practice is. This does not bode well for inclusive education, as Armstrong et al (2011) argues, because its implementation in practice is dependent on policy definitions and meanings.

The practice of inclusive education is also dependent on flexible curricula. Vayrynen (2004) argues that its success is directly related to the curriculum. Similarly WP6 proposes that 'curricula create the most significant barrier to learning and exclusion… and are central to accommodation of diversity' (DOE, 2001:31).

The South African curriculum evolved from a previously pedagogically defective, authoritarian, teacher-centred and inflexible curriculum, to Curriculum 2005 which was based on outcomes-based education principles and which blended well with inclusive education. Unfortunately the country did not have the infrastructure, financial backing or human resources to deal with its proposed changes (Hay & Beyers, 2011).

At the time of this writing a new curriculum, Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS), of which inclusive education is a fundamental principle, has been launched. The CAPS document requires all schools to offer the same curriculum to their learners while ensuring variations in delivery and assessment to accommodate them all. Furthermore, this document provides guidelines for learner diversity in the classroom, which are envisioned for teachers, principals, subject advisors and other school personnel and which clearly steer and outline curriculum differentiation in the classroom (DoE, 2011). In my opinion this is a policy statement which speaks to teachers and therefore has the potential to translate into practice in the classroom and benefit the learners. It presents differentiation and assessment strategies in a clear and easily readable way for teachers to enable the school curriculum to be accessible to all.

We have seen how a government and its policy ambiguities can act as barriers to inclusion. The barrier to successful inclusion which was described earlier by Naicker (2006) as an apartheid approach which impacts on people's thinking and practice in

the classroom, can only be discarded by means of extreme philosophical and pragmatic intervention and change. Engelbrecht (2006) believes the change will only occur when the balance of forces is shifted by continuous engagement with the application of inclusion education as a strategy. The question I ask is whether CAPS is sufficient or if we need more than that.

In Lewin's opinion this forcefield could only be altered under complex psychological conditions. Merely providing a driving force for change would result in an immediatie counteraction in the form of a restraining force which would prevent there being any change (Schein, 1996). For example, an apartheid approach would be seen as a restraining force to maintain the equilibrium of current thinking and practice. The shift would need more than engagement with inclusive education. It would need an intense psychological influence to effect change.

What of change in South Africa? At this time, eight years after the initializing of Curriculum 2005 and twelve years after WP6, South Africa's inclusive education system (hereafter referred to as SAMIE) has evolved into the implementation phase (Hays & Beyers 2011). It is important to note however, that as of March 2010 only 8 of the proposed 500 primary schools selected for full conversion schools to inclusive practice had completed the process (Motshegka A, 2010a in Walton & Nel, 2012). In Hay & Beyer's (2011) opinion South Africa has not taken the route of full inclusion but has instead, developed a nuanced or graded system where special schools and specialized settings remain in force.

Slee (2012) argues that special schools only exist because of the failure of regular schools. Yet in South Africa this is not the case. There are many special schools with learners on waiting lists. Pather (2011:1103) implies that in South Africa regarding inclusive education 'we have not arrived as yet'. His argument is that the tensions between the beliefs of those with the individual-deficit mind-set and those with the social mind-set that are evident in the challenge of policy translating into practice. These continuing contradictions in the minds of policy-makers and teachers prevent successful implementation.

On a positive note, Hay & Beyers (2011) are of the opinion that South Africa has the best socially just model for a developing country and they see it as a fair and morally correct route for the shorter to medium terms, until societal inequities have receded. Pather (2007) too believes that it is important to look for understandings of inclusion in the context in which inclusion finds itself.

On this point Naicker's (2006) two arguments seem feasible. His first point which is relevant to South Africa as a result of the apartheid doctrine, is that many people are still stuck in a special education and medical deficit mind-set. His second point is that teachers have not been given conceptual tools as guidance to navigate their way through the new educational pedagogy. He believes we have underestimated the significance of knowledge of new theories and how a lack thereof restricts the shift to inclusive policy goals and aims.

As described earlier, the 'synchronicity' of South African's democracy and the increase of inclusive education practices internationally has impacted overwhelmingly on education transformation in South Africa. Yet there remains continuing tension in transforming policies into practice (Engelbrecht, 2006:254). According to Naicker (2006) the change to a democratic society was the dream of every oppressed South African, yet the apartheid ideology still remains. Inclusive education requires a paradigm shift away from a pathological medical model, which was instrumental in sanctioning special education, to a social model of non-racist, non-disablist, anti-class and non-sexist assumptions (Naicker, 2000), which is framed within a human rights approach as outlined in WP6 and as per the constitution of the Republic of South Africa.

Many authors deem that teachers are the key agents to bring about a change in the reconstruction of education. It seems obvious then that teachers will, as Naicker (2006) argues, need to be trained in the knowledge of new theories in order to make the shift to a social model and to the resulting inclusive teaching. What follows is a closer look into South African state and independent schools to see the extent to which learners who experience barriers to learning (a preferred South African description of disabled learners) are included by their teachers, and to understand the practices of teachers who enable or disable inclusion.

2.4.3 State schools

Almost 95 per cent of schools in South Africa are state schools and 5 per cent are independent schools. The Department of Education (DoE, 2009) has identified many schools in the state schools arena whose principles and practices are commensurate with those of inclusive schools (DoE, 2009). Some examples of inclusive practices in South Africa were taken from Mpumalanga and Northern Cape classrooms as a result of SCOPE's four year programme (South African – Finnish Co-operation Programme in the Education Sector pilot schools).

These schools followed a sequential pattern with the starting point being the uncovering of thinking, attitudes and beliefs behind teacher practice in order to identify areas which teachers needed develop to cater for diversity in ordinary schools. Following this was the practice of getting to know the learners and identifying barriers to learning. Strategies for this included Venn diagrams and using the Multiple Intelligences Theory which allowed learner profiles to be determined. With learners being central to the planning for teaching and learning, the teachers were able to design their differentiated lessons (Vayrynen, 2004).

The prevailing theme in these schools and a prerequisite for inclusive education was the awareness and constant development of an inclusive culture. An example of one criterion for this culture was the belief and high expectations of all learners regardless of their abilities or differences (Vayrynen, 2004). However, this culture was not prevalent in the majority of schools researched, and contradicts the earlier DoE's (2009), findings that many schools practise inclusive education.

Surty, (2012) found that particularly in the low socio-economic communities a large number of disabled children still do not attend school and the majority of schools were not inclusive. It appeared that the most serious obstacle to overcome was that of widespread prejudice towards children with intellectual disabilities.

This points to an absence or misconception of the meaning of disability and inclusion. Investigations in the Mtata regions concluded that teachers lacked a clear

understanding of the concept of inclusion. They understood it to mean learners with profound disabilities and many believed that learners with physical disabilities and mental and behavioural problems should be in special schools (Greyling, 2009).

This lack of clear understanding was confirmed by Du Toit & Forlin (2009). They found there was a perception by teachers that inclusive schools were those that had resource classrooms for learners with high support needs. Teachers were including children, yet their understanding was related to the provision of a special classroom rather than an attitude of acceptance. The majority felt that if any child unable to cope should not be included.

Generally, Du Toit & Forlin (2009) found evidence that there was no comprehensive understanding of what constitutes inclusive education. The practice of identification and support of children was confusing to teachers and they did not know what appropriate support strategies should be used to assist the learners.

It is well known that for inclusive education to be successful, it is essential to up skill and empower teachers to ensure that the appropriate curricular pedagogies are implemented (Du Toit & Forlin, 2009). Greyling (2009) found that many teachers were given little or no training in remedial or special education at their initial training colleges or institutions, many possessed only a two-year teaching diploma. Many had also not furthered their education. Moreover, while some of the training was not based on academically sound principles, other training had been provided during an apartheid separatist environment.

It therefore appeared that the "eradication" of apartheid did not mean the end of conservatism in education. This resulted in inhibited growth of a shared inclusive school philosophy (Engelbrecht, Oswald & Forlin, 2006). One can argue that the belief of exclusion had become part of the national psyche and many South African teachers, who are currently teaching, were trained in and began their teaching careers within a paradigm that held fast to the idea of the correctness of exclusion.

Similarly, Pather (2007) found that mainstream teachers and especially those who were born and brought up in a context which centred on two separate systems of education, assumed that disabled learners were better provided for in special schools. This is supported by an interesting finding by Greyling (2009) that younger teachers seemed more enthusiastic and eager to try out new ideas and viewed inclusive education as a challenge. They also seemed to be conceptually better informed.

Interestingly, Basson (2011) found that within the same school different degrees of inclusion were being practised. He concluded that teachers' inclusive practices were likely to be sustained in a short to medium period as teachers employed practices they have learnt. They would then revert back and draw on personal practices entrenched in their teaching repertoire (Basson, 2011). This erratic practice creates inconsistencies, as inclusion is teacher driven.

To put inclusive education into practice within diverse classrooms, teachers are seen as among the most valuable sources of implementation. They are responsible for creating an environment that contributes to the academic social and emotional wellbeing of the learners (Perold et al, 2010). Basson (2011) found that teachers who had been trained in inclusion, drawn into the process, coached in their classrooms and supported drove the intervention.

It is ultimately the teacher in the classroom who has to implement a government's policy and the significance of this role is stressed by (Nel et al, 2011). However, in South Africa, Nel et al (2011) found that because of the relatively new implementation of inclusion, teachers generally were indecisive regarding specialized support and felt unsure of the future implications of policy implementation.

Teachers are not the only barriers to inclusive education. Some, like Pillay & Di Terlizzi, (2009) will argue that the greatest barrier to it is South Africa's socio-economic environment which is not ready for its successful implementation. There is a lack of resources and facilities and they believe that implementation in South Africa requires greater economic investment.

In support of this Du Toit & Forlin's (2009) concluded that schools in high socio-economic areas had functioning educational systems with recognized strategies and measures to support them to become more inclusive. These schools had put structures in place to identify children requiring additional help and had established systemic support provision. There was also a monitoring of schools to ensure that procedures are enacted. In low socio-economic systems, however, such measures are generally absent.

It seems that two issues are important for inclusion's survival. The first one is the economic investment which enriches teacher experience and training and provides infrastructure. This appears to have an effect on the second, that of attitude and understanding. These two factors serve to inform the practice of inclusive education at schools and to diminish the special education, dual system mind-set.

Yet it is feasible that there is a third issue, an understanding of inclusion which 'is value-based and about community, rights, compassion, belonging and respect' (Pather, 2011:1114). The following findings inform this third point as indicated in Pather's study.

'Off the policy radar' in a Black rural community in the Ladysmith region, refers to a secondary school with an open admission policy and an array of learners regardless of age, disability or family economic status. Shleni High voluntarily admits all learners and sees itself as a community school valuing all learners equally. Disability is accepted in this community and the school admits such learners without carrying out the tedious red tape on background. Furthermore, Shleni High has reported never having excluded a learner on the grounds of non-payment of school fees (Pather, 2011:1103).

Peer and family support is evident, as for example transport arrangements which involve a lift club as opposed to a special needs bus. Two learners, one of them in a wheelchair, are in a lift club run by a 20 year old Grade 12 learner who has his own van. He is paid R40 monthly for this service and he helps them in and out of his van. Community support is further noted in the effort to address the needs of learners with

physical disabilities by means of make-shift concrete ramps, specially modified toilets and concreted assembly areas. Most significantly, there is evidence of an understanding of inclusion which is based on values about community, rights, compassion, belonging and respect (Pather, 2011).

This is not the only inclusion success story. An eleven year old learner with a severe-to-profound bilateral hearing loss was successfully included in a local mainstream primary school in Durban's urban area. Since leaving school she has qualified to be a teacher in a mainstream Islamic school. Her successful inclusion in mainstream education for the duration of her school career was attributed to the support she received from her parents, siblings, the school and her peers. Additionally the principal of the school had an open and welcoming attitude and a belief in the capabilities of all the children at the school. This attitude permeated throughout the school contributing to a welcoming school ethos and support from the teachers (Pather, 2011).

Like Shleni High, some mainstream schools became inclusive by default, which seems to be as a result of a community ethos and support. In the case of the school in Durban, successful inclusion could be attributed to the principal's beliefs and attitude. However, unlike Shleni High and the Durban school, some schools which became inclusive had questionable teaching methods and practices. Generally discipline at these schools was chaotic and demotivated and despondent teachers regarded their practice of inclusive education as negative (Greyling 2009).

In summary, it is apparent from available research that despite the challenges confronting mainstream schools which relate mainly to general barriers such as teacher training, lack of resources, funding and resistant attitudes, there is some evidence, however limited, of successful practice where support is available and where teachers demonstrate an ability to respond positively and effectively to inclusion. There is also evidence in the absence of economic support that those attitudes of "Ubuntu" which are prevalent are the forces which successfully drive inclusive education.

Where there is commitment by principals or other key personnel, inclusive education is present. What follows commitment are structures, the provision of support through support teams and personnel, instructional practices, assessment modification, individual support and accessibility, all of which serve to reduce exclusion and welcome diversity.

Pather (2011:1115) argues that focusing on conversion to full-service schools (as outlined in DoE, 2005) may further reinforce a model supported by a learner deficit rather than a system-deficit approach. What needs to be done to strengthen inclusive practice is to provide further support for the current process and to share research from schools where learners are included. However, this is not happening and this critical knowledge he believes is 'off the policy radar'

Sharing of research is not enough and using Shleni High and the Durban school again as examples, for inclusion to be possible and become a reality, schools, according to Du Toit & Forlin, (2009), need to change within themselves. This 'profound psychological dynamic process' called change according to Schein (1996:28) would involve painful relearning but perhaps as Engelbrecht (2006) suggested earlier, continuous engagement with inclusive education would be the action needed to shift the forces.

2.4.4 Independent schools

In the independent sector there is greater economic investment and concomitantly seemingly more evidence of inclusive practices being employed than in the state sector. Walton et al (2009) found that that most of the schools which fall under the Independent Schools Association of Southern Africa (ISASA) include learners who experience barriers to learning although Gous (2009) found very little documentation on inclusive practice in independent schools.

Walton, et al, (2009) addressed what they believed was a gap in research in South Africa and reported trends indicative of inclusive education in independent schools. They found that many schools employed special needs coordinators (SENCo) and support personnel which suggested that there was a high value placed on inclusion.

Other commonly occurring support specialists included occupational therapists, speech therapists and psychologists, although the prevalence of these therapists was connected to the affluence of the school.

Additionally, it was noticeable that ISASA schools were employing some of the strategies described in the literature such as cooperative learning, teaching for diverse learning styles and modified classroom environments, as well as, the management of class size. In contrast, however, was the lack of wheelchair access and modified reports to reflect individual education plans. Also noted was a low incidence of classroom facilitators. The use of facilitators is a well-known practice of inclusive education in developed countries so this lack could be as a result of the high cost and of parents having to fund facilitation themselves (Walton, et al, 2009). Where there are facilitators at all in South Africa they would mostly be present in independent schools.

It is doubtful that South Africa will in the near future surface from years of segregation on all levels and experience an undamaged thought process. Teachers must not only learn inclusive teaching methods but also question their beliefs, value systems, structures and the practices that continue to enable exclusion and marginalization in this society (Walton, 2011).

Having said that, Walton (2011) believes that South Africa can add a valuable dimension to the global understanding of inclusive education, especially with its context and history and its recent adoption of this education policy. However, despite this, many children are still being excluded from mainstream education. If South Africa is to realize fully its constitutional values of equality, social justice, and freedom from discrimination, inclusive education must to be seen as an urgent imperative by all schools, not as another program to be debated and delayed.

It is important to remember that because of South Africa's context in order to facilitate change, each school and the community in which it exists would need to be carefully assessed. It is vital that specific contextual influences that bear upon the way in which these schools function, must be analysed and understood by all stakeholders. Walton

(2011:244) suggests the approach to take to further the principles of WP6 is by 'learning more about the inclusive culture and practices at these schools'.

To this end I conclude that by exploring the different stakeholders' understanding of inclusion and how this understanding influences the practice in a monocultural Jewish community school, the knowledge base will be furthered. The next section will provide a brief history into the South African Jewish community.

2.5 The Jewish community in South Africa

From the time of the Dutch East India Company, Jews have lived in South Africa. There was a dearth of Jews at that time mainly due to a lack of community facilities, so as a result Jews tended to convert to Christianity. Later the 1860's witnessed an influx of Jews immigrating from Lithuania to South Africa (Greenblatt, 2006).

In 1849 the first synagogue was established in Cape Town and other cities and towns followed suit. The first rabbis were British and orthodox. Initially South African Jews were English speaking and homogenous until the 1880's when Jews from Eastern Europe began to arrive (Greenblatt, 2006).

As a result of there being two groups, there was a blending of English and eastern European influences referred to as "Anglo-Litvak". Later in the early 1900's the initial rush of immigration began to slow down. The merging of these two groups of Jews also slowed down and the Jews began to form new divisions incorporating anglicised and Yiddish oriented ones (Greenblatt, 2006).

Jewish immigrants began to absorb the cultures of the South African way of life and denounced their shtetl[2] mentality while still maintaining their sense of Jewish identity. Their lifestyles became more ritual-free which seemed to be tolerated by the rabbinate[3]. This somehow prevented their fragmentation and protected their affiliation to orthodoxy (Greenblatt, 2006).

---

[2] A Shtetl was typically a small town with a large Jewish population in Central and Eastern Europe until the Holocaust.
[3] The term of rabbis as a group.

66

There were, however, educational restrictions on the Jews at the beginningof the 20th century. Because South African education in government schools was based on a strictly Christian Protestant religious foundation, Catholic and Jewish children were refused admission to government schools. The motive behind this was not as a result of any particularly anti-Jewish sentiment, but rather because of the severe Calvinist constitution of the Republic (Saron, Shain & Saks, 2008).

When they first arrived in South Africa Jews were not exposed to discrimination, but that changed over time. One area of discrimination was the limiting of Jewish immigration into the country and in 1930 a quota act formalizing this was passed. The discrimination between 1948 to 1976 during the apartheid years all but disappeared and only affected the South African Jews inasmuch as they were segregated along with the other English speaking whites and were even able to support the state of Israel, albeit tacitly. These conditions allowed Jews to preserve their cultural identity and thriving Jewish communities were to be found all over South Africa (Greenblatt, 2006), as a result of South Africa's racial policies.

The flourishing and growing Jewish community adopted the mantle of a middle class lifestyle and moved into the cities and by the 1970's and 1980's Jewish day schools had replaced government schools in most Jewish areas as the schools of choice, where the curricula inculcated not only knowledge of, but emotional attachment to Judaism. Zionism in South Africa, the loyalty to and support of Israel, is perhaps stronger here than anywhere else in the world partly due to the strength of the Jewish day schools and the Zionist youth movements (Beinhart, 1996).

The ideology of apartheid had promoted separateness, at the same time legitimizing Jewish separateness and identity, and it seemed by the end of the twentieth century that Jewish identity, specifically in Johannesburg had shifted from ethnicity to religion. The shift had been enabled by the drive towards a homogenous community and was created and maintained by the educational domain, namely the community schools (Herman, 2004).

The community by its homogenous nature had leanings towards exclusivity and separateness and this was mirrored in the community schools which had played a vital role in both maintaining and creating the shift. Tension has always surrounded faith-based community schools and encouraged questions around whether they were discriminatory, whether the system was undemocratic, and how a Jewish school could open its doors to all and yet still maintain its Jewish ethos (Herman, 2004).

Historically the Jewish day schools offered remedial services, but after a marketing campaign in the 1990's and the influx of children from government schools the number of children with learning disabilities grew (Herman, 2004). There was a steady stream of children enrolling in Jewish day schools from remedial schools each year. This particular school community was now faced with learning diversity as opposed to homogeneity as the educational landscape changed rapidly.

Schein (1996) argues that all forms of change arise when there is dissatisfaction or frustration caused by the contradiction of our expectations or hopes. This contradiction or disconfirmation is the first force which unbalances our equilibrium. We then have some choices to make: we can either ignore the information, dismiss it, blame it on others or simply deny it. Change only occurs if we accept the information and attach it to something about which we care.

The above paragraph is the beginning of Lewin's change model and Schein (1996) trusts this model as the one which is best able to explain various change phenomena. Like Schein, I rely on this model to explain the forces which played out among the stakeholders during this time. Furthermore, I use this theory as a lens through which to view understandings and the practice of inclusive education as the school transformed from a homogenous environment to an environment abounding with children who experienced barriers to learning. The next section illuminates Lewin's change model as a theoretical framework.

Chapter 3 Theoretical framework

3.1 Lewin's Theory of Planned Change

I have striven not to laugh at human actions, not to weep at them, nor to hate them, but to understand them.

Baruch Spinoza (Quote Junkie: Philosophy Edition 2008:18)

In this chapter, I investigate Lewin's Planned approach to change, specifically exploring the key elements of his Field Theoretical approach and Group Dynamics methods. His approach to change was to promote ethical behavour and allow change by free will (Burnes, 2009). In order to shed light on the philosophy of inclusive education, as understood and implemented by the stakeholders of the Jewish community school, I intend to separate some of his precepts for the purposes of this study.

Lewin's theory has many components: he saw it as a unified whole with each element supporting and reinforcing the others on a path to bring about planned change. The four elements of his Planned approach comprised: Field Theory, Group Dynamics, Action Research and the 3-Step model of change (Unfreezing-Moving-Refreezing). Field Theory and Group Dynamics provide an understanding of behaviour and change, Action Research brings about planned change and the 3-Step model explains it (Burnes, 2009).

Kippenberger (1998) is of the opinion that current thinking is to adopt a separatist view of the components of his theory. So for the purposes of this study, I will use Lewin's key tools of Field Theory and Group Dynamics as a lens to understand how behaviour is formed, motivated and maintained, as I believe that knowledge of the stakeholders' thoughts and feelings will explain their level and type of implementation of inclusive education. I relate specifically to these two elements since I find that they will provide me with useful tools to explain the data.

Lewin contended that if an individual's learning facts ran counter to his beliefs, this may lead to denial of the knowledge, increased guilt and frantic defense. The individual may try to deal with his beliefs in new ways that reconfirm the beliefs, or this may lead to immobilization because of inner conflicts (Benne, 1976). So, based on this premise, the hypothesis of this study is that the stakeholders' understanding and implementation of inclusive education is extensively influenced by individual beliefs.

Lewin viewed an individual's belief as set in the context of his group. This group idea of Lewin's has left an enduring mark on modern thinking, as has the concept of a forcefield which consists of opposing forces holding group processes in a state of equilibrium (Kippenberger, 1998). Lewin termed this forcefield, a quasi-stationary equilibrium which was in a constant state of change (Burnes, 2004). In other words the whole psychological field within which people live and act has to be viewed in order to understand behaviour (Smith, 2001).

In our lives the rhythm and pattern of our actions, such as regular shopping trips, settle us into a routine and pace and we achieve a level of equilibrium. Lewin argues that this regular pattern is determined by the interplay of a multiplicity of forces (Kippenberger, 1998). These forces fluctuate constantly due to changes in the circumstances that intrude on the group and if one could establish the influence of these forces, one could understand individual and group behaviour (Burnes, 2004).

The field theoretical approach is used to explain social behaviour by looking at the total situation and the forces which are distributed in it (Lewin,1939). This approach in the social sciences explains regularities in individual action through the position of the individual to others, where the force invades 'from the inside' (Martin, 2003). The personality is structured from within, but linked to the outside in any form with the environment. Field theory looks at the individual person embedded in other relations of interdependence (Mey, 1972).

Field Theory was initially apparent in the physical sciences and classical electromagnetism highlights its characteristics. It explained changes involving the interaction between the field and the existing states of the elements which have

attributes that make them prone to the field effect (Mey, 1972). It regarded the rate and direction of movement in any dynamic system to be determined by the structure of the total field. The path of movement of any system was decided on by the vector-field (force field) of that system (Brown & Voth, 1937).

In psychology, it became effective with the Gestalt theories, with individual precepts being understood in relation to a wider perceptual field (Mey, 1970). A gestalt is a coherent whole with its own laws and is a construct of the individual mind rather than reality (Smith, 2001). Lewin adopted this totalistic perspective into social psychology (Martin, 2003). However, his theory is set apart from the model in physics by its comprehensive view of constellations of tension and conflict (Mey, 1970). Lewin brought field theory into a position where it was relevant for the social sciences and had implications of the theorizing of social fields (Martin, 2003).

To approximate his theory, he suggested the existence of a 'psychological field alive with a host of elusive but discoverable forces'. As an example of what might occur within this field, one would think of an individual caught in the entirety of facts which determine his behaviour (lifespace), as being attracted by something that appeals to him/her, taking measures to attain it (positive valence), engaging in locomotion and either reaching it or not and perpetually being changed or changing his forcefield all this while being intimately connected to the group (social field) (Kariel, 1956:281). To explain Lewin's Field theory and Group dynamics I will unpack the concepts in this assumption.

Martin, (2003), sums up field theory in three overlapping or interrelated ways. In the first, the field is conceived of as an analytic area of simplified dimensions where individuals or institutions are positioned. In the second, the field is perceived as an organization of forces. Thirdly, there is the sense of the field as a field of contestation or a combat zone.

Martin's (2003), combat zone is what Mey (1972) describes as a pattern of stress in the human psyche which leads to actions and relations. Any action and intellectual act is conditioned by the situational field existing at an infinitely close instant previous to it.

The situational field determines the action. Past and future are mentally referred to in the moment, insofar as it operates here and now (Mey, 1972). An important implication is that behaviour should be seen not as something in the past or future, but grounded in an understanding of the totality of the present situation. The principle of contemporaneity, of behaviour occuring at the same time or same phase as something else, was an appealing contribution to social analysis (Martin, 2003). To quote an example, looking at the strength of a floor, one looks at it in the here and now, not at how it was constructed years ago (Mey, 1972).

Every individual acts within a field with other peoples' influence contributing to it. As well as being influenced by other individuals, the individual influences the field and so does the ecological environment which consists of human institutions and human consciousness. So, the environnment acts as a field of forces to shape the individual and the individual also forms a field around himself, for himself and for others and in these fields he acts as a force factor (Mey, 1972).

According to Martin, (2003), institutions are seen as the building blocks of social explanation. The best description is that institutions contain observable regularities. Participants of institutions cannot only observe but will need to interact and experience a certain knowledge of what to do, when interacting. Examples of institutions are marriage and parenthood. Thus a field may exist when a set of elements occurs and their position to one another is described and in so doing shared subjectivities are induced. Put in another way, fields arise when individuals tend to negotiate a set of institutions in predictable ways with minimal disruption of subjectivity. Brown (1939) is of the opinion that social institutions, as well as customs, political and economic systems can reveal a wealth of information on human behaviour.

To examine the individual in social reality, one must be aware of the individual's dependence on the group and of the integration of sociology, which includes the political and economic nature of the culture, psychology, which includes psychoanalytic factors and biology. The basic science of human behaviour is termed socio-psycho-biology and the solution of a social science problem in terms of field theory requires the consideration of all this pertinent data (Brown, 1939),

Lewin saw the individual in a phenomenological life world, which is intrinsically emotional and in the head of the individual (Martin, 2003). The personality of the individual is structured from within but linked outside in any form with the environment (Mey, 1972). In the life world, the individual perceives something with the senses and the field which surrounds the precept reveals the presence of the precept, as well as, its specific properties (Mey, 1972). The individual is free to move about in the life world, coming into contact with positive and negative valences, which cause locomotion, and it is this locomotion which can be analyzed as focussed action in the field, or individual striving which points an individual on a certain path (Mey 1972). Valence is a value of demand equivalent to a goal which forms the cause of attraction or repulsion in the life-space of a person (Mey, 1972).

Changes occur as a result of the individual's own movement or locomotion and by internal developments of the field itself (Martin, 2003). These developments reduce the forces which restrain change, rather than increasing the forces which drive change (Coghlan & Brannick, 2003). The individual has conceptions of these changes in the field at any given time (Martin, 2003).

Thus if an individual is to live in reality and exhibit normality, he must be integrated into a group. True understanding can only be achieved from within the group in which the individual operates and on which he depends. To comprehend reality, 'the individual must function in the dynamic field, outside of which no meaningful knowledge is possible'. Lewin believed that 'all thought is inescapably woven into the factual field in which the thinker finds himself'. If he is in conflict with the field, his knowledge of social reality is inadequate, he is uncertain about his conditions and he suffers from anxieties. Therefore, the more he belongs the better for him (Kariel, 1956:283).

The best example of a social field is a group. A group is determined by the dynamic relation of forces existing between the members. Although individual characteristcis are different, a father, mother and child form a family bound by the dynamic relationship they have with one another (Mey,1972). To appreciate group processes Brown (1988), discusses two key ideas, interdependence of fate and task interdependence. Interdependence of fate means that groups exist as a result of their

fate depending on the fate of the group as a whole. An example is that the common fate of all Jews in the1930's formed them into a group despite any individual's change in attitude to Jewish issues. In this situation, the individual would also be more tolerant of differences of opinion among his fellow Jews. Task interdependence is a more significant factor, as there is interdependence in the goals of group members for achievement.

Lewin showed that crucial data were overlooked when behaviour was described without reference to the environment. He dramatized the intimate connection between group and member, indicating that all problems of individual behaviour, attitude and morale are really problems of group behaviour, group attitude and group morale. Furthermore, he agreed that to study groups one must observe the group as a whole, observe the group as composed of interdependent parts of members and observe each member as existing in a social field in which individual problems must be observed in a framework of group membership (Lewin & Lippitt,1938).

Behaviour must result from a totality of coexisting facts which have the character of a 'dynamic field' in so far as the state of any part of this field depends on every other part of the field. Therefore, true understanding can be achieved only from within the group upon which the individual depends (Kariel,1956:284).

Crucial questions which need to be asked are, what forces are keeping up the group life, what change would be brought about by what type of action, what forces would resist what changes, when would a change be permanent and when would group life spring back to previous design (Lewin, 1945)? There are a complicated network of problems and conflicting interests around whichever unit of group life we focus, whether it be groups of teachers, middle management groups, the community group, the parent group or top management groups.

To understand the workings of a school community it is not enough to know about education or finances or how to teach in a classroom. The cultural habits of the individual, the leadership techniques of management and the social atmosphere in the school are all vital information for enhancing this understanding.

All these relations around the individuals and many other aspects of group life have to be taken into account. Human factors are closely interlocked with the way individuals act. This action depends on the status relations in the family, the stereotypes we apply when thinking of our neighbours and the people we select as our authority. Every aspect of group life is involved including power politics, individual needs for security, religion, education, love, economic security, leadership, disposition and skills. All these forces, as well as the relations between the individual and the group, loyalty, belonging and marginality, are central to an understanding of behaviour (Lewin, 1945).

It is remarkable to what extent a strong cohesive group can control aspects of a member's behaviour and actions. Once one recognizes this fact and that attitudes, beliefs and values of the individual are all firmly grounded in the groups to which he/she belongs, behaviour change must occur as a result of the influence of the group on its members (Kariel, 1956).

Kariel, (1956) uses eight principles to shed light on the group as a medium of change and as a target of change. He states that in order to use the group effectively as a medium of change, those who are to exert influence for change must have a strong sense of belonging to the group. Also, the more attractive the group is to its members, the greater the influence that the group can exert on its members. In other words the more cohesive the group, the more ready its members are to influence others and the more ready they are to be influenced by others and to conform to pressures relevant to the group.

A group is attractive when it satisfies the needs of its members, when the importance of the group goal is increased, and when the group has increased status among other groups. Attitudes, values or behaviour which are relevant to the group will influence the group. The greater the prestige a group member has on other members, the greater the influence he can exert. Kariel, (1956) warns, however, that if subparts of a group change rather than the whole, this would result in resistance. Changes in one part of a group can produce strain in related parts, which can be diminished by eliminating or readjusting the change. Groups exert tremendous pressures upon members to conform to the group's norms. Deviation from these norms results in the

rejection or even expulsion of members. A shared perception by members to change, shifts the source of pressure to change within the group. Communication is critical for change to take place and need and plans for change must be shared by all relevant members in the group (Kariel, 1956).

The group approach provides the framework for explaining some of the limits to inclusion such as individual difficulties, teachers' lack of inclusiveness or lack of knowledge of inclusion, and a general lack of an inclusive culture. In addition, the focus of this study, which is to determine the stakeholders' understanding of inclusive education, will consider how this Jewish school community constructs its own limits to diversity and to what extent it can 'handle diversity without perceiving diversity as a threat to the cohesion of the community' (Hansen, 2012:94).

Lewin's analysis assumed that an individual's beliefs drive the possiblility and consequences of action in an individual's phenomenal world. Beliefs represent an individual's principles, in other words what an individual should or should not be doing. Principles as well as cognitive views of an individual's world are respresented by his beliefs. Thus beliefs are powerful forces which include an individual's attraction and aversion to his own and other groups and standards, his feelings regarding status differences and authority and his reactions to approval and disapproval (Benne, 1976).

Lewin argued that beliefs are such authoritative forces that a change in behaviour presupposes that new beliefs are perceived and determine action. His notion was, that change involves a change in beliefs, which is intimately linked to membership and identification with groups (Coghlan & Jacobs, 2005).

The identified beliefs were evident from the literature as well as from the data. During the coding stage the four discourses emerged and helped frame the data. The discourses of social justice (inclusion) and special education (exclusion) manifested abundantly in the literature. Pragmatism and community were derived from a study by Herman (2004) where two contrasting forces which pushed and pulled at the Jewish community group were identified. The first, managerialism/marketization suggests that schools are run like businesses within a determined set of practices indicating a

pragmatic viewpoint. The second, community/religion suggests schools are run on common standards and shared goals which provide emotional fulfillment to its members. So in addition to Lewin's Field Theory, the theoretical assumption of this study is that there are four belief systems or discourses at play in the context of a faith-based community school in South Africa.

The first belief system is special education. This mindset subscribes to a medical deficit model which means a diagnosis of the defect which is to be found within the child and needs to be remediated through certain prescribed programmes. In addition this belief system views diversity as problematic in both school and society (Brantlinger, 1997). The second is the pragmatic discourse, according to which a school needs to survive in a very competitive context and must ensure that it can be financially and academically viable.

The third belief system is that of the ideal of social justice on the basis of which inclusion and WP6 are envisaged. The fourth belief system is the community discourse of care, in particular the Jewish community which endeavours to care for each child regardless of financial or academic ability. In the next sections I will expand on these discourses.

3.2 The four discourses

3.2.1 The special education discourse

Special education discourse is based on the medical model that treats disabilitiy as a disease and difference as a social abnormality (Christensen & Dorn, 1997). These understandings guide teachers in their work and thoughts (Christensen & Dorn, 1997) and have had a pervasive influence on teacher training, beliefs and attitudes (Carrington, 1999). Special education advocates see learners with disabilities as needy. This is in direct conflict with meritocratic postulations of schooling. They view these needy children as not having achieved success in schools and therefore as not being worthy of receiving the associated rewards (Christensen & Dorn, 1997).

This discourse thus supports the idea that interventions for identified learners would be effectively provided in separated settings where special education teachers would be more successful than general education teachers in working with these learners. After receiving specialized intensive and individualized instruction, these learners may be able to be reintegrated into the mainstream, but only if they have the subsequent academic skills and school behaviours required by the mainstream norm (Brantlinger, 1997).

The special education approach has been criticized by those who advocate equity, social justice and human rights yet there are some who will argue that present special education structures should be retained on the very basis of equity and social justice. Furthermore, those with a special education approach disagree that labeling and placement are more damaging than possible replacements. In fact they argue that some learners actually prosper with special services (Christensen & Dorn, 1997).

3.2.2 The pragmatic discourse

Another theme that became apparent from the literature review, shows beliefs of pragmatism at play. Pragmatism, is based on the premise that speculative propositions can only be answered by deciding what the practical consequences of this acceptance would be. Pragmatists ask questions like: What practical difference would it make to a particular person's life if he were to accept this proposition? So, what is true for a particular person, is determined by the practical consequences of the plan in which he chooses to believe. By believing in something, it is made real, thereby changing aspirations to realizations (Jordaan & Jordaan,1989).

Pragmatic beliefs eschew hardened habits dear to philosophers and turn instead towards concrete facts and power. They are uncomfortable away from facts (Menand, 1997). Pragmatism answers questions about truth, norms and hope by determining what the practical consequences are. So what practical difference has including learners with barriers made in the lives of the stakeholders? What practical differences have been made in the classroom? In other words how have teachers created opportunities for children with barriers, to access the curriculum? What methods have

they employed in their classrooms? What practicalities have blocked or improved the implementation of inclusive education at the school?

3.2.3 The social justice and diversity discourse

Bartolo (2010) sees inclusion as an ideal towards which teachers need to work continuously. The mindset of teachers must be that inclusive education is a feasible option and not just something to talk about. Thus, the advocates of inclusive education need to find effective ways of convincing teacher educators to be commited towards quality education for all within a social justice context.

Any definition of a social justice belief system is problematic because in diverse societies people understand it differently (Taymum & Gunter, 2008). In South Africa, human rights and social justice have been realized through the process of struggle. It is accepted that human rights have both ethical claims and legal entitlements yet they cannot be enforced if they are unknown to teachers and the citizenry in general (Osler & Zhu, 2011).

A social justice belief system in a school refers to the principles of equality, including equal opportunity and the value of human rights. I will explore the influence that social justice beliefs have had on the understanding and implementation of inclusive education on this school. An example of social justice in schools would for a teacher to teach in a way that encourages behaviour toward a just world. It would signify a teacher or parent taking a stand against the mainstream trends to chase standards, accountability and testing, yet it could label one as a troublemaker, as individual beliefs are often in direct opposition to superfically enforced directives (Donnell, Yang, Winfield, Canestrari, Marlowe & Kamii, 2008).

3.2.4 The community discourse

Another belief system relevant to this study is community. By community, McMillan (1996) means a sense of belonging together, a feeling of trust and a spirit that comes from shared experiences. The first principle of the sense of community is membership, the sense of belonging and the sense of acceptance, which he has currently evolved

into the sense of friendship. The emphasis on friendship provides an audience where one sees oneself mirrored in the responses of others. Simply being Jewish opens the door to membership in this community.

Once one has the status of being a member of the community, does the community provide empathy, acceptance and support of each member to allow him to speak his truth and be himself (McMillan, 1996)? This is the question with which I am concerned. In this community which provides innate acceptance by virtue of birth, are children with barriers supported and accepted? Does the child tell his or her 'intensely personal truth', does the community accept this truth 'safely', and does the community respond with courage equal to the courage of the 'truth teller' (McMillan, 1996:316)?

Having an authority body making decisions develops trust in a community. If one looks at the authority, was it based on principle rather than person and does it allow members of the community to influence each other and authority reciprocally? If so, such a community would have trust and fairness but does it (McMillan, 1996)?

Strike (1999) suggests community is about belonging and all people want to belong, to have a sense of ownership, to be nurtured and to nurture. In fact, says Omoto and Snyder (2002), by belonging and by having a heightened and broadened sense of community, personal efficacy may be effected. Through clear psychological boundaries of social support and within a caring enrivonment, increased feelings of confidence and greater feelings of optimism and self-esteem are likely to increase. It is as if community provides collective self-esteem.

It is by way of created boundaries that community determines 'membership'. This differentiates the 'us' from the 'them' and continues the reciprocal relationsip of belonging, confidence in belonging and acceptance that enables belonging. The result of belonging to a community produces a feeling of emotional safety and security which envelops its members (McMillan 1996:315).

Community also endows its members with a sense of friendship. Together with belonging, friendship and community spirit can provide the connections to a setting in

which we exist and in which we see ourselves through the 'eyes and responses of others'. It is like looking in a mirror and viewing onself through the collective narratives of memory making, which then become one's reality. Belonging is being a part of the transcendent and eternal community, which is passed down from one generation to the next representing values which outlive community members and remain a part of the spirit of the community (McMillan,1996:316).

Herman (2004), in her case study of the Jewish community schools in South Africa, developed a bipolar framework contrasting the community discourse with managerialism discourse by using Tonnies' (1887) 1957) concepts of Gemeinschaft (community) and Gesellschaft (organization).

Gemeinschaft depicts school as a social good, with education being in the interests of the public, while Gesellschaft depicts school as a business or a commodity. Gemeinschaft emphasises community needs and implicit shared values, while Gesellschaft emphasises individual rights and explicit goals.

Herman (2004), demonstrated the challenges that the Jewish community in South Africa faced in having to balance inclusiveness and exclusiveness, and argued that they claim inclusiveness and diversity but practise homogenisation and exclusivity. The stakeholders' belief in the community discourse offers a framework to examine how the community understands and values inclusive education and how it has created opportunities for inclusive learning in the school.

Strike (2000:630) believes Tonnies' bipolar account of community is too singular. Furthermore it underestimates the diversity of types of communities and the 'glue' that binds them together. To contemplate making schools more Gemeinshaft in character is to make them 'thick' and 'illiberal'. This refers to constitutive values that create community and which can promote exclusivity and intolerance. To avoid this, he suggests that schools should not be total communities but should rather produce the goods of community like tolerance, because they are committed to a shared vision of education. These communities will not be fully inclusive and Strike (2000), accepts

that there will be voices not heard and people excluded, but he believes it is the price to pay for learners to be initiated into rich and powerful practices and traditions.

The 'glue' that holds communities together is shared values where the aims are such that people need to cooperate to further their fulfillment (Strike 2000:618), yet not all shared values constitute community, as values have to be constitutive. Constitutive values comprise two properties, one being a mindset to generate the end result, and the second being the desire to fashion common projects cooperatively, for example worshipping together in a congregation which brings a sense of mutual attainment. In addition in a community there must also be public common goods which are pursued by the members. An example of a common good is the definition of good education, where the common good provides a source of ethical coherence for the community (Strike 1999).

Constitutive values unite members of a community in the realms of common goals and assignments. McMillan's (1996) explanation illustrates an example of membership based on constitutive values. He holds that membership of a religious community (my example) creates in the member a sense of entitlement and defines boundaries which distinguish members from non–members. These boundaries provide emotional safety for the member. Furthermore members would not need to test new members for membership as membership is automatic. There is a feeling within the member of acceptance and an ensuing strong attraction to the community.

However, says Strike (1999), the set of values which is shared by community members will create membership for those who share the community's values and non-membership for those who don't. He expands on this by explaining that communities cannot become cohesive through shared values and at the same time be interminably inclusive. A community bound together by religion is entitled to privilege its own faith but not to discriminate on any other basis. Those who don't share in the values will be excluded or become second-class members. There is also the danger of the community isolating people into sub communities segregated by different constitutive values (Strike,1999).

A community formed through commitment to the principles of religion will employ these commitments to regulate membership. The resulting marginalization of other religions, for example, is not problematical. In fact the right to include or exclude under these circumstances is part of the right of freedom of association. However, what we have a right to expect is that there is no marginalization with respect to qualities unrelated to their constitutive commitments (Strike, 2000).

In conveying this argument to the educational domain, despite religion being a prerequisite to membership of the community, a community school may not reject anyone on grounds of belonging to another religion. This may pose a liability in schools which may then exclude with respect to other unconnected reasons (Strike, 2000).

Regrettably, says Strike (2000), it is not always clear what it means for a school to be a community or whether desiring to be a community is congruent with the vision of a good education. Because learners are selected for their constitutive doctrine, schools fail at inclusivity and may fall prey to evils such as dogmatism, intolerance and rigid adherence to their religion.

In this state, schools would then become fixed in a comprehensive doctrine (Rawls,1988) which may rebuff independence and cause the marginalization of anyone who does not subscribe to the constitutive doctrine (Strike, 2000). A comprehensive doctrine is a conception of a good life related to tradition, like religion, and includes conceptions of what humans value and the personal ideals which inform our conduct, such as religious and philosophical conceptions (Rawls, 1988). Constitutive values can engender common educational goals and assignments because they are grounded in the conception of comprehensive doctrine (Strike, 2000).

So for a school to be a community it must have a comprehensive doctrine (Rawls, 1988). There must also be a shared and distinct view of good education to drive people to group together in school communities in order for them to pursue it and secure its attainment. The consequences of engaging in these activities must produce

the positive characteristics (goods) of community such as belonging, loyalty, trust and mutual attachment (Strike, 2000).

This doctrine with its goals and practices happens prior to the establishment of the community. Acceptance of the goals is a prerequisite to acceptance in the community. The curriculum of the school is organized to realize the distinctive goods and way of life of the traditions. Elders are exemplars of the goods and virtues and play key roles in the administration and work of the school. Teachers and administrators are viewed as elders, parents are a part of the larger community and children are the initiates into the tradition. The children are taught to want to learn for reasons internal to the values of the community and to internalize a desire for the goods important to the tradition. The school community is viewed as a part of the larger community (Strike, 2000).

Jewish community schools educate both Jewish learners and learners who are not Jewish in the Jewish way of life. This is a community which shares constitutive values of religion and agrees on how education improves human vibrancy (Strike, 1999:46).

Group dynamics and the field theoretical approach, together with the four belief systems, are relevant to the research questions set out at the beginning of the study. Group dynamics and the field theoretical approach will help me to focus on the forces acting on the different stakeholder groups, which clarify their understanding of inclusive education, while the four belief systems will illuminate the attitudes and values of the stakeholder groups. The next chapter accounts for the methodology decisions of this study and includes the data collection, analysis and the limitations of the study.

Chapter 4 Methodology

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study is to explore, describe and analyse how the inclusive education policy has been understood and implemented in a mono-cultural Jewish community school in South Africa. It is argued that forces in the form of individual and group norms entrenched in community culture generate discourses. These discourses guide an individual's thinking and understanding of the meaning of inclusive education. The methodology of this thesis seeks to elicit these discourses in ways that give appropriate attention to each without muting any one discourse. It is also interested in the forces which pushed and pulled towards or away from this type of education. This is investigated by eliciting the various stakeholders' responses, understandings and experiences. Stakeholders' perceptions illuminate the main research and sub-questions namely:

How has inclusive education policy been implemented in a mono-cultural community school in South Africa?

- How do the various school stakeholders understand the concept of inclusion and what are their attitudes towards inclusion?
- How is inclusive education managed at class, school and community level?
- To what extent do attitudes and understandings influence practice of inclusive education?

4.2 Research methodology

These questions are explored within an intepretative/constructivist research paradigm. This paradigm assumes a relativist ontology that suggests there are multiple realities and that the researcher and participant cocreate these realities and understandings. Put another way, qualitative realities and understandings are constructed by both researcher and participants and the 'writer as interpreter' then moves from this text to research text interpretations, to public text, all based on the field text (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000:26). I have chosen qualitative research because when studying a complex phenomenon such as inclusive education it is necessary to examine it's

characteristics through the eyes of the individual. In other words, qualitative research lends itself to the understanding of the subjective world of human experience. Cohen, Manion & Morrison, (2000) believe that each individual's reality is multi-layered and and requires interpretation.

My research began with an assumption and a theoretical lens. The assumption was that belief systems determine how the stakeholders understand inclusive education and determine inclusive education action. The theoretical lens which assisted me was Lewin's Theory of Planned Change. I used aspects of his theory which allowed me to study my problem.

I collected my data in a natural setting (Creswell, 2007), the School. Qualitative research suited my study as its interpretative design enabled me not only to gain new insights and develop new concepts or theoretical perspectives about inclusive education, but also to discover the problems and challenges that exist within the phenomenon. Being a systematic approach to understanding 'a phenomenon within a particular context', qualitative research helped me to achieve this aim (Brantlinger, Jimenez, Klinger, Pugach & Richardson, 2005:195).

Qualitative research enabled me to gain knowledge about stakeholders' perceptions. This method allowed me to draw out valid information about their social worlds. Through qualitative research I was able to weave an 'intricate fabric' of my stakeholders' worldviews and perceptions (Creswell, 2007:35). I did this by means of *verstehen*, an empathetic understanding which allowed me to discover and learn about the personal reasons or motives which shaped the stakeholders' feelings and understandings (Weber 1864-1920 in Neuman 2006). Sharing in my stakeholders' knowledge while consciously attempting to place myself in "their shoes" allowed me to understand their worlds.

Each one of us experiences a different reality and within the boundaries of the qualitative approach, I was able to account for the different realities seen from each stakeholder's perspective. Trochim (2001) refers to the qualitative researcher as an instrument of the research, so I had to be aware that the research was in principle

influenced by my own reality. In addition to allowing me to characterize the understandings of the subjective world of the participants' experiences this approach served to preserve the integrity of the topic being investigated (Neuman 2006).

This research design gave me autonomy to change my questioning and allowed for the emergence of other questions as I became more familiar with the field study and the stakeholders. The deeper I ventured into the literature, the more I was able to change, adapt and broaden my questions. For example as I read about what factors cause teacher change, I added those types of questions into my schedule. Like Neuman (2006) suggests, I followed a nonlinear research path during the data collection. This type of research allowed me entrée to the context of the matter of inclusive education and I was able to look through my own magnifying glass at the specific context of the School and experience policy implementation, leadership influence, classroom organization, attitudes to and conceptions of inclusive education.

While the methodology was qualitative I have used a case study as research design. The case study approach provided me with extensive data on inclusive education. Cohen et al (2000) note that case study research of a school, for example can provide the reader with an exclusive example of real people in real situations recognizing that context is a commanding determinant of both causes and effects. And so, by using the School as my case study I was able to generate detailed and varied data to illustrate aspects of inclusive education (Neuman, 2006). The method of collecting data were interviews, personal accounts and document analalysis which will be discussed in detail later.

4.3 The scope of this research

The data for this research was collected over a period of ten months beginning in March 2010 and concluding in December 2010. My purposive sample was limited to one school. During this time there was a change in leadership at the School which made the challenges of inclusion more visible. This unexpected change allowed me to identify those stakeholders with strong opinions for and against inclusion.

Research participants

My research participants were the stakeholders in a Johannesburg Jewish community school which falls under the management of the Board of Jewish Education. Four main stakeholder groups were identified for the purpose of this study. They were: teachers, parents, middle management and top management. In the teacher group were representatives from each department, namely Hebrew, Jewish Studies, Art, Physical Education, Intersenior Phase and Foundation Phase. In the parent group, I included parents of both supported and unsupported children. The middle management group consisted of the principal, deputy and heads of the various departments and in the top management group were members of the Board's executive committee. Some participants had a dual role as they were both parents and teachers. The teacher and middle manager group included various participants from inside and outside of the community. In other words, I tried to include both Jewish teachers and managers, were not of the Jewish faith. I attempted to give voice to all groups as I believed the teachers who were not Jewish could provide an interesting perspective.

Table 1 – Stakeholder groups

Stakeholder Groups	Members
Primary School Teachers (including management if they teach)	
Secular or academic support	Participants who teach any secular subject.
Hebrew	Participants who teach Hebrew Studies.
Jewish Studies	Participants who teach Jewish Studies.
Management	
	Principal, deputy and heads of departments.
Board	
	Management committee within the Board comprising, General Director, the chairperson, vice-chairperson, treasurer.
Parents	
	Includes PTA members, board representatives and any participant who has children at the School.

Table 2 – In depth semi-structured interviews- schedule

	Middle Management	Top Management	Parents	Teachers	Number of interviews
March			1	1	2
April	2			1	3
May	1		1		2
June		1	1	3	5
July	1				1
August					0
September	2		1	1	4
October				2	2
November		1	2	1	4
December		1	3		4
	6	3	9	9	27

I employed purposive sampling to select my participants. This type of sampling uses the 'judgment' of the researcher who has a specific purpose in mind when selecting the participant and is appropriate when selecting cases for in-depth investigation. It requires participants whose information could be especially illuminating (Neuman, 2006:222) and so I selected my participants based on those who could purposefully inform an understanding of inclusive education (Creswell, 2007).

I also used snowball sampling or reputational sampling. This type of sampling relies upon personal contacts of participants. Put another way, participants interviewed offer information about other prospective participants. This technique enabled me to be selective and choose participants who met the criteria for inclusion in my study. I asked each participant to recommend another and in that way I was able to get participants who were identified as having strong and diverse views regarding inclusive education (Trochim, 2001).

As I was conducting insider research, which comes with its own dilemmas and which I will describe in some detail later, I was able to use my knowledge to approach stakeholders who I believed would give me diverse opinions. In addition I was 'linked' to other stakeholders with similar or different opinions to theirs. As an insider, in those cases I also had some previous knowledge (Neuman, 2006:223).

The reasoning I applied to my parent stakeholder group was to ensure they had experience with the phenomenon of inclusive education and were representative of parents of supported children, parents of unsupported children, parents on the PTA and parents who were representative on the Board. I also chose parents I knew and who I had been told had outspoken views. Again, by using the snowball method I was able to get a good mix of varied opinions and views of inclusive education. In terms of middle management, I simply interviewed everybody in middle management, while in terms of top management I limited my interviews to members of the executive.

When interviewing teachers, I based my choice on those who I knew were proponents of inclusive education and those who I knew were resistant. I also made sure that all the teacher stakeholders were representative of the different departments which

comprise the school structure, as well as both teachers who were Jewish and teachers who were not of the Jewish faith.

Originally, I had designed a worksheet with which to elicit the learners' views. I targeted a small focus group of grade 6 supported learners, and after receiving permission from their parents I administered the worksheet. Some examples of questions on the worksheet were the following: How do you feel about coming to academic support? How do you think the other children feel about you coming for academic support? Give an example of when you felt excluded/included by teachers in the classroom? What does the teacher do to help you understand in that class? Are you given the opportunity to participate in the classroom? Answer yes or no then say in which subjects and why.

Their responses did not yield the data to use for research to support or refute inclusionary practice at the School, instead yielding information regarding friends and friendships which I deemed irrelevant to my study. I thus decided not to use their information and to limit the research to the four stakeholder groups. Therefore the learners' voice is missing.

When quoting a stakeholder, I usually gave a brief history regarding his involvement at the School and included whether he/she mentioned was a parent, teacher, middle manager or top manager.

Method used for getting access

The first stage was to gain official permission to undertake my research at the School. I began with an email to the General Director of the Board requesting permission to do my research. The reply came back with the required permission and concomitant support. However, it is worth mentioning that there was an additional suggestion from the Director indicating limited support for my chosen topic:

> I would most certainly support you in the topic you have chosen if that is the direction you want to take in your research. It may certainly be worth a conversation however

it could be far more beneficial to the school if your research dealt with forward strategies for the schools…[4]

Subsequently I was granted permission by other significant people at the School. Because I was well known to most of my participants, my "insiderness" granted me an easy passage to goodwill, cooperation and trust.

Being the "in" person

My research was undertaken within the hermeneutics paradigm which means that as researcher I was an integral part of the research process. This approach follows a subjectivist ontology and epistemology, signifying that social reality is understood by interpreting the meanings held by the members of the organization (Brannick & Cochlan 2007).

I conducted the research 'in and on my own organization as a complete member' of my organization and I had the responsibility of carrying out academic research on it while still remaining a member within my desired career path when the research was completed. During the research I experienced many "insiderness" dilemmas. One such dilemma was being too close to the issue and not being able to attain the distance and neutrality aspired by a researcher (Brannick & Cochlan 2007:72). The questions I continually asked myself were, how do I get close but maintain my distance as the researcher and employee? How do I remain objective and yet protect and remain loyal to my department and position at the School?

Because I was immersed in the organization and had built up knowledge as an actor in the very processes I was studying, I experienced another dilemma which was that of being in a dual role. One of my roles was to interact with the participants of my organization and form relationships with them, while the other role, the research role demanded that I remain aloof and gather data. In order to clarify and explain the issues I was experiencing I looked at them through Brannick & Coghlan's (2007) concepts of access, pre-understanding and role duality (Brannick & Coghlan, 2007).

---

[4] Email from General Director of the Board on 15 November 2010

As a member I had primary access, I also had secondary access because of my status in the organization. However, this secondary access often excluded me from being privy to grapevine or informal conversations. It also created a situation where there was pre-trust and in all my interviews despite my offer to my participants of the opportunity to read my transcriptions post interview, they all said they trusted me and it wouldn't be necessary. This posed issues for me of not complying with respondent validation along with the additional concern that they were saying what they thought I wanted to hear (Brannick & Coghlan, 2007).

Over and above my bestowed access I was also privileged to pre-understanding. This refers to knowledge of the lived experiences and insights of the stakeholders and the theoretical understandings of the dynamics of the organization and so another problem I experienced was assuming too much when interviewing. What resulted in this case was a sense that I may not have probed enough or reframed enough because I thought I knew the answers. Another problem related to pre-understanding is the concern that perhaps I was denied deeper access because of my hierarchical position and because I would have to cross hierarchical boundaries. Perhaps as an insider I was denied access which an outsider would have been granted. Again I worried that my participants may not have wanted to reveal what they were really feeling (Brannick & Coghlan, 2007).

I also had to be aware of the choice of participants to make sure that I pursued those who could provide different sources of information and not just the ones who produced a flattering view of me and the site, given my strong and direct personal interest in the subject matter. I went into the research with my own preconceived understandings and beliefs as well as what I believe is right (Brannick & Coghlan, 2007) and this information was known to most participants.

Role duality is difficult and awkward and often very confusing. It was not easy to withdraw from my role as academic head and become researcher. I felt pulled between loyalty to my department, my colleagues and my community while conversely trying to be the objective distant researcher. I was experiencing role identification confusion. I was also not sure if my participants were giving information to me as

researcher or as head of department, and a further dilemma was what to do with the information once I received it (Brannick & Coghlan, 2007). I was concerned about the dangers of dual roles affecting the validity of data.

An example of the above dilemma was when one of my participants described her challenge regarding diverse learners in her class and after the research had taken place, I decided that I had to put some strategies in place as I was now aware of her problem which was impacting on the smooth running of the School.

I felt like a spy watching and observing, all the while experiencing the feeling that I was going through my own role identity crises. Coupled with this issue was another. My participants accepted me and gave me their trust easily, but I was constantly aware of and concerned about the validity of the research.

In this regard I took comfort in Brannick & Coghlan's (2007) argument that insider research is not only valid but can provide important knowledge about what organizations are really like. Insider research brings with it disadvantages as well as advantages, and through a process of reflexivity I was able to become aware of my pre-understanding and used this knowledge to reframe my understanding of each situation. In addition, aware of the demands of each of my roles, I was able to attend to them individually.

4.4 Data collection plan

The research was conducted in six phases (see Table 3). Some of these phases were conducted simultaneously.

Table 3 – Research Schedule

Phase	Research Activity	Time Frame
Pre-research phase	Discovering a theoretical framework and submitting a research proposal	February 2009 – October 2009
Phase 1	Documentation Analysis	March 2010 – on-going
Phase 2	Interviews	March 2010 – December 2010
Phase 3	Coding and Analysis (using Atlas.ti)	April 2011 – July 2011
Phase 4	Manual analysis, re reading interviews	July 2012 – October 2012
Phase 5	Writing up the research report	July 2012 – March 2013

1. Pre-research phase – During this phase I refined the concepts of the theoretical framework so that it would be able to demonstrate appropriate application and explanation of my data.

2. Analysis of documentation was on-going whether as Academic Head reading minutes of meetings and letters to and from stakeholders or as researcher reading through a past principal's logbooks. All relevant minutes, letters, newsletters etc were recorded in my journal.

3. Interviews – I had extensive knowledge of the institution as I had worked at the School for the past thirteen years. I also had been reading extensively on inclusive education as this assisted me in putting structures in place at the School. I conducted some pilot interviews in order to rehearse the interview, test my interviewing schedule (see Appendix 1) and ensure quality responses. I felt prepared to conduct the interviews to gather the information I required. Reading of literature and document analysis continued throughout the interviewing process.

4. During this phase I used all my documentation and with the help of Atlas.ti I coded it – computer assisted qualitative data analysis software. This analysis allowed me to gain an overall picture of how inclusive education was understood and implemented by the various stakeholders.

5. During phase 4, I restructured my research plan. While I was using Atlas.ti the identified dominant discourses unfolded from the data. However in order to achieve a coherent and logical argument I realized that my initial coding and analysing plan would need to change. I reread all the data and established the four main themes,

those of special education, pragmatic, diversity and community, all the time focusing on the research questions and the theoretical framework. I then identified the stakeholders and grouped them into each theme after which I then read each interview in its entirety which allowed me to discuss each theme using the relevant stakeholders to showcase it. This method of collecting data and analysing shaped the narratives and gave me the stories I was seeking.

6. This phase involved writing up the research report. I used the narrative method to let the voices of the stakeholders speak and through telling the story of each stakeholder, I was able to illuminate the real world issues which arose from the data.

4.5 Data collection techniques

Interviews, document analysis and personal accounts were the main techniques used to describe the stakeholders' understanding and implementation of inclusive education at a Jewish community school. By using these different techniques to examine my data I was able to triangulate.

Interviews

Interviews enable the interviewers and interviewees to discuss their interpretations of their world and to communicate on how they see situations from their personal point of view. The interview offers information which is inseparable from its human embeddedness (Cohen et al, 2000).

I used semi-structured or open-ended interviews 'to seek information' and in turn to receive information (Cohen et al, 2000:268). The interviews prompted by a few central questions served as the principal means of gathering information which directly supported the research questions. The purpose of the interview was to try and see the world through the eyes of the participant. By probing questions and clarifying questions rich data was collected. Although the interview schedules differed slightly for each stakeholder group, the essence of each interview schedule focused on drawing out the participant's understanding of inclusive education.

Cohen et al (2000) believe that the interview should be conducted as a social, interpersonal encounter in an atmosphere where the participants can feel secure to talk freely and so I gave my participants the choice of where the interview would take place. The venues ranged from the School boardroom or office to their homes or my home. The interviews lasted anywhere from 45 minutes to 2 hours. I guaranteed confidentiality and anonymity and in all cases received permission to record the interview. The interviews were transcribed verbatim and then analysed.

The interviews began with my gathering demographic information, followed by knowledge questions. After that, the field was narrowed and a focus established. This focus took the form of direct questions about experience and feelings. This was followed by a much narrower focus and the questions became more directive such as explanations of perceptions and implementation. Although I had a prepared schedule, the nature of the semi-structured interview permitted open-ended questions and enabled me to re-order the questions or to digress and expand the questions in order to probe further (Cohen et al, 2000).

Because of my insiderness, the interviews were often followed by casual chats in the staffroom or on the campus. I recorded all the conversations in my journal and this provided me with additional data and validity checks. It also allowed me the respondent validation which was denied me as a result of participants trusting me enough not to want to read through the transcriptions. Stemming from these casual chats I was able to assess intentionality, to correct and verify facts and to offer my participants the opportunity to add further information. This allowed me to follow the process of change that took place and how the different stakeholders related to it.

Personal accounts

I kept a journal throughout the research process and besides recording the accounts of casual conversations and observations, I also wrote down my feelings and experiences. The journal is hidden from public view. Its purpose is not to communicate the research to others but rather to facilitate the research process by means of recording observations, thoughts and questions as they happen for my later use and

to stimulate reflective thinking about the research. I used the journal to record all my observations and the informal or formal conversations from the very beginning of the research in order to allow me to consider all important research data. I also used it to reflect on my role as an insider. My diary became a coherent receptacle for my ideas, information and activities and constantly stimulating reflected thinking. It also assisted me as another validity check. At one point I was writing every evening but then due to lack of time I was unable to sustain that level of commitment and only used it to record defined periods in the research. I was able to organize the information in my journal on the research by using headings for example, my journey of the writing process and my core interview questions.

Document analysis

I used private and public documents. These included: minutes of meetings, records of parent interviews, case conference minutes, grade meeting minutes, policy statements, archived log books and letters for specific meanings they had in relation to the study. I analysed the documents by noting patterns and themes, relationships and linkages which emerged. Examples of emerging themes were: attitudes to supported learners, resistance and adaptation to change, practice and attitudes of the educators, and class and school management.

The strengths of this method gave me the opportunity to examine the participants' texts unobtrusively and with continuous comparing and contrasting of the information, a coherent conceptual structure emerged. For example, I read a past principal's logbooks intensively and extensively which allowed me to move beyond a superficial understanding of the history of special needs at the school.

Documents used

Board's documents
Documents used were downloaded from the SABJE's website (www.sabje.co.za) and included, the constitution, purpose statements, development of the schools including

future plans, project excellence and various other documents such as 'Jewish Education: A Principled Approach'.

Minutes of meetings

I was able to access all minutes of meetings pertaining to inclusive education, management meetings at the School, grade meetings and case conferences.

Correspondence

I had access to all notices which went out to parents and teachers as well as private letters and emails which have not been quoted out of respect and to protect the anonymity of the stakeholders and others. I merely used those incidentally to set the tone of the research.

Although the documentation I used was comprehensive enough, I did not have access to the Board's executive committee meetings or any other Board meetings. I did not pursue this as I did not believe that I needed those documents to support my findings.

4.6 Data analysis

Atlas.ti allowed me to organize my text into a project (Creswell, 2007). I was able to transcribe the raw data and load my interviews onto Atlas.ti for storage. I then began the task of coding. I read each sentence of each interview and assigned a code label to each.

For code labels I used either some words of the participant or a term that related to the situation. This allowed me to locate all the text that fitted a code label and see which participants were discussing an issue in a similar or different way (Creswell, 2007). I ended up with over a thousand codes which I then had to first reduce and then combine into themes which gave me rich detailed data with explanatory power. I looked for recurring themes for example in table 4, I show responses to the question, *how do you understand inclusion?* I show how this question was analysed.

Table 4 – Analysing the text

Interview – Community (parents)	Code
Interview number 1 – My understanding of it is that children with all forms of disabilities will be integrated into any school, but that there will be a backup facility for them.	1:19 (21) – Understanding
Interview number 2 – so inclusive education I see as attempts methodologically and pedagogically all ways to try and facilitate learning and bridge differences.	2:20 (128) – Understanding
Interview Number 2 - The sign of a sophisticated school is that you're catering for all needs of children at the top and the bottom end whatever and just because you have special needs doesn't mean you're stupid you just have different kinds of challenges	2: 20 (239) – Understanding
Interview Number 2 – Inclusive education as I understand it is to work with student's different educational needs, special needs, whatever and try and integrate methods to accommodate all those students within the system. So to try a kind of systemic approach to handling difference.	2:20 (26) – Understanding
Interview Number 3 - To help children that are struggling give them a better advantage there's nothing wrong with these kids academically they just need the extra help and that's why it's there.	3:21 (30) – Understanding
Interview 4 – Because they were excluded from the mainstream rather than being included in the mainstream. If one is talking inclusive then by definition that means having children in the mainstream of school with additional assistance not separate. That's my understanding	4: 22 (33) – Understanding

The numbers in order above refer to the document number, the quotation number and then the line number. All this information is noted in the footnote corresponding to each quotation together with, for example, the code's label.

Community, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (26). Codes: Understanding].

At the start of this section I divided my stakeholders into four groups: community, management, teachers and top management, then searched for all the quotes that pertained to the understanding, perception and implementation of inclusive education. As my understanding grew, my direction changed and I identified quotes which I still grouped under understanding and implementation but more detailed codes emerged. Examples of more detailed codes those which are influenced by beliefs, attitudes and feelings, management of inclusion at school level, management of inclusion at class and management level, school image, standards and streaming. I was still searching for themes which I could use as headings in my study. Below in figure 1, I show the number of quotations associated with each code and in Figure 2, I show the broader themes which developed and the number of quotations associated with each theme.

Figure 1 Family – Understanding of inclusive education

Community
Understanding – {28-0}

Middle management
Understanding of policy {32-0}

Teachers
Understanding – {65-1}

Top management
Understanding – {12-0}

Figure 2 – Understanding of inclusive education

Community
Understanding - influenced by beliefs {15-5}
Understanding - belief in accomplishment {1-0}
Understanding - belief in competitiveness {2-0}
Understanding - beliefs {19-0}
Understanding - not huge tolerance for difference {16-1}
Understanding - attitudes and feelings {36-0}
Understanding - effects of inclusion {53-0}

Middle management
Understanding - attitudes and beliefs {59-2}
Understanding - effects of inclusion {21-0}

101

Understanding - teachers' beliefs about inclusion {22-0}

Teachers
Understanding - attitude {15-1}
Understanding - belief in acceptance {14-2}
Understanding - belief in professional development {15-0}
Understanding - belief religious {13-2}
Understanding - belief in teaching {10-2}
Understanding - beliefs {55-5}
Understanding - not huge tolerance for difference {11-1}
Understanding - pragmatic beliefs {13-0}

Top management
Understanding - pragmatic beliefs {18-1}

Figure 3

Community
Implementation – image of school {22-1}
Implementation – at class level {40-0}
Implementation – management of inclusion at school level {29-0}
Implementation – practical constraints and implementation {30-0}
Implementation – standards {10-1}
Implementation – streaming {8-1}

Middle management
Implementation – class management of inclusion {8-0}
Implementation – effects of inclusion {21-0}
Implementation – image of school {2-0}
Implementation – practical constraints and implementation {24-0}
Implementation – school management of inclusion {26-0}
Implementation – standards {1-0}
Implementation – teachers enable or disable inclusion {25-1}

Teachers
Implementation – challenges of diversity {32-0}
Implementation – class management of inclusion {92-5}
Implementation – effects of inclusion {44-1}
Implementation – training {12-0}
Implementation – image of school {23-0}
Implementation – school management of inclusion {32-0}
Implementation – standards {13-0}
Implementation – teachers as barriers to inclusion {28-1}

Top management
Implementation – school image {10-0}
Implementation – teachers enable or disable inclusion {16-1}

I grouped the codes into families. Figure 4 describes some of these families and the number in brackets indicates the number of codes associated with each family.

Figure 4 – Code families

Attitudes towards inclusion (14)
Beliefs and behaviour (29)
Disequilibrium (23)
Equilibrium (8)
Implementation (18)
Pragmatism (7)

As I looked for codes, I was constantly aware of the need to keep both my research questions in mind as well as the terminology used in my theoretical framework, Lewin's Theory of Planned Change.

Figure 5 an example of a code family – attitudes towards inclusion

Middle manager 2 - 2:49 [I think specially the ones who..] (567:571)
Codes:[teachers: beliefs - Families (2): attitudes and feelings towards inclusion, beliefs and behaviour]
I think especially the ones who have been teaching for a long time and they have seen that those kids didn't go to a mainstream school and they went to a special school or they were in a special class. Some of them would prefer it if all the weak children were put in one class.
Middle manager 2 - 2:173 [I think it also could be becau..] (560:563)
Codes:[middle management: teachers' belief in inclusion - Family: attitudes and feelings towards inclusion]
I think it also could be because they don't buy into the whole thing that children with severe difficulties should be in a mainstream school. It's possible some of them don't buy into that.

Teacher 2 - 11:59 [my belief that you know that e..] (246:246)
Codes:[teachers: beliefs - Families (2): attitudes and feelings towards inclusion, beliefs and behaviour]
My belief that you know that everyone should be entitled to equal education.

Teacher 2 - 11:84 [I mean an example of intoleran..] (137:137)
Codes:[teachers: beliefs - Families (2): attitudes and feelings towards inclusion, beliefs and behaviour]
I mean an example of intolerance what we've lived through here in apartheid years were there was such inequality and why should anyone with any disability or handicap be prejudiced.

Teacher 6 - 15:113 [I mean just by the term commun..] (157:157)

Codes:[teachers: beliefs - Families (2): attitudes and feelings towards inclusion, beliefs and behaviour]

I mean just by the term community school it's there to serve the community and the community is the Jewish community and in that way it's sort of its almost sort of made its own bed. If you're going to be a school and it's Jewish children and be run on a Jewish ethos which is one of charity, giving I imagine, understanding then I think it's the school's role to accept the children as many children and children of diverse as you know as I say you can't accept all children, they can't all be included because sometimes the disability is just so extreme that they it will not benefit the child to be in our set if we do not have the extra physio or whatever that might be needed. But definitely as a community school I think if you want to give all Jewish children an opportunity for a Jewish education then you've got to try your best and just because it's a little bit harder or a little bit more work or the results are a little bit less. Because these children are maybe bringing down the class average by 2%.

Parent 2 - 20:4 [The purpose of those classes a..] (34:34)

Codes:[community beliefs - Families (2): attitudes and feelings towards inclusion, beliefs and behaviour]

The purpose of those classes as I saw it was to take kids who weren't quite up to scratch, they weren't managing in the mainstream tasks and to give them the extra time and space in a separate space. And they're in their separate space so maybe it's a you know there is an argument for that if they're going to catch up, but it was seen as a setting apart.

Parent 4 - 22:26 [Because I think it can be nega..] (59:59)

Codes:[community: attitudes and feelings towards inclusion - Families (3): attitudes and feelings towards inclusion, beliefs and behaviour, disequilibrium]

Because I think it can be negative for the kids who don't need special attention or intensive attention.

According to Lewin, human behaviour is supported by a forcefield of driving and restraining forces. When stable, this is termed quasi-stationary equilibrium. Disequilibrium would occur when the forcefield was altered under complex psychological conditions which removed restraining forces (Schein,1996). Therefore I was looking for forces which determined understanding and drove or resisted the change to inclusive education. Some but not all of the discovered pull forces included, standards, accountability, and human and other lack of resources, human. Other forces were a belief in separate education as superior for supported children, while still other pull forces were, human rights, social justice and community. I was looking for common forces which would clarify to me of how inclusive education was understood and implemented. Below in figure 6 are some quotes from code families to illustrate how my thinking progressed up till the point of its culminating in the four belief systems.

Figure 6 – example of code family

Middle manager 2- 2:80 [That there's because of there ..] (120:126)

Codes: [middle management: practical constraints and implementation - Families (4): beliefs and behaviour, disequilibrium, implementation, pragmatism]

Because if there aren't the resources we aren't able to take all children that are… you know you can't say it's a fully inclusive school because we do refuse children because we don't have the facilities and I think they can't be included unless we have the right facilities and the right things in place to meet their needs. So that's a big stumbling block.

Teacher 6 - 15:4 [but I think a lot of teachers ..] (51:51)

Codes: [teachers: teachers as barriers to inclusion - Families (3): beliefs and behaviour, disequilibrium, implementation]

 I think a lot of teachers are reluctant to cope with anything other than average and above, children.

Parent 2 - 20:17 [And its seems however there we..] (60:60)

Codes: [community beliefs: not huge tolerance for difference - Families (3): attitudes and feelings towards inclusion, beliefs and behaviour, disequilibrium] [community: attitudes and feelings towards inclusion - Families (3): attitudes and feelings towards inclusion, beliefs and behaviour, disequilibrium] [community: community dynamics - Family: beliefs and behaviour] [loud voices]

And its seems however there were other attitudes prevalent that I picked up of parents like you know these kids are compromising the standards and so on and the sort of precious parents who want their children to be unhindered by anyone

Parent 3 - 21:24 [There's been a couple of moms ..] (90:90)   (Super)

Codes: [community: standards - Family: disequilibrium]

There's been a couple of moms in the grade who are not happy with children they feel that by bringing remedial kids into the school is dropping the standard of the school

Parent - 22:32 [It's a simple answer I suppose..] (77:77)

Codes: [community: attitudes and feelings towards inclusion - Families (3): attitudes and feelings towards inclusion, beliefs and behaviour, disequilibrium]

It's a simple answer I suppose, I think it's because people like egalitarian ideas and inclusive education is one of them and I'm not opposed on an ethical basis I feel like a pig to say no that child shouldn't be in a mainstream school.

Parent 4 - 22:60 [I think that parents prejudice..] (130:130)

Codes: [community beliefs: not huge tolerance for difference - Families (3): attitudes and feelings towards inclusion, beliefs and behaviour, disequilibrium] [community: attitudes and feelings towards inclusion - Families (3): attitudes and feelings towards inclusion, beliefs and behaviour, disequilibrium]

 I think that parents prejudices would actually withdrawing their kids out of the school if you would have moderate to severe, not mild to moderate.

105

Parent 7 - 25:34 [I think it is possible, I thin..] (198:198)

Codes: [community: attitudes and feelings towards inclusion - Families (3): attitudes and feelings towards inclusion, beliefs and behaviour, disequilibrium]

I think it is possible, I think we should work towards that because I think that we do need to teach our children how to interact with people who are at different levels, and people with physical challenges shouldn't be unusual and shouldn't be sent to different institutions or whatever.

Teacher 3 - 38:45 [No, I can't understand if you'..] (306:306)

Codes: [teachers: attitude - Families (3): attitudes and feelings towards inclusion, beliefs and behaviour, disequilibrium] [teachers: understanding]

No, I can't understand if you've got a school like [remedial school] why we would want to change, because I think it's such a nurturing atmosphere for them.

Top Management 1 – 29:90 [what's going on and one of thos..] (54:56)

Codes: {community – Family: disequilibrium}

 …one of those figures that you always watch is the amount of kids that leave to go to remedial schools, standard, and one of the worries, the big worries was all these kids have been lost to the, not to the Jewish community but they have been lost to the Jewish social   environment and the ability to mix with other Jewish kids and what does that mean for them.

Although I was using only limited functions of Atlas.ti because of time constraints, it helped to direct me towards my final themes. Atlas.ti allowed me to separate my data into stakeholder groups, to examine themes in isolation and to compare different quotes. However those themes became clearer when I started writing the dissertation.

After a while I stopped breaking out the data and instead turned to an exploration of the narrative encompassing the entire story. I focused on the four belief systems, namely special education, pragmatic, diversity and community, as well as on my data. I then realised that Atlas.ti was no longer useful and at this point I changed to a narrative analysis as I realised the importance of the holistic experience. I now had to read each interview as a whole and began to think about each of my participants in relation to their approach.

Writing the dissertation

I began the task of the writing in order to bring 'the entire study together' (Creswell, 2007:177). I had limited knowledge of how to present an argument via a clear flow of text and even less experience in using theoretical and analytical knowledge in a

sophisticated way for the research community. My pedagogical requirements were to find my writer's voice and then to translate text from the data into crystal clear pieces of writing. Additionally I had to make sure my writing came across as credible and trustworthy.

This posed some challenges for me. The initial drafts were fraught with problems. Dilemma's such as, do I refer to myself as I, do I refer to myself as the author, do I write in the first person or third person, were clearly evidence of the fact that there was a mismatch between my writing and my academic expectations. It was not clear who I was in the text, or where my "writer's" voice was, or how much of myself I should disclose, or how to be a 'valid instrument' of research in an engaging way (Brantlinger, Jimenez, Klinger, Pugach & Richardson, 2005:197).

Creswell, (2007) refers to modern qualitative researchers as much more self-disclosing and no longer the distanced qualitative writer. So I needed to understand how one tries and works through all the numerous mentions in the data, while referring to the themes and still producing clear elegant text which is coherent and self-disclosing. How does one get to the next level and theorize?

I began to reflect. My doctorate centred around examining a problem from my own practice and then illuminating it. As I was already involved in the situation this should have been fairly straightforward. The writing output so far however, was a somewhat tortured version of what should have been scholarly writing. Upon closer examination of my writing I was able to identify the key problems. I was not framing the research in my writing and the structure of my text was illogical. Furthermore I was failing to explain the relevance of the specific issues of the research. In fact my writing was obscuring the research questions.

My first task therefore was to frame this issue using my research questions and structure my writing so that the writing contextualized and illuminated this problem. Furthermore, I had to do this without confusing the reader. I began by organizing the writing using an outline which included the four main themes which had framed the data. This clarified the parameters and guided my writing.

I approached this next stage by structuring the text around the four main issues. Once I had ascertained which stakeholders identified with each theme, I then read each interview in its entirety. This allowed me to shape my text in a way that the relevant stakeholders showcased the themes. I had to be aware all the time of giving equal voice to each stakeholder. Because people are storytellers who live 'storied lives' I decided to use the narrative method to tell the stories of my participants while at the same time to clarify the theory (Brantlinger et al, 2005:197).

4.7 Narrative

I employed a narrative approach as an educational tool for expressing a deeper understanding of the data. Through the potential of narrative I was able to communicate the stakeholders' understanding of inclusive education.

The narrative is a common way to communicate, given that storytelling is a strong characteristic of human beings. Moreover, the narrative is well favoured as it makes reading accessible, intriguing and engaging while at the same time stimulating a sense of relationship and common humanity between the narrator and the researcher (Osler & Zhu, 2011).

Connelly & Clandinin (1990) refer to the use of the narrative as characterizing phenomena of human experience by collaboration and mutual storytelling. They suggest storying and restorying as one connects with the data. This method helped me to gain insight into how the stakeholders understood inclusive education.

I was able to authenticate and confirm how this type of education was practised at the School through interpreting the stories of the particpants, a method which allowed me to demonstrate the diverse experiences of the stakeholders and present their understanding holistically.

Through collaboration and developing relationships Connelly & Clandinin (1990) believe people feel free to construct their stories. And so this method offered me the opportunity to listen to, as well as to speak and to share the story with my participants.

Osler & Zhu (2011) warn about awareness of the trustworthiness of narrative data. This has the potential to be potentially unethical. I as researcher needed to be aware that I could twist or exaggerate the story or interpret it differently from the way it was presented to me. A narrative is representative of the story-teller's perspective, rather than an objective truth. It needs to be understood as representing the subjective position of the story-teller at the time of the telling and could differ from one recitation to the next. It seems that there is not a neutral position and I had to be aware of the particular standpoint of each individual person.

4.8 Validity

Qualitative researchers are tasked with ensuring that their studies are credible and trustworthy. There are many concepts of validity and I relied on some credibility measure from Brantlinger et al (2005) to guide me. In order to establish that the results were credible (Brantlinger, 2005) and believable I addressed validity through the participants I chose and the degree of triangulation and objectivity I achieved.

Triangulation is the process of observing something from different viewpoints to improve accuracy (Neuman, 2006). It is the use of two or more methods of data collection. I used interviews, document analysis and personal accounts in the case of this study and by amalgamating these methods, I was able continuously to compare the views and experiences of inclusive education among my purposively selected participants. Additionally, the data yielded corresponding results which served to strengthen the richness of my study. In this way I endeavoured to protect my study of the understanding and implementation of inclusive education at a Jewish community school.

Through researcher reflexivity (Brantlinger et al, 2005) I tried to understand and self-disclose my assumptions and beliefs. I entered the study with my own beliefs and biases, but in order to assure validity I had to disclose my position and perspective. I did this by making use of researcher reflexivity, using a research diary to write my thoughts and reflections on the process of the data collection and analysis.

Peer debriefing (Brantlinger er al, 2005) allowed me the opportunity to receive critical feedback on the descriptions, analyses and interpretations of my study. Being part of the world of my participants meant that I could not be totally objective. However as this study was done for degree purposes, my supervisors provided an objective view of the research process and data and in that way afforded me an additional validity check.

I used an audit trail as another validity check. This meant keeping track of the times and dates of interviews conducted. This ensured that I spent sufficient time in the field to substantiate dependable and confirmable results.

As I was a complete member of my organization I had the advantages of 'an assumption of understanding and shared distinctiveness', securing 'trust' and an openness to talk from my participants. This gave me opportunities for casual chats on the campus post interviews where I was able to cross check interim research findings in an informal way. However, my status could potentially hamper the research process as my participants did not want to read through their transcriptions of the interviews I therefore had to be vigilant by engaging in regular writing in a research journal to reflect on my research assumptions and in addition I had at all times to be altered to my own biases and perspectives. I also had to be constantly aware that I accurately and adequately representing my participants' experiences (Corbin, Dwyer & Buckle, 2009:58).

4.9 Ethical considerations

As a qualitative researcher in my own community I faced many ethical dilemmas. One such was the responsibility to my participants to preserve their dignity and privacy. But, in a small and inclusive community identities could be revealed by deduction.

I had a moral obligation to defend the confidentiality of my participants, yet also to present the data to support my research questions. Cohen et al (2000) say that the interviewer can only ensure confidentiality and not anonymity. I grouped my particpants and assigned broad overlapping categories such as, parents, teachers, middle management and top management. This aimed to present 'a composite

picture' rather than an individual one (Creswell, 2007:141). Addtionally I disclosed the purpose of the study to all particpants with specific information about the study giving them the choice to particpate or not.

Another dilemma was that as a member of the Jewish community myself, I wanted to tell the truth but without any prejudice to the community to whom I felt loyal. In this case I was able to discuss the issues with one of my supervisors who is also a member of the Jewish community. Her advice to me was to be truthful at all times to the members.

My insiderness presented yet another ethical dilemma. As Academic Head, I was invested in the success of the department as well as being supportive of inclusive education. This constantly challenged me as I had to remain objective and to keep my emotions in check. I often heard statements that spoke either against my own beliefs or supported and my ethical dilemma was whether to use any of this "off the record" information as research data. I overcame this by using reflexivity relentlessly and thinking about whether this information would 'harm individuals' (Creswell, 2007:142) if reported. I was continually thinking about my thinking and discussing these types of issues with my family who was able to view them from an objective perspective.

This on-going awareness during the research process whereby knowledge was made visible "on or off the record" became second nature to me. By using reflexivity I was able to validate and legitimize the research by constantly raising questions about the research process, which became a type of self-disclosure or exposure. This self-reflective practice allowed me to acknowledge my role in the research setting and the research discussion (Pillow, 2003).

Through my self-reflexivity I was continuously aware of the strengths and limits of pre-understanding. I used my experiential knowledge to reframe my understanding of situations to which I was close and was always aware of the demands that both organizational and researcher roles made on me (Pillow, 2003).

I leave the research with a heavy feeling that the 'site' has been infused and disturbed with feelings and talk of beliefs, ideology and deep personal stories (Creswell, 2007:44). My relationship with the School and my participants has changed since the research journey began, and has presented me with many challenges. One of the challenges was that of role identity confusion. It seems fitting that I end the journey with another but final role, that of protector.

Throughout the research I have been constantly aware of my appreciation to my participants for the sensitive and revealing information with which they entrusted me. And so I end as eternal protector of the knowledge gained and the undertaking to my participants to protect them in the way in which I will write it in the final study.

This study explores how a Jewish community includes learners with barriers. It is essential to have a brief background into the history of the Jewish community in South Africa and its community schools and the next section provides the reader with this background. It should be noted that the next section relies primarily on document analysis.

Chapter 5 The history of special needs education at the School

5.1 Introduction

The Torah[5] teaches that it is a parent's obligation to teach his own child. The first Jewish schools were set up in Talmudic[6] times to cater for children who didn't have parents to teach them. Throughout history, the Jewish school has been an agent of the parent to teach the Torah. This means that the parent is able to send his child to school to receive an education in Judaism. A Jewish day school is obliged to engage learners in varying degrees of Torah study, balanced with general studies. This is integrated into the school experience together with informal experiences such as Shabbatonim, otherwise known as spiritual getaways for young Jewish people.[7]

The Jewish day schools connect the Jewish community with its past. The school ranks second to the home in influencing and educating the child in his Jewish identity and Jewish continuity. Community is introduced to children at school and the Jewish law that prescribes that one should fulfil obligations rather than rights encourages a community of support and kindness. It is difficult to engage in the full Jewish experience without the knowledge of Hebrew, and this experience allows Jews throughout the world to connect in a meaningful way. Outside of the formal classrooms, Jewish life continues through the eating of kosher food at the tuck shop and incidental talk about Jewish events and culture. Essentially, Jewish day schools engage in moral education that guides children to care, show integrity and respect.[8]

As is reflective in the belief system of Jewish day schools, inclusive schooling is also based on a clarifiable belief system. Inclusionists believe that all children belong in socially all-embracing schools. An important mode of academic and social learning is imitation and it is in the classroom, a place where all children are valued and feel welcome, that imitation occurs. So it is the role of the school to exemplify values of community and belonging.

---

[5] Jewish name for the first 5 books of the Jewish bible.
[6] The Talmudic times was the period in history when the Talmud, Judaism's holiest book was written.
[7] Unpublished and undated article by Rabbi Kacev, Director of the Jewish Board of Education.
[8] Unpublished and undated article by Rabbi Kacev, Director of the Jewish Board of Education.

5.1.1 The beginning

The School was established in 1960 to serve the local and growing Jewish community in one suburb of Johannesburg (Herman, 2004). It is community funded and governed and therefore engages in inclusive education separately from the state policy. The governing body, the South African Board of Jewish Education (the Board), was established in 1928 and its functions are to control, coordinate and inspect schools, while representing the Jewish community in educational matters. The Board's main and fundamental objective

> ... is to endeavour to ensure that as many Jewish children as possible receive Jewish education.[9]

Because it is independent, the School is obliged to follow the Diversity and Equity Policy of ISASA, as well as to be cognisant of state policy and adhere to the constitution of South Africa. This means that it should include supported children (my preferred name for children with barriers to learning) wherever possible and wherever it is educationally realistic (ISASA, 2002 in Kruger & Yorke, 2010).

The School, which has been educating children for over fifty years, had at the time of this writing three hundred and sixty six learners from grade's one to seven, of whom fourteen per cent were supported children receiving academic support of varying levels. From the 1980's until around 2004, with the exception of a small peak in the mid 1990's due to an influx of supported children, there had been a steady decline in numbers in the total enrolment, not only of supported children. This can be attributed to an aging community, demographic shifts to other suburbs (Herman, 2004) and strong competition from elite independent schools.

Going back to 1993 and prior to the transformation in the country, a dramatic drop in numbers, due partly to emigration, compelled the Board to embark on an aggressive marketing drive, which included expanding the current remedial services and including supported children in the mainstream (Herman, 2004). From 2004 until the present

---

[9] SABJE constitution, www.sabje.co.za

time, 2013, the School has remained stable in its numbers and this is perceived to be as the result of a steady influx of supported children.

Over the last twenty to thirty years inclusive education at the School has undergone numerous and radical changes. The purpose of this section is to highlight those changes in order to provide a backdrop to the study. This is an informal historical glimpse based on extracts from a past principal's logbooks. This section traces the history of special needs education (the preferred term at the time) at the School.

5.1.2 Looking back on special needs education at the School in the 1980's

In the 1980's there was an established Remedial Department staffed by two fulltime remedial therapists, known as secular remedial therapists. This title differentiated them from the Hebrew remedial teachers who supported children in Hebrew. The secular remedial therapists made provision for children to have assistance during the school day, in the form of reinforcement of English and Mathematics skills. At the beginning of each year the children were assessed and referred by their class teachers to the Remedial Department.

> The secular remedial teachers would not give lessons for the first two weeks of the year. This time would be used for liaison with class teachers to decide which children needed to attend remedial classes.[10]

The practice at that time was the provision of on-site specialist personnel who, together with the class teachers, would decide which children were to receive support. It did not follow that if a child had attended remedial classes the previous year, that child would automatically continue with these classes.

> There should be more liaison between remedial teachers and class teachers regarding this matter. The teachers should also form their own assessment of the child's ability.[11]

Once children had been identified for support, it was given to them by means of a pullout system. This means children were taken out of the classroom individually or in

---

[10] Principal's logbook, minutes of meeting held January, 1980.
[11] Principal's logbook entry, January 1980.

small groups for a limited period to receive assistance from support personnel. There seemed to be a sense of commitment to special needs at the School. It must be noted that I am using the terminology of that time, for example the term "remedial" which was used and which epitomizes the period in time, before the shift to "barriers to learning".

In South Africa's state schools at that time, special needs education and education support services revealed extreme neglect and lack of provision for the majority of children (Muthukrishna & Schoeman, 2000). Yet for the children at the School experiencing learning difficulties, a strong focus on remediation was reflected and is evidenced by regular meetings held by the remedial therapists and the principal.

In addition to these meetings there was also a high value placed on professional in-service development. The principal related that '…*two remedial therapists went on a one day course over the weekend to Pretoria',* [12] and were encouraged to share their knowledge with the rest of the teachers.

Allocation of space was another factor indicating how the School made its facilities available for supported children. Again, this signified the orientation of the School towards special needs education. [The] *principal and* [remedial therapists had ensured that] *a remedial room* [13] [was set up].

The School, like many others in the country at the time, was working from a within-learner or deficit special needs model, yet there was sensitivity towards children in need and a responsibility borne by the school to make adjustments to their structure. The inclusion of these children seemed to be both natural and necessary and the principal collaborated regularly with staff when decisions had to be made regarding supported children. This contributed to a culture of inclusion.

At that time, there was little movement to and from remedial schools, but in rare cases a decision was made as for example.

---

[12] Principal's logbook entry, 15 June 1981
[13] Principal's logbook entry, 22 June 1981.

the child [would be] leaving [at the] end of year to go to [a Remedial School in] grade 1.[14]

In the case where the School was unsure, the decision to have remediation at the School or placement in a remedial school became the primary responsibility of the parents.

Remediation of [the] child [must be] at [the] parents' discretion, parents have [the] option to take [their] child to [a Remedial School].[15]

The School displayed sensitivity to diversity and continued to provide low-intensity support. The School also took responsibility for implementing differentiation methods which were evaluated. A co-ordinator of education appointed by the Board reported that, '…*many teachers are practising differentiation in various lessons. This is essential, as we do not stream the pupils and we owe it to individual pupils to allow each one to develop to his full potential*'[16].

In addition to the practice of differentiation the School, strongly influenced by high academic standards and parental requests, implemented an enrichment programme. By means of the enrichment and differentiated lessons, the curriculum was adapted to cope with some pupil diversity. An enrichment programme commenced in '*Standard four in 6th period*'[17]. One can see from the notes that there was an awareness of and sensitivity to the needs of children at the School.

A key characteristic of inclusive education is offering varied curriculum and support. It seems from a historical perspective that the School transformed its context to provide a welcoming and educationally appropriate learning environment. A summary of the key characteristics of an inclusive education system which was envisaged much later (Lomofsky & Lazarus, 2001), can be equated to these earlier practices at the School. It appeared that during the 1980's the School was progressively implementing some of

---

[14] Principal's logbook entry, December 1983.
[15] Principal's logbook entry, 2 September 1987
[16] Principal's logbook entry 13 September 1985.
[17] Principal's logbook entry, January 1985.

the main characteristics of inclusive education which were laid down by the Commission more than a decade later in 1997.

Some of the policy recommendations for Special Needs Education set down in 1997 by the National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training (NCSNET) and the National Committee for Education Support Services (NCESS) were: offering a varied curriculum and support interventions to deal with diversity in the learner population; developing a welcoming and supportive ethos for learning and teaching; focusing on human resources development through training and support programmes and the development and implementation of a practical plan to progress towards inclusive education (Lomofsky & Lazarus, 2001). It appeared that the School was ahead of its time.

The School continued to enter into discussions with its specialized staff to identify ways in which children could be aided and assisted there. In this regard the School recruited community resources to provide support. The principal reports a case where a

> hard of hearing pupil [was] admitted with [a] remedial teacher. [The] Remedial teacher came in daily for one period to assist and this to be at the expense of the parents[18].

But there was still a strong influence of medical deficit ideology and some children were prevented from even gaining access to the School. Children with severe needs, who applied at the School, were rejected, but not without an initial effort to help by the School, as noted in the following quote.

> a parent of a Down syndrome child has applied for the child, [the principal] said it would be difficult to admit the child. [The] remedial therapist was called in to see if one could assess the child. [The] parents were called in and advised that the school was not for their son with Down syndrome[19].

---

[18] Principal's logbook entry, 18 November 1985.
[19] Principal's logbook entry, 2 March 1988.

It is evidenced at that time in 1988 that the natural place for supported children was in separated environments. There were also broad categories of labels for children by which exclusionary decisions and practices were legitimated. However, at the School structures, practices and organization indicated recognition, acceptance, the value of special needs education and a sense of undertaking.

During the late 1980's, there seemed to be a growing practice to ensure the inclusion of learners with special education needs at the School. Although '*two children left to go to [Remedial school]*',[20] there was an impression of renewed energy to try and include children and provide additional remediation. This was in the form of the appointment of a coordinator of special needs, which indicated the vision of special needs as a developmental, rather than a static process.

However, despite this progressive move, the School employed the integration model, which was understood to mean supported children had to fit in to the mainstream with assistance. In the mainstream the situation continued unchanged, with the School merely committed to the task of identifying and then remediating.

> [There was a] parent meeting with [the] principal as to whether [the] child be transferred to [a] remedial school. [The] principal called in [the] advisor [new appointment to school]. Parents are prepared to leave [the] child at the school if more remediation may be given.[21]

In another example,

> [The] parents saw [the] principal about remediation for their son. [The] advisor was called in to monitor [the] situation and call future meetings.[22]

5.1.3 In the1990's

> The beginning of the 1990's witnessed the beginning of '*a remedial centre starting in 1994* [from] *grade 1 to std 5* [entitled the] *Alef programme*'[23].

---

[20] Principal's logbook entry, December 1988
[21] Principal's logbook entry, 9 May 1989
[22] Principal's logbook entry, 6 June 1989.
[23] Principal's logbook entry, 1993.

With this new programme the goal of the school was to move beyond the current status quo and expand the structure to include small classes. Supported children were put into smaller classes of not more than 12 children. The idea behind this was to give more individualized tuition. The introduction of these classes which initially covered grades 1 to 7, and the presence of a coordinator on the remedial team, provided many opportunities for infusing the values and principles of inclusive education. There was a readiness by the School to move outside traditional professional boundaries.

Where necessary, a social worker also provided assistance with therapy for those children who needed more help than could be given by the remedial team

> This morning [the principal] met with [head of new programme] and [social worker] to discuss pupils who I felt needed help and watching this term...I have started talking to the teachers about the pupils and we are busy identifying which children will need help.[24]

Research indicates that the most important resource for successful integration is adult resources, which consists of teachers with knowledge and expertise to handle the challenges of inclusive education, and that collaboration between all stakeholders is a factor for successful inclusion implementation (Wah, 2010). There were attempts to increase the staff, and including the coordinator, the School had employed '*three staff members for remedial teaching, 2 fulltime and one part-time* [and there was] *a private occupational therapy practice on campus'.*[25] The coordinator liaised between the principal and the teachers and monitored which children were to be supported.

> No sooner had the bell rung than I had [the coordinator] in my office. [The coordinator] wanted to call [the teacher] in to a meeting as [the teacher] was sending children to therapy without following the channels. I insisted that therapy would only begin once the therapist, teacher and parent met.[26]

The above quote refers to the class teachers tending to push identified children into the hands of the experts and specialist personnel who they believed adopted the expert role. There seemed to be a view of remedial therapists being distinct from the

---

[24] Principal's logbook entry, 1995.
[25] Principal's logbook entry, 1995
[26] Principal's logbook entry, 16 May, 1995

general staff, which further indicated the discourse associated with a medical model and difference. This was reflective of the country's special needs policy which was one of a dual special and general education system where general education did not recognize and address the diverse learning needs of all learners. In South Africa at the time, regular education teachers and special education teachers saw their roles as defined with clear boundaries. The School was determined to include teachers even if their role was merely to identify learners for support.

> I have started talking to the teachers about the pupils and we are busy identifying which children will need help.[27]

The collaboration between the principal and the team of teachers and coordinator seemed to inculcate a culture of inclusive values and norms. This process of addressing and responding to the diverse needs of all children impacted on the School and the increased participation of the children.

> [The coordinator] also saw me to discuss the remedial programme now that we are reaching the end of the first term. Good strides have been made and [the coordinator] discussed certain additions to the programme that now can be added.[28]
> We need to decide what our requirements for next year will be in the remedial field. [The coordinator] will report back to me and our proposals will be forwarded to [the Board representative] and [Director]. Our expectations and proposals for next year will rest heavily on the actual number of children at the school next year.[29]

There was a respect for diversity and a culture of teaching and learning at the School with some support from the Board, all of which was concurrent with a restoration process beginning in the country. The principal seemed to have enlisted the co-operation of the staff and this appeared to involve discussions between staff, coordinator and principal in which agreements and differences were identified. It was a learning process for all involved. Sufficient time and repetition had caused the behaviour of the staff to become assimilated into a routine.

---

[27] Principal's logbook entry, 1995.
[28] Principal's logbook entry, 5 April 1995.
[29] Principal's logbook entry, July 1995.

The principal as "change agent" had created an inclusive environment ahead of its time and in the 1990's the School emerged as a hub and a beacon, providing hope in the community and opening its doors to children with special needs.

> Today we had two new pupils start at the school. [a boy] Grade 1 and [a boy], grade three [going into the] smaller class.[30]
> [A boy] has started at the school in [teacher of small] class. [The boy had been] at [a Remedial School].[31]

There were visionary attempts by the principal to continue and extend the ethos of the School into one that was more inclusive.

> I met with [the superintendent of Education and family of supported child at the Pre Primary School]. [the child] has been refused permission to remain on at the nursery school for an extra year. I have room for [him] in my grade one classes. I explained to [parents] that there could be problems ... but that we would try and help. It was also pointed [out] to the [parents] that in the event of problems further discussion would then take place at that stage.[32]

There was also an attempt to develop policy, and in a meeting...[with the coordinator and remedial therapists] *we discussed the policy the remedial department was utilising and the new structures the ladies wanted introduced.[33]*

In sum, the School was providing infrastructure changes for accessibility and additional staff such as remedial therapists, coordinator and private therapists while making sure that teachers implemented differentiated curricula and enrichment programmes for children who were not coping. All stakeholders were encouraged to become involved in the development of special needs structures and policy framework.

Provision of training and support programmes continued for all the relevant role players and in a meeting with teachers the principal spoke '*about courses that* [he]

---

[30] Principal's logbook entry, 23 January, 1997.
[31] Principal's logbook entry, 24 February 1997.
[32] Principal's logbook entry, 22 January, 1997.
[33] Principal's logbook entry, 13 April, 1998

would like to see run for the teachers at this school… what they felt could be of value[34].

Quality control at the School continued and the principal voiced his disappointment

> that there was very little extension work... when finished with their work the children sit aimlessly with nothing to do. I have told [teacher] that I will be visiting again tomorrow.[35]

Research has shown that the principal's accountability is seen as critical to the success of an inclusion programme, and the major responsibility for special education devolves upon the principal (Forlin, 2006). There was no law or statutory requirement during that time, yet the School made the process of special education part of its vision, ethos, values and culture. There was a strong philosophical movement in the School towards greater inclusion of children with special needs into the community.

There were small classes, generally well-trained teachers, more educational resources and access to additional specialized support, private therapists and a social worker. Through years of planning, the principal remedied the shortcomings at the School, so that inclusive education could become an important cornerstone of Jewish education. There were challenges in implementation, but they provided opportunities for innovative practice. This movement at the School had the effect of influencing and directing future educational changes.

During the 1990's there was political change and uncertainty in South African education circles. As a result of this and of the Board's forceful marketing drive, there was a mass exodus of children from public schools to independent schools. So the number of children who needed support at the School increased and the remedial department was extended (Herman, 2004). The services offered at that time were still in the form of the pullout system, in which learners were drawn out of the classroom during the school day and remediated individually or in small groups.

---

[34] Principal's logbook entry, 17 June. 1999.
[35] Principal's logbook entry, August 1998.

In 2001, following a financial crisis restructuring at the Board took place which affected the remedial and social services that were currently enjoyed by the community. As some of these services were cut back, remedial therapists' hours were cut down and parents had to pay for the remedial lessons that their children received. Also, the small classes which were managed parallel to the mainstream were disbanded (Herman, 2004). The School principal at that time persisted in accepting children who needed support, despite the reduced human resources, financial restraints and the confusion of a clear special needs policy at Board level.

The very sparse and ill-equipped remedial department continued to attend to the needs of the children, while at Board level changes such as curriculum change, lowering of standards and exclusion of children with diverse learning needs were being discussed (Herman, 2004). It seems that the eventual change of the remedial department to an Academic Support Department, with a recognized and expanded staff, came about as the result of a new management at the Board, as well as of a new principal at the School in 2006. At the same time the School had to adjust to WP6 and accept the recommendations.

It is apparent that a school environment built on equity, equality and justice and where there is a desire for social justice, is the ideal backdrop for inclusive education to succeed. This is dictated by the philosophy of the school management. During the research done in 2010, the principal resigned and an interim management team together with the assistance of the Board, became responsible for the running of the School. Pressure on inclusive education mounted. Supported children and the Academic Support Department were blamed for many of the ills at the School, such as lowered standards and benchmark results, as well as incompetent teaching and leadership.

Certain stakeholders at the School were concerned with the lowering of standards and the tipping of the balance between supported and non-supported children. These insecurities concerned the Board which through its Executive Committee, controls the finances and education policy of the schools including the School. Up until that time the Board had been absent from the School's premises unless specifically invited, but

as a result of the paucity in leadership and the stakeholders' complaints, the Board's director had become a regular and visible presence on the campus. In response to the complaints and concerns expressed by the School's stakeholders, the Board introduced a moratorium to cap the number of supported children who could attend the School.

> The School has built a reputation for being a small and nurturing school and has put a lot of effort into community building by welcoming students of varying educational abilities. In contemplating the correct balance within the school of these various student levels, a decision has been taken to cap the number of special needs students so as to ensure that these students get the best support that the school can provide while ensuring that an excellent academic level is delivered in every class. Acceptance of all future students will follow a specified process and will be monitored by the school head.[36]

5.1.4 The current context

Currently in 2013 the School management comprises the principal, the deputy and six other heads of department. Two additional members of management have been appointed since the research began. Rayner, (2007) has found that management needs to have clear direction in order to manage inclusive education. He is aware of the volatility of education policy around inclusion and argues that the challenge for those managing inclusion and special education is one of efficacy and efficiency with equity as the central intention. Accordingly, managers need to work in interactive contexts within a dynamic system.

The School is homogenous by its nature as a faith-based school but it is typified by academic diversity. Sitting next to one another in classrooms are supported learners, highly advanced learners, learners who underachieve, learners from diverse economic backgrounds and learners with preferred modes of learning. Yet they all have one thing in common: they are all member of the same religious community.

Fourteen per cent of the School's learners are receiving support in learning, some of experiencing difficulties in language and some in mathematics. There is also a small

---

[36] Letter from the General Director, 14 November 2011.

group of learners who need individual facilitation which is paid for by their parents. One has been diagnosed as being on the Autistic spectrum, one has Goldenhar syndrome and three have an intellectual disability. By contrast there is also a group of learners who are high achievers, to which inclusion also applied.

The Academic Support Department at the school is responsible for this range of learners. The department has two fulltime remedial therapists, one part-time remedial therapist and one part-time support teacher. It offers support to small groups of learners, using the pullout system, and facilitates in the classrooms. In addition to support, the department offers enrichment during the school day to a few learners who have been identified by their teachers as high achievers.

This community school is currently facing a dilemma between its shared values of membership, loyalty and nurturing beliefs of community (Strike,1999) and the reality of some children being denied access to mainstream education, based on learning differences, socio-economic grounds and tipping the balance. The children want to belong and expect to belong and this extends to their pursuit of education. It seems the dilemma is compounded by the Board's policies which are driven by competitiveness and the public market.

Although the School has been described as inclusive in organization, inclusion is seen as the accommodation of supported children in an unchanging space rather than a conscious attempt to restructure the environment. It is evident to me that the community is facilitating the process of inclusion by withdrawing their children from remedial schools and applying at the School. The increased enrolment applications and subsequent influx of supported children precipitated the emergence of some resistance to the change. Fullan & Miles (1992), prefer to reframe resistance as individual attitudes and behaviours which are natural responses to change.

The change resulted in some teachers embracing the arrival of the children from remedial schools, while others complained that it was difficult to teach children on different levels in the same class. The mixed reactions by the teachers to supported children can be attributed to their personal prejudices, their lack of information of the

126

concept of inclusion itself, and the fear of not being able to teach supported children. Tomlinson, Brimjoin & Narvaez, (2008) give reasons for teacher disinclination to change as their need to cling to what can be controlled in a classroom that changes constantly. Therefore, teachers develop habitual patterns to ensure some dominion in an unpredictable setting. Naicker (2000) believes that in order for teachers to have a complete paradigm shift, it must include not only their thinking but, their practices. In other words their thinking must embrace their performance according to a particular vision of reality.

The standards agenda, achieving the correct balance of supported to un-supported children, obstructive staff attitudes and beliefs and a resistance to change will impede the advancement of inclusive education and as a result, disruptive learners or learners who struggle academically will be labelled or marginalized. My study questions various stakeholders about how they understand inclusion and what practices the policy has in fact generated at ground level. The next section details their answers.

Chapter 6 Findings

6.1 Introduction

This chapter analyses the responses to the research questions, *How do the various school stakeholders understand the concept of inclusion and what are their attitudes towards inclusion? How is inclusive education managed at class, school and community level? To what extent do attitudes and understandings influence practice of inclusive education?*

It is important to note that although the Board, the parent body and the majority of teachers, are from a religious standpoint a relatively homogenous group because of being Jewish, their understandings of inclusive education are varied and ambiguous. It is important to note that the voices of all groups of teacher were included. I will show that there are four identifiable approaches which guided the stakeholders' understandings of inclusive education. These were the special education, pragmatic, diversity and community approaches.

Concurrent with the stakeholders' understandings of inclusion were their anticipated implementations of it. The proponents of the special education approach viewed inclusion as separate to the mainstream, in the form of special schools and self-contained classes. Here, designated professionals are assigned to the needs of supported children, developing a distinct special education pedagogy and curriculum. Those stakeholders who held a pragmatic approach to inclusion approved of supported children in the mainstream, as long as academic standards were maintained, "as long as" there were sufficient resources, and "as long as" there was a reasonable balance between neurotypical children and supported children. Stakeholders with a diversity approach to inclusion viewed implementation as the adaptation of curriculum and pedagogy to meet the needs of diverse children in the mainstream, and described pull-out programs as segregated and discriminatory. The community approach saw all Jewish children as belonging, no matter their learning needs.

I argue that the different approaches to inclusion saw some congruence, but at other times competed for power and prominence. The different approaches saw forces which pulled towards acceptance and belonging, based on the fact that the children were all Jewish and had rights. On the other hand, there were forces which pushed for separate education, resources and standards. The School and its population is the setting and the centre of the analysis and I will show, throughout the chapter, how the School, which is positioned in the hub of contestation, continued working with learners who experienced barriers to learning.

I open this section with a discussion of the Special Education discourse. This discourse differs from inclusion discourse in that special education is synonymous with separate schools and self-contained classrooms, while inclusion signifies a radical term located within a human rights discourse (Brantlinger, 1997). The special education view understands inclusion through the medical deficit model which defines a person's disability as a disease to be treated (Carrington, 1999) as opposed to the inclusion view which supports the Social Model of Disability. This latter model describes disability as resulting from the inability of institutions to accommodate diversity (Terzi, 2004).

Supporters of special education believe children with innate conditions are essentially different, which poses a problem in both school and society. These children achieve above or below the grade level norm and are therefore given descriptive labels such as gifted, learning disabled or mentally handicapped. Likewise, children with problematic attitudes are labelled emotionally handicapped, conduct disordered or ADHD (Attention Deficit Disorder with Hyperactivity) and ADD (Attention Deficit Disorder). In order to improve significantly or to catch up to their peers, these labelled children will need to receive specialized, intensive and individualized instruction provided for in separated settings. Mainstream school structures, being homogenous and with learning as developmentally linear, do not cater to diversity (Brantlinger, 1997).

This discussion has provided a brief overview of debates within special education. It is therefore opportune to begin with the data which revealed the special education

approach to inclusion. In the section which follows I show how three stakeholders understood inclusion from the special education approach. Pseudonyms have been used for confidentiality.

6.2 Inclusion as special education

In the early 1990's, the Board initiated a marketing campaign in a drive to bring children with learning disabilities to the School. Simultaneously learners from government schools were enrolling at the School (Herman, 2006).

From 2001-2003, following the restructuring and massive budget cuts, many children began to leave the schools. There was also the talk of closing the School because of depleting numbers. For this purpose a survey of the remedial schools in the area was undertaken (Herman, 2004).

In the year 2004, the Board initiated another drive to include supported children in the School, in order to boost its enrolment figures and prevent migration of children to remedial schools. The general decrease in numbers across the system, but more so at the School, was due to demographic changes such as the area hosting an aging community, the other schools offering more in the form of better sporting facilities, and the social attraction of a bigger school and accessibility (Herman, 2004). The remedial schools seemed to provide an untapped market of children to boost potential numbers.

Charles, a Board member, was given the brief to research the number of children at the School who were leaving to enter remedial schools and Jewish children currently in remedial schools. After a number of conversations with the principal of a remedial school, he was distressed to learn of the social implications for Jewish children who were educated in remedial schools. One of the concerns they discussed was around Bar Mitzvahs and Bat Mitzvahs[37]. It was argued that children at remedial schools,

---

[37] Bar Mitzvah, when Jewish boys become thirteen, and Bat Mitzvah when Jewish girls become twelve they become accountable for their actions. These coming of age rituals occur in a synagogue, followed by a party to celebrate.

'don't feel a part of the community, don't have the same sort of [Bar Mitzvah, Bat Mitzvah] function...they feel excluded'[38].

Furthermore, it seems

> ...all these kids have been lost to the, not to the Jewish community, but they have been lost to the Jewish social environment and the ability to mix with other Jewish kids[39].

Feeling uneasy about this, he approached the Board and they advised him to look at what '*that would mean*'[40]. They tasked him with researching the financial implications to the Board of losing children to remedial schools, and the practical ones to the School. The main dilemma at the Board was then

> ...should they be opening a Jewish [Remedial School]...We went and looked at the pricing model, especially if you don't get the support you know, from different places to be able to financially set that up[41].

Yet despite the possibility of there being a solution to the loss of these children to the Jewish social environment, as well as a way to attract more revenue for the School, Charles described how '*at that stage financially the Board certainly couldn't contemplate*' [opening a remedial school on the campus][42]. At that time the Board was coming out of '*that roller coaster dip of R40 million debt*'[43] and so he was also tasked, to find a temporary solution until there was funding for a remedial school. In the meantime, the Board would provide the necessary resources to ensure that those children in the School, who could be responsibly educated, were catered for in such a way that there would be less need for them to consider going to remedial schools. Charles also questioned the viability of building a remedial school based on the observation that children only stay at the school for a limited period.

---

[38] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:29 (056). Codes: pragmatic, why the school became inclusive].

[39] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:29 (056). Codes: pragmatic, why the school became inclusive].

[40] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:29 (056). Codes: pragmatic, why the school became inclusive].

[41] Top management, 8 June 2011 [1:29 (053). Codes: Top management: board attitude, two track belief].

[42] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:29 (056). Codes: Top management: how inclusion at the School began].

[43] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:29 (053). Codes: pragmatic considerations].

...do you go and build something where in fact whoever's leaving the community is coming back in? When I say community, I mean the school community, the social environment community, people are leaving for a year or two and coming back in...[44]

It seemed Jewish children were excluded temporarily but would return, and it was on that basis, coupled with limited finances, that the idea of a remedial school was shelved. Thus while conceptually Charles viewed inclusion as special education, he acknowledged that supported children need to be included for practical reasons.

Seven years later, in 2011, there was still no remedial school on the campus. At the same time the School was progressing towards inclusivity and its reputation as a school able to cater to diversity was growing. Because the Board's original intention was not for the School to become inclusive but rather to build a remedial school on the campus, Charles was reluctant to describe the School as a provider of inclusive education which he thought would mislead the community.

> We chose to call it special needs education and not to call it inclusion and I think all of us around the table were very clear that it would be misleading to call it inclusive education.[45]

Interestingly, Charles explained that currently there was existing funding which was housed in a special needs category. He maintained that he and the Board still had a future vision '*of a fully running special needs school*'[46] on the campus. At the same time there was greater movement towards inclusion at the School, but he was wary about the degree involved. He believed the School was *'going too far on this'* [and questioned]*... 'are we moving too quickly on it'*[47]*?*; expressing his concern that the School was moving too quickly in an inclusive direction which was not in line with the Board's original purpose.

> He challenged the current model at the School and the structure of the Academic Support Department (ASD) which was an inclusive model, '*the model here is not the*

---

[44] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:29 (056). Codes: pragmatic considerations].
[45] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:29 (104). Codes: understanding].
[46] Top management, 8 June 2011 [1:29 (073). Codes: Top management: board attitude, two track belief].
[47] Top management, 8 June 2011 [1:29 (156). Codes: Top management: board attitude].

right model ... and if we went and staffed this department in a different way, we [would] have different results in the School[48].

He did not garner support for inclusion at the School, but still seemed ambivalent in understanding which model would be best suited to supported children. His dilemma was between establishing a remedial school on the campus or introducing inclusive education.

I'm not certain in my own mind which would be the better model for student achievement of children with learning difficulties... of whether we add in one class per grade and have a specific class that is structured in a way that the therapies and everything that happens with that group of kids, without them having to be pulled out of classes all the time and therefore have a [Remedial School] look a like....[49]

His main goal remains to include Jewish children socially.

So I'm all for them being in our environment, participating, so they are part of sports, part of assemblies and part of plays...[50]

But they were not to be part of the academic environment. The initial concern he had expressed over the social marginalization was tempered and his view had become progressively more aligned with separate education. Unless there was funding for a remedial school on campus, children would continue to be temporarily excluded.

He remained uncertain as to the feasibility of inclusion, as such a model would need to demonstrate success and, he would need to *'be convinced'*[51]. He would consider it if the structures were right, but even then he continued '*I'm still not certain as to which one [model] does the best for those children*'[52]. Inclusive education would need to validate itself to Charles by proven practices rather than by ideology or persuasiveness

---

[48] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:29 (138). Codes: understanding].
[49] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:28 (156). Codes: Board attitude].
[50] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:28 (156). Codes: Board attitude].
[51] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:28 (156). Codes: Board attitude].
[52] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:28 (156). Codes: Board attitude].

Referring children to remedial schools was a view shared as well by Sarah, a teacher. Sarah believed that although the structures in place for supported children at the School had been successful, she, like Charles, endorsed special education traditions. Where Charles displayed a somewhat ambivalent view as to the best model, Sarah was clear in her support of remedial schools for these children, stating that they provided a less pressurizing and more intimate environment for teachers and children. Her understanding of inclusive education aligned with the medical model and she described traits of supported children as being *'psychological problems [and] learning problems'*[53]*,* which would be more successfully dealt with by special education than by general education teachers.

Even with her experience of seeing inclusion work at the School, she was driven by the threat of high school pressures and her impressions of the teaching and learning materials she had seen at the remedial schools. There she had seen classes of only eight children, where the remedial teachers could teach using individual education plans for each child. She did not further the aims of inclusive education and she presented her reasons in a very practical way.

> I think it's [inclusion at the School] a big success, but I'm not convinced with kids with learning difficulties that this [being in a mainstream environment] is the answer. From what I've noticed at [Remedial School] is that it's a very intimate environment, the teacher gets to every single child in that class. There isn't that pressure on her of having to prepare these kids for High School, or getting you know, just the basic things done[54].

She was a teacher who needed to get a '*sense of satisfaction*'[55] from her teaching and to feel like she was '*giving something*'[56] to the children. She would reinforce concepts and work at a slow pace and re-explain to children who '*don't get it*'[57]. Nonetheless, she worried about mainstream education for children with special needs and indicated that a remedial school would benefit the children at the same time as it would ease the burden of the teachers and their workload.

---

[53] Teacher, 13 October 2011 [Document 3:38 (053). Codes: teachers deficit model].
[54] Teacher, 13 October 2011 [Document 3:38 (138). Codes: teachers beliefs].
[55] Teacher, 13 October 2011 [Document 3;38 (222). Codes: teachers: class management].
[56] Teacher, 13 October 2011 [Document 3;38 (222). Codes: teachers: class management].
[57] Teacher, 13 October 2011 [Document 3;38 (250). Codes: teachers: class management].

I can't understand if you've got a school like [Remedial School] why we would want to change, because I think it's such a nurturing atmosphere for them[58].

It seems that her views of inclusion as special education were directly related to the frustration and pressure she faced compared with teachers at the remedial schools. Her feelings of anger were evident as she compared her workload and that of the teachers at the [Remedial school]. They, *'sit with 7, 8 kids in a class and I'm sitting with 25'*[59]. One could sense the emotional strain she was under as she described how pressurized she was to prepare supported children for high school. She strongly believed in separated education, and simultaneously felt hopeless and frustrated at having supported children in her class. She set high standards for herself as a teacher, was self-driven and frustrated if her lessons were not successful. So, despite her moral pull to support the

underdog...it frustrates me to a point of sometimes despair you know, when I feel I just don't get anywhere[60].

Again, her response was couched in special education language and ignored diversity and inclusion. She referred to the supported children as the "underdog", presupposing them to be second best to everyone else. What follows is an example of her experience of a typical class scenario.

...we have kids with concentration problems... sometimes... they are naughty... they get restless and you've also got mixed kids that battle to learn. I often have kids that cry in my classroom. I have kids with Aspergers...[61]

Sarah was challenged by diversity in ability and learning in her classroom and while she tried to differentiate her lessons, she didn't really believe in the success of inclusion. Besides, she added, she didn't see the reason for supported children being at the School, when there were perfectly competent remedial schools which could cater to individual needs. She did, however, agree that for the social and emotional benefits, inclusion could work and conceded that maybe supported children

---

[58] Teacher, 13 October 2011 [Document 3:38 (306). Codes: teachers understanding].
[59] Teacher, 13 October 2011 [Document 3:38 (270). Codes: teachers understanding].
[60] Teacher, 13 October 2011 [Document 3:38 (399). Codes: teachers understanding].
[61] Teacher, 7 October 2011 [Document 6:15 (274). Codes: teachers: class management].

shouldn't be in a separate school, but they should almost have a remedial school within the school because I just don't see them really benefiting in this setup, when they go the High School and they are taught by people like us in huge classes[62].

Sarah's views were formed through her negative personal experience, when her own child was eventually diagnosed with problems after many years. She presented with a strong rigid front and it was only well into the interview that she let her guard down.

It began in a fairly pragmatic way. Sarah was discussing how it might be easier to include children with academic problems but '*behaviour disability is maybe worse, because in a way it's something that they can never overcome*'[63]. Quite willingly, she began to describe how as a parent she would have to pave the way for her child for the '*rest of [her] life*'[64]. It was then that she related how she had struggled for many years with various labels ascribed to her own child, and how she went from professional to professional until she finally found somebody who got to the root of the problem and presented a diagnosis. Her journey with her child had been long and without support and although she had finally found the help she desperately needed, she was grateful for the personal experience she had gained by being at the School. It had assisted her

> to see how other people deal with them [children with behavioural problems]. I've learned from this community thing, I've learned a few things that I didn't know, you know about Aspergers because there isn't a lot of help out there...[65]

Sarah's own negative personal experience may have been the grounds for her tensions regarding diversity and her insistence of supported children being looked after by trained professionals. She had begun her teaching career as an idealist, wanting to make a '*difference in every single child's life*'[66]. She still felt that way, but her personal experience convinced her that children with needs would be better served by professionals and she, in turn, would dedicate herself to the neurotypical children.

---

[62] Teacher, 7 October 2011 [Document 6:15 (322). Codes: teachers: understanding].
[63] Teacher, 7 October 2011 [Document 6:15 (512). Codes: teachers: challenges of diversity].
[64] Teacher, 7 October 2011 [Document 6:15 (512). Codes: teachers: personal experience].
[65] Teacher, 7 October 2011 [Document 6:15 (524). Codes: teachers: personal experience].
[66] Teacher, 7 October 2011 [Document 6:15 (597). Codes: teachers: personal experience].

Dave, a middle manager, supported the notion that it is the teachers' personal experience that affects their attitude towards inclusion. In other words he argued that some teachers had assumed separatist ideas regarding education, which were tied to a personal conflict in their own lives.

> ...it is in response to the hard times they have had with their own personal lives that they're now responding negatively to it...it could be a factor where it is a reaction to the action that you have had in your life, because you have experienced it in your home[67].

He was convinced that beliefs and ideals underpin preferences for certain types of schooling, and that the negative attitude of some teachers towards inclusive education had to do '*with their own personal stuff, stuff that they are working with and holding on to*'[68]. As in the case of Sarah, Dave believed that a teacher who was engaged in a personal inner struggle would carry this over to the current context which would influence his practice in the classroom.

This perspective seemed to explain Sarah's inflexible definitions of disability and the stress she showed when confronting difference. Katherine, a middle manager, also supported appropriate segregated teaching and learning contexts for supported children. One reason she gave for her viewpoint was inadequate support from the Board for inclusion, '*we've got a long way to go to get to that mind shift, to get to the powers that be to shift their minds*'[69]. She blamed this on the Board's motivation for finances and business traditions, which she said would obstruct or diminish the success of inclusive school practices. She said that for the Board '*money is more important than the actual human side of children*'[70].

Moreover, she believed that the School management was divided in its philosophy with some supporting inclusion and others not. She noted that with the principal's

---

[67] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (135). Codes: middle management: attitudes and beliefs].
[68] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (139). Codes: middle management: attitudes and beliefs].
[69] Middle management, 21 September [Document 4:30 (313). Codes: middle management: board attitude].
[70] Middle management, 21 September 2011 [Document: 4:30 (33o). Codes: middle management: understanding].

support for inclusion there had been a positive move, but then *'the principal resigned'*[71] and things changed at the School.

She claimed further that there were insufficient structures in place at the School to cater satisfactorily for inclusion and although, it worked hard, the Academic Support Department (ASD) was not able to reach all children.

> ...it is a department that works extremely hard, I feel that it's understaffed for the number of kids that we have that are within that inclusion[72].

She emphasised the importance of children being able to participate within the structure of the School.

For Katherine, inclusion was about children fitting into the current structure rather than the structure fitting the needs of the children. She did not mention access or accommodating children's needs, and felt that if the current space denied certain children's needs, these children would require a remedial school. Like Sarah, she explained that supported children should attend remedial schools, where special education teachers would be more successful in securing their learning and development.

> If it's somebody who needs a remedial school, it's not fair to take them in and include them and you can't offer them what's best for them[73].

To Katherine, it was more important for children to be able to take part in a school capable of dealing with their needs, even at the expense of their Jewish education and she argued that it was the family's responsibility to provide a child's Jewish education, and not the school's. She definitely displayed a sense of fairness and justice and was intolerant of the School making promises it would not be able to keep. In fact, she said making promises to educate supported children, which the School could not honour, would be likened to "cheating" children of their education.

---

[71] Middle management, 21 September [Document 4:30 (265). Codes: middle management: nature of management].

[72] Middle management, 21 September 2011 [Document: 4:30 (131). Codes: middle management: school management of inclusion].

[73] Middle management, 21 September 2011 [Document: 4:30 (035). Codes: understanding].

It's a very difficult one, because you want them to have the Jewish education ...but if you're going to make promises of things that we're not so sure we can do, then I think we're cheating them and if their Judaism is important to their family, their family will make a plan or should make a plan to keep them going. I just feel that to make promises that you can't keep it's not fair on us and it's not fair on them.[74]

Taking the present circumstances at the School into consideration, Katherine articulated strong, unbending anti inclusion views. Unlike Charles who earlier had spoken of feelings of sadness and loss at the thought of Jewish children being socially isolated from their community, Katherine was not concerned about the social marginalization. She felt that if the School structures were not sufficient, supported children would need to find another school to attend to their needs. Her view was that special education would benefit supported children who needed the professional services which the School was not able to provide.

I think that if you know that your structures can cope with it, yes take them in, but if we know that our structures can't, we know that it's going to be putting that much extra pressure and that's not fair. Then I would say let them drive an extra twenty minutes and find a school that's better.[75]

So far the stories of Sarah, Charles and Katherine illustrate the discourse of inclusion as special education. The common theme in the above section was that separate education by trained professionals would be more responsive to the needs of supported children than inclusive mainstream education. There was definite concern around the concept of inclusion and the direction of the inclusion movement.

This approach saw a viable system for supported children as one with separate identity, boundaries, staff, budget and authority. Supported children were seen as having learning characteristics that were markedly different from the normative or general case and needed to be in a more explicit, carefully controlled and carefully monitored environment, where education was seen as a place and not a service. From the perspective of the above stakeholders, the factors that impacted on the discourse of inclusion as special education were personal experiences, frustration, finances and

---

[74] Middle management, 21 September 2011 [Document: 4:30 (305). Codes: understanding].
[75] Middle management, 21 September 2011 [Document: 4:30 (301). Codes: understanding].

the fact that remedial schools were a better option. However the fact that supported children were included was because of lack of funding at the School and also the need to integrate them socially.

6.3 Pragmatic approach to inclusion

The second approach, the pragmatic approach, is one which endeavours to interpret a belief or perception by tracing its practical consequences. Proponents of this approach are attracted to concreteness and competence, to facts and action and to power (Menand, 1997).

The term pragmatism is derived from a Greek word meaning action and from which the words practice and practical are also derived. Pragmatism appeals to particulars, to positivism and to emphasising practical aspects. It shows disdain for verbal solutions and useless questions. The pragmatist looks towards end results, consequences and facts (Menand, 1997).

It seemed that the following stakeholders' realistic, sensible, practical and down to earth attitudes played an important role in their understanding of inclusion. They, like Barbara were concerned with finding effective methods for completing specific tasks.

Barbara, a parent at the School, assumed a practical approach to inclusion. For her, the value of an idea was measured by the consequences it produces. She was driven by what she believed were practical consequences and their bearing on the School.

Barbara had been involved with the School for many years, during which she had seen three principals come and go and many practices and policies conceptualized. She currently had children in different phases of the School, ranging from pre-school to high school. None of them had up until now needed support and she was grateful *'that [she has] very bright children and they don't have special needs'[76]*. However, she

---

[76] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (072). Codes: community: personal experience].

acknowledged *'if I had children with special needs, I would feel thankful that the support was here'*[77].

She initially chose the School for her children above the other Jewish day schools, as she believed her children had the added advantage of a warm, friendly and caring environment where they were allowed the space to express themselves.

> I think it is more intimate...I think maybe the School is a place for a more different child. In my perception,... I think there is the space to be your own person, that if you are different from the rest it is ok here. We like being different[78].
> That's why my kids are at [the School] they must be with everybody part of everyone. One day they will be in the world and the world is full of different people. I want them to come up with a sense of values, to be menschen[79] [80].

Over the years, however, she became increasingly disillusioned and concerned that the initial reasons for placing her children at the School were changing. She expressed her apprehension, '*I pray that we haven't lost that [values]*'[81].

> I think we have our values as tolerance, respect and integrity, but I very seldom see them being brought into action[82].

At around the time of the interview, she had become aware of a dearth in special needs education in the Jewish community. This was as a result of being exposed to a family member's difficult experience in being unable to obtain proper support for her child.

Like Charles, Katherine and Sarah, Barbara believed the panacea to the "special needs" predicament in the Jewish community, was a remedial school. However, this was because of problems experienced at the School, for example, that there could be no inclusion without leadership and trained teachers.

---

[77] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (072). Codes: community: management at school level].
[78] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (100). Codes: community: ethos of school].
[79] The plural of Mensch, a Yiddish word from German meaning a person of integrity and honour.
[80] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (124). Codes: community: ethos of school].
[81] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (108). Codes: community: ethos of school].
[82] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (104). Codes: community: ethos of school].

I think within the Jewish community we actually need a remedial school. I genuinely think there is a great shortage... I think it would be wonderful to have one in the Jewish community, but should that burden be placed at the School when we have other critical matters, absolutely not[83].

The "critical matters" she referred to were ineffective leadership and the poor quality of teaching there. Barbara believed that under the previous management, the teachers lacked guidance, direction and professional development. She claimed that good leadership and teaching were even more important than facilities.

...what is much more important is the quality of the teachers and the leadership in terms of pushing them, extending them and moving them in the right direction[84].

Katherine agreed with Barbara that teachers need to be

prepared to go the route... they [must be] prepared to go through the courses to be educated in that direction...they [must be] prepared to put the time in and prepare their lessons[85].

She, like Barbara, believed that under the previous leadership, there had been very limited guidance for teachers. There had been an open door policy and everybody could voice their opinion but as a result, she believed that teachers were given too much freedom, there were no clear boundaries for professional development and they were neither instructed nor guided on how to differentiate their lessons, or to '*deal... with that child differently*'[86].

Barbara differed from the previous stakeholders in that although she agreed that a remedial school was the solution to the "shortage of special needs education", she also believed inclusion at the School could be considered, if the "critical matters' were confronted and improved. Barbara referred to a past lack of leadership which she thought with concern may still pervade the School and result in a lack of commitment from the teachers.

---

[83] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (188). Codes: community: attitudes and feelings towards inclusion].
[84] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (164). Codes: community: pragmatism].
[85] Middle management, 21 September 2011 [Document 4:30 (050). Middle management: teachers enable or disable inclusion].
[86] Middle management, 21 September 2011 [Document 4:30 (050). Codes: middle management: teachers enable or disable inclusion].

I think there was a lack of leadership... And I think there is a lack of buy in from the teachers, in terms of changing things so they can get better[87].

The principal had resigned halfway through the year and the School was being run by an interim management. A new principal would take up his position in the new year and she was hopeful but apprehensive.

...in terms of the new principal we hold thumbs, it is very much a wait and see approach[88].

According to Barbara, pedagogical causes such as insufficient knowledge in learning styles and differentiation and poor classroom management resulted in teachers giving more attention to supported children and thereby reduced interaction with unsupported children. She understood that '*the teachers haven't focused on the stronger children... they are too busy trying to prop up the weaker children*'[89]. She described how important it was that all children were '*challenged to the kind of level that they can reach and [should be encouraged to] help them reach their potential*'[90].

Barbara would support inclusion, but she remained concerned that the School did not have the sort of classrooms where challenging, practical and relevant experiences as well as and where differentiated learning took place. In fact, she maintained that there was '*a vacuum of education... from grade 4-7*'[91], which she thought was not because there were supported children at the School, but because there was a deterioration in the teaching as a result of prior ineffective leadership.

The above historical barriers influenced the children's progress and for inclusion to be considered, she argued, teachers would have to make adjustments and compromises in the quality of their teaching. She felt very strongly that '*all education is the quality of your educator*'[92]. She vehemently expressed her anger and frustration at the quality of

---

[87] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (032). Codes: community: pragmatism].
[88] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (036). Codes: community: pragmatism].
[89] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (056). Codes: community: pragmatism].
[90] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (132). Codes: community: teachers enable or disable inclusion].
[91] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (076). Codes: community: pragmatism].
[92] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (156). Codes: community: pragmatism].

the teaching and the teachers at the School. She believed the school was frozen in a time warp of poor quality teaching.

> ...it feels exactly like it is the 1970's, but we are in 2011 and we need to move on 40 years in the way we educate, the way we teach our children. In the senior grades I think our level of education is pathetic. I think our kids learn nothing... I think half of them [teachers] should have gone years ago. They [are] dead they [are] tired, they bully the children around, they are emotionally immature. The quality of the input, the quality of creativeness is non-existent[93].

Barbara claimed that once the above pedagogical shortfalls and the current tensions of leadership were addressed, a carefully thought out discussion on the implementation of inclusion would need to take place. Before accepting supported children, there would need to be vigilant considerations with part of the discussion centred around the degree or level of support a child would need.

> ...at what stage does the child need to be at [remedial school] and at what point should they be here? There is a point at which it is too bad to be in a mainstream environment for the other children and it is a disadvantage for that child who needs more help. And I think we need to pick those points quite carefully. I am completely happy to have an environment where some [children] can cope and some cant, some are bright and some are educationally challenged and some are more physical and some are less active. It is wonderful, as long as we try to make every child feel special for what they have got.[94]

The discussion around balance often translated to the question of numbers or quotas. She was concerned with the ratio of supported children to neurotypical children and wondered if *'the school [would] be better if we had 10% or 15% of special needs kids*'[95]. She thought that perhaps *'we could have a school that attracts all of them, but I genuinely think you need some kind of boundaries in terms of numbers*'[96]. However, after a while she changed her position and strongly dismissed the idea of attracting all children. '*No I would hate to see that, I think it would be very, very bad for our school*'[97].

---

[93] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (064). Codes: community: implementation or non-implementation at class level].
[94] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (140). Codes: community: pragmatism].
[95] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (180). Codes: community: pragmatism].
[96] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (232). Codes: community: pragmatism].
[97] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (196). Codes: community: pragmatism].

Barbara believed that instead of the School trying to upgrade and attract all children, it needed to remain focused on its strategy, which was to educate the majority of children who were functioning well.

> I still think there's a tipping point and there's a point at which [the] support department would become too important, too large... would unbalance it [the School]. I think we are an able-bodied school and that is what our strategy is and the fact that we assist the pupils who are on the weaker side is wonderful, that shouldn't take away from our core strategy, to educate the vast majority of our kids who are absolutely functioning well[98].

Still concerned with practical limitations at the School, her position changed again as she harked back to the ideal that every Jewish child should have the right to an education. In theory she supported the ideal of children's rights to education and especially every Jewish child's right to be at the School, but she was aware it could not be practically fulfilled.

> I think everybody's got rights and want to exercise their rights and obviously every Jewish child should have an education. All of those things would be absolutely wonderful, but then there is the corollary to that, also practical limitations.[99]

Barbara's reflections offer particularly interesting perspectives of inclusion. Her earlier reasons for enrolling her children at the School demonstrated her belief in celebrating and respecting difference and wanting her children to be exposed to core values. She also supported the ideal of every Jewish child having a right to a Jewish education. However, these reasons seemed to be overshadowed by more dominant practical considerations. Her pragmatic approach dictated that inclusion must be limited by balance and level of disability. In terms of balance, she believed the School would need to construct boundaries with a careful and reflective ratio of supported to neurotypical children. It seemed as though the delineation of diversity influenced her thinking around inclusion, and best inclusive practice would be determined by the balance as well as by good leadership and teacher training.

---

[98] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (200). Codes: community: pragmatism].
[99] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (224). Codes: community: practical constraints and limitations].

Andrew, another parent, was adamant that it was less about all Jewish children's rights to be at the School and more about following a policy of admission.

> No there's no right… at any school at any private school one needs to apply and you need to accepted. There isn't an automatic right to be accepted into a school[100].

Moreover, he proclaimed, even if the child were Jewish, if there were not sufficient resources and the school was full, *'they have a right to be on a waiting list, but they don't have a right to automatic acceptance into the school'[101].* Andrew had a methodological approach to inclusion. The end product was important to him and accordingly, inclusion has nothing to do with human rights, as the end product was all about the resources available at the School.

> It's inappropriate… it's not a human rights issue it's an issue of what the school is geared to dealing with...It's not about human rights it's about the resources that are available and the structures available[102].

Andrew had been a parent at the School for many years and was very involved in collaborating with parents in the designing of structures and practices that impacted on the School. He began and ended the interview in a cautious and consistent way. Inclusion for him was

> ...a structure where there is both the teachers and the class structure that allows for inclusive children or for inclusive education. My understanding is that the School doesn't really have enough resources to do that effectively[103].

Like Barbara, Andrew was predisposed to inclusion with conditions, yet he differed from Barbara regarding those conditions. Barbara was concerned with teaching, leadership and balance, while Andrew was inclined towards resources and specifically

---

[100]Parent, 5 December 2011 [Document 9:27 (316). Codes: community: attitudes and feelings towards inclusion].

[101] Parent, 5 December 2011 [Document 9:27 (320). Codes: community: attitudes and feelings towards inclusion].

[102] Parent, 5 December 2011 [Document 9:27 (345). Codes: community: attitudes and feelings towards inclusion].

[103] Parent, 5 December 2011 [Document 9:27 (048). Codes: community: practical constraints and implementation].

the adequacy of resources. In a matter of fact tone he suggested that inclusion is *'working for those children, but it's not working for the school as a whole'*[104].

It was his belief based as well on what he had heard and been told by other parents, that the School's resources had buckled under the pressure of too many supported children. This imbalance had affected the benchmark test results '*which are 'lower than it should be'*[105]. He was not aware of which benchmark tests had been used, but referred to too many "remedial" children being accommodated within the framework of the School's available resources*.*

Andrew believed that the problem of balance had reached the Board and culminated in a decision by the Board to cap the intake of children from remedial schools to the School. A letter was sent out informing the School community of this decision. This for him was the only way to balance the numbers and prevent a completely '*open door policy'*[106] which would tip the balance.

Andrew worried about the balance between supported children and resources and felt that *'...in terms of accommodating a large body of inclusive children, it [the School] doesn't really have the resources for that'*[107]. It was vitally important to him that there were sufficient resources for inclusion to work at the School.

> I've seen a few of the special needs kids who have actually excelled, so with the right kind of support I think any child can be brought up to the right level[108].

From his reflections, Andrew affirmed that one of the chief shortages at the School was that of human resources. Like Barbara, he pointed out that too few and inappropriately qualified teachers presented one of the major challenges for inclusion.

---

[104] Parent, 5 December 2011 [Document 9:27 (064). Codes: community: practical constraints and implementation].

[105] Parent, 5 December 2011 [Document 7:27 (084). Codes: community: standards].

[106] Parent, 5 December 2011 [Document 7:27 (262). Codes: community: practical constraints and implementation].

[107] Parent, 5 December 2011 [Document 9:27 (056). Codes: community: practical constraints and implementation].

[108] Parent, 5 December 2011 [Document 9:27 (144). Codes: community: attitudes and feelings towards inclusion].

I think resources are always a challenge, having enough teachers who are qualified in that area. It's all very well to allocate teachers, but it has to be properly qualified teachers[109].

Poor human resources and lack of expertise, impacted directly, on the supported children as teachers failed to diagnose specific issues and children could be in the schools for a number of years without proper diagnoses or suitable programmes. It was often only after some informed parents had pointed out these issues, that the teachers became aware of them.

There has never been a sense that teachers are aware of, or teachers are able to pick up issues with a particular child, never, I've never found that. I find that if you raise an issue with a teacher and they look out for it and they can see it, but for parents who are not aware of it, a child has the potential of going a few years without having issues recognized, whether it's special needs or its extension that is needed[110].

He rationalized that not enough emphasis had been put on acquiring the best available teachers and that the experienced teachers who had added a lot of value had been replaced by *'young teachers who don't have the knowledge and gift of experience as the old ones'*[111]. In addition, he believed that the lowered benchmark scores, which he alleged were linked to the ratio of supported children, could be improved with good teaching.

There is a correlation between the proportion of special needs children and the benchmark scores, I mean that's naturally going to be the case, but one could alleviate that with really great teachers[112].

In addition to human resources, Andrew spoke about financial resources and despite showing regret at having to turn children away he said, *'it's sad if they couldn't come,*

---

[109] Parent, 5 December 2011 [Document 9:27 (225). Codes: community: practical constraints and implementation].
[110] Parent, 5 December 2011 [Document 9:27 (233). Codes: community: practical constraints and implementation].
[111] Parent, 5 December 2011 [Document 9:27 (336). Codes: community: practical constraints and implementation].
[112] Parent, 5 December 2011 [Document 9:27 (341). Codes: community: practical constraints and implementation].

'but if there weren't resources to deal with their issues, there's nothing we can do about it'[113].

The justification for his view was that the school fees coming in did not cover all that was needed. Part of the problem, he maintained, was that the School was a community school with a subsidy programme and ten per cent of the Board's budget was allocated to children who could not afford to be there. He added that in another

> ...private school that 10% would be what would be going towards extra facilities infrastructure, resources, teachers etc. But here, that 10% is chopped off the top and goes to bring more kids into the system[114].

Charles, a board member, had earlier expressed the need for a remedial school on the campus, conditional on funds. He noted how inclusion placed stress on financial resources.

> I know what that [inclusion] means financially, I know what that's meant to fee increases for parents... [there is] the dilemma that it effects ex percentage of students, however everyone is going to pay for this[115].

Funding for special needs could be realized through donor funding, but Charles pointed out that *most donors ...are seen to be not interested*[116]. Therefore, Charles believed that until such time as there were enough finances, the School could no become inclusive. When asked the question if the School was inclusive he said, '*no because... there is not full finances*'[117].

However, Charles provided another viewpoint to that of the financial problem. He suggested that there was a danger of the issue of finances becoming so consuming that it would detract from the educational aspect.

---

[113] Parent, 5 December 2011 [Document 9:27 (294). Codes: community: practical constraints and implementation].
[114] Parent, 5 December 2011 [Document 9:27 (242). Codes: community: practical constraints and implementation].
[115] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:29 (053). Codes: top management: pragmatic considerations].
[116] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:29 (073). Codes: top management: pragmatic considerations].
[117] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:29 (148). Codes: top management: pragmatic considerations].

The moment finances become an issue you can't think education and I've watched that also in the past. So, you are so busy worrying about the finances you can't even have... a discussion with anybody around a future programme or innovation or anything, you just can't do that and yet it also needs the education side. [118]

And yet it seemed that was exactly what was happening. Education and specifically inclusion, had taken a back seat to everything else and children were being turned away because of a lack of financial resources.

The language of practicalities and resources seemed to have taken precedence as the stakeholders attempted to understand what inclusion meant for them. Although Barbara seemed to straddle a middle ground between practical issues and the need for Jewish supportive education, Andrew came across as a strong and unbending promoter of resources as a condition for inclusion.

Winnie, another teacher, held an interesting viewpoint on financial resources. Her view was that the Board had endorsed and financially supported inclusion sufficiently to enable it to convey to the world the idea that "we are doing it", but did not have a vested interest in it.

I think they have given us ex amount to put it in place kind of be seen that we are doing it, but are they really investing the time? Has anyone actually been here to actually see what's going on, to see how its run, to see what's going on[119]?

Katherine seemed to endorse this viewpoint

I get the sense that it's lip service... I don't get the feeling that every Board member is behind it. I think some people see it as out there you've got to say you do, it but practically they're [the Board] not into it. [120]

Winnie agreed with the view that in order for inclusion to work, sufficient structures would have to be provided and finances were needed to supply these structures. However, she believed that it was all about priorities and the persuasiveness and

---

[118] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:29 (022). Codes: top management: pragmatic and academic, can't do together].

[119] Teacher, 9 September 2011 [Document 1:9 (1361-1364). Codes: Board involvement].

[120] Middle management, 21 September 2011 [Document 4:30 (66). Codes: middle management: Board attitude].

power of the promoters of those priorities. Her poignant account explains what she believed were some of the Board's priorities when they allocate funds.

> I believe that they find money for everything. They find money to send people to Israel to twin with schools, but we can't find money for desks in the classroom. I don't believe we are concentrating on the fundamental basis of the [School] system. We spend thousands of rands on peripheral things, rather than dealing with the core problems that we have[121].

An experienced teacher, Winnie had spent many years in the school community as a parent and a teacher. An outspoken person who abhorred injustice and dishonesty, she believed that ideas of inclusion were embedded in broader political and social issues. She acknowledged that inclusion is a "core problem" and in her view the Board had invested a certain amount of money in inclusion which she understood to be *'tokenism'*[122].

To Winnie the practice of inclusion at the School was a way to be seen to be politically correct, just enough to be noticed as doing something, yet not enough for it to be a priority. Furthermore, she maintained, we spend too much time on other things and *'not enough time considering what's best for the child'*[123].

Her sense of fairness suggested that if inclusion was going to be implemented it must be done honestly and properly. It would be unfair to the children and to the reputation of the School to keep admitting supported children without putting structures in place.

> Truthfully, I believe that we can't keep taking and taking [supported children] without putting structures in place, if we are not going to be given the facilitators or the ability to run it where we can... [An example is] if the whole school has maths at the same time and everyone goes to their level... until these structures are in place, the School will get a name of being a remedial school[124].

She saw inclusion as possibly damaging in one way, that of to the reputation of the School. And again, was aware of negative consequences arising from this.

---

[121] Teacher, 9 September 2011 [Document 1:9 (1332-1338). Codes: Board involvement].
[122] Teacher, 9 September 2011 [Document 1:9 (1357). Codes: Board involvement].
[123] Teacher, 9 September 2011 [Document 1:9 (1351). Codes: teachers underlying values].
[124] Teacher, 9 September 2011 [Document 1:9 (1275-1281). Codes: teachers: practical limitations].

We do have this reputation [remedial school], but on the other hand there are parents who are fighting from all over the country to bring their children here because they accept the weak children and because we have such a marvellous department[125].

Charles, on the other hand, was also concerned with consequences to the School's reputation, but his argument, unlike Winnie's, was based only on a negative reputation because of an imbalance in the academic achievement of the children there. He seemed to hold inclusion accountable for the non-delivery of quality education and for poor academic results and standards.

...on the one hand we want to get good results it impacts on the reputation of the school. The last thing you would want is parents turning around saying this is not a school where my child achieves what they potentially can achieve, because of this, that and the other. So you want to show that the results that are being achieved are great results[126].

For Winnie, the fate of inclusion was dependent on a sincere commitment to the policy, together with appropriate financial support for the necessary resources. Without this, the School's reputation would suffer and the supported children would continue to be blamed for lowered standards.

Parents [of children at other schools] say to me I am not bringing my child there because it is becoming a remedial school. We do have this reputation[127].

This view was shared by some parents from the academic sector of the community. Lana, a parent, believed there were '*attitudes prevalent that [she] picked up of parents, like... these kids are compromising the standards*'[128]. Parents had discussed with her that they were disappointed when the previous practice of having small classes at the School, was discarded.

---

[125] Teacher, 9 September 2011 [Document 1:9 (1050-1055). Codes: teachers: image of school].
[126] Top management, 8 June 2011 [Document 1:29 (120). Codes: Top management: board attitude, pragmatic belief].
[127] Teacher, 9 September 2011 [Document 1:9 (1049-1051). Codes: teachers: practical limitations].
[128] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (060). Codes: community: streaming].

Lana thought the purpose of those classes was to take children who were struggling in the mainstream and provide them with *'extra time and space in a separate space'*[129]. These views were based on her casual conversations with other parents and she viewed those classes *'as a setting apart and a dumping ground'*[130].

The parents she had spoken to believed that the solution to the alleged lowered standards and the School's reputation for being a remedial school could be addressed by implementing the streaming of children into ability determined classes. She described those parents as wanting their *'geniuses, so called, to be in the very good class'*[131].

> ...there's very high expectations for their children and it's a bit like the sort of Harvard thing where you want your kid to be on the track...there always is going to be a bit of that and the easy way out is to stream.[132]

In summary

Stakeholders embracing the pragmatic approach to inclusion viewed the success of inclusive education as dependent on existing infrastructure and resources. If those structures were limited, one would have to make choices. Despite the intention by the stakeholders to cater educationally to as many Jewish children as was possible, there were choices as to which child was in and which child was out. Inclusion was understood as a balance between a pragmatic world of resources, infrastructure and balance, against an *'ideal world'*[133] of belonging and equality. These values and meanings were embedded in the thinking of the stakeholders and seemed natural to some of them. However, setting cut-off points and exceptions to inclusive education weakened it and served to instil old and new forms of segregation.

Issues included school reputation, balances between resources and numbers of children and pedagogical considerations.

---

[129] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (034). Codes: community: streaming].
[130] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (034). Codes: community: streaming].
[131] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (060). Codes: community: streaming].
[132] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (060). Codes: community: streaming].
[133] Top management, 8 November 2011 [Document 2:33 (060). Codes: duties of CEO].

6.4 Diversity as an approach to inclusion

This approach begins with a description and understanding of social justice and diversity. It shows how a group of stakeholders attempted to put this approach at the School into operation and the barriers they faced which prevented them from doing so. A diversity or social justice approach to inclusion embraces all people, regardless of race, ethnicity, disability, gender, sexual orientation, language, socio-economic status and any other aspect of an individual's identity that might seem different. Supporters of this view have a vision of an inclusive and equitable society, which takes into account a broad range of diversity beyond disability (Polat, 2011). Proponents of this approach see inclusion as the educational ideal which is promoted through schools as the site for diversity.

Taysum & Gunter, (2008) argue that social justice is more than taking diversity into account. It manifests as any endeavour that involves individuals having equal rights and responsibilities in the choices that affect their lives. This simply means equality of opportunity and being conscious of that opportunity.

From the data collected, inclusive education was understood by some stakeholders to be based on a Social Model of Disability which implies a child's impairment is not the cause of disability, but is the result of how society is organized, which can disadvantage and exclude. Inclusion for these stakeholders meant elimination of social exclusion and a belief in education as a basic human right. In this study, the basic human right applies to all children regardless of their ability.

Education and specifically inclusive education is viewed as a means to address issues of social justice, inequality and human rights. Each stakeholder had his own lens through which he viewed inclusion and each viewpoint was deeply rooted in his personal life and experiences.

Lana is a parent who is privileged with a broad knowledge of the School. She was also influential because of her knowledge of current educational trends and methods. A prominent and active member of the School community, Lana benefitted from many

discussions with parents around educational matters. It pleased her that '*there were kids who were always coming from [remedial schools]*'[134] to the School and she spoke proudly of her own child who took it upon himself to work with supported children in class and then come home and discuss with her all the benefits of these mutual relationships. She set high standards of tolerance and respect in her own home and believed this to be the reason her youngest child received supported children in a favourable way. It worried her greatly when he would come home and relay incidents of racism and labelling at the School.

> I've noticed my older boys didn't pick it up nearly as much as [name of her child]. There are issues around tolerance. I notice he comes home sometimes... he says ma you know the kids are quite racist or he picks up issues around gays[135].

This attitude troubled her. She didn't believe that the School community was one '*that has huge tolerance for difference*'[136] and had also picked '*up a kind of narrowness in thinking more so now* [than when her older son] *was at school*'[137].

She was caught between her belief in equality and quality education and the realisation that some of the parents she "hung out with" favoured streaming or a track approach to education in order to achieve academic excellence. She had previously described these parents' leanings to streaming and she found this problematic and voiced strong disapproval at this "intellectual snobbery". It troubled her deeply that there were parents who believed that children should be separated on the basis of their ability and results. Interestingly, Lana is a high achiever and so are her children and yet she did not support streaming. It bothered her that some parents would discriminate against others, so that they could solidify and privilege their children's and their own status.

She challenged parents' views that supported children compromised the standard of education and argued that it depended on the quality of the educational provision:

---

[134] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (060). Codes: community: understanding].
[135] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (198). Codes: community: not huge tolerance for difference].
[136] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (060). Codes: community: not huge tolerance for difference].
[137] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (202). Codes: community: attitude to diversity].

I think that those kids themselves shouldn't compromise the education. If a teacher is well trained and equipped and knows how to handle it, there should be no issue at all. You know I think that a good setup will actually be able to use kids in a way that they all work at their level or extended[138].

Lana could not understand why there was resistance to inclusion, but thought it may be because parents were '*protecting their little darlings*'[139]. *She* wasn't sure how widespread it was but she believed that because parents '*want their kids to be the top*'[140], they could feel threatened by supported children.

An inclusive form of schooling was for Lana a means to bridge differences and a way to cast aside discrimination. As an informed parent, she saw how inclusion as a process which '*attempts methodologically and pedagogically, all ways to try and facilitate learning and bridge differences...*'[141]

To implement inclusion successfully, Lana believed there should be supplementary support offered where necessary to supported children, but the ideal would be for teachers to integrate methods to '*accommodate diversity within the classroom*'[142]. She was convinced that with sufficient resources in both teacher training and classroom methods, all children could work effectively and efficiently in an inclusive classroom. Her past experience with remedial schools and support departments influenced her thinking that the meta-cognitive methods they employed would develop the language of thinking for all children. She acknowledged fundamental academic support as being support for individuals or small groups and was not opposed to pullout systems, but she also believed that those methods should spread to the mainstream classes for the benefit of all the children.

I would see academic support certainly as providing support for individual students or groups of students who have particular educational needs, special needs, whatever one wants to call them. And sure one needs a service like that, where these students can get that kind of supplementary support, or enrichment, or whatever to support them. At the same time, I'm a big believer that a lot of the

---

[138] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (064). Codes: community: teachers enable or disable inclusion].

[139] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (243). Codes: community: not huge tolerance for difference].

[140] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (194). Codes: community: not huge tolerance for difference].

[141] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (128). Codes: community: understanding].

[142] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (038). Codes: community: understanding].

methods that are used in academic support could be used far broadly you know, both for training and for work with other students.[143] …I feel there could be more dissemination of those ideas into main for the benefit of all students[144].

Lana viewed inclusion as good pedagogy, bringing the world into the classroom, which she worried, was not happening currently at the School. It concerned her that the teachers were not showing an awareness of different teaching strategies. She would like to see teachers '*really branch out and use other resources and the environment. And I think that's a way of handling inclusive education*'[145].

I'm not sure it's done effectively or they're really managing those differences in the group...and really teaching kids how to work collaboratively and learn from each other[146].

She remembered that only once during that year had her son relayed to her an exciting project he had done in a group at school. One of the members of the group was a supported child. The topic was something about which her son was passionate and each member of the group excelled in his part of the task. Even the supported child in the group '*was learning, he must have learnt an enormous amount because the two boys were obsessed with aeroplanes so they obviously gave [him] a lot of the knowledge*'[147].

This account of a collaborative method was for Lana an acknowledgement of inclusion. Again, she stressed that inclusion was about developing a *'systemic approach to handling difference'*[148]. In other words, inclusion meant integrating methods to accommodate all children in the School. Lana's broad outlook as a parent demonstrated her concern around unequal separate education, and her approach to inclusion was one of the means to bridge those differences.

---

[143] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (136). Codes: community: implementation].

[144] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (144). Codes: community: implementation or non-implementation at class level].

[145] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (128). Codes: community: implementation or non-implementation at class level].

[146] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (108). Codes: community: implementation or non-implementation at class level].

[147] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (112). Codes: community: implementation or non-implementation at class level].

[148] Parent, 16 November 2011 [Document 2:20 (026). Codes: community: understanding].

Lee, a teacher who is not Jewish, had similar concerns to Lana regarding attitudes to difference at the School. She spoke about some of the teachers who appeared to be prejudiced against differences in children. Her opinion was, '*there is so... little difference in our school, they're all Jewish, they're all white*'[149]. It seemed to Lee that some of the teachers, who were not Jewish, had come to teach at the School '*as a way to get away from diversity within the country*'[150]. She believed '*we have ...staff ... not terribly open to difference and... [supported children] is just another difference*'[151]. This perception made Lee very uncomfortable and she would avoid those teachers, as she didn't enjoy participating in

> that kind of conversation and I think to myself that if people are bigoted or prejudiced on certain levels, they are going to be throughout and... I'm sure [they] are prejudiced against Jewish people[152].

Lee continued saying, '*but then there're also the Jewish staff who are... anti this inclusive [education]*'[153]. She interpreted this as the fact that different levels of children in the classes, were making the teachers' jobs harder. It seemed to her that because some of the older, experienced teachers were set in their ways and were used to prior homogenous classrooms, they found supported children unsettling.

> ...children have differences [and] are making their [some teachers] lives more difficult, unsettling the balance in the class,...[and] are... now being called the cause for... lower marks...[154]

According to Lee it seemed that those who were against diversity used the supported children as a scapegoat for the school problems, while the real reasons for the problems were unbalanced classes resulting in more work for the teachers. It seemed as if some of the teachers had to lay the blame somewhere.

---

[149] Teacher, 7 October 2011 [Document 6:15 (114). Codes: teachers: not huge tolerance for difference].

[150] Teacher, 7 October 2011 [Document 6:15 (114). Codes: teachers: not huge tolerance for difference].

[151] Teacher, 7 October 2011 [Document 6:15 (114). Codes: teachers: not huge tolerance for difference].

[152] Teacher, 7 October 2011 [Document 6:15 (117). Codes: teachers: not huge tolerance for difference].

[153] Teacher, 7 October 2011 [Document 6:15 (114). Codes: teachers: not huge tolerance for difference].

[154] Teacher, 7 October 2011 [Document 6:15 (124). Codes: teachers: not huge tolerance for difference].

…the teachers who are not interested in inclusion [say] that the standard is dropping, that they're [supported children] pulling everyone down, that they can't get through anything, that the lessons are chaotic[155].

Some of the data revealed a sense of scapegoating. In modern usage a scapegoat refers to an individual or group blamed or singled out for unmerited negative treatment. The word is derived from the English translation of the Hebrew term aza 'zeyl, with its origin coming from the Bible. In biblical times the scapegoat was a goat that was designated to be outcast in the desert after the high priest symbolically laid the sins of the people on its head. This formed part of the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement.

It seemed that supported children and the inclusion programme were being used as the scapegoat and being blamed for lowered standards and other School problems. This was a concern for Katherine.

Yes, it's very easy to look for a scapegoat and somebody to blame… and unfortunately a child with learning difficulties is an easy scapegoat[156].

She noted that in life people who were different or less fortunate were always getting

pointed at and so they, in my opinion, are getting used as a scapegoat for a lot of things... I'm not saying that it [inclusion] hasn't got its challenges, it has, but I don't feel that it's got as many as what has been put out there[157].

Vicky, a parent, echoed similar sentiments. She said

...when something doesn't work just attack whatever you want... so if [a neurotypical] child is not doing well, what's the easiest thing to blame it on, the inclusion programme.[158]

It was apparent that some stakeholders felt the same way and Annie, another teacher, said that *'the negativity at that school...has got nothing to do with inclusion, but they will blame inclusion, they will blame anything'*[159].

---

155 Teacher, 7 October 2011 [Document 6:15 (075). Codes: teachers: school as combat zone].
156 Middle management, 21 September 2011 [Document 4:30 (234). Codes: middle management: blame].
157 Middle management, 21 September 2011 [Document 4:30 (238). Codes: middle management: blame].
158 Parent, 2 November 2011 [Document 1:19 (126). Codes: school as combat zone].

Samantha viewed inclusion as a way to deal with the history of exclusion and discrimination, which was experienced both by black South Africans during apartheid and by Jews, who have had a long history of anti-semitism and exclusion in Europe, with traumatic experiences of the Holocaust.

Samantha opposed injustice and found it difficult to understand how in South Africa, anyone who had lived through the apartheid era could discriminate against anyone else based on their disability or handicap.

> An example of intolerance, what we've lived through here in the apartheid years, where there was such inequality and why should anyone with any disability or handicap be prejudiced[160].

Furthermore, she believed that the after-effects of the Holocaust and apartheid had resulted in a radical need for justice and equality. She was dismayed that past injustices seem to wash over some people who continued to press for conditions which sanctioned exclusionary behaviour.

> [like] the Holocaust where a nation was persecuted just for being a certain religion. [there is] such a need for fairness and everyone should be given an equal opportunity no matter who and what you are...I mean who are we to judge, who are we to play G-d and say who can come into our school, who can't come into our school, who's worthy enough and who is not worthy enough...[161]?

Samantha's orientation towards tolerance and equality compelled her to discredit superiority and power when misused to separate and label. She stressed the importance of tolerance as a quality which children need to learn and develop in order to make them "whole". She believed that the only way children could become tolerant was to be exposed to diversity. As a mother, she wanted her children to know that there are different kinds of people which make up society and she would like her children to be accepting of everyone. In her opinion, her children attending a Jewish day school paid the price of limited contact with diversity. She felt it vitally important,

---

[159] Teacher, 26 April 2011 [Document 7:16 (264). Codes: teachers: tone of school].
[160] Teacher, 29 June 2011 [Document 2:11 (137). Codes: teachers beliefs].
[161] Teacher, 29 June 2011 [Document 2:11 (140). Codes: teachers beliefs].

especially in this particular privileged environment, to expose children to a larger diverse population.

> ...I think tolerance is a very important quality [which] children [need] to develop and people in general and the only way we can become tolerant is by including all kinds of people and being exposed to all kinds of people... I have always felt that my kids have been privileged enough to go to a private school and being at a Jewish school only exposes them to such a small population of privileged people...if they could be exposed to some kind of difficulty, to people with some difficulties, it would be so good for them to develop them as whole proper human beings[162].

Samantha hoped that by exposure to diversity the School community would become more tolerant and accepting of it. Furthermore she hoped a spin off to this would be that this experience would encourage teachers to be supporters of inclusion. She also believed supported children would keep teachers '*on their toes, it keeps them more aware of the different levels and how to teach to all kids, not just to one level of kid*'[163]. Her own journey had begun in a similar way. Before she came to the School she had vaguely heard about inclusion as a white paper brought out by the government, '*but coming to the School I heard about it more formally. [There] was more of a label put to it*'[164].

> ...I think in the beginning I might not have been as open to inclusive education as I am now. But I think over the time I have definitely come to believe in it much more.[165]

It was long after the end of the apartheid era when Samantha began teaching at the School. Yet she still had uncomfortable, lingering feelings of the damage the discrimination had caused humanity. These feelings became more overt when she was faced with supported children, and she was forced to look inwards because of her experience.

---

[162] Teacher, 29 June 2011 [Document 2:11 (128). Codes: teachers beliefs].
[163] Teacher, 29 June 2011 [Document 2:11 (128). Codes: teachers: effects of inclusion].
[164] Teacher, 29 June 2011 [Document 2:11 (067). Codes: teachers: effects of inclusion].
[165] Teacher, 29 June 2011 [Document 2:11 (243). Codes: teachers: effects of inclusion].

Working in the department, learning from [the ASD head], also my theory, my belief that ... everyone should be entitled to equal education and just seeing these children who have come to our school like [names of supported children] and just to see what special beautiful children they are and what they can add to the school. I can just see how important it is[166].

It also forced her to look practically at how she could assist these children.

I would look and research and see whatever I could do to try and help. I would ask questions, I would try and find as much knowledge as I can to try and assist this child[167].

She was concerned that teachers don't *'have enough knowledge'[168]* and in her opinion that was a barrier to the advancement of inclusion. Earlier, Lana too had noted that teachers need knowledge and should be capable of using strategies to handle diversity. Like Lana, Samantha also recognised the value of knowledge and she was determined to broaden hers. She described how she had developed professionally.

...I do a lot of research on the internet and get a lot of information from [the ASD head] ...and Gardner's... theory...[working with supported children] was a whole new enlightening experience for me and at the moment I need to study further[169].

Samantha's passionate feelings and belief in equality and tolerance signified her conviction that all people should be valued and have the same claim to the respect of their peers and the benefits of society. She understood inclusive education as an end to stigmatization and the process which historically resulted in rejection of certain groups of people. Besides her sincere belief in repairing past injustices, she was also influenced by her own schooling.

I don't know why I feel differently to... some other teacher. It may be because when I was a pupil in school... a lot of things that were taught to me had no meaning and only now that I'm older and I can see... that's why I have this passion to... teach to kids... things that are meaningful for them[170].

---

[166] Teacher, 29 June 2011 [Document 2:11 (245). Codes: teachers: effects of inclusion].
[167] Teacher, 29 June 2011 [Document 2:11 (255). Codes: teachers: effects of inclusion].
[168] Teacher, 29 June 2011 [Document 2:11 (143). Codes: teachers: understanding].
[169] Teacher, 29 June 2011 [Document 2:11 (170). Codes: teachers: effects of inclusion].
[170] Teacher, 29 June 2011 [Document 2:11 (173). Codes: teachers: effects of inclusion].

Samantha emphasized the weight of teachers' own experiences on their teaching. To her, certain beliefs underlay support for inclusion. She believed however, that some teachers were influenced and driven by timeous completion of their syllabi, something which she felt would not further the aims of inclusion. She stressed that inclusion was about looking at the bigger picture, which was to reach each child in a significant way through meaningful teaching.

> I think it's just a mind-set ... I think it's about thinking about the bigger picture instead of honing in on just a small little thing. I think teachers at the moment are teaching just to get through their syllabus. They're looking at the smaller picture, so it's to get through their syllabus, to make sure they covered what they've had to cover, make sure that they've got enough marks to write a report about these children. It's just that they are covering their tracks instead of extending themselves and looking at the much bigger picture and trying to reach each kid in such a meaningful way. They are not teaching meaningfully enough[171].

Teaching for Samantha went beyond mere completion of what was in the syllabus. She emphasised that teachers had to get to know each child and his or her needs.

Samantha mentioned another barrier to inclusion at the School, that of the admission policy of the School. She described the process by which the School had established conditions of acceptance to determine which child was in and which was out. This was based on the degree of the child's need for academic support and the concurrent resources available at the School to fulfil that need. She believed that while the quota policy was in place, the School could not call itself inclusive until the time

> when any child who applies to come into the school, is accepted automatically and..., not a whole process of getting everyone to agree, or the Board to agree, or the principal to agree and getting the teachers to agree[172].

She believed schools endorsed exclusionary practice through assessment, selection and sorting of children, which reproduce and perpetuate intolerance and inequality. Therefore, she explained, education had the power to contribute to negative or positive identities of children.

---

[171] Teacher, 29 June 2011 [Document 2:11 (173). Codes: teachers: understanding].
[172] Teacher, 29 June 2011 [Document 2:11 (091). Codes: teachers: understanding].

To sum up, for Samantha there were plausible explanations as to why all children should be included in mainstream schooling. Firstly, inclusion prevents further discrimination and distinction in a country which had previously legalized them. Secondly, through inclusion teachers are encouraged to develop themselves professionally and turn themselves into life-long learners. Diversity is thus an enriching experience enabling every child and an opportunity for the whole school to learn from one another. Thirdly, she believed that reciprocal interaction between supported children and teachers could be the trigger to stimulate learning, embrace diversity and instil respect for all people.

Samantha viewed inclusion as a mind-set and part of the bigger picture of education. She defined inclusion as pertaining to the values which we want to instil in children based especially on history of persecution and discrimination rather than reinforcing them by promoting elitism and excellence. As part of this she advocated the automatic acceptance of all children to the School.

Etta, a middle manager and experienced teacher, told her story of how supported children triggered a deep and painful feeling in her which spurred her on a journey of self-discovery and allowed her to develop into becoming a better teacher and person.

She understood inclusive education firstly as a basic human right and in a broader context as individual and group diversity which contributed positively not only to the School climate but to all living creatures on earth. Inclusion for her was

> …every single child that enters this school... everybody deserves the right, in fact is entitled to the right to be educated. It's not just for the chosen few...everybody has a place inside the School[173].

Etta had no hesitation in describing the worth of inclusion as a global significance and expressed that inclusion *'embraces every living thing on this planet'*[174].

---

[173] Middle management, 5 July 2011 [Document 6:32 (038) Codes: middle management: understanding].
[174] Middle management, 5 July 2011 [Document 6:32 (038) Codes: middle management: understanding].

Her journey began when she was given supported children in her class. Initially, she was fearful and insecure. She questioned whether she had enough knowledge and whether she would be

good enough, because [she was] not trained to do this, so how could [she] possibly be able to do it[175].

She decided not to sabotage her '*growth as an educator*'[176] and took advice from a learning support teacher, who told her to move slowly with the children and teach with love. She described how this was her opportunity '*to look at [herself], look at [her] responses and to do it in a different way*'[177].

Her experiences with supported children had been central to her growth as a teacher and a person. Reflecting retrospectively, she found it interesting that each year she had always been presented with children of varying achievement levels and competencies. It seemed to her that she had more supported children in her class than other teachers, mainly because she was ready to recognize her failures and acknowledge how they had previously influenced her work, following which she would seize this opportunity to "get it right".

...what's been interesting for me in hindsight, is that when I was teaching in the classroom I was always given these children and I always wondered why am I given these children...and I understand that it was the lesson for me...it was the opportunity for me to look at myself...and to understand the importance of me getting it right... those children were brought into my sphere of influence for a reason[178].

Etta viewed her contact with supported children at the School as her personal evolution, believing that this experience had been '*...the turnaround for [her]...*'[179] At the same time, she was making progress with supported children.

I am really pleased to say that I got into it more and more and I really feel that I have made progress with those children[180].

---

[175] Middle management, 5 July 2011 [Document 6:32 (084). Codes: middle management: attitudes and beliefs].
[176] Middle management, 5 July 2011 [Document 6:32 (084). Codes: middle management: attitudes and beliefs].
[177] Middle management, 5 July 2011 [Document 6:32 (076). Codes: middle management: attitudes and beliefs].
[178] Middle management, 5 July 2011 [Document 6:32 (076) Codes: middle management: personal experience].
[179] Middle management, 5 July 2011 [Document 6:32 (084) Codes: middle management: personal experience].
[180] Middle management, 5 July 2011 [Document 6:32 (084) Codes: middle management: personal experience].

The inclusive learning environment had been a stimulating context which provided Etta with an opportunity for meaningful internal growth and a platform which encouraged her lifelong learning.

> I really feel that I have grown within myself a lot and I have evolved a lot and there is still a way to go...but, I have healed a lot of stuff within me, so I [am] much more understanding and more patient...[181]

The interview was an emotional journey for Etta. As she confronted her "dark side," her inadequacies, she was forced to take a break to compose herself. She believed that people find it too difficult to look at their own deficiencies and prefer to cling to an insular and comfortable view.

> ...they are not prepared to look at their dark shadow side, they're not prepared to look at their inadequacies, they'd rather keep it out there, it's too painful, and it's too scary it's too hard and too tough. It's much more comfortable to just be in your little comfort zone and do it in the same way and that's safe for you... It's just about them being comfortable and not being pushed in any kind of way[182].

It seemed that confrontation with diversity had made some people uncomfortable. Lana, a parent, indicated that the School community's perceived lack of tolerance could be due to their concern that their children's achievements could be threatened. Samantha also, believed that parents felt threatened by supported children, because of their lack of knowledge of inclusion.

> I think that people are scared, I think people are insecure, I think people can be threatened and I don't think people have enough knowledge[183].

Etta's explanation was somewhat different. She believed confrontation with difference forced people to embrace their personal fears which made them uncomfortable. Keeping the status quo preserved their strength and prevented them from confronting their fears. Acknowledging difference threatened their norms and allowed contradictory discourses which could ultimately betray them. When they were confronted with somebody who they perceived as different, they looked inside

---

[181] Middle management, 5 July 2011 [Document 6:32 (096) Codes: middle management: personal experience].

[182] Middle management, 5 July 2011 [Document 6:32 (100) Codes: middle management: personal experience].

[183] Teacher, 29 June 2011 [Document 2:11 (143). Codes: teachers: effects of inclusion].

themselves and asked *'am I okay?'*[184] Etta emphasised that individuals defined themselves through the groups they believe are the norm.

> ... it all comes back to the way that you see yourself within yourself and the way that you see yourself with others. And...what really needs to change is society's perception about children who come into the world that are different because that's where we get these belief systems... there is... a supposed norm... And these children I believe are sent here to show us something different, that it's not just about academics, it's not just about learning content, it's not anything like that, it's about what... they bring as human beings. What is the love and the light that they bring as human beings into the world to show us that there is a different way of being[185]?

Etta's philosophy of appreciating all humanity for the love it brings into the world was one philosophy which she believed should begin at Board level and permeate downwards to teachers and children. For inclusion to be successful, this philosophy would need to become part of everyone's understanding including the decision regarding teachers' appointments.

In addition, in order for the philosophy to change, Etta believed terminology would also have to change. She expressed concern that mainstream society believes its knowledge is the legitimate knowledge and it circulates ideas that reinforce its advantaged position. She saw mainstream society as controlling the terminology and the norms, with everything on the periphery or out of mainstream society being unacceptable.

> If the terminology changes, the philosophy will change. Mainstream is saying, this is mainstream, everything out of that isn't acceptable and that's just a societal thing.[186]

Etta believed her orientation to inclusion occurred as a result of her contact with supported children. This contact was the force which propelled her on a journey of

---

[184] Middle management, 5 July 2011 [Document 6:32 (178) Codes: middle management: philosophy].
[185] Middle management, 5 July 2011 [Document 6:32 (178) Codes: middle management: philosophy].
[186] Middle management, 5 July 2011 [Document 6:32 (253) Codes: middle management: philosophy].

self-discovery. She described how her experience with supported children elicited a desire within her to question and reflect on herself as a teacher and person. What she subsequently learned was painful but developed her in a positive way. It allowed her to transform herself into a patient, understanding and accepting teacher best able to reach these children. She believed strongly that people found the journey to internal change very painful, which encouraged their resistance to inclusion. It was therefore easier to maintain the status quo, as this situation naturalized their existence.

Dave is an experienced middle manager, having worked in both state and independent schools. His philosophy was similar to Etta's in that he regarded inclusion as involving processes of changing values, attitudes, policies and practices. For him, inclusion was first and foremost a personal philosophy.

He described how he had first become committed to the philosophy of inclusion. He spoke about his childhood with a disabled father and although he didn't think his father's disability itself had been an influencing factor in forming his philosophy, he believed it was the lessons of understanding and limitations he learnt by observing his father, which solidified his own values and goals. These lessons and his father's example of the *'way you speak to people, the way to look at people and consider people and respect, regardless of who and what they are'*[187], had a profound impact on his behaviour and were the forces which shaped his philosophy and his focus on equal opportunity for all people.

Equal opportunity is the force which drives him today. However, he feels strongly that he is merely a means to actualize this philosophy but has *'no power to distinguish which child should and which child shouldn't'*[188] have equal opportunity*.*

> I'm talking from a really deep kind of place and understanding so I think ...we don't have any right...Whatever possible chance there is for a child to grow, to be the greatest person he could be, is ultimately what we need to aim for. So where that fits in with inclusivity is, we have to create a vehicle for a child to become great in his

---

[187] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (392). Codes: middle management: personal experience].
[188] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (384). Codes: middle management: personal experience].

own capacity... It's growing people and if there is no opportunity or a place for a child to go to that has a disability, how on earth does he or she grow...[189]?

Dave believed that in order to foster an inclusive environment, there had to be a clear definition of what an inclusion philosophy was, as there was a distinct difference '*between having an inclusive philosophy or having a support and remedial philosophy*'[190]. For Dave, the support and remedial philosophy merely '*assist[s] children that have got learning difficulties or gaps in their learning within the School*'[191]. Inclusion, on the other hand, had the same characteristics as the support and remedial philosophy, but offered more of that service with additional values of *'tolerance, respect [and] the understanding [that] inclusion [is a] sense of belonging, [a] sense of acceptance'*[192].

He felt it to be essential that the School community identified a clear educational philosophy, as every philosophy was coupled with implications of the school practices which it endorsed. Diversity, he said, contributed positively to the classroom, learning outcomes and community worth, but he doubted whether all his colleagues on the School management team was united in this way of thinking. Moreover, he believed that some managers, in discussions around inclusion, with the head of the ASD, would claim one account but would claim another in private discussions with him. This he believed resulted in a misrepresentation of their beliefs and a distortion of the entire policy development and application of inclusion.

> ...I think that the management [middle management] has got to stop fence sitting and make a stand. Because to be honest with you I am unclear of what the philosophy, of what each member feels. I am completely unclear. So what they would say to me or what they would to say to the head of the unit [ASD]... I don't trust that it's valuable information because what they say to each one will be completely different... depending on what the situation is and who it impacts on. So for me, trust is a massive thing and for inclusivity to work you need trust and I question the trust... I am not clear of each one's philosophy because it's inconsistent[193].

---

[189] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (392). Codes: middle management: personal experience].
[190] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (032). Codes: middle management: understanding].
[191] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (036). Codes: middle management: understanding].
[192] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (032). Codes: middle management: understanding].
[193] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (228). Codes: middle management: nature of management].

Interestingly, in regard to the attitudes of management to inclusion, Etta shared Dave's sentiments. She too felt that there was a tendency among some of the members of management to appear to support inclusion, yet there was some incongruence in its implementation.

> I think that there are definitely those who are for it and there are a couple who say that they are, but I'm not sure about the implementation of the policy[194].

Katherine also believed that on the subject of inclusion, *'management itself in [her] opinion is divided'*[195]. Although Dave was unclear about the dominant philosophy amongst management towards inclusion, his own understanding was crystal clear. He saw it as a broad philosophy which applied not only to the children at the School, but also *'the folk outside of the school community'*[196]. The philosophy of inclusion was important to him, not only because of limited facilities generally in the country for supported children, but because of its immense advantages for all children.

> … it not only gives them [supported children] an opportunity but it also gives our other children the opportunity to understand it. Just [to] be exposed to children with all different capacities...[197]

Dave viewed inclusion as the channel to actualize equality of opportunity for all children. However, when applying this viewpoint to the School he expressed some concern.

At that time the composition of the teaching staff was fairly racially diverse. The School community comprised mainly Jewish children and parents, while among the teaching staff there was a good mix of religious groups. Dave believed that the attitude of the teachers who were not Jewish compared with that of the Jewish teachers differed with

---

[194] Middle management, 5 July 2011 [Document 6:32 (066). Codes: middle management: nature of management],

[195] Middle management 21 September 2011 [Document 4:30 (265) Codes: middle management: nature of management].

[196] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (032). Codes: middle management: understanding].

[197] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (040). Codes: middle management: understanding].

regard to the community approach of belonging. He felt that some teachers who were not Jewish did not support the philosophy that every Jewish child should be included at the School regardless of his learning difficulties. He believed that even though these teachers were committed to teaching in the environment, their

> secular thoughts are still existent...It could seriously be a factor, the understanding that every Jewish child needs an education, regardless if they have a disability or not. That philosophy could pose a problem for a non-Jewish teacher. Because as it is they find the kids...challenging just because of who they are, that sense of entitlement, their empowerment etc. So the fact now that there is a kid coming in with a disability could pose a problem. I mean that's a bold statement I'm the making, so what I'm saying is that it could quite possibly be a factor[198].

It worried him that some teachers who were not Jewish had not yet fully understood the Jewish way of life. Cheryl, a parent, saw the School as going on a journey towards securing its status as an inclusive school, but as yet had not reached its destination. It seemed therefore that was no commonly agreed definition of the School, and according to Cheryl, for inclusion to be successful, the School's ethos must be taken into account and the significance of the School's vision and mission would have to be addressed.

> I am not sure if it has [been] formulated as a school policy that the School is a community school and we're an inclusive school and all are welcome[199].

Deon, another parent, concurred there was a broad fudging of issues around the philosophy and policy of the School and he felt '*there are too many contradictions within each element of the ethos of the school*'[200]. Other stakeholders were seeking satisfactory answers about the School. Was it an ethical institution, did it realize the rights of its population, to which outcomes and education systems did it aspire? This confusion created a separation between different options and directions for the School.

---

[198] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (143). Codes: middle management: tone and culture of school].

[199] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (047). Codes: community: community discourse].

[200] Parent, 8 September 2011 [Document 4:22 (164). Codes: community: image of school, community discourse].

This was one of the flaws which Dave believed would inhibit the process of inclusion. Leaving aside his personal mission, he continually questioned the School's general mission. Added to the School community's perceived lack of clarity on its philosophy and policy was his concern about what appeared to be its lack of understanding regarding to the advantages of inclusion.

> ... the Torah... is based on core values. And so the understanding of what inclusivity is and how it should be and the impact that it can have and the advantages it has for the children. I think they [the School community] don't consider the advantages it has [and that] is a huge problem[201].

Dave believed that inclusion in the Jewish community should be a natural occurrence, but he felt that the School community was unaware of the compensations of this possible liaison. In noting their approach to difference and their failure to address social divisions with understanding, he became aware that they lacked adequate understanding of the value of inclusion and he was concerned that some would banish those who were different without due consideration or understanding. He reiterated this with his personal experience of knowing how some people at the School are '*...not given a chance, they're cut off*'[202].

He quoted the story of a Senior Primary boy with a behavioural disorder, who had a meltdown on the playground and kicked somebody. *'As it is he had this picture portrayed of him as a monster... So after that incident it just became worse*'[203]*.* He was then rejected by his peers and not invited to parties or included in social circles. Dave emphasised that the boy had made one mistake, yet he was not forgiven for it. He struggled to understand how '*people don't let go of stuff... They hold on to it and it's a huge problem*'[204]*,* and he thought there was the likelihood that a lack of understanding could be linked to this intolerance.

---

[201] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (192). Codes: middle management: understanding].

[202] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (420). Codes: middle management: community dynamics].

[203] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (420). Codes: middle management: community dynamics].

[204] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (420). Codes: middle management: community dynamics].

It's a problem and I think it... permeates into the way people see things. So maybe the lack of understanding, or [lack of] accepting the inclusivity at the school, or in the community, could be linked to that in some way[205].

Deon was less convinced that it was a lack of understanding than simply that the schools were not very good

at catering to differences generally within the mainstream of the pupil population anyway, so to have a consistent focus on special needs top or bottom of ability, I don't see how it can be[206].

Deon's slant on diversity was interesting. He viewed conforming to social principles as a major issue in the School. He explained that in general the School community was one that wanted to excel but at the same time did not want to stand out because '*the tallest cloud gets shot down and that happens in the school system often*'[207]. Conversely, he continued, children who were different became targets either by the system or within it. Yet these same children, would need to excel in '*some area of creativity then they are tolerated, if they don't forget it. They get nailed and I have seen that within the system*'[208]. In other words children paid a penalty for being different. This difference could be eradicated and even celebrated if they excelled in some area. Alternatively, if they failed in that, they could be evaluated more harshly than regular children.

The risk of children being marginalised and failing to meet the goals of equity and justice was increased by a lack of understanding of diversity, and/or by negative responses to differences. Yet as far as Dave is concerned, inclusion at the School continued to progress. He believed the School was

...on the road to moving towards inclusivity, there is no question that we're there. I think in comparison with schools that I have dealt with, we are certainly a pilot and a role school in that sense, with regard to where we are... We have taken on the challenges of children with Aspergers, we have taken on challenges with children

---

[205] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (424). Codes: middle management: community dynamics].
[206] Community, 8 September 2011 [Document 4:22 (100). Codes: community: not huge tolerance for difference].
[207] Community, 8 September 2011 [Document 4:22 (106). Codes: community: not huge tolerance for difference].
[208] Community, 8 September 2011 [Document 4:22 (106). Codes: community: not huge tolerance for difference].

with hearing impediments, with physical handicaps... and I'm not convinced that you can get to a 100% inclusivity[209].

Again, aligned with his own philosophy, he attributed this progress to the personal philosophy of *'a group of people that had passion for it...'*[210] *it [inclusion] was really speaking to [the support staff's] philosophy'*[211]. He regretted, however, that inclusion was being implemented under the radar so to speak, and had not become an item for intense discussion at the School *'...which sounds absolutely weird that what we can be successful in [is]... not open...it's not an avoidance, but it's a protection... [rather] than openly discussing it, [as we] potentially have folk that [might] sabotage it...'*[212] It seemed that it was only a small passionate group of people who decided on and practised inclusion. This was because of the danger or fear of its being sabotaged by the majority should they be forced into dealing with it.

Dave supported inclusion and showed how one's own personal philosophy could impact on the least powerful members of society. He saw no coherent alternate vision for supported children other than their being included in regular schools. His responses led to much debate and discussion on the question of identified barriers to inclusion in the School community. His arguments centred around complex issues relating to attitudes and reactions of the School community to diversity, the lack of clarity of the School's mission and the protective silence imposed on the practice of inclusion. These various entangled facets provided a substantive review of some of the barriers to inclusion experienced at the School.

Dave believed that teachers would rather be in control where it was safe and comfortable. However in his opinion one could only grow when one was uncomfortable. He was convinced that if teachers *'understood that philosophy, we would change we would revolutionize the School... that lack of understanding of*

---

[209] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (052). Codes: middle management: practical constraints and implementation].

[210] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (200). Codes: middle management: community dynamics].

[211] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (224). Codes: middle management: tone and culture of school].

[212] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (228). Codes: middle management: tone and culture of school].

moving out of the comfort zone is a critical factor[213]. Dave's argument was based on the notion that an inclusive school is created when a school community is able and willing to step outside of its comfort zone, in an effort to change and grow.

In summary

Inclusion describes a personal and community philosophy which in the Jewish community should be a relatively seamless process as the values of inclusion are synonymous with the values of a Jewish way of life. However, inclusion also often refers to the difficult and generally painful decision to step out of one's comfort zone in the right direction and to move towards a more socially just education.

Many of the stakeholders came to adopt this discourse through personal experience, in other words through some kind of life changing event that led to their growth and understanding. It appeared as though they were able to get in touch with what they believed was important in their lives to enter into intimate territory and, through their own consciousness to create values which were compatible with inclusion.

The personal responses of the stakeholders which were collated in this section, indicated their common belief in the need for equity and fairness in resources, rights and treatment for all children. For these stakeholders, the vision of an inclusive society would be one society where all individuals are self-determining and interdependent. It would involve individuals who have a sense of social responsibility towards and with others.

It was important for them that these values be embedded in the School ethos and structure. This could only happen, however, when the following barriers were eradicated: the current attitude of intolerance, which fostered unfairness in the form of streaming and labelling; and scapegoating, which was a significant aspect of apartheid and the Holocaust, symbolizing extreme intolerance to indifference.

---

[213] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (374). Codes: middle management: teachers' attitude].

Although inclusion is a mind-set, it does not rule out remedial support where necessary, and the stakeholders believed that inclusion could be achieved at the School by implementation of the following points: educating those involved that inclusion is an important mechanism for challenging oppression; making visible and vocal the underlying beliefs that produce and reproduce structures of domination; enabling education structures and learning methodologies which commit to reducing inequalities at the School and which inculcate a clear personal, Board and community philosophy of commitment to diversity; adoption of an ethical attitude towards equality; and a genuine belief in the capabilities of all people.

6.5 The community approach to inclusion

Inclusion has moved beyond a simple dichotomy between mainstream and special education. It is instead based on specific values about education and the community it serves. Through its Jewish day schools as one channel, the Jewish community imparts values such as Klal Yisrael[214] and Tikkun Olam[215] which connect children to the larger Jewish community and offer them resources for successful Jewish living.

The School is the gateway, connecting the children to the Jewish community, providing a support network of peers, and enabling the preservation of that connection even after the children have left the School. The School is the representative of major investments in community life, epitomizing the vision for the future of the Jewish community. Besides its being the chief promoter of social inclusion among Jewish children and their families, it provides serious educational connections to Jewish history and texts and the Hebrew language. In addition by nurturing the children's relationships to Jewish tradition, beliefs, and practices, the School ensures that Judaism becomes second nature to them.

It is apparent that the purpose of a community school is multifaceted, in that it covers a number of complex issues related to social life as well as education. Therefore, it seems appropriate to use Cheryl's story about Josh to signify the community approach

---

[214] Jewish unity.
[215] A Hebrew phrase that means healing and restoring the world suggesting humanity's shared responsibility with the Creator.

to inclusion, which was one viewpoint the research question evoked. In addition, her story exemplifies the effects caused by a forced disconnection to the community and its setting.

Before describing Cheryl's journey, it is fitting that I begin this section with some of the stakeholders' views of the community approach. The rationale behind this is to set the scene and provide some information around the meaning and necessity of inclusion as seen by stakeholders who hold this approach.

The notion of community was paramount to Dave, a middle manager. He argued, *'the community is established and it's there, there is no reason why that [inclusion] shouldn't happen*[216]. Using an example of a Jewish child with Down Syndrome who had recently applied to enter the School, he described how important the commonality of being Jewish was for cutting across socially constructed categories of disability.

> …why shouldn't the nine year old with Down Syndrome be included in the school so that he or she could… relate to the Jewish identity, have a Jewish background, enjoy the Jewish faith with every other Jewish child….? It's really working together to make sure that everybody in the community has a place, a sense of belonging and can function[217]

According to Dave all Jewish children could benefit from being a part of the Jewish community. However, in order to function, a child would need to have an identified and accepted "place" within the community. He saw the success of the Jewish community as synonymous with a cycle bound by core values. He described each component of the cycle as contributing to the whole in a meaningful way, which in turn allows growth for both the individual and the community, that is, members of the community can benefit one another in a way that is reinforcing.

> ...whatever we do serves different aspects of the community.... when our children go out... they contribute, the parents contribute... the community contributes to the School.... we build those that are part of the community... we build them from a core

---

[216] Middle manager, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (176). Codes: middle management: understanding].
[217] Middle manager, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (155). Codes: middle management: understanding].

value ... and not deprive anybody in the community of the privilege that everybody else has in the community[218].

It worried Dave, though, that some teachers who were not Jewish had not yet fully understood the Jewish way of life. The children at the School could be challenging because they had a sense of their rights and power. Despite being committed and dedicated to teaching, some teachers were not comfortable with including all children at the School. He put this down to the fact that some of these teachers could feel that *'this is a regular school not a community school, it's a regular school and if you have a special need you should be at a remedial school'*[219].He thought that there was a*'...lack of understanding of what it really means to be a community school'*[220].

Maree, a parent, thought differently from Dave about community. She believed that an all-encompassing philosophy of belonging was an essential ingredient of a community school. In her view a Jewish child was born within the established boundaries of his community, thus encompassing and privileging education at a community school. She recognised that inclusion at the School for any Jewish child would be his fate

…regardless of where that child is on the academic scale, that child...should have a chance of having a Jewish education too[221].

Lee had another meaning of community. In her opinion, if the School is defined as a community school, that is what it should stand for and what it should achieve. In other words the School should be the objective of the term used to describe it.

I mean just by the term community school, it's there to serve the community and the community is the Jewish community and in that way … it's almost sort of made its own bed. If you're going to be a school and it's… run on a Jewish ethos which is one of charity, giving, I imagine... it's the school's role to accept the children, as many children and children of diverse [needs]...[222]

---

[218] Middle manager, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (155). Codes: middle management: community dynamics].
[219] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (149). Codes: middle management: tone and culture of school].
[220] Middle management, 12 May 2011 [Document 3:28 (151). Codes: middle management: community dynamics].
[221] Parent, 30 June 2011 [Document 7:25 (170). Codes: community: discourse].
[222] Teacher, 7 October 2011 [Document 15:6 (157. Code: teachers beliefs].

Some of the stakeholders had expressed their views and their understanding of inclusion in the context of community. Dave described inclusion as being mutually beneficial for all, and he saw the joint contribution of particular strengths to benefit the whole community which in turn contributed to the individual's strengths. For Maree, inclusion at the School meant a sense of entitlement and access for all Jewish children. However, in terms of academic excellence, she was concerned that the School may not achieve that on the basis of hosting inclusive education. She worried that the education given to her own neurotypical children could be compromised as a result. Lee, a teacher, argued on the other hand, that if the School was a Jewish community school, it had to live up to its title and be accessible to the entire Jewish community.

Charles considered inclusion from the Judaica perspective, but then rejected the ideal for practical reasons. He said children outside the School system felt excluded from the community, but Katherine disagreed saying, *'the Judaica side they can pick up from home, or from by the way, or go privately once a week to hear the stories'.*[223] It seemed that it was considered problematic to be excluded as a Jew but fine to be excluded because of one's disability.

For Cheryl, a parent of a supported child, providing Judaica at home was not enough to instil into her child the sense of belonging to a community. In her opinion belonging to a community was dependent on a shared relationship between school, family and community. She was adamant that the defining aspect of the School as a community school and '*a Jewish school, [it should therefore] be more inclusive, not losing Jewish children to remedial schools...*'[224]. She felt that one consequence of the School losing Jewish children to remedial schools would render the school, family, community relationship asymmetrical and result in excluded children no longer feeling a sense of belonging.

---

[223] Middle management, 21 September 2011 [Document 4;30 (039). Codes: middle management: attitudes and beliefs].
[224] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (089). Codes: community: Josh's story].

This is the story of Cheryl's heart-warming struggle to bring Josh, her son, back into the fold of the community. Her journey is an example of determination and optimism.

Cheryl's story

Josh's educational journey began happily and enthusiastically at the School; it then deviated abruptly and rapidly to his having to attend a remedial school, after which he returned cautiously and somewhat damaged to the expected emotional safety of the School and community.

Cheryl had enjoyed an extensive history at the School. She herself had attended and matriculated at the School. Her siblings and friends' children were all at the School and thus it seemed a natural progression that her children would go there as well. She had always wanted a *'Jewish school and [the] familiarity'*[225], of that environment and according to her preference, there just wasn't *'much choice involved'*[226].

It was when Josh was in Grade R that the difficulties were noticed. He was identified as learning disabled and after the teachers realised that an alternative didn't exist at the School, he was soon sent off to the local remedial school.

In hindsight Cheryl described how this event and Josh's resultant suffering could have been avoided. She believed that if the School had had an inclusion policy at that time, and were able and committed to accommodate diversity and be welcoming as well, they could all have avoided Josh's ordeal.

During his time at the remedial school, Cheryl worked very hard to make sure he maintained the friendships he had begun in Grade R and thus continue his social connections to the School and community. She regularly made social arrangements for Josh which was confirmed by Lynne, a parent of one of Josh's friends.

---

[225] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (027). Codes: community: Josh's story].
[226] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (027). Codes: community: Josh's story].

But despite Cheryl's efforts to maintain his social connection with the community and School, Josh's years at the remedial school gave him a debilitating sense of separation. He believed he was missing out on what his siblings and peers were experiencing at the School. He felt he didn't belong and was overwhelmed by a feeling of isolation. Having to experience specialized, intensive, individualized and separate education had made his deep-seated needs transparent. His need to belong and identify with his group became more overt and he developed such a strong sense of alienation and disconnection that his academic progress deteriorated even more.

The professional staff members at the remedial school were concerned, yet, according his test results at the time, they were wary to recommend mainstream education for him. However, they did eventually agree to it because at that time, the School's two year old Academic Support Department provided an alternative to remedial school placement. They also agreed to it as they believed and hoped that once connected to his siblings, cousins and friends and being back in the community setting, Josh would be free to express the unique aspects of his personality.

Josh returned to the School after being away for three years. Josh, his family and friends celebrated his return according to his mother Cheryl.

> …and it has been fantastic. It has enabled him to be at a school with his brothers, his cousins, have an identity, being part of....[Jewish life] socially. It's changed him completely[227].

Josh's story conveys a strong message of how a sense of belonging can create emotional safety which in turn encourages self-expression. It was the connection to his family, friends and community which set Josh free and allowed him the parameters within which he could express himself. Cheryl describes how Josh became liberated from the boundaries of separate education and how this freedom permitted him to return to the familiarity of his community, giving him the confidence to '*excel in sport and have access to everything and achieve in so many other areas*'[228]*.* For Josh and

---

[227] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (163). Codes: community: effects of inclusion].
[228] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (233). Codes: community: effects of inclusion].

Cheryl, inclusion extended beyond issues of just schooling into the realms of belonging.

Josh's homecoming was not, however, without its challenges. For Cheryl the greatest one was the overpowering feeling she had of having to take sole responsibility for Josh. Initially Cheryl felt so thankful to the School for including her son that she began to feel the need to pre-empt any disturbance Josh might have caused and to ease it before it upset anyone.

> What's been the most challenging for me [is] I have felt responsible to take care of Josh because I don't want to upset teachers and I don't want to upset parents. I don't want anybody to feel that they have Josh in their class and it's a negative... And so I want to alleviate everybody and that was my tune initially, because I was so grateful that the school was going to include him[229].

Cheryl's wish was to preserve the status quo of Josh's inclusion at the School and to consolidate his acceptance in the community, which meant that she had to go to any lengths to do so. One way of doing this was to remain silent and stay on the sidelines even when she became aware of challenges at the School which affected Josh's learning. Another way was to provide a facilitator for Josh so as not to burden the class teachers and thus give him a lower profile. She chose the second option that of the facilitator who was outsourced and managed by the ASD, and whose salary Cheryl paid.

The facilitator worked with Josh in the classroom, reinforcing instructions and re-teaching skills where necessary, but there were some challenges with the implementation of this system. Cheryl worried about how the '*teachers [would] interact with him [Josh], it was almost like one less child to think about...*'[230]. She was concerned that they would view Josh as the facilitator's responsibility, disregard him and isolate him from his teachers.

This did pose a problem which again Cheryl, together with the ASD, had to work hard to overcome. Retrospectively, she was thankful that having a facilitator had lessened

---

[229] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (163). Codes: community: Josh's story].
[230] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (163). Codes: community: Josh's story].

the stress of Josh's transition into the School, but she believed a different system for future facilitation programs should be considered.

I do think one on one facilitation is flawed...I think one on one facilitation had its merits, it integrated him but I wouldn't recommend it. I would be reluctant to go that route. I would rather have a rotational basis, different facilitators, different subjects not that one on one.[231]

Cheryl suggested that a more productive way to manage facilitators would be for the School to employ them and pay their salaries. In this way the School would exercise exclusive management of facilitators, which would solve the problem of teachers' giving less attention to supported children. She said *'it would be fantastic that if the facilitators were provided by the school and... it [was] worked into the system where facilitators were absorbed into the school'*[232]. However, she said currently *'for children with special needs... there's no fund'*[233] to support this idea.

Cheryl praised inclusion at the School, but also realized that inclusion is an arduous task for both the parent and the School. She spoke of her daily bouts of anxiety, with each day and each new task presenting itself as an obstacle for both her and Josh. Yet despite this she felt empowered, she appreciated the School's support, and she was certain that Josh's return to the community would work positively for him.

[inclusion] completely, absolutely works... if there's that real support...it is onerous on the parent, it is onerous on the school. I mean it is an anxiety I am always having, day by day, each test you know, each obstacle. But it has been amazing it has been empowering ... I think he will be fine and ... his third year [at the School... I have] a sense of, he'll be ok[234].

Cheryl felt that the most basic requirement for inclusion to be successful was the total commitment by the parents of the supported child.

---

[231] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (241). Codes: community: Josh's story].
[232] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (114). Codes: community: Josh's story].
[233] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (114). Codes: community: Josh's story].
[234] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (175). Codes: community: Josh's story].

It is a commitment you can't just send him to school. Somehow even in a remedial school all the remediation is taken care of.... I still had to be involved and see to his therapies...there still needs to be the support at home and even extra[235].

As Josh progressed academically and socially at the School, Cheryl's anxiety began to abate. She was able to step back and this was when she noticed the importance of inclusion for all children. She felt it to be extremely important that children be included unconditionally.

But now that I think about it about how important inclusion is and ... for the child to really feel included without having to apologize for it. You know that's quite a big thing that he is part of it ... is free[236].

In her view the School should have as one of its major goals that of including all Jewish children. She believed unequivocally that the School should accommodate and be able to meet *'the needs of all Jewish children not just the academic kids'*[237]. Cheryl noticed that of late that there was a prevalence of children of varying achievement levels and competency learning together at the School and this pleased her.

...I think that there are more kids having difficulty more ADD kids more Aspergers... it seems to be more prevalent...[238]

Cheryl believed and was thankful that circumstances at the School had changed since years ago when Josh had needed to go to a remedial school. She commented, '*I think if you look back that each year there is progress'*[239] at the School. Concurrent with the change to more inclusive support structures at the School, Cheryl noticed that the earlier sense of complacency exhibited by the parents was being replaced by their emerging assertiveness. Parents were exercising choices regarding remedial schools versus inclusion at the School; and she thought '*parents being more assertive'*[240] could be a factor which explained the increased prevalence of inclusion there.

---

[235] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (181). Codes: community: Josh's story].
[236] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (233). Codes: community: Josh's story].
[237] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (097). Codes: community: Josh's story].
[238] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (093). Codes: community: Josh's story].
[239] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (199). Codes: community: Josh's story].
[240] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (233). Codes: community: Josh's story].

Another reason for this was the improvement of support structures. This was described by Dalene the parent of a child who had mainstreamed more recently to the School from [Remedial School], she said '*... there's no other school that can offer us what* [the School has] *done for him*'[241].

> They [remedial school] just said it's the best remedial department and it's the best school that they recommend for all Jewish kids.[242]

It seemed to Cheryl that while Josh was on his painful journey from the School, to a remedial school and back to the School, the School itself had embarked on its own journey to becoming more inclusive. Because she could view from close-up the progress of inclusion at the School, she was able to describe the emergent challenges and fears with an informed yet distressing inside view.

She articulated the challenges which she believed the School community faced as they came to terms with its ambivalent views of inclusion. On the one hand there was the possibility that inclusion and diversity could potentially contribute positively to the classroom climate, to learning and ultimately to community quality. On the other hand, members of the School community were concerned and fearful for their own children who they believed might get less than the best. In describing the community's fears, Cheryl believed they were as a result of ignorance. They simply need '*educating... and allaying all their fears...*'[243]

> I think that it is an anxiety I think that it's a competitive Jewish syndrome of wanting their kids to have [the] best and be given the opportunity to accelerate and to achieve and there's just a fear. It is fear based, that the teacher won't have enough time or attention [for their children]... I think it is borne out of ignorance...[244]

Barbara, a parent referred to earlier, theoretically supported the idea of inclusion despite its contradicting her pragmatic approach. Although her fear revolved around practical limitations at the School, her position changed as she adopted the ideal that

---

[241] Parent, 1 December 2011 [Document 3:21 (163). Codes: community: management of inclusion at school level].

[242] Parent, 1 December 2011 [Document 3:21 (021). Codes: community: management of inclusion at school level].

[243] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (137). Codes: community: understanding].

[244] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (145). Codes: community: understanding].

185

every Jewish child should have the right to an education. In theory she supported the ideal of children's rights to education and especially the right of every Jewish child to be at the School. However, she was aware that this ideal could not work in practice.

> I think everybody's got rights and wants to exercise their rights and obviously every Jewish child should have an education. All of those things would be absolutely wonderful, but then there is the corollary to that, also practical limitations.[245]

Cheryl felt certain that when the ethos was clearly understood all the way from the Board down to the teachers and children, when the myths were dispelled and the stereotyping and labelling had been driven out

> the School will be shown as a school of academic excellence, as well as a school which caters to children with special needs. They are not mutually exclusive. You can have an excellent academic school and be inclusive.[246]

The above story portrays the devastating side-effects that separation from one's community can potentially cause a child, yet at the same time shows optimism, the personal account of a parent's determination, and the power generated by being part of and belonging to a community, together with the community's vital acceptance, empathy and support.

6.6 Synthesis

In analysing the research questions and sub–questions:

How has inclusive education policy been implemented in a mono-cultural community school in South Africa?
How do the various school stakeholders understand the concept of inclusion and what are their attitudes towards inclusion?
How is inclusive education managed at class, school and community level?
To what extent do attitudes and understandings influence practice of inclusive education?

---

[245] Parent, 4 December 2011 [Document 8:26 (224). Codes: community: practical constraints and limitations].
[246] Parent, 3 March 2011 [Document 5:23 (199). Codes: community: Josh's story].

four clear approaches infolded from the data and framed the stakeholders' understanding. They were the special education approach, the pragmatic approach, the diversity approach and the community approach.

These approaches were distinctly different in concept and in the resultant expectations of the stakeholders around the implementation of inclusion. Furthermore, the contrast between the responses from the different approaches indicated the different personal experiences and attitudes of the stakeholders.

It seems reasonable to assume that the Board with its Special Education approach should have a profound influence on how the School is organized in terms of inclusion. The Board includes special education in its bureaucratic rationality. The interests of these bureaucrats appeared to revolve around the size of their budgets and to maintain the status of academic excellence.

According to the Board, academic excellence could be achieved at the School with separated schooling for supported children. The budget at that time, however, would not allow for it and so children were excluded temporarily. Here it is important to note that separated schooling and special school systems are detrimental to the goals of inclusion. This approach was not only promoted by the Board, there were other stakeholders who subscribed to this approach as well but for different reasons. These included the fact that those children who achieve below the norm will improve significantly if they receive specialized, intensive, individualized instruction which the School was not able to provide.

For those with a pragmatic approach, inclusion should be carefully monitored and should fit within boundaries and parameters. The proponents of this approach discredited unconditional inclusion for all children and offered rational reasons to solidify and privilege conditional inclusion. This voice of moderation protected its turf with quota systems, balance, streaming, the standards agenda and sufficient resources, while at the same time derailing aspirations of inclusion.

The diversity approach is in direct contrast with the above two approaches. The stakeholders who believed in this approach viewed inclusion as benefitting all children and saw the disproportionate and unequal management of children in education as a powerful indicator that something was wrong. Those stakeholders believed that the end result was beneficial social conditions for supported children, and negated those who were obsessed with the pathology of difference. Intolerance to difference seemed evident in some members of the School community and so this group advocated inclusion as a means to remove injustices of the present and past by encouraging learning and self-growth within the community.

The diversity approach is the basis for inclusion. It provides a strong position arguing for the success of the process of inclusion, and in which the decision is based on individual's choices. Any notion of inclusion involves major changes in the educational system and it is hard to see how such changes could be accomplished without the diversity ethos of the people involved. This approach puts forward the notion that children should have resources at their disposal to develop their full capacity. However, this cannot be effected if the broader community does not reflect the equitable distribution of resources and the positive interaction of its members.

This alternate approach appeared to continue silently at the School because the process of inclusion continued despite there being opposing views. The reasoning of one of the stakeholders was that inclusive practice at the School was silenced in order to prevent "sabotage".

It was apparent that certain values of community such as belonging and acceptance were ethereal and eternal amongst the stakeholders. This led to a common understanding that every Jewish child should belong at the School. This understanding united and linked all the approaches while causing contradiction within the stakeholders. One contradiction was the question of whether the School was an inclusive school, a community school or both? There appeared to be no commonly agreed definition and for inclusion to be successful, the ethos had to be taken into account and definitions of the School's vision and mission would need to be addressed.

It seemed that community beliefs compelled stakeholders towards inclusion. This reduced the challenges pragmatism and special education posed, yet at the same time disturbed their inherent beliefs. Following this reasoning and accepting there was a measure of inclusion at the School, the question emerges as to, who or what had driven the implementation. The practice of inclusion at the School affirms a point that is central to other studies of inclusion, that a committed person or group is essential to its successful implementation. The community brought its children to the School and pressured the system to support them. There was sufficient support to allow admission albeit on a limited basis and qualified basis. It was also noteworthy that despite the demand for special needs education in the community, it was neither encouraged nor promoted as a service to the community, probably for fear of a deluge.

Yet despite this silence, it seemed apparent that the School continued to support children. Even with poor leadership and then absence of leadership, children continued to be admitted to and supported at the School. The ASD simply went ahead with its structures and processes, which may explain why inclusion was sustained at the School.

Inclusion seemed to be deliberately muted to protect it. That suggests that its implementation at the School was unknown to certain sectors of the community. It was obvious that in discussions on inclusion, conversations and feelings about it seldom engendered indifference. Instead there was a plethora of conflicted perspectives and strongly articulated positional stands. Many reacted to inclusion based on their emotions, their personal beliefs, their moral responsibilities and their perceptions of justice and equality.

To answer the earlier question, it may be possible that what propelled some stakeholders was their drive to abolish discrimination at all levels and specifically against a member of one's own community. Or simply stated, approval for the implementation and expansion of inclusion may come from those with a moral and ethical attitude towards equality and who believe it benefits all children.

Chapter 7 Discussion

7.1 Introduction

A study of the literature led me to Lewin's Theory of Planned Change and the four discourses as an appropriate theoretical framework for exploring how inclusion was understood and implemented in a community school. The findings of the study reveal contestations between the four discourses as they vied for power and dominance. This chapter will examine this.

In this chapter I make two assertions. The first is that four main belief systems determined both how the stakeholders understood inclusive education and how inclusive education was practised at the School. Such belief systems may be individual or group systems. Secondly, I allege that it was not the community discourse but the individual beliefs which were the driving force for or the restraint against inclusive education. The community belief was not strong enough to sustain the practice of inclusive education against the individual beliefs which dominated it.

The community belief was the overarching vehicle for the others. This belief system through its constitutive values of religion created the entity which was the community school. Complex interplay and contradictions between the community belief system and the other belief systems resulted in a splintering of inclusive practice and conditional inclusion. Thus, in the case in which a community school which was directed towards an inclusive community philosophy should be ideally suited for the practice of inclusive education, this was found not to be so.

To explicate these claims I will show how these elements support or question Lewin's Theory. Lewin's Theory states that individual beliefs drive actions and control their significances within an individual's world. These beliefs embody an individual's principles and are powerful forces which limit or free behaviour change (Benne, 1976). In this case in the study Lewin's theory is supported. However, the drive to change or restrain beliefs is closely linked with the individual's membership and identity with the group (Coghlan and Jacobs, 2005). There is an intimate connection between the

individual and the group, and individual understanding is only achieved from within the group upon which the individual depends. Groups exert immense pressures upon members to conform to their norms and any deviation from these norms results in the expulsion of members (Kariel, 1956). The findings in the study question this aspect of Lewin's theory.

My thesis clearly indicates that inclusive education at the School was not a neutral process of including supported children, but represented the site of struggle between belief systems. Based on the evidence I claim that it was not the community group force which pushed and pulled for inclusive education, but rather the three individual belief systems which were continually grappling for dominance. This striving for dominance to protect individual beliefs created a fractured or haphazard inclusion or inclusions and in some cases, exclusion. This study found that each belief system provided its own understanding of inclusion. Lewin's Theory provides the explanation that beliefs determine behaviour, which is confirmed by this study. His theory, however, does not adequately extend to the test for a community from which you cannot be expelled, to show that such a powerful belief based on homogenous identity was not able to sustain a common belief of inclusive education.

7.2 The case study in the light of the literature

The overall discourse which formed the essence and the raison d'etre of the School was the community discourse, with the School having been created by the community belief. To create a community, Strike argues that it is essential to have 'shared constitutive values' (Strike, 1999:47) 'but not any shared values will do' (Strike, 2003:172). The Jewish community school was founded on shared values of religion, which were central to the whole notion of community as opposed to other independent schools or state schools where these values would not be central.

The community's understanding was limited to an automatic and irrevocable qualification criterion: that being Jewish allowed you access. This qualification of birthright signalled an assumed belief system which is supported by McMillan (1996) who notes that community means having the right to membership and acceptance.

Through the pervasive community discourse all children who were Jewish should have been able to attend the School.

But in practice this was not happening, as supported Jewish children in the main continued to be schooled separately. A large number of them attended remedial schools and there were some who were being supported at the School. It was not purely for the ideal of social justice and inclusion that there was a drive to bring supported children to the School. There were also practical and pragmatic elements involved. The mixture of finances and a numbers drive with social responsibility formed the basis by which supported children were admitted to the School; but there was never a clear top down inclusive education policy or coherent vision from the Board to filter down into the School. In fact Charles, the Board member, felt that it would actually mislead the community to present the School as inclusive.

Although there was no formal inclusive education policy or direction from the Board, the pragmatic discourse appeared to set the standard, and from the start the discourse of pragmatism provided the conditions and the parameters under which inclusion could be provided. This discourse set the tone of how much inclusivity would be accepted at the School. This included funding, teachers' skills, educational support, and a balance between those who are supported and those who are not. The balancing criteria determined that the School did not become a special needs school. It seemed to cohere to a large extent with the community discourse of care although not for all, because care was given conditional on certain criteria.

The community discourse was silent to the pragmatic discourse as qualified inclusion dispelled the threat of declining norms and standards. Qualified inclusion prevented inclusion from achieving its main tenet which according to Winzer and Mazurek, (2010) is founded on social justice and is about providing educational rights for all. Inclusion's central tenet implies that it is the actions of society which disable by means of a lack of supportive structures and accountability (Hodkinson and Vickerman, 2009).

As a result of the community's silent tolerance of conditional inclusion, the School practised its own form of inclusion. Walton and Lloyd, (2011) argue that top down ambiguous and unstated policy and directives enable schools to develop their own interpretation and implementation of inclusion. So while the diversity discourse implemented a community spirit of belonging and friendship, the pragmatic discourse limited its recipients.

In contrast to the pragmatic conditions for inclusion, the view of the diversity discourse (inclusion) was an unconditional acceptance of all children. This belief system rejected segregation on all levels and identified tools needed to manage diversity at the School. This meant integrating pedagogical methods to accommodate diversity as a supplement to the support offered. The diversity discourse tested both the strength of the community discourse and the trustworthiness of its elements of caring and acceptance of all its community members in spite of differences. With its principles of equality and the value of human rights, the diversity discourse suggested that all children were welcome at the School, yet these individual beliefs were in direct opposition to the enforced directives of standards and accountability imposed by the pragmatic discourse.

The diversity discourse caused disequilibrium at the School as it expected the community discourse to live up to the idea of abandoning the created norms and conditions and to oppose the standards agenda in order to accommodate diverse learning needs. The community discourse of care and unqualified acceptance was not able to fit into this paradigm and instead managed it by silence.

A minor point to mention here is that the diversity discourse was not faith specific. Dave was concerned that there may be a difference in the attitude of the teachers not of the Jewish faith compared to that of the Jewish teachers towards the community approach. He was concerned that some teachers not of the Jewish faith would not support the community approach which encouraged every Jewish child to be included, and he believed the Jewish teachers would be more supportive and empathetic. Lee argued the point of there being Jewish teachers who did not subscribe to the diversity

belief. It had nothing to do with the faith disabling the community approach, but rather that of individual beliefs.

Individual beliefs of special education (medical discourse) conflicted to a large extent with the community discourse of togetherness, yet this discourse provided the privileged educational status quo demanded by the community. The special education belief did this by protecting the community discourse from children who were not able to fit into the "norm". This therefore determined the continuation of the goals towards academic excellence and increasing competition in the market place. While noting its values of belonging and inclusion on the one side, the community discourse was not able to align its views with these notions as they threatened to disturb its centre which appeared to have become influenced by the norm.

The medical model supports the notion of the "norm" which according to Soudien & Baxen, (2006) views disability as associated with deficiency and uses the ideal subject with which to model, compare and categorize. Any veering from the norm would require that the deficit is controlled and regulated through institutionalized procedures. This type of thinking protected the community discourse from the threat of diminished accountability.

Children at the School were therefore being lumped together in the classroom without a change in curriculum or attitudes. This 'locational inclusion' (Hodkinson (2010:62) meant the child was merely included physically, while subliminally excluded from participation. The special education force at the School demonstrated a strong boundaried view of difference and veered away from inclusion. This discourse was able to function as it had no direct influence on the community discourse, nor did it disturb the equilibrium of the community discourse. Special education may have rattled the community discourse. It did not, however, test the community as the members were not expecting children to meet the norms.

7.2.1 How change took place

Change towards inclusion happened at the School not because of the group but because of individuals. The continual admission of supported children resulted in

change or resistance to change in the perspectives of various individuals. Special education beliefs sanctioned the status quo of separateness and discredited inclusion. Diversity beliefs promoted unified educational systems and inclusion while the impact of conditional inclusion set by the pragmatic discourse accelerated its power and constituted a threat to inclusion.

This change or lack thereof can only partially be explained by Lewin's Theory. In this community, there was an automatic acceptance by means of birthright. This resulted in children being entitled to a shared life. However it appeared necessary to limit and set conditions before diversity could become a threat to the cohesion of the community. Put in another way, it was the threat of diversity which introduced conditions. Because members of the community group could not be expelled, it was easier to readjust the change. Thus while ideally the community discourse and inclusion have much more commonality, there are other considerations and it was therefore more appealing to the community to use the special education discourse which posed no threat to the community notion of inclusivity. The community did not allow inclusive education to thrive, so individual discourses stepped in, in order to manage it.

Eventually the individual beliefs became more powerful than those of the group and specifically the pragmatic discourse which resulted in the official implementation of a quota system. This was the first time the School had formal direction from the Board. This action denounced the community belief which defined it. Andrew, a parent believed this was the only way to balance the numbers and avoid the unconditional entry of supported children which could tip the School's academic equilibrium.

The community faced a dilemma. The community discourse was bound by constitutive values which did not allow for expulsion. Advocacy and conflict between individual beliefs had challenged the value placed on education, and without a clear strategy in place for the inclusion of all Jewish children, change was happening irregularly and erratically at the School.

Change according Fullan (1996) needs shared vision and leadership. In terms of the School, there was no shared vision, only contradictory individual discourses pulling away from and pushing towards norms. Neither 'top down nor bottom up' strategies are able to work by themselves: the top and bottom must work in combination (Fullan, 1996:421). The fundamental challenge at the School was that entering into open discussion and establishing a shared vision would threaten the community discourse with diversity.

Hence the concept and practice of inclusive education at the School came from within the individual beliefs and there appeared to be no community resistance, even though some of the beliefs contradicted the principal community belief. There was no need to resist while there was a perception that the pragmatic belief was the gatekeeper of inclusive education; and while the muted diversity approach to inclusion appeased the community conscience. This resulted in a fragmented change where all those involved were representing and implementing what they felt according to their own beliefs, personal experiences, abilities or skills.

Individual volition alone is not sufficient to achieve or sustain change. The system must indicate clear and inspiring learning goals with a central purpose which includes structured networking to develop new beliefs (Fullan, 1996). In this complex system there were so many different discourses pulling in different directions with their own conditions that there was no dominant group thinking that could have initiated and sustained the change. This explains the tolerance under silence that Dave describes, which was a way of allowing inclusion to continue. Inclusion had to continue "under the radar" for it to succeed.

The School was established to accept all children who are Jewish. It was a community school with constitutive values of care, yet it was threatened. But it was neither its identity nor its constitutive value of religion which was being threatened. Instead it was its values of belonging, trust, social support and caring. These values could not withstand the perils of individual beliefs and the community ethos was substituted for individual forces of standards and accountability.

Silence was the undercurrent of the debate around inclusive education, a silence which gave the community discourse a safety net against cynicism and being undermined. There was little consensus among the belief systems regarding the inclusive education principles. The polarized views of diversity and pragmatism were not able to rely on the community discourse to unite them and they were in fact divided even further.

Despite all this, inclusion filtered into the School and although it was practised in pockets it made a profound impact on the whole. It appeared that inclusion depended on individuals who had the will and energy to drive it. Although volition alone was not able to effect systemic change, Fullan (1996) argues that change by individuals has the opportunity to affect the system despite the system. Dave confirmed that inclusion was being successfully practised at the School due to the passion and drive of individuals and their belief in the philosophy.

7.3 Implications and suggestions

I begin the summation of this thesis with a concept borrowed from Norberg (2001). Inclusive education is not merely about education. It is in fact a way to transfer values to future generations, and to reconcile constitutive values with inclusive values. I continue this section with implications of this research and suggestions for its implementation, recommendations for future research, the way forward for the School and finally my reflections on the journey to which this thesis took me.

Inclusion in South Africa is viewed as an educational plan that can contribute to democracy, equality and non–discrimination. It is also a means to "transfer values" to future generations about rights, compassion, belonging and respect. Almost two decades post democracy, the concepts of equal education and the right of every child to have quality education are still challenges that are to be dealt with and hopefully solved. The furthest South Africa has progressed with regard to an inclusive education policy is the consultative WP6.

The process of inclusive education seems to have stalled, possibly due to a lack of shared vision among policy makers or alternatively a lack of sufficient academic

research. There is no cohesive understanding of practice, thus exclusion is the outcome for many. Although the above point does not fall within the ambit of my research, it is a point which parallels my findings in the case study.

The South African Jewish community schools were established for and committed to providing Jewish education to every Jewish child who chose it (Herman, 2004). Similar to the broader South African situation, the Jewish community's lack of a shared vision of inclusive education has resulted in the exclusion of some of its members from the School. The community values of care and friendship were compromised by other overriding beliefs and practice at the School which resulted in varying degrees of inclusion which were articulated through four belief systems. These complex contextual influences shaped and continue to shape the understanding and implementation of inclusive education in the School.

The four belief systems or discourses determined the practice of inclusive education at the School. The question that I interrogated is whether these discourses succeeded in the successful implementation of inclusive education. I suggest that this form of education was partially successful. The process of inclusion was an interplay of a multiplicity of forces (Kippenberger, 1998), which divided inclusive practice and resulted in either dominant and minor practices of inclusion or no inclusion at all. Beliefs displayed such authority that they determined action (Coghlan and Jacobs, 2005) and implementation or non-implementation of inclusion.

I suggest that the practice of inclusive education at the School was hindered by individual beliefs which determined their own practice and behaviour. There was no common group belief to create coherence among the individual beliefs. Perhaps as Lewin's Theory suggests, there has to be group change in order for the individual to change, or as per Fullan and Miles (1992), new personal meaning must be a learning process on a guided and shared journey.

Besides the four belief systems, the data was further imbued with the core community discourse giving way to the assertiveness of the individual discourses. In the absence of a strong binding force the individual discourses ran amok. The lack of a central

directive resulted in the practice of different inclusions. It also resulted in the implementation of successful inclusion by individuals with passion and a belief in the philosophy albeit "under the radar". Silence allowed its continuation but muted its significance.

An interesting point to mention is Jewish teachers seemed to vacillate between their individual beliefs and the community belief while the teachers who did not belong to the Jewish faith were not as conflicted. On the one hand Jewish teachers who held for example a pragmatic discourse promoted standards and balance yet on the other hand worried about the exclusion of Jewish children from Jewish social life. This often noted confusion signified internal conflict which seemed absent in the voice of stakeholders who were not of the Jewish faith. Their views were more uncomplicated and trouble–free than Jewish views and this notion served to reinforce the power of individual beliefs.

Returning to the the absence of debate and a shared vision, I suggest that inclusion at the School was not afforded the significance it needed. Meaningful inclusion posed too great a threat of diversity to the community discourse and that would leave it vulnerable. An absence of discussion and analyses of the significance of beliefs on behaviour resulted in pockets of inclusion. In addition I suggest that inclusion at the School was fragmented as there was limited leadership to empower passionate individuals and provide them with the skills to propel inclusive education forward in an open way.

The process of inclusion as a shared educational goal at the School failed in part as it was not driven by leadership. I suggest that stakeholders need direction to build on their existing knowledge and understanding in order to increase inclusivity. Systemic change cannot depend only on individuals but needs pressure, guidance and continuous development and change towards supportive, collaborative, inclusive communities. For inclusion to be successful, leadership should project a shared philosophy which is targeted at everyone, as well as a clear articulated policy and explicit goals.

Without shared goals, without teachers and managers who support and drive this goal, and without suitable financial support and teacher skills, total inclusion could not take place in a community school whose discourse seemingly resembles the discourse of inclusion and social justice. Inclusion rather occurred in pockets based on teachers' individual beliefs, life experience and skills. This has implications for the implementation of inclusion in the broader South African system where difficulties such as lack of commitment, lack of funds and poor management are seen to be responsible for the delay of its implementation.

7.4 The way forward for the School

As a homogenous community it needs to realize that in addition to its shared norms, beliefs and values of religion which joined them, they were also a 'community of difference'. (Shields, 2004:38). There was diversity of a different kind, difference in the way children learn, difference in children's ability and difference in the beliefs of the stakeholders. Shields (2004) states where there is difference there is not a set of established norms and members of a community need to develop norms together with openness and respect. By developing norms while remaining focused on understanding, dialogue, relationships and an unconditional regard for the intrinsic worth of every individual, leaders can deliver academic excellence as well as social justice to learners.

Instead of notching up achievements and embarking on strong marketing drives, what is needed is a shared understanding around short–term and long–term goals using criteria such as justice, caring, democracy and optimism in the quest for academic excellence. Academic excellence must be re–defined to mean success which extends equally to all learners, success which results from equal opportunities for all learners, success which stems from the seamless unity of academic excellence and social justice, success which develops from the belief that they are not mutually exclusive and must be attended to and driven together, because as stated by Shields (2004:38) 'one implies the other'.

7.5 Recommendations for future research

This study has revealed a number of areas which might require further research. Firstly the study focused on understanding which influences practice of inclusive education in a community school. This raises the question of whether other schools have experienced similar outcomes and this is a question which is worthy of further study. More specifically it would be interesting to research how inclusion is understood in another community school. Secondly, my study suggested that the School was practising a conditional or fragmented inclusion which was dependent on individual beliefs. This broaches the subject of whether more research is required to examine the influence that beliefs could have on inclusive practice. Thirdly, different perspectives and beliefs will always be an inherent part of any school and therefore more research is required to understand ways of dealing with these differences.

7.6 Reflections

The narrative ends but the beliefs continue. They follow us and cling to us holding on to and guiding our every move. The journey began with a belief, a belief in human dignity and equality and the necessity of an inclusive education system which welcomes all children.

There is something inherently unfathomable and magical about belonging to a community, something beautiful and comforting about not having to prove oneself and, just being accepted. But for some, acceptance into a community school was not yet viable. It was instead merely a future prospect, limited by parameters, conditions, compromises and anxieties.

After taking up my position as Head of Academic Support I was more exposed to teacher and parent opinions and general disquiet and unease regarding disability. I became aware of teacher "talk" the bandying about of phrases such as "he doesn't belong here" and "she should be at another school" or "this is not the place for her". These phrases appeared to be expressed because they lacked the ability and skills to deal with it, and thus became defensive rather than inclusive. It was this and my desire

for equality in education which propelled me on an academic and personal journey into the then unknown territory of segregation, marginalization, standards and balance.

Recognising aspects of individualism within the community and questioning the community's inclusive ethos was difficult as I observed how they resulted in the exclusion of children based on disability. I found that I either reacted with anger or entered into a space where I would separate myself from them. My trust in the safety of community and my own acceptance in this community was losing ground and I began questioning their criteria for inclusion or exclusion.

Exclusivity is destructive to any community but more destructive to the individual, and while giving my stakeholders the opportunity to voice their views, I became aware of and disturbed to recognise how destructive exclusion from one's community can be. Children who were denied access to the School were excluded not only academically but socially from the Jewish community.

Through my personal and academic journey I learnt that like the success of Shleni High, in spite of a lack of resources, driven and passionate people achieved inclusive education. This role model school saw itself as a community school valuing all learners equally. Disability was accepted in this community and most significantly, there was evidence of an understanding of inclusion based on values about community, rights, compassion, belonging and respect (Pather, 2011). Thus it appears, in the absence of economics and other deterrents to inclusion, that it is the prevalent attitudes of "Ubuntu" which are the forces which successfully drive inclusive education.

7.7 Conclusion

I hope this thesis will encourage thinking and debate about inclusive education. I hope it will encourage an understanding that an inclusive school is capable of producing an inclusive society where differences are appreciated rather than ignored, denied, hidden or changed. More importantly I hope this thesis will give voice to the children who continue to wait in the margins.

References

Agbenyega, J. (2007). Examining teachers' concerns and attitudes to inclusive education in Ghana. *International Journal of Whole Schooling, 3*(1), 41–56.

Ainscow, M. (2005). Developing inclusive education systems: What are the levers for change? *Journal of Educational Change, 6*, 109–124.

Ainscow, M., Booth, T., & Dyson, A. (2004). Understanding and developing inclusive practices in schools: A collaborative action research network. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 8*(2), 125–139.

Ainscow, M., & Cesar, M. (2006). Inclusive education ten years after Salamanca: Setting the agenda. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 21*(3), 23I–23S.

Ainscow, M., Howes, A., Farrell, P., & Frankham, J. (2003). Making sense of the development of inclusive practices. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 18*(2), 227–242.

Ainscow, M., & Miles, S. (2008). Making Education for All inclusive: Where next? *Prospects, 38*, 15–34.

Ainscow, M., & Sandill, A. (2010). Developing inclusive education systems: The role of organisational cultures and leadership. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 14*(4), 401–416.

Apple, M. W. (2004). Creating difference: Neo-liberalism, neo-conservatism and the politics of educational reform. *Educational Policy, 18*(12), 12–44.

Armstrong, D., Armstrong, A. C., & Spandagou, E. (2011). Inclusion: By choice or by chance? *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 15*(1), 29–39.

Armstrong, D., Spandagou, I., & Armstrong, C. (2008). *One nation globalization and inclusive education.* Retrieved December 23, 2012, from www.aare.edu.au/08pap/spa08682.pdf

Armstrong, F. (1997). Inclusion, curriculum and the struggle for space in school. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 3*(1), 75–87.

Artiles, A. J., Harris-Murri, N., & Rostenberg, D. (2006). Inclusion as social justice: Critical notes on discourses, assumptions and the road ahead. *Theory into Practice, 45*(3), 260–268.

Bartolo, P. A. (2010). The process of teacher education for inclusion: The Maltese experience. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 10*(s1), 139–148.

Basson, R. (2011). Adaptation, evaluation and inclusion. *Africa Education Review, 8*(2), 193–208.

Beinhart, P. (1996). The Jews in South Africa. *Transition, 71*, 60–79.

Bell, J. S. (2002). Narrative inquiry: More than just telling stories. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(2), 207–213.

Benne, K. D. (1976). A process of re-education: An assessment of Kurt Lewin's views. *Group and Organization Studies, 1*(1), 26–42.

Bicknell, J. (2004). Self-knowledge and the limitations of narrative. *Philosophy and Literature, 28*(2), 406–416.

Blecker, N. S., & Boakes, N. J. (2010). Creating a learning environment for all children: Are teachers able and willing? A sociological perspective. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 14*(5), 435–447.

Boling, E. (2007). "Yeah, but I still don't want to deal with it". Changes in a teacher candidate's conceptions of inclusion. *Teaching Education, 18*(3), 217–231.

Boyle, B., Scriven, B., Durning, S., & Downes, C. (2011). Facilitating the learning of all students: The'professional positive' of inclusive practice in Australian primary schools. *Support for Learning, 26*(2), 72–78.

Brannick, T., & Coghlan, D. (2007). In defense of being "native": The case for insider academic research. *Organizational Research Methods, 10*(1), 59–74.

Brantlinger, E. (1997). Using ideology: Cases of nonrecognition of the politics of research and practice in special education. *Review of Educational Research, 67*(4), 425–459.

Brantlinger, E., Jimenez, R., Klinger, J., Pugach, M., & Richardson, V. (2005). Qualitative studies in special education. *Exceptional Children, 71*(2), 195–207.

Brown, J. F. (1939). Individual, group, and social field. *American Journal of Sociology, 44*(6), 858–867.

Brown, J. F., & Voth, A. C. (1937). The path of seen movement as a function of the vector-field. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 543–563.

Brown, R. (1988). *Group processes: Dynamics within and between groups.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Burnes, B. (2004). Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change. *Journal of Management Studies, 41*(6), 977–1002.

Burnes, B. (2009). Reflections: Ethics and organizational change – Time for a return to Lewinian values. *Journal of Change Management, 9*(4), 359–381.

Campbell, F. K. (2008). Refusing able(ness): A preliminary conversation about ableism. Retrieved December 21, 2011, from *M/C Journal, 11*(3): http://journal.media-culture.org.au/index.php/mcjournal/article/viewArticle/46

Carrier, J. G. (1990). Special education and the explanation of pupil performance. *Disability, Handicap and Society, 5*(3), 211–226.

Carrington, S. (1999). Inclusion needs a different school culture. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 3*(3), 257–268.

Case study in contemporary educational research: Conceptualization and critique. (2009). Retrieved February 9, 2013, from cscanada.net/index.php/ccc/article/download

Christensen, C. A., & Dorn, S. (1997). Competing notions of social justice and contradictions in special education reform. *Journal of Special Education, 31*(2), 181–198.

Coghlan, D., & Brannick, T. (2003). Kurt Lewin: The practical theorist for the 21st century. *Irish Journal of Management, 24*(2), 31–37.

Coghlan, D., & Jacobs, C. (2005). Kurt Lewin on reeducation: Foundations for action research. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 41*(4), 444–457.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Florence, KY: Routledge.

Connelly, M. F., & Clandinin, J. D. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19*(5)*,* 2–14.

Connor, D. J., & Fern, B. (2007). The conflict within: Resistance to inclusion and other paradoxes in special education. *Disability and Society, 22*(1), 63–77.

Corbett, J. (1997). Include/exclude: Redefining the boundaries. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 1*, 55–64.

Corbin Dwyer, S. C., & Buckle, J. L. (2009). The space between: On being an insider-outsider in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8*(1), 54–63.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). The discipline and practice of qualitative research. *Handbook of qualitative research*, 1–28.

Department of Basic Education (DBE). (2010). *Curriculum news.* Pretoria: DBE.

Department of Basic Education (DBE). (2011). *Guidelines for responding to learner diversity: National Curriculum Statement, Curriculum Assessment Policy Statement.* Pretoria: DBE.

Department of Education (DoE). (2001). *White Paper 6: Special needs education.* Pretoria: DoE.

Department of Education (DoE). (2005). *Conceptual and operational guidelines for the implementation full inclusion: Full service schools.* Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education (DoE). (2008). *National strategy on screening, identification, assessment and support school pack.* Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education (DoE). (2009). *Guidelines for full-service/inclusive schools.* Pretoria: DoE.

Department of Education (DoE). (2010). *Guidelines for full service schools.* Pretoria: Department of Basic Education.

Department of Education (DoE). (2012). *Education statistics in South Africa (2010).* Pretoria: DoE.

Deppeler, J. (2006). Improving inclusive practices in Australian Schools: Creating conditions for university-school collaboration in inquiry. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 21*(3), 347-360.

Deppeler, J., & Harvey, D. (2004). Validating the British Index for Inclusion for the Australian context: Stage one. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 8*(2), 155–184.

Donnell, K., Yang, L., Winfield, A., Canestrari, A., Marlowe, B., & Kamii, M. (2008). Conversations about social justice. *ENCOUNTER: Education for Meaning and Social Justice, 21*(4), 37–39.

Drudy, S., & Kinsella, W. (2009). Developing an inclusive system in a rapidly changing European society. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 13*(6), 647–663.

Dunne, L. (2008). Discourse of inclusion: A critique. *British Educational Research Association Annual Conference* (pp. 1–15). Edinburgh.

Du Toit, P., & Forlin, C. (2009). Cultural transformation for inclusion: A South African perspective. *School Psychology International, 30*(6), 644–666.

Dyson, A. (1999). Inclusion and inclusions: Theories and discourses in inclusive education. In H. D. Garner (Ed.), *World yearbook of education 1999: Inclusive education* (pp. 36–53). London: Kogan Page.

Dyson, A., & Forlin C. (1999). *An international perspective on inclusion.* Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Dyson, A., & Gallannaugh, F. (2007). National policy and the development of inclusive school practices: A case study. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 37*(4), 473–488.

Eloff, E., Swart, E, & Engelbrecht, P. (2002). Including a learner with physical disabilities: Stressful for teachers? *Koers, 67*(1), 77–99.

Engelbrecht, P. (2006). The implementation of inclusive education in South Africa after ten years of democracy. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 21*(3), 253–264.

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

Engelbrecht, P., Oswald, M., & Forlin, C. (2006). Promoting the implementation of inclusive education in primary schools in South Africa. *British Journal of Special Education, 33*(3), 121–129.

Evans, J., & Lunt, I. (2002). Inclusive education: Are there any limits? *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 17*(1), 1–14.

Ferguson, D. L. (2008). International trends in inclusive education: The continuing challenge to teach each one and everyone. *European Journal of Special Needs, 23*(2), 109–120.

Force Field Analysis. (2011). Retrieved March 29, 2012, from Value Based Management.net: http://www.valuebasedmanagement.net/methods_lewin_force_field_analysis.html

Forlin, C. (2006). Inclusive education in Australia ten years after Salamanca. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 21*(3), 265–277.

Fullan, M. G. (1996). Turning systemic thinking on its head. *Phi Delta Kappa, 77*(6), 420–423.

Fullan, M. G., & Miles, M. B. (1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73*, 745–752.

Gabel, S., & Peters S. (2004). Presage of a paradigm shift? Beyond the social model of disability toward resistance theories of disability. *Disability and Society, 19*(6), 585–600.

Gous, J. G. (2009). *How inclusive education is understood by principals of independent schools* (Doctoral thesis, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa).

Graham, L. (2005). Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault. *Annual Conference* (pp. 2–15). Sydney: Queensland University of Technology.

Graham, L. J. (2005). *The incidental "other": A Foucaltian interrogation of educational policy effects.* Retrieved May 14, 2010, from www.eprints.qut.edu.au/archive

Graham, L. J., & Jahnukainen, M. (2011). Wherefor art thou inclusion? Analysing the development of inclusive education in New South Wales, Alberta and Finland. *Journal of Education Policy, 26*(2), 263–288.

Graham, L. J., & Slee, R. (2008). An illusory interiority: Interrogating the discourse/s of inclusion. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 40*(2), 277–293.

Greenblatt, S. S. (2006). *To a golden land.* University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg: Faculty of Humanities.

Grenier, M. (2010). Moving to inclusion: A socio-cultural analysis of practice. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 14*(4), 387–400.

Greyling, A. J. (2009). Reaching for the dream: Quality education for all. *Educational Studies, 35*(4), 425–435.

Guzman Johannessen, B. G. (2010). Pedagogical ethics for teaching social justice in teacher education. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Globalization, education and social justice* (pp. 3–13). Dordrecht: Springer .

Haihambo, C., & Lightfoot, E. (2010). Cultural beliefs regarding people with disabilities in Namibia: Implications for the inclusion of people with disabilities. *International Journal of Special Education, 25*(3), 76–87.

Hamre, B., & Oyler, C. (2004). Preparing teachers for inclusive classrooms: Learning from a collaborative enquiry group. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(2), 154–163.

Hansen, J. H. (2012). Limits to inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 16*(1), 89–98.

Harry, B., & Klinger, J. (2007). Discarding the deficit model. *Educational Leadership, 64*(5), 16–21.

Hay. J., & Beyers, C. (2011). An analysis of the South African model of inclusive education with regard to social justice. *Africa Education Review, 8*(2), 234–246.

Herman, C. (2004). *Prophets and profits: A case study of the restructuring of Jewish community schools in Johannesburg, South Africa* (Doctoral thesis, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa).

Herman, C. (2006). *Prophets and profits: Managerialism and the restructuring of Jewish schools in South Africa.* Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Hodkinson, A. (2006). Conceptions and misconceptions of inclusive education – one year on: A critical analysis of newly qualified teachers' knowledge and understanding of inclusion. *Research in Education, 76*, 43–55.

Hodkinson, A. (2010). Inclusive and special education in the English educational system: Historical perspectives, recent developments and future challenges. *British Journal of Special Education*, 61–66.

Hodkinson, A., & Devarakonda, C. (2009). Conceptions of inclusion and inclusive education: A critical examination of the perspectives and practices of teachers in India. *Research in Education, 82*, 85–99.

Hodkinson, A., & Devarakonda, C. (2011a). Conceptions of inclusion and inclusive education: A critical examination of the perspectives and practices of teachers in England. *Educational Futures, 3*(1), 52–65.

Hodkinson, A., & Deverokonda, C. (2011b). For pity's sake: Comparative conceptions of inclusion in England and India. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, 1–22.

Hodkinson, A., & Vickerman, P. (2009). *Key issues in special educational needs and inclusion.* London: Sage.

Jaffe, J., & Schafer, R. (2009). *Everyone is included … all people, all places, all ways: Inclusion quotes 09*. Retrieved November 5 November, 2011, from http://www.everyoneisincluded.us/inclusionquotes09.html

James, W. (n.d.). *Brainy.quote*. Retrieved January 18, 2013, from http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/w/williamjam132537.html

Jordaan, W., & Jordaan, J. (1989). *Man in context.* Isando, Johannesburg: Lexicon.

Kariel, H. S. (1956). Democracy unlimited: Kurt Lewin's Field Theory. *American Journal of Sociology, 62*(3), 280–289.

King, K. (2007). Multilateral agencies in the construction of the global agenda on education. *Comparative Education, 43*(3), 377–391.

Kippenberger, T. (1998). Planned change: Kurt Lewin's legacy. *The Antidote, 3*(4), 10–12.

Kruger, D., & Yorke, C. (2010). Collaborative co-teaching of numeracy and literacy as a key to inclusion in an independent school. *South African Journal of Education, 30*, 293–306.

Kugelmass, J. W. (2006). Sustaining cultures of inclusion: The value and limitation of cultural analysis. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 21*(3), 279–292.

Kumari Campbell, F. A. (2008). Exploring internalized ableism using critical race theory. *Disability & Society, 23*(2), 151–162.

Lalvani, P. (2013). Privilege, compromise, or social justice: teachers' conceptualizations of inclusive education. *Disability & Society, 28*(1), 14–27.

Landsberg, E. (Ed.). (2005). *Addressing barriers to learning: A South African perspective.* Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Lasley, T. J. (1980). Preservice teacher beliefs about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 31*(4), 38–41.

Lawson, H., Parker, M., & Sikes, P. (2006). Seeking stories: Reflections on a narrative approach to researching understandings of inclsuion. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 21*(1), 55–68.

Lewin, K. (1939). Field Theory and experiment in social psychology: Concepts and methods. *American Journal of Sociology, 44*(6), 868–896.

Lewin, K., & Lippitt, R. (1938). An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A preliminary note. *Sociometry, 1*(3/4), 292–300.

Lewin, K. M. (2007). Diversity in convergence: access to education for all. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 37*(5) , 577-599.

Lippitt, R., & Radke, M. (1946). New trends in the investigation of prejudice. *American Academy of Political and Social Science, 244*, 167–176.

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

Lo Nai-kwai, L. (2007). The sustainable development of inclusive education. *Chinese Education and Society, 40*(4), 44–62.

Martin, J. L. (2003). What is Field Theory? *American Journal of Sociology, 109*(1), 1–49.

McClain, N., Watermeyer, B., & Schneider, M. (n.d.). *Disability and human rights: The South African Human Rights Commission.* Retrieved June 25, 2012, from Disability and Social Change: A South African Agenda: www.hsrcpress.ac

McLeod, S. A. (2009). *Jean Piaget/Cognitive Theory.* Retrieved February 3, 2013, from http://www.simplypsychology.org/piaget.html

McLeskey, J., Hoppey, D., Williamson, P., & Rentz, T. (2004). Is inclusion an illusion? An examination of national and state trends toward the education of students with learning disabilities in general education classrooms. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 19*(2), 109–115.

McMillan, D. W. (1996). Sense of community. *Journal of Community Psychology, 24*, 315–325.

Medley, B. C., & Haki Akan, O. (2008). *Creating positive change in community organizations: A case for rediscovering Lewin.* Retrieved April 11, 2012, from Wiley InterScience: www.interscience.wiley.com

Menand, L. (Ed.). (1997). *Pragmatism: A reader.* New York: Vintage Books.

Mey, H. (1972). *Field-theory: A study of its application in the social sciences.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Miles, S., & Singal, N. (2010). The Education for All and inclusive education debate: Conflict, contradiction or opportunity? *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 14*(1), 1–15.

Munby, H. (1982). The place of teachers' beliefs in research on teacher thinking and decision making, and an alternative methodology. *Instructional Science, 11*, 201–225.

Muthukrishna, N., & Schoeman, M. (2000). From special needs to quality Education for All: A participatory, problem-centred approach to policy development in South Africa. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 4*(4), 315–335.

Naicker, S. (2000). *From apartheid education to inclusive education: The challenges of transformation*. Paper presented at the International Education Summit: For a Democratic Society. Detroit, Michigan.

Naicker, S. (2006). From policy to practice: A South African perspective on implementing inclusive education policy. *International Journal of Whole Schooling, 3*(1), 1–6.

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

Neuman, W. L. (2006). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

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

Nkabinde, N. G. Z., & Rodriguez, L. (1998). The social context of the special education debate in South Africa. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 13*(1), 72–85.

Omoto, A. M., & Snyder, M. (2002). Considerations of community. *The American Behavioural Scientist, 45*(5), 846.

Orsati, F. T., & Causton-Theoharis, J. (2012). Challenging control: Inclusive teachers' and teaching assistants' discourse on students with challenging behaviour. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1–19.

Oscar Wilde. (n.d.). Retrieved June 21, 2012, from Wikiquote: http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Oscar_Wilde

Osler, A., & Zhu, J. (2011). Narratives in teaching and research for justice and human rights. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 6*(3), 223–235.

Paliokosta, P., & Blandford, S. (2010). Inclusion in school: A policy, ideology or lived experience? Similar findings in diverse school cultures. *Support For Learning, 25*(4), 179–186.

Pather, S. (2003). Critical, cross-cultural perspective on achieving sustainable inclusive education Development: A South African experience. *North South Dialogue II: Moving from Rhetoric to Reality.* Kerala, India.

Pather, S. (2007). Demystifying inclusion: Implications for sustainable inclusive practice. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 11*(5–6), 627–643.

Pather, S. (2011). Evidence on inclusion and support for all learners in mainstream schools in South Africa: Off the policy radar? *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 15*(10), 1103–1117.

Pather, S., & Nxumalo, C. P. (2012). Challenging understandings of inclusive education policy development in Southern Africa through comparative reflection. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1–15.

Perold, M., Louw, C., & Kleynhans, S. (2010). Primary school teachers' knowledge and misperceptions of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). *South African Journal of Education, 30*, 457–473.

Peters, S. (2007). A disability rights in education model for evaluating inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 9*(2), 139–160.

Peters, S. J. (2003). *Inclusive education: Achieving Education for All by including those with disabilities and special needs.* Retrieved December 20, 2012, from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1099079877269/547664-1099079993288/InclusiveEdu_efa_strategy_for_children.pdf

Peters, S. J. (2007). Education for All: A historical analysis of international inclusive education policy and individuals with disabilities. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 18*(2), 98–109.

Pillay, J., & Di Terlizzi, M. (2009). A case study of a learner's transition from mainstream schooling to a school for learners with special educational needs (LSEN): Lessons for mainstream education. *South African Journal of Education, 29*, 491–509.

Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(2), 175–196.

Polat, F. (2011). Inclusion in education: A step towards social justice. *International Journal of Educational Development, 31*, 50–58.

Porteus, K. (2003). Decolonising inclusion: Constructing an analytic framework for inclusion/exclusion for the decolonising context. *Perspectives in Education, 21*(3), 13–23.

Quote Junkie: Philosophy Edition. (2008). *Hagopian Institute.* Retrieved March 18, 2012, from Google books: http://books.google.co.za/books?id

Rainio, K. (2009b). *Kurt Lewin's dynamical psychology revisited and revised.* Retrieved April 10, 2012, from http://www.goertzel.org/dynapsyc/Raino-Lewin's-psych-pdf-6-8-09.pdf

Rawls, J. (1988). The priority of right and ideas of the good. *Philosophy & Public Affairs, 17*(4), 251–276.

Rayner, S. (2007). *Managing special and inclusive education.* London: Sage.

Reindal, S. M. (2008). A social relational model of disability: A theoretical framework for special needs education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 23*(2), 135–146.

Sandkull, O. (2005). *Strengthening inclusive education by applying a rights-based approach to education programming ISEC.* Retrieved april 24, 2009, from http://www.unescobkk.org/fileadmin/user_upload/appeal/IE/Publications_and_reports/OS_ISEC_2005_Paper.pdfhttp://www.unescobkk.org

Saron, G., Shain, M., & Saks, D. (2008). *Jewish Virtual Library South Africa.* Retrieved February 15, 2013, from Encyclopaedia Judaica.: http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/judaica/ejud_0002_0019_0_18925.html

Savin-Baden, M., & Van Niekerk, L. (2007). Narrative enquiry: Theory and practice. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 31*(3), 459–472.

Sayad, Y., & Soudien, C. (2003). (Re)framing education exclusion and inclusion discourses: Limits and possibilities. *IDS Bulletin, 36*(1), 9–19.

Schein, E. H. (1996). Kurt Lewin's Change Theory in the field and in the classroom: Notes toward a model of managed learning. *Systemic Practice and Action Research, 9*(1), 27–47.

Schein, E. H. (2002). Models and tools for stability and change in human systems. *Reflections, 4*(2), 35–46.

Schugurensky, D. (2010). The heteronymous university and the question of social justice: In search of a new social contract. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Globalization, education and social justice* (pp. 49–66). Dordrecht: Springer.

Sharma, U., Loreman, T., & Forlin, C. (2012). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 12*(1), 12–21.

Shields, C. M. (2004). Creating a community of difference. *Educational Leadership, 61(7)*, 38–41.

Singal, N. (2006). Inclusive education in India: International concept, national interpretation. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 53*(3), 351–369.

Slee, R. (2001a). Inclusion in practice: Does practice make perfect? *Educational Review, 53*(2).

Slee, R. (2001b). Social justice and the changing directions in educational research: the case of inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 5*(2–3), 167–177.

Slee, R. (2006). Limits to and possibilities for educational reform. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 10*(2–3), 109–119.

Slee, R. (2012). How do we make inclusive education happen when exclusion is a political predisposition? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1–13.

Slee, R., & Allan, J. (2001). Excluding the included: A reconsideration of inclusive education. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 11*(2), 173–191.

Smith, M. K. (2001a). *Kurt Lewin, groups, experiential learning and action research.* Retrieved December 30, 2011, from the encyclopaedia of informal education: http://www.infed.org/index.htm

Smith, M. K. (2001b). *'Kurt Lewin: Group, experimental learning and action research. The Encyclopedia of Informal Education.* Retrieved November 26, 2011, from infed: http://www.infed.org/thinkers/et-lewin.htm

Soudien, C., & Baxen, J. (2006). Disability and schooling in South Africa. In B. S. Watermeyer (Ed.), *Disability and social change: A South African agenda.* Cape Town: HSRC.

Starczewska, A., Hodkinson, A., & Adams, G. (2011). Conceptions of inclusion and inclusive education: A critical examination of the perspectives and practices of teachers in Poland. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs,* 1–8.

Steiner, I. D. (1974). *What happened to the group in social psychology?* Retrieved December 25, 2011, from http://0-www.sciencedirect.com.innopac.up.ac.za/science?_ob=MiamiImageURL&_cid=272387&_user=59388&_pii=0022103174900584&_check=y&_origin=browse&_zone=rslt_list_item&_coverDate=1974-01-31&wchp=dGLzVlV-zSkWA&md5=cfe6407810af7a3b27f519a469010c02/1-s2.0-00221

Strike, K. A. (1999). Can schools be communities? The tension between shared values and inclusion. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(1), 46–70.

Strike, K. A. (2000). Schools as communities: Four metaphors, three models and a dilemma or two. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 34*(4), 617–642.

Surty, E. (2012). *From inclusive education to an inclusive society.* Keynote address by the South African Deputy Minister of Education at the World Down Syndrome Congress (pp. 1–8). Chicago: Department of Education.

Swart, E., & Pettipher, R. (2005). A framework for understanding inclusion. In E. K. Landsberg (Ed.), *Addressing barriers to learning: A South African perspective* (pp. 2–23). Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Taysum, A., & Gunter, H. (2008). A critical approach to researching social justice and school leadership in England. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 3*(2), 183–199.

Terzi, L. (2004). The social model of disability: A philosophical critique. *Journal of Applied Philosophy, 21*(2), 142–159.

Thomazet, S. (2009). From integration to inclusive education: does changing the terms improve practice? *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 13*(6), 553–563.

Tomlinson, C. A., Brimjoin, K., & Narvaez, L. (2008). *The differentiated school.* Virginia USA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tomlinson, C. A., & Kalbfleisch, M. L. (1998). Teach me, teach my brain: A call for differentiated classrooms. *Educational Leadership, 58*(3), 52–55.

Tonnies, F. (*trans.* 1957). *Community and society.* Translated by C. P. Loomis, East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Trochim, W. M. K. (2001). *Research methods knowledge base.* Cincinnatti, OH: Atomic Dog.

Turner, C. S. V., & Louis, K. S. (1996). Society's response to differences. *Remedial and Special Education*, 134–141.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (1990). *World Declaration on Education For All.* Retrieved December 17, 2012, from http://www.unesco.org/pv_obj_cache/pv_obj_id_760E13319F15E9160A7F66 913B4BBB7795A60400/filename/JOMTIE_E.PDF

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework on Special Needs Education UNESCO Paris.* Retrieved March 18 2010, from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2000). *Dakar Framework for Action.* UNESCO Paris.

United Nations Educational, Scientific, Cultural and Organization (UNESCO). (2008a). *The EFA Global Monitoring Report. Education for All by 2015. Will we make it?* Paris: UNESCO.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2008b). *Inclusive education: The way of the future.* International Conference Centre, (pp. 5–18). Geneva: UNESCO.

Van Rooyen, B., & Le Grange, L. (2003). Interpretive discourses in South Africa's Education White Paper No 6: Special Needs Education. *South African Journal of Education, 23*(2), 152–156.

Van Rooyen, B., Le Grange, L., & Newmark, R. (2004). (De)constructions of radical humanist discourses in South Africa's Education White Paper 6. *Perspectives in Education, 22*(1), 1–16.

Van Rooyen, B., Newmark, R., & Le Grange, L. (2003). (De)constructing systems discourses in South Africa's Education White Paper 6:Special Needs Education. *Acta Academica, 35*(1), 167–189.

Vayrynen, S. (2004). *Observations from South African classrooms: Some inclusive strategies.* SCOPE Project Report. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Villegas, A. M. (2007). Dispositions in teacher education: A look at social justice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(5), 370.

Vlachou, A. (2004). Education and inclusive policy-making: Implications for research and practice. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 8*(1), 3–21.

Wah, L. L. (2010). Different strategies for embracing inclusive dducation: A snap shot of individual cases from three countries. *International Journal of Special Education*, 98–109.

Walton, E. (2006). *The extent and practice of inclusion in independent schools (ISASA Members) in Southern Africa* (Doctoral thesis, University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa.

Walton, E. (2011). Getting inclusion right in South Africa. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 46*(4), 240–245.

Walton, E., & Lloyd, G. (2011). An analysis of metaphors used for inclusive education in South Africa. *Acta Academia, 43*(3), 1–31.

Walton, E., & Nel, N. (2012). What counts as inclusion? *Africa Education Review, 9*(1), 1–26.

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

Winzer, M and Mazurek, K , 2010. Including Students with Special Needs: Implications for Social Justice. In: *Globilization, Education and Social Justice.* Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 87-101.

www.sabje.co.za. (n.d.). Retrieved March 3, 2012, from http://www.sabje.co.za/

Appendix 1

Data Collection Instruments

Table of Contents:

Interviewing Schedule A - Teachers

Name of teacher:

School:

Gender:

How long have you been teaching?

How many years have you been at the school?

What grade/s and learning areas do you teach?

What other roles do you have at the school?

1. How do you understand inclusive education?

   a.   What does it mean?

   b.   How did you hear about it?

   c.   Where does it originate?

   d.   Why do you think it came about?

2. What experiences have you had regarding inclusive education?

   a. Describe an experience you had regarding inclusive education?

   b. Are you involved in inclusive education at your school?

3. How do you accommodate learners who experience barriers to learning?

   a. What methods do you employ in your classroom to accommodate learners who experience barriers to learning?

4. What challenges do you face when teaching learners who experience barriers to learning?

5. Has a belief system shaped your understanding?

6. What life experience shaped your understanding?

7. Is your school inclusive?

8. How has being in an inclusive school affected:

   a. Your teaching load?

   b. Your teaching methods?

   c. Your motivation?

   d. The philosophy at the school?

   e. The image of the school?

   f. The learners?

   g. Your relationship with colleagues?

9. Can you describe the change that has taken place at the school since the implementation of the inclusive education policy?

10. How has management dealt with the change?

11. How have the teachers responded to the change?

12. Has there been resistance to the change?

13. What has caused the resistance?

14. Who is resisting and what factors caused the resistance?

15. How has management dealt with the resistance?

16. Do you believe inclusion works?

17. Should learners with additional needs be at special schools?

18. Why?

19. What values and beliefs shaped this view?

20. What are the driving forces behind these values?

21. Do you think it is your responsibility to teach a diverse range of students?

22. Do you get encouragement from people in authority?

23. Do you know about the government policy of inclusive education? Do you accept and implement the policy?

24. Have you views towards inclusive education changed historically?

25. What are your beliefs regarding disability – pathognomic or interventionist perspective?

26. Do you get support from the learning support teachers?

27. Do you get feedback from management on your teaching?

28. Are you able to address the learning problems or difficulties to teach students?

29. How does your teaching style impact on your learners?

30. If a learner is having difficulty with a task what do you do?

31. Can you get through to most difficult learners?

33. What do you attribute the improved marks of your learners to?

34. What makes a learner master a new concept quickly?

35. What do you do when a learner becomes disruptive?

36. What are your expectations as a teacher?

37. What are or were your hopes as a teacher?

38. What caused you to change?

39. When and why did you make the shift?

40. Is your feeling congruent with your behavior?

Interviewing Schedule B - Parents

Name:

Gender:

Children's grades:

How many years have you been involved in the school?

What other role do you play in the school?

What made you bring you child/children to the school?

1. What is your understanding of inclusive education?

2. Do think the school is inclusive?

3. What brought about inclusive education?

4. Do your children receive support or enrichment?

5. What do you think about the process of inclusion?

6. Has inclusive education affected you as a parent?

7. Has inclusive education affected your child/children?

8. Has inclusive education affected the ethos of the school?

9. Has inclusive education affected the image of the school?

10. Has inclusive education affected the teachers at the school?

11. What do you think are the challenges facing inclusive education?

12. What is your role on the PTA?

13. What main issues are discussed in the PTA meetings?

14. What sort of school do you see King David Victory Park as?

15. Should this school serve the Jewish community as a whole or should it be seen as an academic institution?

16. What are the advantages and disadvantages of inclusive education?

17. Are you aware of inclusive education implementation in the classroom? Who is doing it and how is it done?

18. Are you aware of the teachers' attitudes towards inclusion?

19. We are in a period of change. What have you noticed during this period at the school?

20. Is there a need in the community for inclusive education?

21. Does the community want inclusive education?

22. Have you heard of WP6?

23. Do you think the values of the community are to include all regardless of difference?

24. What are your concerns as a parent and as a community member regarding inclusive education?

25. Could you explain the resistance of some community members.

26. Can you describe the school in terms of its attitudes and culture.

Interviewing Schedule C - Managers

Name:

Gender:

Position at the school:

How many years have you been teaching?

How many years at the school?

What are your duties at the school?

1. What do you understand by inclusive education?

2. Do you play a role in inclusive education at the school?

3. What role do you play inclusive education?

4. Have you been involved in special needs education during your career as a teacher?

5. What do you think of the process of inclusive education?

6. What are your concerns regarding inclusive education?

7. Describe your career path from your studies until now?

8. How has inclusive education at the school affected you as a principal/deputy/ head of Department in terms of:

   workload?

   motivation?

   training?

   relationship with members of staff/parents/director of the board/learners?

   you personally?

9. How have the attitudes of the teachers at the school changed since the process of inclusive education began?

10. Can you describe the change that has taken place at the school since the implementation of inclusive education policy?

11. How has management dealt with the change?

12. How have the teachers responded to the change?

13. Has there been resistance to the change?

14. What has caused the resistance?

15.Who is resisting and what factors caused the resistance?

16. How has management dealt with the resistance?

17. Do you believe inclusion works?

18. What values and beliefs shaped this view?

19. What are the driving forces behind these values?

20. Do you believe inclusion works?

21. Should learners with additional needs be at special schools?

22. Why?

23. What values and beliefs shaped this view?

24. What are the driving forces behind these values?

Interviewing Schedule D – Members of the Board

Name:

What is your position at the Board?

What are your responsibilities?

Why did you become involved?

1. What is your understanding of inclusive education?

2. What is your opinion of inclusive education?

3. What has your role been in inclusive education?

4. What are the short term goals of the schools regarding inclusive education?

5. What are the long term goals of the schools regarding inclusive education?

6. What are the main challenges facing inclusive education of the schools?

7. What opportunities do you see for successful implementation of inclusive education?

8. Are you aware that the implementation of inclusive education has affected School A
   in terms of:
   a. the school's finance
   b. attitudes of staff
   c. ethos of the school
   d. image of the school

9. Does the Board have a policy on inclusive education and does it vary from school to school?

10.If the aim is to give every Jewish child a Jewish education, how do you balance the policy of inclusion with this aim?

11. What roles do the principals play in inclusive education?

12. How do you balance your values as a rabbi with the realities and financial constraints in running an organization and how do you cope with this dilemma?

13. What are the challenges you face in your capacity as a rabbi who is concerned about your community and the realities and pressures of being CEO to this big organization?

14. When you make decisions what premises are they based on? Are you conflicted between your values and the organization's values?

15. Who drives the inclusion policy, is it you the boards members, the principals of the schools or the SENCO?

16. Have you experienced resistance from parents, teachers or learners to the inclusion policy and if so how did you handle it?

17. Why do you think there is resistance and if so how do you suggest it be handled?

18. What is your view on facilitation? Has it become a something that only the affluent can afford, what about the parent who cannot afford a facilitator? Should that child be afforded any support from the Board?

19. Would you support a foundation which raises funds for learners with additional needs at the school?

Appendix 2

Letters of introduction and consent

<u>Letter of Introduction to Principal</u>

A study of the understanding and practice of inclusive education in a monocultural Jewish community school in South Africa.

<u>Research conducted by:</u>

Mrs A Meltz(10385984)

0823321352

I am a Doctoral candidate at the University of Pretoria in the Department of Education Management and Policy Studies led by my supervisor, Dr Chaya Herman. My main research interest is individual and institutional educational change. More specifically, the research is how White Paper 6, Inclusive Education, has been implemented in the context of an independent, Jewish school. It will therefore not only serve to document a significant area in educational transformation, but also inform educational research of the practice of inclusive education.

The data for this research will be collected from February until November of 2011, subject to ethical clearance. For the purpose of this study, I would like to interview stakeholders from Board level, such as the Director, to the school level, that is management and teachers, as well as parents. As part of my study, I would like to observe a number of lessons in Grade 6-7 and give a worksheet for learners to complete. The purpose of the worksheet is to elicit responses to questions about how they value themselves academically and socially.

The interviews will be approximately 45 minutes and will take place after school hours at the convenience of the stakeholders. Some of the core questions are: How do you understand inclusive education? What experiences have you had regarding inclusive education? How do you accommodate learners who experience barriers to learning? What challenges do you face when teaching learners with barriers? The other method of collecting data is to analyse documents such as parent interviews, minutes of grade and case conferences and the policy documents of the school and board.

The research is under the scrutiny of rigorous academic safeguards to ensure discretion and the protection of individual privacy. The name of the school will not be mentioned and anonymity and confidentiality of all participants will be ensured. Every effort will be taken to ensure that sensitive information is handled with care and that no harm will come to any of the participants. I would appreciate it if I could enlist your permission for this research.

Sincerely

Adrienne Meltz

Supervisor _____

Date _____

220

Letter of Introduction and Informed Consent for participation in Academic Research

The understanding and practice of inclusive education in a monocultural Jewish community school in South Africa.

Research conducted by:
Mrs A B Meltz
0823321352

Dear Participant

You are invited to participate in an academic research study conducted by Adrienne Meltz, Doctoral student from the Department of Educational Management and Policy Studies at the University of Pretoria.

The purpose of the study is to examine how the policy of inclusive education has been implemented in a community school, how the various stakeholders have embodied inclusion and what the challenges are. This means describing your understanding of the concept of inclusion and how you manage inclusion.

- This study involves interviews. Your name will not appear and the answers you give will be treated as strictly confidential. You cannot be identified in person based on the answers you give. The personal information you provide will be treated confidentially and will only be used for the purposes of determining themes which suggest that experience, age or gender might change attitudes and understanding towards inclusive education.

- Your participation in this study is very important to us. You may however, choose not to participate and you may also stop participating at any time without any negative consequences.

- The results of the study will be used for academic purposes only and may be published in an academic journal. We will provide you with a summary of our findings on request. Please contact my supervisor, Dr Chaya Herman (012 420 5665) if you have any questions or comments regarding the study

Please sign the form to indicate that:

- You have read and understand the information provided above.
- You give your consent to participate in the study on a voluntary basis.

Signature: _____

Supervisor: _____

Date: _____

Informed Consent to be Interviewed

I …………………………………...……………consent to be individually interviewed by Adrienne Meltz for approximately 45-50 minutes.

I understand the following conditions:

- My participation in the interview is completely voluntary.

- I will not be in any way advantaged or disadvantaged by agreeing to be interviewed.

- The interviews are confidential.

- My direct quotes may be used but no information that could identify me will be included in the researcher's report.

- I have the right to withdraw from the study at any stage.

- I may refuse to answer any question/s during the interview which I would rather not answer.

…………………………………………..

(Signature)

Consent to be audio-recorded

I……………………………………………………………give consent for my individual interview with Adrienne Meltz to be audio-recorded.

I understand the following conditions:

- The tapes and full transcripts will only ever be in the researcher's or her supervisor's possession.
- All audio tapes will be destroyed by the researcher after she has obtained her degree.
- No information that may identify me will be included in the transcripts or research report; however my direct quotes may be used.

…………………………………….

(Signature)