

https://dspace.org/

Inclusive Practice in South Africa: A Deaf Education Perspective

Peel, Emma Louise

2006-03-22
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/265

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Master of Education by Dissertation

(Deaf Education)

"Inclusive Practice in South Africa: A Deaf Education Perspective"

Emma Louise Peel

Student Number: 010 4160 G

A Dissertation submitted to the School of Human and Community Development, Discipline of Special Education, Deaf Education, The University of the Witwatersrand, in the fulfilment of the degree of Master of Education.

Johannesburg, 2004

DECLARATION

This dissertation is my own unaided original work, unless specified to the contrary in the text. It is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education by dissertation at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any other degree or examination at any other university.

_____

Emma Louise Peel

Johannesburg 2004

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr Claudine Storbeck for her encouragement, motivation and many hours of hard work. I would also like to thank Judith Inglis for sharing her knowledge and materials as well as for her support and insight.

Thanks also to my husband, Kevin and my parents Anne and Derek Coop for all their love and patience.

To all the principals in schools for the Deaf who participated in my study, thank you for your honesty and willingness to complete my questionnaire and thus provide me with valuable information.

Lastly to all the Deaf children that I have taught, you are a constant reminder of why I am so passionate about the education and upliftment of Deaf children, thank you.

ABSTRACT

In accordance with Education policy post 1994 there is currently a move in South Africa toward implementing an inclusive approach to educating learners who experience barriers to learning into regular/mainstream schools. Such an inclusive philosophy is considered, at policy level, to be the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building an inclusive society and achieving education for all (Department of Education, 2001). From an inclusive viewpoint, it is important that all learners are given the best education possible from an academic, emotional and social perspective and emphasis is placed on, educating the whole child by meeting individual needs through the identification and accommodation of any barriers to learning. Within such an education and training system, it is important that Deaf learners are not excluded and that the practice of inclusion takes into account the needs of all Deaf learners.

The intention of this research project is to provide an accurate account of the current situations in schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa with regards to barriers to learning and development. It will examine whether these schools, currently, foster the ideals of inclusion as made explicit in White Paper Six (Department of Education, 2001). This thesis will also investigate whether Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf, have access to the most appropriate, least restrictive barrier free education. In order to achieve this, a questionnaire, based on the barriers to learning and development as identified by the above-mentioned document, was sent by post to every principal working in schools for the Deaf in South Africa. In addition, the research intends to determine whether barriers to learning and development are presently being experienced by Deaf learners in current schools for the Deaf and if so, what barriers are being experienced and how these barriers can be addressed and prevented so that Deaf learners be accommodated in a manner that promotes a school environment that is most appropriate and least restrictive for Deaf learners.

From the findings it was revealed that schools for the Deaf do not foster inclusive principles as many Deaf learners experience barriers to learning and development as identified in White Paper 6 (Department of Education, 2001: 7 & 18) within schools for the Deaf. To address the barriers found in the findings of the study, this dissertation provides recommendations to assist principals with strategies and information necessary for transforming schools for the Deaf in order to become inclusive and thus provide Deaf learners with access to the most appropriate, least restrictive education possible.

KEY WORDS AND PHRASES

AC's	Assessment Criteria
Barriers:	External and internal factors that prevent learners from reaching their full potential
C2005	Curriculum 2005
CODA's	Children of Deaf Adults
Deaf:	A linguistic minority group and cultural group who refer to themselves as 'Deaf'.
deaf:	A lower case 'd' will be used when referring to the auditory hearing impairment.
Deaf Community	A group of Deaf individuals who use Sign Language, share Deaf Culture, fight for the rights of Deaf people
DEAFSA	Deaf Federation of South Africa
DES	Department of Education and Science
FM systems	Frequency Modulation Systems
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
INSET	In -Service Education Training
LEA	Local Education Authorities
NCESS	National Committee for Education Support Services
NCSNET	National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
OBE	Outcomes Based Education
PRESET	Pre-Service Education Training
RNCS	Revised National Curriculum Statement
Schools for the Deaf	Schools using Sign Language as medium of instruction for teaching and learning
SAFCD	South African Federal Council on Disability
SASL	South African Sign Language
SEN	Special Education Needs
SO's	Specific Outcomes
UNESCO	United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation

CONTENTS

DECLARATION …… i)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS …….. ii)

ABSTRACT ……. iii)

KEY WORDS AND PHRASES …… …….v)

LIST OF FIGURES ……vii)

CHAPTER ONE
RATIONALE AND SUMMARY OF CHAPTERS ……2

1.1 Introduction …… 2

1.2 Rationale …… 3

1.3 Outline of Chapters ……... 5

CHAPTER TWO
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK ……..8

2.1 Paradigms on Deafness ……9

2.1.1 Clinical Pathological Paradigm ……..9
2.1.2 Socio-Cultural Paradigm ……..11

2.2 Differences Between Mainstreaming and Inclusion ……...12
2.2.1 Mainstreaming and Integration …….. 12
2.2.2 Inclusion ……13

2.3 Communication Options for Deaf Learners ……14
2.3.1 Oral-Aural Approach ……... 14
2.3.2 Manulism …… 16
2.3.3 Total Communication ……... 17
2.3.4 Bilingual-Bicultural Model ……. 19

2.4 Global Influences in Deaf Education ……21
2.4.1 The Milan Congress of 1880 ……..22
2.4.2 The Salamanca Statement of 1994 ……24

CHAPTER THREE
LITERATURE REVIEW …….. 27

3.1 Educational Trends in the United States of America ……...27

3.2 Educational Trends in the United Kingdom ……30

3.3 Deaf Education Trends in South Africa …… 32

3.4 Policies, Document and the Implementation of Inclusion in South Africa …… 33

3.5 Schools for the Deaf in South Africa ……39

CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY ……45

4.1 Qualitative and Quantitative Research ……45

4.2 Data Collection …… 47
4.2.1 Primary Data Sources ……... 47
4.2.2 The Questionnaire ……... 47
4.2.3 Secondary Data Sources ……... 49

4.3 Data Collection Used in this Study ……49

4.4 Data Analysis …… 50
4.4.1 Data Coding, Reduction and Analysis ……50

4.5 Ethical Considerations ……... 52

4.6 Limitations of this Study ……... 54

CHAPTER FIVE
BARRIERS, RESEARCH FINDINGS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS …55

5.1 Barriers to Learning and Development ……..55

5.2 Research Findings, Discussions and Recommendations ……...56
5.2.1 Provincial Location of Schools for the Deaf ……57
5.2.2 Response Rate of Schools ……..58
5.2.3 Number of Educators and Learners …….. 59
5.2.4 Grades and Level of Education Offered ……60
5.2.5 Number of School Leavers and Standard of Education Departing with …… 61
5.2.6 Number of Hearing verses Number of Deaf Qualified Educators & Deaf Community Involvement…… 67
5.2.7 Perceived Fluency in SASL and Access to SASL Classes for Educators …….71
5.2.8 Are Learners with Special Education Needs being Accommodated……... 75
5. 2.9 Are any Educators Trained to Educate Deaf Learners? ……...78
5.2.10 Training of Educators, Implementation & Adaptations needed for Deaf Learners in C2005 …… 80
5.2.11 Do Current Policies & Legislation Reflect the Strengths & Needs of Deaf Learners? ……..88
5.2.12 Rate of Parental Involvement and Governing Body ……...92
5.2.13 Would Staff Benefit from In-Service Training? ……95

5.3 General Recommendations ……... 98
5.3.1 Inaccessible and Unsafe Build Environments ……98
5.3.2 Research …… 99
5.3.3 Early Identification and Intervention …… 100
5.3.4 Community Based Support ……. 101

CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSION …… 103

ADDENDUM A: COVERING/PERMISSION LETTER ……... 107

ADDENDUM B: QUESTIONNAIRE ……... 108

ADDENDUM C: SCHOOLS INCLUDED IN THIS STUDY ……...110

REFERENCES …… 111

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure number 1:	The Deafness Continuum	...10
Figure number 2:	Provincial Distributions of Schools	... 34
Figure number 3:	Provincial Number of Schools	57
Figure number 4:	Response Rate of Schools	...58
Figure number 5	Number of Deaf Learners per Province	59
Figure number 6	Number of Educators per Province	60
Figure number 7	Highest Level of Education Offered	...61
Figure number 8	Total Number of Senior School Leavers	... 63
Figure number 9	Number of Deaf verses Hearing Qualified Educators	68
Figure number 10	Capacity of Deaf Adults	69
Figure number 11	Perceived Fluency in SASL	72
Figure number 12	Overall Relevance of C2005 Training to Deaf Education	...80
Figure number 13	Implementation of C2005	... 82
Figure number 14	Present Policies & Legislation Reflect Strengths & Needs	88
Figure number 15	Parental Involvement	93

CHAPTER ONE
RATIONALE AND SUMMARY OF CHAPTERS

1.1 Introduction

Since 1994 South Africa has undergone extensive political changes in an attempt to redress discrimination, segregation and injustices of the Apartheid rule. Under the new constitution, all South Africans are now seen as having equal rights and status in society. The changes accompanying democratic transformation have had a ripple affect on the education system in our country, which has moved from one of segregation and discrimination on the basis of race, gender, disability etc. to a unified, centralised, national system of education aimed at meeting the needs of all learners in South Africa (Department of Education, 2001: Introduction). In the quest to establish a democratic, free, just and nondiscriminatory society, education policy has moved toward promoting the inclusion of learners with special educational needs into 'regular' schools. The rationale for this being the ideological belief that an inclusive education system would serve as

> the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building an inclusive society and achieving education for all, moreover they provide an effective education to the majority of children and improve the efficiency and ultimately the cost-effectiveness of the entire education system (UNESCO, 1994: ix).

The proposed single, unified, inclusive education system as set out in White Paper 6 (Department of Education, 2001) in South Africa is a radical attempt at re-dressing the inequalities of the past education system. However placement of Deaf learners into hearing schools needs to be examined carefully in order to prevent exclusion and barriers to their learning and development from occurring within an inclusive ideal.

As it appears, inclusion that promotes non-discriminatory practices with regard to language and culture is a contested area when it comes to deafness. On the one hand, hearing educators regard Deaf learners as having a special need, which they are not equipped to deal with. On the other hand, the Deaf community regards deafness not as a special need, but rather as a linguistic/cultural issue. The author of this research agrees with the Deaf communities approach and regards Deaf learners not as being disabled but as being capable of achieving anything that hearing learners are able to as long as they are provided with access to Sign Language. Having said this, however, the author needs to make explicit that she does not believe that all learners who are Deaf, deaf or Hearing Impaired must be forced to attend schools for the Deaf. Rather that parents of these children must be given access to

information about each differing educational and communication option so that they are able to make informed decisions as to the most appropriate educational placement and communication method for their child.

1.2 Rationale

After many years under Apartheid governance, South Africa committed itself to *democracy for all* in 1994. In line with constitutional principles of equality and equity, democratic transformation of South African have been strongly reflected in education policies for all sectors of the country in an attempt to transform the South African education system from one of "total inadequacy" (Donald, Lazarus & Lolwana, 2002: 297) and discrimination on the basis of disability, culture, language, race, etc. to an inclusive system that aims to meet the unique and diverse needs of *ALL* South African learners.

From an inclusive perspective, even though government policy recognizes Deaf learners as learners with special educational needs due to the nature of their disability (Department of Education, 2001), the Deaf community objects to this method of classification of need. The Deaf community does not categorize Deaf learners as a special needs or disabled group but rather as a linguistic and cultural minority group who use Sign Language and share Deaf culture. This is a vital distinction to make as to many hearing people, Deaf learners are perceived as having a barrier to learning due to their inability to hear. From the perspective of the Deaf community, however, it is believed that the barriers Deaf learners experience within the education system come from the inappropriate ability of hearing people to accommodate their linguistic and cultural needs. This has important implications for how inclusion is conceptualised and implemented at a school and classroom level as inclusive education is not simply about reforming special education, and an inclusive school is not simply one that includes and educates some disabled learners.

> Rather, inclusive education is about reducing all types of barriers to learning and developing ordinary schools, which are capable of meeting the needs of all learners. It is, indeed, part of a wider movement towards a more just society for all citizens (UNESCO, 2002:22).

Having one unified, inclusive education system in South Africa is important in re-dressing the inequalities of the past education system and preventing barriers to learning and development. According to White Paper 6 (Department of Education, 2001) barriers to learning and development may arise from both intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Intrinsic barriers include blindness, physical disabilities etc. while extrinsic barriers may arise due to negative attitudes to and stereotyping of differences; an inflexible curriculum; inappropriate languages or language of learning and teaching; inappropriate communication; inaccessible and unsafe built environments;

inappropriate and inadequate support services; inadequate policies and legislation; non-recognition and non-involvement of parents; inadequately and inappropriately trained education managers and educators (Department of Education, 2001: 7 & 18).

White Paper Six, Building an Inclusive Education and Training System (Department of Education, 2001), clearly states that learners are to be educated in the most appropriate, least restrictive environment, where barriers to their learning and development will be prevented. Professor Kader Asmal, the previous minister of Education clearly stated that, "Special schools will be strengthened rather than abolished" (Department of Education, 2001:3). Emphasis on the creation of 'least restrictive environments for learning' allow for inclusive education to focus on individual learners and the type of environment that will best suit her, rather than forcing the learner to change to fit into the environment. A further focus of inclusive education is to provide education provision and support for learners with diverse needs. In addition, an inclusive education system acknowledges that when learners have needs that will not or cannot feasibly be adequately met in a 'regular' classroom [1], they should be given the option of remaining in "vastly improved special schools" (Department of Education, 2001:3) where individual needs will be best accommodated.

Findings from research into Deaf education have shown that placing Deaf learners along side their hearing peers in 'regular' classrooms may cause barriers to their learning and development, as deafness itself is not a special need but rather a language issue (Foster, 1999; Johnson & Cohen, 1994, Livingston, 1997; Stinson & Antia, 1999). From this perspective Deaf learners should be educated in separate schools using South African Sign Language as the medium for teaching and learning. UNESCO's 1999 report proposes that if schools for the Deaf follow the policy of inclusion which emphasizes eliminating barriers to learning in a supportive environment then these schools may be the most appropriate, least restrictive, barrier free educational option for Deaf learners in South Africa. This would result in Deaf learners remaining in schools for the Deaf and not being required to move to a more broadly inclusive hearing schools based on the condition that these schools best serve Deaf learners needs.

Presently there is little information available about the current educational situation in schools for the Deaf particularly with regard to White Paper 6's broad definition of current barriers to learning and development specifically with regard to an inflexible curriculum and assessment policies. White Paper 6 states that,

[1] The author believes that there are no 'regular' learners or classrooms as each learner is an individual with differing strengths and weaknesses.

> barriers to learning arise from within the various interlocking parts of the curriculum, such as the content of learning programmes, the language and medium of learning and teaching, the management and organization of classrooms, teaching style and pace, time frames for completion of curricular, the materials and equipment that are available, and assessment methods and techniques (Department of Education, 2001:32).

The aim of this research is to provide an in-depth view of the current situation in schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa, examining whether they follow and/or apply the principles of inclusion as set out in White Paper 6 (Department of Education, 2001).

The following section provides an overview of the content of each chapter of the research

1.3 Outline of Chapters

This section provides a summary of the content to be covered in each chapter of this study.

Chapter Two situates current debates around Deaf education. It provides information about two differing paradigms on deafness, the Clinical-Pathological and the Socio-Cultural Paradigms and explores how these two paradigms sit on opposite ends of the deafness pendulum with regard to the education of Deaf learners. The chapter also looks at differences between mainstreaming and inclusion, as well as issues relating to mainstreaming, inclusion and integration which are examined with information and examples taken from the United States of America, the United Kingdom and South African Schools for the Deaf. Following this, the chapter explores the differing linguistic modes of communication available to Deaf learners in South Africa, namely the Oral/Aural approach, Total Communication, Manualism and the Bilingual-Bicultural approach, which are each influenced by either the clinical-pathological or socio-cultural paradigms.

In conclusion, this chapter explores global influences in Deaf education and highlights two events, which have resulted in dramatic influences on the education of both learners with special needs and more specifically the education of Deaf learners throughout the world. The first event is the Milan Congress of 1880, which had a significant impact on promoting the use of Sign Language and on promoting the use of Deaf educators in schools for the Deaf. The second event is the World Conferences on Special Needs Education, held in Salamanca, 1994, which lead to the adoption of inclusive education globally.

Chapter Three begins by providing a brief history of the trends in the education of Deaf learners in the United States of America and the United Kingdom and the move towards the inclusion of

Deaf learners into 'regular' classes in these countries. Documents such as the 1978 Warnock Report (DES, 1978a), the American Passage of Public Law (PL) 94-142 (142nd Public Law passed by the 94th congress), otherwise known as the 'Education of All Handicapped Children Act', the United Kingdoms 1997 policy of inclusion for all learners including the Deaf known as DfEE, and the Salamanca Statement on Principles, Policy and Practice in Special Needs Education (UNESCO, 1994) have been used as a base. Links have been made to the global influences discussed in chapter two as these impacted on the education of Deaf learners throughout the world.

The remaining section of the chapter is devoted to giving an in-depth account of the educational trends in South Africa with specific focus on education policy promoting the inclusion of learners with special needs into 'regular' classrooms with their non-disabled peers. It identifies the barriers to learning and development that learners experienced under the past education system, (Department of Education, 2001), and supplements this information with specific reference to Deaf learners from the following documents:

a) Report of the National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training (NCSNET) and the National Committee for Education Support Services (NCESS) *Quality Education for All: Overcoming Barriers to Learning and Development* of 1997 (Department of Education).
b) UNESCO's 1999 *Consultation Report: Inclusive Education and the Deaf Child in South Africa*
c) Department of Education (2001), *White Paper 6 Special Needs Education: Building an Inclusive Education and Training System*
d) UNESCO's 2002 *Open File on Inclusive Education.*
e) Department of Education (2002), *Curriculum 2005 Assessment Guidelines for Inclusion*
f) Department of Education (2002), *Draft Guidelines for the Implementation of Inclusive Education (Second Draft)*
g) DEAFSA's 2003 *Memorandum to the National and Provincial Departments of Education*

From this background, the history of Deaf education in South Africa is related as well as the move towards the consideration of inclusion as an option for Deaf learners in South African schools. This chapter places specific emphasis on educational matters of language of instruction, teaching and learning practices and educational placements.

Chapter Four covers issues relating to the research design and methodology for this study and includes information on the differences between qualitative and quantitative research, data

collection including both primary and secondary data sources, data analysis, ethical considerations and the limitations of this study.

Chapter Five provides the reader with insight into the barriers to learning and development as made explicit in White Paper 6 (Department of Education, 2001). After which information regarding the findings from the completed questionnaires, a discussion around these findings and a conclusion and summary of the research in which recommendations for further research will be addressed.

Chapter Six provides a conclusion where a summary of the study as well as information regarding whether schools for the Deaf are inclusive and provide Deaf learners with access to the most appropriate, least restrictive barrier free education will be provided.

CHAPTER TWO
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

> Before you make any decision about how you're going to educate or how you're going to allow your deaf child to live, you make sure you get as much information as you possibly can (Luckner & Muir, 2001:79).

Research has shown that more than ninety percent of Deaf children are born into hearing families, many of whom, have had no previous contact with Deaf people (Johnson; Liddell & Erting 1989; Rawlings 1973). Many of the remaining ten percent of Deaf learners are able to acquire Sign Language, via interaction and communicating with other Deaf family members. This small percentage of Deaf learners has access to the information that is critical for those aspects of normal socio-emotional development and first language development (Johnson, Liddell & Erting, 1989).

The way in which we view deafness has a direct influence on how educators see and educate Deaf learners, which is why it is crucial that those involved in Deaf education are aware of the theory behind each method of instruction and communication option available to Deaf learners. This is because it is necessary to make choices and decisions regarding the most appropriate form of education based on the individual needs of each Deaf learner. One needs to look at every Deaf learner as an individual and examine which teaching and language style would best suit her. As with hearing learners, Deaf learners are unique, with differing strengths and weaknesses, which need to be strengthened for optimal learning and development. It is important that we provide Deaf learners with the most appropriate, least restrictive, barrier free education in order that they are provided with the opportunity and access to reach their full potential.

This chapter provides a theoretical foundation relevant to research into Deaf education. It begins with an account of two differing views on deafness, the clinical-pathological and socio-cultural paradigms. These two paradigms directly influence the way in which people view deafness and decide on the types of educational options that will be provided for Deaf learners within particular schools. For example, Oral schools for the deaf are generally influenced by the clinical-pathological paradigm, while some schools for the Deaf use Sign Language as the medium of instruction in accordance with the socio-cultural paradigm of deafness. Both paradigms will be examined with regard to language choices and differing educational approaches.

2.1 Paradigms on Deafness

A paradigm can be defined as, "a model, theory, perception, assumption, or frame of reference" (Covey, 1992:23). A paradigm is the way we view the world around us, not visually, but rather how we perceive, understand and interpret things. "Paradigms are the source of our attitudes and behaviours. We cannot act with integrity outside of them" (Covey, 1992:28). Naiker adds that paradigms "include not only thinking, ways of seeing and evaluative judgments, but also, crucially, practices" (2000:5). Thus, the paradigms to which people ascribe regarding deafness will influence the way they view, treat and educate Deaf learners. Due to this, it is important that we understand what different paradigms advocate in order to ensure that the one we follow in South Africa is one, which promotes successful learning amongst Deaf learners, rather than one, which has the potential to create barriers to success.

The first area of investigation is the clinical-pathological paradigm. This will be followed by the socio-cultural paradigm on deafness. These two paradigms are located on opposite ends of the deafness continuum as seen in the figure on the following page.

2.1.1 The Clinical-Pathological Paradigm

The clinical-pathological paradigm of deafness is also known as the Medical Model or the Deficit Model. This model

> has focused on disabled people's impairments and has explained the difficulties they experience in their lives in terms of those impairments. This medical model sees disability as a 'personal tragedy', which limits the capacity of the disabled person to participate in the mainstream of society
> (UNESCO, 2002:21).

From such a perspective is it the responsibility of 'disabled person' to adapt to and fit into the world. In other words, a person who is deaf needs to find a way of fitting in to the hearing world, a world that does not accommodate him or her. This approach towards 'disability' was, according to the UNESCO report, developed by "non-disabled people to meet the needs of non-disabled people" (UNESCO, 2002:21).

People, who locate themselves within the clinical pathological paradigm, are normally hearing people who view hearing people as being the norm, and who believe that those differing from the norm (hearing) have a deficit that needs to be fixed. From this perspective, a deaf person's inability to hear is viewed in a negative light and seen as a deficit. In addition, from a clinical-pathological perspective, a group of deaf/hearing impaired persons are frequently regarded as being 'doubly handicapped' as it is believed that they experience learning and psychological




Figure Number 1: The Deafness Continuum

problems due to their hearing loss and communication difficulties (Levine, 1965; Davis & Silverman, 1960). Working from a clinical-pathological paradigm, deaf learners are seen as disabled because they cannot hear and are defined as "a minority group composed of hearing-impaired persons who are treated in certain negative ways by the hearing majority" (Baker-Shenk & Cokely, 1980:54)

According to Baker-Shenk and Cokely (1980), people who hold this view, see deaf people as lacking in something (hearing) and how they are different from the norm and believe that society needs to assist the deaf in becoming as "normal" as possible. Accordingly, educational practices and interventions place huge emphasis on "remedying the deficiencies of deafness- for example, speech, language, and literacy" (Paul & Quigley, 1990:6).

The Medical Model is problematic in its views of 'disability' as it locates differences within the learner and perceives their inability to hear as something to be 'made right'. This perspective regards hearing loss as a societal deficit and does not account for diversity that is 'clinically' or 'medically' based. Accordingly, Deaf learners are "excluded from regular education schools and such exclusion immediately results in the perception of such people as inadequate human beings who are unfit to be included in mainstream economic and social life" (Engelbrecht, Green, Naiker & Engelbrecht, 1999:13).

Many specialised education systems (including schools for the Deaf) have been founded by people viewing deafness from the clinical-pathological paradigm (religious orders etc) where the aim was to both 'convert' and 'help' Deaf learners. Unfortunately, such a view of deafness assisted in promoting hearing people's understanding of Deaf learners as being "in need of assistance, as objects of pity, and eternally dependent on others … underachievers and people who are in need of institutional care and thus special schooling (Engelbrecht, Green, Naiker & Engelbrecht, 1999:14). From a clinical-pathological paradigm, it is clear that decisions affecting 'disabled' people are made by 'non-disabled' people who place themselves in a position of power, which subsequently results in the 'non-disabled' individuals assuming authority over those who are 'disabled' thus disempowering the 'disabled' further. When Deaf learners are regarded as being disabled, reliant on hearing people, and not being able to achieve the same outcomes as hearing learners *negative attitudes to and stereotyping of difference* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18).result in the creation of barriers to learning.

The next section explores a contrasting perspective of how deafness is perceived from within a socio-cultural paradigm.

2.1.2 Socio-Cultural Paradigm

At the other end of the deafness continuum is the socio-cultural paradigm, also known as the Social Model of disability. Within this paradigm, the focus of disability has shifted from that of "the 'personal tragedy' of the individual towards the way in which social environment within which the disabled have to live acts to exclude them from full participation" (UNESCO, 2002:21).

Within the socio-cultural paradigm, Deaf people are seen as members of a linguistic minority group sharing a strong identity, a common language (Sign Language) and a unique culture (Deaf culture). According to Schlesinger and Meadow (1972:16) deafness viewed through the lens of this paradigm can be defined as "a group of persons who share a common means of communication (signs) which provide the basis for group cohesion and identity." Woodward and Markowicz state that it is "a group of persons who share a common language and a common culture" (1975:32). The attitude of people who work from a socio-cultural paradigm believe that the Deaf community should be accepted and respected as a separate cultural group having its own values and language, Sign Language. The Deaf are proud to be part of the Deaf community and thus refer to themselves as a unique linguistic and cultural group. For this reason they refer to themselves as 'Deaf' with a capital 'D' to distinguish themselves as a separate linguistic and cultural group in the same way that all other linguistic and cultural groups such as the French, the Chinese, the Portuguese etc. are named with an upper case letter, indicating the use of a proper noun for identification. The use of the capital 'D' also distinguishes Deaf people from other individuals who experience hearing loss but who do not form part of the Deaf culture or who do not use the language of the 'Deaf' namely Sign Language.

If educators of Deaf learners view Deaf learners as being a part of a linguistic and cultural minority group who are able to achieve the same outcomes as hearing learners, and not as a disabled, they may prevent the barrier caused by *negative attitudes to and stereotyping of difference* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18) from occurring.

In the following section the differences between mainstreaming and inclusion are examined, how in general mainstreaming has its roots in the clinical-pathological paradigm while inclusion is influenced by the socio-cultural paradigm. An overview of inclusion will then be given from both an international and South African perspective.

2.2. Differences between Mainstreaming and Inclusion

In order to understand why this research has a clear focus on exploring issues related to inclusive practice in South Africa from a Deaf perspective, a clear distinction between mainstreaming and inclusion needs to be made as each will fit into a different paradigm on how learners with special needs are seen.

2.2.1. Mainstreaming and Integration

Mainstreaming is linked to the concept of integration where children with disabilities have contact with their non-disabled peers (Clark et al., 1997; Dyson, 1997b; Murphy, 1996). Mainstreaming

has its roots in the desire to see disabled and differently abled learners 'fit into' an already existing education system as a reaction against isolation. The intentions of this approach are good however mainstreaming of learners who are Deaf perpetuates the view held by subscribers to the Medical Model of disability that regards learners as 'lacking' in one or more areas, which then need to be changed in order that the individual be able to function within the 'normal' system of education. From this example, it is clear that mainstreaming (specifically without ongoing relevant curricula support) is influenced by the clinical-pathological paradigm of Deafness. Mainstreaming is about providing learners who are perceived as 'different' with added support to enable them to adjust into the 'normal' routine of the system. Specialised medical professionals assess learners with special learning needs (including the Deaf), diagnose and prescribe assistive devices such as hearing aids, cochlea implants, FM (Frequency Modulation) systems etc all which correspond with the assistive devises promoted within the clinical-pathological paradigm as described in Figure 1. Within mainstreaming, the educational focus is centered on the changes that need to take place within the learner so that he or she is able to adapt to the 'norm'.

The underlying idea with mainstreaming and integration is that separate settings are linked to difference and that differing from the norm is linked to abnormality (Artiles, 1989). While mainstreaming Deaf students provides opportunities for interaction between both Deaf and hearing students, these interactions do not guarantee social integration. The physical proximity and integration does not sufficiently ensure social integration. Additionally "familiarity or permanent contact with a person with special educative needs is not always enough to reduce the sense of stigmatisation" (Cambra, 2002:38).

2.2.2 Inclusion

Within an inclusive education setting, the educational focus is on how best to accommodate the needs of individual learners within a classroom setting rather than forcing the individual to conform to the educational environment, which may be highly unsuitable to their particular needs. "The emphasis for change is directed towards the system and its environment rather than the learner" (Department of Education, 2001:1) and to accommodation rather than remediation of special needs. Within an inclusive paradigm, the educator is encouraged to focus on what an individual learner is able to do rather than what she is unable to achieve in a learner-centered environment. Further, an inclusive education philosophy encompasses the belief that all learners have the right to learn in the medium of instruction that is best suited to them and that curricular activities including learning style and pace, content of learning materials, methods of assessment, etc. are central to the success of inclusivity within education.

Having viewed the different approaches to educating learners with special educational needs, and having identified the fact that the predominant barrier to learning in education for Deaf learners is one of language and communication, the following section examines a number of communication options currently used within schools for the Deaf or hard of hearing.

2.3 Communication Options for Deaf Learners

The debate over which is the most beneficial route to follow in the education of Deaf learners is ongoing both within South Africa and around the world. In this section differing linguistic modes of communication available to Deaf learners in South Africa will be examined beginning with the oral-aural approach.

2.3.1 Oral-Aural Approach

The Oral-Aural approach to the education of deaf learners emphasises auditory skills and aims to teach deaf children to speak so that they are able to communicate with the hearing world. The Oral-Aural approach has as its focus teaching deaf children to develop listening skills through speech and language therapy that focuses on residual hearing using assistive devises. These may include hearing aids, FM systems (Frequency Modulation) and Cochlea Implants. This approach strives to make the most of a child's listening abilities as well as encourages lip-reading skills. Oralists believe that deaf children will acquire spoken languages through seeing and 'hearing' them, and "that this language acquisition will lead to more complete integration with the hearing world" (Johnson, Liddell & Erting, 1989:4). No manual communication is used and the child is discouraged from relying on visual cues. This may have a negative effect on the learner's cognitive development as they cannot communicate adequately with each other or hearing adults and therefore do not have access to general cultural knowledge and socio-emotional experiences (Johnson, Liddell & Erting, 1989). Some activists for this approach forbid the use of gesture. They believe that the deaf child's "ears are his input, not his eyes. If you want to make use of his residual hearing as primary input, additional visual input will detract from that. It will confuse his understanding more" (Schmulian, 2002:33). If the child gestures, activists believe one should repeat what the child has gestured in the spoken form (Schmulian, 2002).

While some oralists are firmly convinced that 'spoken' language is the best form of communication for deaf learners, some researchers believe that once deaf children have established a sound foundation of spoken language, they should be given the choice to learn Sign Language which would then allow them mobility across both hearing and Deaf communities. Supporters of this idea believe that the best way to promote spoken language is by means of residual hearing and this must be encouraged as soon as possible through the use of hearing aids

and Cochlea implants. Accordingly early identification and diagnosis of the child's hearing loss and remedial therapy is crucial.

Many parents who send their children to Oral schools for the deaf are influenced by the clinical-pathological paradigm. These parents chose this educational route for reasons such as wanting their deaf child to be able to communicate with them and the hearing world. They want their child to gain communication competence which can be defined as "how to say something, when to say it, and to whom to say it" (Schmulian, 2002:27). This is a skill that cannot be taught but which is rather developed via "routine, everyday play and caregiving activities to enjoy, share, request, assist, inform and/or learn about the world" (Schmulian, 2002:28). Parents who regard their child's deafness as a deficit want their child to achieve things that the child would achieve if she had not been born with a hearing loss and this, they feel, is achieved by having fluent speaking abilities. They want their child to grow up into a fully independent adult who does not need to depend on the help of another person. Interestingly, parents choosing the Oral route for their child believe that their child has "the same innate wiring to acquire spoken language that a normally hearing child has" (Schmulian, 2002:29) which is a misconception.

Deaf learners who do succeed in Oral programmes only do so by devoting large amounts of time on developing reliable lipreading and speech skills. As discussed earlier the use of residual hearing is encouraged through the use of cochlea implants and hearing aids, which are extremely expensive. Speech and language therapy that accompanies these assistive devises are both costly and time consuming, and require ongoing commitment from the educator, child and parent.

Johnson, Liddell and Erting believe that Oralism as a means of educating deaf children has failed, as at the end of intensive oral-aural therapy, children who are deaf still cannot hear and are limited in their ability to communicate with hearing or deaf individuals as "only a small part of the spoken English signal may be comprehended visually" (1989:4). Johnson, Liddell and Erting further state that, "competent lip reading requires prior knowledge of the language and being able to use that knowledge to supply missing information" (1989:4). If educators follow the Oral/Aural approach with deaf learners they will create a barrier to effective communication due to the inappropriate use of language for communication or teaching and learning.

To conclude, the primary goal of this approach is to develop speech through the use of aided hearing alone, and communication skills needed for integration into the hearing community. This belief is in direct contrast to the beliefs of those who follow the Manual method of communication who conversely believe that only once Deaf learners have a firm foundation in

Sign Language are they ready to be exposed to a written form of a spoken language via the Bilingual-Bicultural approach. This will be discussed in detail later in this chapter in the section.

2.3.2 Manualism

Manualism is an approach which supports the use of Sign Language which is formed in the visual/gestural modality and which uses space rather than sound produced using the upper body, and hands and face (Petitto, 1994; Bellugi, 1980; Klima & Bellugi, 1979; Stokoe, 1974). Manualism like the socio-cultural paradigm, is placed on the opposite end of the communication method/approach pendulum. Where Oralism developed from the clinical-pathological paradigm, Manualism developed within the socio-cultural paradigm.

According to followers of the socio-cultural paradigm of deafness, Signed languages demonstrate that the human capacity for language is not bound by physical impairment and suggest that language is in the brain and may be expressed by humans in more that one modality. Further, it is believed that Deaf learners whose learning context is mediated by signed language will have the same access as hearing learners whose context is mediated by spoken language. A number of researchers have given credence to Sign Language claiming that it is entirely capable of being used as a medium of instruction from birth to tertiary-level (Petitto, 1994; Klima & Bellugi, 1979, Stokoe, 1974). Further linguistic evidence demonstrates that signed languages are fully-fledged languages entirely capable of expressing all the nuances of meaning that all spoken languages can express (Bellugi, 1989; Petitto, 1984; Aarons & Akach, 1999:8).

Natural signed languages provide a perfect demonstration of the human capacity for language, as they have a linguistic structure quite as complex as any other human language. They have their own independent grammar and can be used for everything that spoken languages may be used for. Sign Language has arisen through use by a community of users (Deaf community). Sign Language is acquired at the same rate as other human languages and like other spoken languages are subject to change and systematic variation as a result of social factors (Storbeck & Morgans, 2002; Aarons & Akach, 1999; Petitto, 1984; Bellugi, 1980; Stokoe 1960). According to Webster and Wood exposure to Sign Language for individuals who are deaf can lead to “much richer and earlier patterns of language interaction, less frustration and less isolation” (1989: 17).

Having said this the author of this research firmly believes that for Deaf learners Sign Language should be used as the language of all teaching and leaning, not only because it is the language most Deaf people are comfortable with, but also because many Deaf learners leaving schools for the Deaf using Oralist principles face barriers, not mentioned in White paper 6 (Department of

Education, 2001), of not being able to read and write at the same levels as many hearing people, and being unaware of some issues in hearing culture.

From informal interviews, personal experience and observation, it is thought that these barriers may be caused by the following: firstly they may stem from a belief among educators that Deaf learners are not able to achieve the same literacy outcomes as hearing learners (thus the barriers *negative attitudes to and stereotyping of difference* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18). Secondly, they may arise from educators not being given the relevant training in areas such as the Bilingual-Bicultural approach to literacy, which will be discussed later in this chapter (thus the barrier *Inadequately and inappropriately trained education managers and educators* Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18).

2.3.3 Total Communication

Total Communication is a philosophy, where every possible means and modality is used to educate learners who are Deaf. A variety of methods such as finger spelling (the Sign Language alphabet), mime, writing, pictures, lip-reading, gestures and oral speech may be used. The use of residual hearing via amplification such as hearing aids, cochlea implants, and FM systems is also strongly encouraged.

Total Communication emerged in the 1960's out of the failures of Oral deaf education. Vernon's 1971 study (Evans, 1982:131), which examined the successes of Oralism, found that over 30% of the deaf student population were illiterate, 60% were at a fifth-grade level or below. Trybus and Karchmer's 1977 study at Gallaudet College revealed that on average these deaf students had an average reading attainment below that of a fifth-grade level (Evans, 1982:131). These results led to a re-evaluation of educational approaches in Deaf education and "a segment of the profession began to articulate the need to develop a philosophical framework that would recognise the value of manual modes as useful adjuncts to accepted aural/oral approaches" (Garretson, 1976b: 89).

In 1968, the philosophy of Total Communication was first used as means of communication with Deaf learners by a deaf man, Dr Roy Holcomb, an educator in a school for the Deaf in Santa Ana (Gannon, 1981; Garretson, 1976b). This philosophy was then adopted in the Maryland School for the Deaf in America (Denton, 1976). The trend was paralleled in Britain out of the failures in Deaf education in schools for the Deaf throughout the United Kingdom. It has been incorrectly labelled as being in opposition to Oralism because of the incorporation of signing and gesture into the communication methodology. In practice, however, Total Communication is known as 'simultaneous communication' as both signed and spoken languages are used together. This approach is often called Signed English, Signed Supported English or Signed Supported Speech.

It needs to be noted that although signs are used in this method, the signs used follow the language structure of a spoken language. As examined in the Manualism section, Sign Language is not based on any form of spoken language but has its own independent grammar and structure. Therefore, those using Total Communication are in fact not using Sign Language but a spoken language supported by simultaneous signs (Sign Supported English). Johnson, Liddell and Erting state that a spoken language such as English is used to serve both as "the input for natural language acquisition and as the vehicle for the transmission of curricular material" (1989:5).

While this approach is believed to have improved the general communication skills between hearing teachers and Deaf learners and acted as a means of facilitating the learning process, it does not lead to the full development of South African Sign Language (SASL) or the improvement of spoken/written language skills (Smuts, 2002:43). The main reason for this "is that two languages with two totally different language structures are being used simultaneously" (Smuts, 2002:54). The task of trying to use two languages simultaneously (signing and speaking), according to Johnson, Liddell and Erting, is seen to be "psychologically and physically overwhelming" (1989:5). This can be seen as being one of the reasons for "Deaf learners lagging behind their hearing peers as learners following this approach experience serious problems with their language skills, especially when it comes to reading, writing, and the understanding of concepts and abstract vocabulary" (Smuts, 2002:54). Deaf learners in classrooms where Total Communication is used often experience boredom as they receive limited amounts of knowledge as the educators take a long time to communicate information via Total Communication (Smuts, 2002:54).

While there are a number of supporters of Total Communication strategies for the teaching of Deaf learners, there are also a number of critics of this method. According to Duffy et al "Signed English fails to satisfy deaf children's need for natural, fluent, accessible language existing within a social context" (1993:13). Komesaroff also suggests that, "Signed English conflicts with the syntactic features of a visual/manual language creating visual confusion" (1996: 41).

To conclude, in classrooms where educators use Total Communication as means of instruction for Deaf learners, either the educator's speech, form of signing, or both will deteriorate. This is because one cannot sign and speak at the same time as Signed English and Signed Language have two very different language structures. This may result in the barriers *inappropriate languages or language of learning and teaching* and *inappropriate communication* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18) being experienced by Deaf learners in schools using Total Communication.

The realisation that Total Communication resulted in Deaf learners not being able to communicate adequately with either Deaf or hearing people led to the adoption of the Bilingual-Bicultural approach to education being adopted (Smuts, 2002:54).

2.3.4 Bilingual-Bicultural Model

From the limitations of both Oralism and Total Communication came the development of the Bilingual-Bicultural approach as a means of promoting literacy development in Deaf learners through respecting and using "both the Sign Language of the Deaf community and the spoken/written language of the hearing community" (Gregory, 1998:64). In this approach, the primary medium of instruction is Sign Language and learners are introduced through Sign Language to literacy in the written (second) language. With the concept of a first language in place, a Deaf child is now able to 'hang' and "attach the new information to existing understanding" (Komesaroff, 1996:41). Not only does this model acknowledge Sign Language as the first language of the Deaf, but it also recognizes the importance of the Deaf community and Deaf Culture (Storbeck, 2000:52; Ewoldt, 1996; Sacks, 1991:150).

The Bilingual-Bicultural model to the education of Deaf learners evolved out of the dissatisfaction and limitations of the Oral approach, the Total Communication model (Gregory, 1998:64) and Manualism as well as from an acknowledgement that Deaf learners struggle to grasp and make sense of a spoken language when they are taught via the medium of spoken language (Komesaroff, 1996; Bellugi, 1989). In a study conducted by Bellugi (1989) the following findings with regard to Signed English were made:

> Deaf people have reported to us that while they can process each item as it appears, they find it difficult to process the message content as a whole when all the information is expressed in the sign stream as sequential elements (Bellugi, 1989:135-136).

It must be noted that ideally a Deaf learner needs to be competent in her first language, namely Sign Language before learning to read and write in her second language. If a learner "does not have a language base then learning a second language, which in the case of Deaf learners would be a spoken one, may result in neither language being mastered" (Paulston, 1977:93).

When reviewing the Bilingual-Bicultural model as a suggested teaching and learning model for Deaf learners, it is necessary to have a broad understanding of the research findings regarding the acquisition of both a first and second language amongst hearing people. Cummins (1989) developed the 'Linguistic Interdependence Model,' which examined how hearing people acquire a second language. This can be used to examine how Deaf learners would acquire a spoken language as a second language. This model suggests that a "common underlying proficiency

makes possible the transfer of cognitive/academic or literacy related skills across languages given adequate exposure, in school and environment, and adequate motivation to learn a second language. According to the 'Linguistic Interdependence Theory', a language user possesses an underlying set of cognitive and language abilities that are similar to the base of an iceberg. The surface features of a language are similar to the caps of an iceberg. If a person knows two languages, it is like having two ice caps with a common underlying base, hence the reference to 'double iceberg model' (Vicars, 2003). From this perspective it is clear that if an individual already has a language base, it easier to acquire a second language (Cummins, 1989). Hakuta summarises research on bilingualism:

> Take any group of bilinguals who are approximately equivalent in their first language and second language and match them with a monolingual group for age, socio-economic level, and whatever other variables you think might confound your results. Now choose a measure of cognitive flexibility and administer it to both groups. The bilinguals will do better (1986:35).

Deaf learners acquiring a spoken language as a second language for reading and writing purposes, as Sign Language has no written form, also need to have exposure to the culture of the spoken language they are learning. Deaf learners need to have exposure to positive language and culture role models from both the Deaf and hearing communities. Deaf learners need to be enculturated into the cultural/social world of both the Deaf and the hearing.

The World Federation of the Deaf calls for the introduction of Bilingual-Bicultural education "into schools for the deaf, for native sign languages to be recognised and used as the first languages for deaf children, and for second languages to be taught through reading and writing" (World Federation of the Deaf, 1993:13). This call has been mirrored in South Africa's Constitution Chapter 1 Section 6(5)(a) which states, "A Pan South African Language Board established by nation legislation must- (a) promote; create conditions for, the development and use of: all official languages; the Khoi, Nama and San languages; and sign languages."

Not only is Sign Language mentioned, but in Section 29, 30 and 31 of the South African Constitution it states that everyone has the right to be educated in the language of their choice, to use the language of their choice and to participate in the cultural life of their choice. This implies that not only should the status of Sign Language be enhanced but also that the Culture of the Deaf community be acknowledge and respected. Sign Language is recognised as the official language of the Deaf and should therefore be used as the medium of teaching and learning in all schools for the Deaf in South Africa. The Bilingual-Bicultural Model can be seen to have its roots in the socio-cultural paradigm as those adopting this model see Deaf people as belonging to a minority

group with its own language and culture and thus use their language, Sign Language. If Deaf learners are educated by educators using this model, they will be able to adapt to interact with both the Deaf and hearing communities (UNESCO, 1999). Then the barriers *inappropriate languages or language of learning and teaching*; *inappropriate communication and negative attitudes to and stereotyping of difference* and *inadequately and inappropriately trained education managers and educators* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18) will not be experienced by Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf. This will be because educators will use Sign Language for all teaching, learning and communication will view deafness from the socio-cultural paradigm and thus expect the same outcomes as hearing learners from their Deaf learners and will have had training in the Bilingual-Bicultural approach and would be implementing it in their classrooms.

Before the Bilingual-Bicultural model can be adopted in schools accommodating Deaf learners, educators of the Deaf first need to acknowledge the inadequacies of past methods of education, and admit that they had a role to play in the low levels of literacy achievement. They need to admit that the methods they have been using in the past have failed or limited the Deaf learners they teach and then "Change then becomes a necessary process rather than something to resist" (Komesaroff, 1996:40). Educators of the Deaf then have a responsibility to become fluent in Sign Language and gain an understanding of Deaf Culture. Schools for the Deaf need to employ Deaf educators and assistants as well as involve the Deaf community in all aspects of the school. "Deaf children need schools filled with qualified Deaf teachers, positive role models, staff fluent in their language" (Komesaroff, 1996:40). Bilingual-Bicultural programmes where there have been no Deaf adults in the classroom and within the school environment resulted in failure as Deaf learners are then only exposed to hearing teachers who are models for a spoken language and thus are not implementing true Bilingual Bicultural programmes (Gibbons, 1992). Gregory (1998:68-69) identifies the following as goals of Bilingual-Bicultural education:

- To enable Deaf children to become linguistically competent
- To provide access to a wide curriculum
- To facilitate good literacy skills
- To provide Deaf pupils with a positive sense of their own identity

The following section examines global policies that have had a dramatic influence on the education of Deaf learners through out the world.

2.4 Global Influences in Deaf Education

Over the past century, "population changes and their effects on the general social milieu of the country, as well as changes in educational philosophies and theories" (Moors, 1992 as quoted by

Cohen, 1994:1) have influenced decisions about where and how to educate disabled learners. This section explores two international events that have had major influences on the education of both learners with special needs as well as Deaf learners throughout the world, namely the Milan Congress and the Salamanca Statement.

The result of the Milan Congress of 1880 raised a number of debates around the use of Sign Language and role of Deaf educators in schools for the Deaf and the outcome of this Congress was to see a step backwards for Deaf education in the century that followed.

2.4.1 The Milan Congress of 1880

The early 1800's has been referred to as the 'golden period' in Deaf history. During this period many positive things occurred as Deaf people were finally welcomed into human society (Sacks, 1991:21). During this period there was a rapid establishment of schools for the Deaf where the ratio of Deaf educators to hearing educators was close to fifty percent. Deaf learners now had positive Deaf role models, who were proficient in Sign Language and could transmit knowledge about Deaf-related issues such as Deaf Culture. Other monumental developments during this time included the National Deaf Mute College in Washington DC being opened 1864, which was the first college for Deaf students in the world (now known as Gallaudet University). Deaf people were given positions of responsibility and gained eminence as Deaf writers, engineers, philosophers, intellectuals etc. emerged (Sacks, 1991:21).

The year 1880 has been named the turning point in the history of Deaf education. An American Deaf leader, as quoted by Lane (1984:394) wrote, "1880 was the year that saw the birth of the infamous Milan resolution that paved the way for foisting upon the deaf everywhere a loathed method; hypocritical in its claims, unnatural in its application, mind-deadening and soul-killing in its ultimate results".

In 1878 an international congress was organised by hearing teachers of the Deaf in Milan. Only fifty-four people attended and only two were not French. No Deaf people were allowed to attend even though the majority of educators in schools for the Deaf in France were themselves Deaf. In spite of this, the group of hearing teachers decided to conduct the First International Congress on the Education and Welfare of the Deaf. On the 6^{th}-10^{th} of September 1880 the Second Congress on Education of the Deaf commenced in Milan. The meeting was carefully planned and "the victory for the cause of pure speech was gained before [the] congress began" (Lane, 1984:390). The officers were pre-selected to ensure an Oralist outcome. Of the 164 delegates, 56 were French and 66 were Italian Oralists, which combined represented 74% of the congress. They had speakers acclaiming:

> articulate language is superior to sign, because it is the method employed by nature. Modern science teaches us that what is natural ends up with the upper hand" and "no doubt signs are often animated and picturesque but are absolutely inadequate for abstraction (Lane, 1984:390).

Although there were other topics to be discussed on the agenda, the congress focused only on Oralism and its implementation and immediately after the presentations the declaration for Oralism was established. This declaration was made that Oralism was the only medium of instruction allowed in schools for the Deaf and that Sign Language was to be banned. Only America (represented by Edward Gallaudet, Rev Thomas Gallaudet, Isaac Peet, James Denison and Charles Stoddard) and Britain refused to agree and tried to fight for the use of Sign Language (Lane, 1984). These few voices were ignored and the declaration was signed.

The following are some of the resolutions passed by the convention:

- "The congress, considering the unarguable superiority of speech over signs, for restoring deaf mutes to social life and for giving them greater facility in language, declares that the method of articulation should be used instead of the method of signs in the education of the deaf and dumb.
- Considering that the simultaneous use of signs and speech has the disadvantages of injuring speech, lipreading and precision of ideas, the congress declares that the pure oral method should be used" (Lane, 1984:394).

This congress caused major changes in the education of Deaf learners as well as in employment opportunities for Deaf educators in schools for the Deaf. After the congress the repercussion to the Milan Congress of 1880 were immediate. Deaf educators in schools for the Deaf lost their jobs as Bell argued that "the deaf teacher generally cannot help the student learn oral language and will use sign with him instead" (Lane, 1984:373). This caused the National Association of the Deaf to grow in number as supporters rallied to fight for Sign Language and Deaf Culture. The President of Gallaudet College (now University), the only Deaf college in the world decided to keep Sign Language as the medium of instruction on the campus in spite of the ban of Sign Language. Laurent Clerk provided this following account as he looked back on the situation for Deaf people after the Milan Congress of 1880.

> Incredible as it may seem, it took only a small clique of hearing educators and businessmen, late in the last century, to release a tidal wave of oralism that swept over Western Europe, drowning all its signing communities. In America, the submersion of sign language was nearly complete for, although the European wave reached our shores attenuated, Alexander Graham Bell and his speech association had cleared the way for its progress from east to west (Lane, 1984:376).

With the Milan resolution advocating Oralism over Sign Language there was the concern that older Deaf learners, who were already fluent in Sign language, Deaf Culture, and who had contact with Deaf role models as well as the Deaf community, may spread Sign Language to those younger learners in the school already following the principals of Oralism. This concern resulted in a separation of younger and older Deaf learners. The older learners continued to receive their education via Sign Language as they were, "too advanced to be taught Orally" (Lane, 1984:396). Each year a new speaking class would be introduced to the bottom of the school as young learners were enrolled, which it was hoped would eventually resulted in a pure Oralist system once the older signing learners had left the school (Lane, 1984:396). These two groups of Deaf learners were kept completely separate (even during meals and play time) and the adoption of Oralism in schools for the Deaf "resulted in a dramatic deterioration in the educational achievement of deaf children and the literacy of deaf generally" (Sacks, 1991:28).

To conclude, the Milan Congress of 1880 was a turning point in Deaf education. Hearing people viewing deafness as a disability forced all Deaf learners to use a communication method, namely Oralism, which was completely inaccessible to them. This resulted in the barrier, I*nappropriate languages or language of learning and teaching*, I*nappropriate communication* (Department of Education, 2001:7 &18) being experienced by Deaf learners across the globe.

The following section, the Salamanca Statement examines what led to the adoption of an inclusive education system throughout the world.

2.4.3 The Salamanca Statement of 1994

In the period between 1880 and 1994 schools for the Deaf throughout the world experienced many changes both in educational approaches (From Oralism to Total Communication to the Bilingual-Bicultural Approach) as well as the way in which hearing people viewed deafness and disabilities in general. The most recent changes were as a result of the human Rights movement of the 1960's, which played a major role in how learners with special needs were treated and thus educated which also impacted on the education and outlook of Deaf learners. The Human Rights movement resulted in many changes, one of which was the Salamanca Statement of 1994, which had an impact on the education of learners with special needs and included Deaf learners in its statement.

In June 1994 representatives from 92 governments and 25 international organisations formed the World Conferences on Special Needs Education, which was held in Salamanca, Spain. All parties agreed that a dynamic new statement to include all learners with special needs into regular classrooms needed to be created. This resulted in the *Salamanca Statement* of the UNESCO

World Conference on Special Needs Education: Access and Quality (June 1994) being adopted by 94 Governments and over 20 non-government organisations. This statement asserts that inclusion is a universal right that links to an inclusive society and provides guidelines for including all learners with special educational needs into regular classrooms alongside their 'abled' peers regardless of their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic or other conditions (UNESCO, 1994). It states that:

- Every child has the fundamental right to education and must be given the opportunity to achieve and maintain acceptable levels of learning;
- Every child has unique characteristics, interests, abilities and learning needs;
- Education systems should be designed and educational programmes implemented to take into account the wide diversity of these characteristics and needs;
- Those with special educational needs must have access to mainstream schools which should accommodate them within a child-centred pedagogy capable of meeting these needs;
- Regular schools with this inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building an inclusive society and achieving education for all.
- Moreover, they provide an effective education for the majority (without special needs) and improve the efficiency and ultimately the cost effectiveness of the entire education system (UNESCO, 1994).

UNESCO's *Open File on Inclusive Education* (2002) states that the move towards inclusive schools can be justified on three grounds, educational, social and economic justification. Firstly there is educational justification, meaning that all learners would benefit from an inclusive education system as educators would need to "develop ways of teaching that respond to individual differences" (UNESCO, 2002:20). Secondly, there is social justification, as within an inclusive education system all learners would be educated together which would "change attitudes to difference…. and form the basis for a just and non-discriminatory society" (UNESCO, 2002:20). Thirdly there is economic justification, as, if all learners are educated together, education would be less costly that having specialized schools accommodating different groups of learners. Hand in hand with this point is the fact that "if these inclusive schools offer an effective education to all of their students, then they are also a more cost-effective means of delivering Education for All" (UNESCO, 2002:20).

The inclusive education approach draws on the social model in understanding educational difficulties. The approach suggests that the difficulties learners experience cannot be simply

explained in terms of the learner's impairments, rather "it is the features of the education system itself" (UNESCO, 2002:22).

To conclude inclusive education is not simply about reforming special education, and an inclusive school is not simply one that includes and educates some disabled learners. Rather, "inclusive education is about reducing all types of barriers to learning and developing ordinary schools, which are capable of meeting the needs of all learners. It is, indeed, part of a wider movement towards a more just society for all citizens" (UNESCO, 2002:22).

The following chapter Literature Review will examine the trends in the education of Deaf learners both globally and locally with regards to language of instruction and communication methods etc. It will provide a short history of Deaf education in the United States of America, the United Kingdom and lastly South Africa, examining why these countries adopted the policies of inclusion within their education systems. It will identify the barriers to learning and development that Deaf learners experienced, as made explicit in *White Paper 6* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18).

CHAPTER THREE
LITERATURE REVIEW

> The purpose of the literature review is to provide the researcher with an overall framework for where this piece of work fits in the 'big picture' of what is known about a topic from previous research (Mertens, 1988:34).

The education of Deaf learners in South Africa as well as throughout the world has been dramatically influenced by trends in areas such as language of instruction in schools for the Deaf as well as communication methods etc. This chapter will examine research on the differing educational trends in the United States of America and the United Kingdom, examining how and why the decision to include Deaf learners into hearing classes emerged. The reason for international trends being included is because these countries adopted the policy of inclusion into their education systems and encouraged Deaf learners to be included into regular education classrooms. Another reason is that, according to Hay and Beyers after 1994, South Africa had to "disentangle itself from the isolation of the apartheid era, and thus had to align itself with international trends" (2000:1), and in order to do this, global trends have to be examined. This chapter will also examine what the impact of these trends had on the education of Deaf learners, as well as look at the effectiveness of differing communication methods that were adopted. After which a history into the trends of Deaf education in South Africa will be given which have been directly influenced by the educational trends in both the United States of America and the United Kingdom. Any barriers to learning and development experienced by Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf will be provided (Department of Education, 2001:7 &18). To conclude, this chapter will provide reasons for inclusion being adopted in schools throughout South Africa.

3.1 Educational Trends in the United States of America

In the United States of America, the debate over mainstream verses residential school programmes for the Deaf has been ongoing since the 1950's. The current trend towards full inclusion referring to "the placement of all children with disabilities in their neighbourhood schools, with non-disabled peers and with the necessary support services" (Innes 2001:156) is rooted primarily in the civil rights movement and social activism of the 1950's and 1960's. Up until then Deaf education was almost exclusively conducted in separated residential schools for the Deaf. In the 1870's over 42 percent of teachers working in schools for the Deaf were themselves Deaf (Johnson, Liddell & Erting, 1989:9; Sacks, 1991). This segregated placement option was, according to Moores (1987:76), mirrored in the segregation and isolation of the American society of the time. Just as 'non-white' Americans were excluded from society so to were learners with disabilities, including Deaf learners. Alexander Graham Bell, known best for

his invention of the telephone, had a negative impact on the education of Deaf learners in the United States of America.

Alexander Graham Bell (1847-1922) was opposed to the segregation of Deaf learners in residential schools for the Deaf from a purely genetic stance. According to Moores (1987), Bell believed that separate residential schools for the Deaf encouraged the formation of separate culture (Deaf Culture) and a shared language (Sign Language), which led to an increase of Deaf marriages, which may result in further Deaf children being conceived. This can be seen as rather ironic as he "selectively supported the Clark School for the Deaf and separate classes and day programs in which an oral philosophy was strictly adhered to" (Cohen, 1994:1).

He also opened a training school for teachers of the deaf in Boston in 1872, which taught educators in the use of lipreading and speech skills. In 1895 Bell testified against the establishment of a teacher training program at Gallaudet College (the only college for Deaf learners in the world) for two reasons. He believed that it would support the "concept of separate classes and because it would perpetuate the training of deaf teachers" (Cohen, 1994:1). Bell became known as "the most fearful enemy of the American deaf, past and present" (President of the National Association of the Deaf quoted by Lane (1984:117). Even after Bell's active participation in lobbying for an inclusive educational setting, Deaf culture was firmly grounded in the United States of America and continued to flourish, and the majority of Deaf children remained in schools for the Deaf (Collair, 2001). Bell's paradigm of deafness can be seen to be based on the clinical pathological paradigm. His insistence on Oralism and warped motivation for inclusion created huge barriers for Deaf learners in terms of *inappropriate languages or language of learning and teaching* and *inappropriate communication* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18). Deaf learners were forbidden to communicate in the language most natural to them, namely Sign Language.

In the early 1960's a rubella epidemic (where pregnant mothers passed rubella virus on to their unborn babies) caused an increase in deafness in the United States. This "Rubella Bulge" (Schildroth & Hotto 1994:12) resulted in residential schools for the Deaf not being able to accommodate the numbers of Deaf children. Due to the epidemic being under control by 1965 it was decided for financial reasons not to build more schools for the Deaf but to rather to include these Deaf children in day school programs in units in their neighbourhood's schools (Cohen, 1989:2).

The US Supreme Court heard in Brown vs. Board of Education (1954) that education was a property right and it further stated that all American children were entitled to equal education.

They went on to state that separate school systems were "inherently unequal" (Innes, 2001:154). In the 1970's the previous ideas of separate programmes for learners with special needs were examined. A movement away from what children with disabilities cannot do to one of focussing on their strengths gained momentum (Engelbrecht et. al, 1999). During this period, schools for the Deaf adopted the philosophy of Total Communication and the number of Deaf teachers dropped from 42 percent in the 1870's to less than 12 percent by the 1960's (Lou, 1988:76). This was due to the belief that

> Deaf teachers are poorly suited to speech-centred methodologies and by perpetuation of the misconception that sign language exposure and acquisition at an early age impedes the acquisition of spoken English and appropriate "hearing World" behaviour (Johnson, Liddell & Erting, 1989:9).

Passage of Public Law (PL) 94-142 (142nd public law passed by the 94th congress), otherwise known as the *Education of All Handicapped Children act* was then passed in 1975. This law insured the right of all students with disabilities to "a free, appropriate education in the least restrictive environment" (PL 94-142). This can be seen to be similar to the South African 'Inclusion Policy' of education as which will be discussed later in this chapter. After the implementation of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, Deaf and hard of hearing children who were previously educated in residential schools or self-contained classrooms were required to attend their local schools "alongside their chronological-age peers who did not have disabilities" (Luckner & Muir, 2001:435). The United States Department of Education estimated that on a national level, approximately 83% of Deaf or hard of hearing students are taught at least part time in general education classrooms. This act resulted in the number of Deaf educators dropping to its lowest point of 11%. This law was then amended in 1986, by adding that free and appropriate education for children with disabilities between the ages of three to five years old was mandatory.

Once again in 1990 the previous Public Law 94-142 was further amended and re-named to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). A conference was held in Salamanca, Spain between the 7th and 10th of June 1994 and was sponsored by UNESCO and the Ministry of Education and Science of Spain which examined the state of special needs education. This conference resulted in the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education being completed. This statement was adopted by the World Conference on Special Needs Education. This Salamanca Statement further impacted on the educational option for Deaf learners in the United States. According to Smith (1998), this new change emphasized that those children with disabilities should be educated in the school that they would have been placed in if they did not have a disability. The change in the education law now meant that Deaf learners could be placed in the education facility best suited to them which included residential schools for

the Deaf, day schools, classes in regular schools and placement in mainstream schools which had support from itinerant teachers of the Deaf (Collair, 2001:19). With this new shift in educational settings for Deaf learners between 1992 and 1993, 50% of children with varying degrees of hearing losses were accommodated in separate classes or in schools for the Deaf either as day scholars or as borders. The remaining 50% of students were accommodated in mainstream settings (Smith, 1998:198).

Although most people support the idea of inclusion, with appropriate special services, as one of the many educational options for Deaf students, it is the introduction of "full" or "total" inclusion terms that is the issue. Full Inclusion means that all Deaf students should be placed in hearing classrooms in their local neighbourhood schools. This extreme position is where the issue lies.

> It seems to me that the push for total inclusion, the placement of all children in regular classes in their own neighbourhoods, flies in the face of educational developments and federal legislation over the past 25 years. Educational placement and services are to be provided on an individual basis, with the understanding that ranges of options must be available. This basic understanding is under attack (Moores, 1993:379)

According to Innes (2001), a consumer advocate and associate professor of education at Gallaudet University the term 'full inclusion' relates back to the 1960's as 'normalisation' (see clinical-pathological paradigm of deafness). He felt that this form of inclusion doesn't see deafness as a unique human experience, requiring due consideration of the Deaf students communicative, social, and cultural needs.

The following section examines the educational trends that occurred in the United Kingdom and shows the many similarities in trends between both the United States of America and the United Kingdom with regards to major policies in education and specifically Deaf education.

3.2 Educational Trends in the United Kingdom

In the United Kingdom, Deaf children were educated in segregated educational institutions until 1947, after which Deaf children were included into partial hearing units, which were linked to hearing schools. According to Kumsang and Moore (1998), this was the beginning of the move towards inclusion in the United Kingdom. This integration movement gained momentum in the 1950's and 1960's. Just as the Deaf in the United States of America were influenced by the Civil Rights campaigns so too were Deaf people in the United Kingdom. This movement led to Deaf people being recognised as being independent, self reliant, valuable members of society. In the 1960's the Department of Education and Science conducted a survey on 90 classes for hearing-impaired learners in mainstream schools (DES, 1967). The study concluded that about a third of these learners had a severe to profound hearing losses. The reason for the survey being conducted

was due to a concern that learners with hearing losses were placed in separate classes were they were 'located' sharing nothing other than the location of the school (Webster & Wood, 1989:26).

In 1970 the Education Act stated that all children should be educated in local schools, regardless of disability. Just as the education of Deaf learners in the United States of America was influenced by the 1978 Warnock Report (DES, 1978a) so to has the British system of education for Deaf learner. The Warnock Report (1978) can be seen as the most substantial call for educational integration in the United Kingdom, which resulted in the act of 1981. The aim of this report was to review the educational provision for 'handicapped' learners in England, Scotland and Wales. This report changed the term 'handicapped' to 'learners with special needs' which defined all learners with individual educational needs. One of the most important areas of this report was the recommendation that provision for special education, where-ever possible, should happen within mainstream practice, and that special schools could establish closer links with the mainstream as either, resource centres or providing more specialised, intensive help on a short-term basis. Special schools should be part of the continuum of provision, which a Local Education Authorities (LEA) can call upon in its response to children's special needs (Webster & Wood, 1989: 25). This report promoted integration of all learners into regular classes including those with Special Educational Needs (SEN) (Kumsang and Moore, 1998). There were subsequent amendments to the Education Acts in 1981, 1988, 1989, 1992, 1993 and 1996. The 1981 Education Act amendment dealt with the integration of learners with special needs into regular. This act decided that the Local Education Authorities (LEA) should be responsible for the placement of these learners. The LEA's responsibilities were limited to three conditions: "that the integration is compatible with the child receiving the help required; that other children are not compromised in the process; and that the resources are being used efficiently" (Webster & Wood, 1989:25). This act stated that learners cannot be excluded because of the nature or severity of their disability, and parental views must be taken into account. In 1997 the United Kingdom government decided on a policy of inclusion for all learners, after they declared their support for the Salamanca Statement.

The following section will examine the educational trends in Deaf education in South Africa, as the global trends in Deaf education also influenced the education of Deaf learners in South Africa. After which an overview of inclusion in South Africa will be investigated. Reasons to why inclusion has been adopted as the best way to combat the barriers to learning of the past education system will be given.

3.3 Deaf Education Trends in South Africa

The Roman Catholic Dominican Order can be seen as the founders of education of Deaf learners in South Africa. In 1863 the Roman Catholic church of Ireland sent six sisters to Cape Town as part of their missionary task. Only one of them, Sister Dympna Kinsella, was a trained teacher of the Deaf and had taught at a school for the Deaf at Cambra, Dublin in Ireland. Bishop Grimley who had also worked with Deaf people before relocating to South Africa was concerned with the lack of facilities for Deaf learners in South Africa. Together these nuns and Bishop Grimley founded the first school for Deaf children in South Africa, which was known as the Dominican Grimley School, which was based in Cape Town. These nuns strictly adhered to the principals of Oralism in the education of Deaf learners. On the 12th of September 1877 the Dominican school for the Deaf opened in King Williams Town in the Eastern Cape which was started by German Dominican sisters. This school then moved to Gauteng in 1934 where it is currently known as St Vincent School for the Deaf. Shortly afterwards on the 15th of June 1881 the Dutch reformed church opened the Institute for Deaf and Blind in Worcester which is now know as the De La Bat School for the Deaf.

Due to the founding educators in schools for the Deaf having migrated from countries overseas that were involved in the Milan Congress of 1880, Oralism was formally adopted in all South African schools for the Deaf in 1920. As mentioned in the last section, Sign Language as medium of instruction was banned even in schools for the Deaf as far away as South Africa. This shows the dramatic influence hearing people had on the education of Deaf learners and how these people created the barriers of *inappropriate languages or language of learning and teaching* and *inappropriate communication* (Department of Education, 2001:7 &18). However having said this, those enforcing Oralism in schools for the Deaf did not cause Sign Language or Deaf Culture to deteriorate rather Deaf children used Sign Language to communicate with each other in non-teaching situations such as in the playground.

The following section will examine South African documents that are aimed at encouraging learners who experience barriers to learning reach their full potential and prevent further barriers developing. The documents to be examined are as follows:

* The South African Schools Act (Act 84 of 1996)
* The recommendations of the National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training (NCSNET) the National Committee on Education Support Service's (NCESS) *Quality education for all. Overcoming barriers to learning and development* of 1997;
* The United Nations Education, Science and Culture Organization's (UNESCO, 1999) Consultation Report: *Inclusive Education and the Deaf Child in South Africa*

* The Department of Education's Draft White Paper 5 on Special Needs in 2000, which resulted in the *White Paper 6. Special Needs Education. Building an Inclusive Education and Training System* in July of 2001
* The Department of Education's 2002 *Draft Guidelines for the Implementation of Inclusive Education (second Draft).*

Each of these above documents will be examined with reference to the education and inclusion of Deaf learners in South Africa.

3.4 Policies, Document and the Implementation of Inclusion in South Africa

This section will examine the policies, documents and the implementation of inclusion in South Africa. The past education system under the Apartheid government where the system was racially segregated resulting in some learners having access to better education and support, while other learners experienced barriers to their learning and development will be examined. Barriers identified in *White Paper 6 on Special Needs Education* (Department of Education, 2001: 7 & 18) will then be explored and a discussion and background to inclusion in general being adopted in South Africa will then be provided. After which documents that led to the changes in the present education system under the new democratic government, which is based on equality and rights of all South Africans will be examined. To conclude, the section will focus specifically on Deaf learners in schools throughout South Africa, examining how both intrinsic and extrinsic factors influence her overall development, as well as identify specific barriers to learning as identified in *White Paper 6* (Department of Education, 2001: 7 & 18).

Prior to 1994, the South African Education Department was divided into eighteen racially segregated education departments.

> Each department had their own policies regarding learners with special education needs. Not all education departments made provision for these learners and the disadvantaged communities were totally marginalized. There were extreme disparities and discrepancies in the provision in the provision for specialised education for the different race groups and virtually no provision for black disabled children at a preschool level (Western Cape Education Department, 2003:1).

In 1934 all state run schools in South Africa were separated into 'European' and 'non-European' which was then enforced by the Nationalist Governments rule in 1948. With the influence from the Apartheid Government of South Africa at the time, the Dominican Grimley School was forced in 1934 to split into two schools, Dominican Grimley in Hout Bay was only available to white Deaf learners while the Dominican School for Deaf Children in Wittebome, Wynberg, enrolled coloured Deaf learners. In 1941 the first school for Black Deaf learners was established and Sign

Language was used as medium of instruction. This was ironic as in all white schools for the Deaf a strong anti-signing policy was legislated. After this time many of South Africa's 47 schools accommodating Deaf/deaf and Hearing Impaired learners were started in South Africa. These are presently situated in the following provinces:




Figure number 2: Provincial distributions of Schools

After South Africa became a democratic country in 1994 the following educational policy initiatives were introduced: the 1995 South African Federal Council on Disability (SAFCD) statement, the South African Schools Act (Act 84 of 1996), the recommendations of the National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training (NCSNET) and the National Committee on Education Support service's (NCESS) *Quality education for all*.

The South African Federal Council on Disability (SAFCD) called for the development of a single inclusive education system for South Africa in October 1995. This is summarised in their statement:

> Learners with Special Educational Needs (LSEN) have a right to equal access to education at all levels in a single inclusive education system that is responsive to the diverse needs of all learners, accommodating both different styles and rates of learning as well as different language needs in the case of Deaf learners where their first language is sign language, and ensuring quality education to all through appropriate curricula, organisational arrangements, technical strategies, resource

> use and partnerships with their communities (SAFCD, 1995 as quoted in Naiker, 1996:17)

The Department of Education appointed The National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training (NCSNET) the National Committee on Education Support Service's (NCESS) to investigate and make recommendations on all aspects of special needs and support services in education and training. The report proposed a move in education from focussing on changes that needed to be made within learners, to a systems-change approach (Department of Education, 1997). After which a report, *Overcoming barriers to learning and development* appeared in November 1997 under the National Department of Education, South Africa, which is known as *Quality Education for All: Overcoming Barriers to Learning and Development* (Department of Education, 1997). This report, according to the UNESCO Consultation Report

> makes recommendations and provides guidelines for the transformation of all levels and aspects of education to meet the diversity of needs of the learner population, minimising and removing and preventing barriers to learning and development so that effective teaching and learning can occur for all (UNESCO, 1999:5)

After which the *Draft White Paper on Special Needs* in 2000 (Department of Education) was compiled, resulting in the *White Paper: 6 Building an Inclusive Education and Training System* (Department of Education, 2001. This revised White Paper resulted in an inclusive policy in the education of all learners in South Africa being adopted. According to Professor Kader Asmal, the past Minister of Education, this White Paper can be seen as, "another post-apartheid landmark policy paper that cuts our ties with the past and recognises the vital contribution that our people with disabilities are making and must continue to make, but as part of and not isolated from the flowering of our nation" (Department of Education, 2001:4).

The education system under the Apartheid rule in South Africa, "promoted race, class, gender and ethnic divisions and has emphasised separateness, rather than common citizenship and nationhood" (Naiker, 2000:1). The exclusion of non-white students was extended to incorporate segregation on the basis of disability (Department of Education, 2001:6) and provisions made for learners with special needs were "clearly both inefficient and inequitable" (Department of Education, 2001:36). *White Paper 6* (Department of Education, 2001) identifies that out of all areas of education, those learners with special needs have been hardest hit by the inequalities of the past education system under the Apartheid government. This was because "people with disabilities are excluded from the mainstream of society and experience difficulty in accessing fundamental rights" (National Government of South Africa, 1997: v).

This resulted in only 20% of learners with disabilities having access to special schools (Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana, 2002:297). Global trends in education led to disabled learners in South Africa also being educated in separate schools according to their specific disability and race. This placement was influenced by the medical model of disability, where learners with disabilities were seen as different from the norm, needing assistance and being dependant of those without disabilities. This form of separation led to "exclusion of learners with disabilities and to prejudice, fear and paternalistic attitudes from those without disabilities" (Naiker, 1996:14). An estimated 50% or more of the remaining 80% of non-white disabled learners, who were not educated in specialised systems of education, remained outside the education system completely (Department of Education, 1996:20) or were educated without the appropriate facilities and resources. According to Collair these learners were "mainstreamed without the necessary learning or psycho-social support needed to progress" (2001:1). Without the support these learners often failed repeatedly and eventually dropped out of school (Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana, 2002:297). This led to those learners becoming marginalized from both their abled peers and from economic participation in the community as well as to a learning breakdown. The Apartheid government misused their power and "Education policy and curriculum development in apartheid South Africa was used as an ideological state apparatus to promote the interests of the ruling apartheid government" (Naiker, 2000:1).

The cause of learning breakdown was based on the belief that problems were located within learners and caused by individual deficits and very little was said about system deficiencies. The Department of Education states that "the manner in which learners are socialised, exposed to intellectual work, poverty and its concomitant social problems have not been taken seriously in understanding why there is a breakdown in learning" (2002:17).

Schools that accommodated white learners with disabilities were very well resourced while the few schools for non-white disabled students were very under-resourced.

> The fiscal allocation in terms of race, where "white" education enjoyed more funding, resulted in wide-scale disparities with regard to all aspects of education. This included: quality of teacher training, level of teacher training, resources at schools, location of schools, support materials and almost every aspect of educational service delivery (Naiker, 2000:1).

The ministry states in the Education *White Paper 6* (Department of Education, 2001:6-7), that there is a broad range of learning needs amongst all learners, known as 'special education needs' or 'learning barriers'. These needs arise from intrinsic factors such as physical, mental, sensory, neurological and developmental impairments, psychosocial disturbances, differences in intellectual ability, particular life experiences or socio-economic deprivation. It further mentions that different learning needs may also arise due to the following extrinsic factors: negative

attitudes to and stereotyping of differences, an inflexible curriculum that is not sensitive to all learners needs, inappropriate languages or language of learning and teaching and inappropriate communication, inaccessible and unsafe built environments, inappropriate and inadequate support services, inadequate policies and legislation and the non-recognition and non-involvement of parents as well as inadequately and inappropriately trained education managers and educators (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18). To summarise, barriers can be located

> within the learner, within the site of learning, within the education system and within the broader social, economic and political context. These barriers manifest themselves in different ways and only become obvious when learning breakdown occurs (Department of Education, 2002:17-18).

White Paper 6 (Department of Education, 2001) further acknowledges that all children and youth can learn and that they all need support. All learners are different and have differing learning needs, which should be equally valued. These needs have to be respected and acknowledged whether due to age, gender, ethnicity, language, class, and disability or HIV status. Education structures, systems and learning methodologies need to meet the requirements of all learners. The Statement on Special Needs Education states, "every child has the fundamental right to education, and must be given the opportunity to achieve and maintain an acceptable level of learning" (Department of Education, 1994: viii)

As mentioned above, global trends in education played a major role in the shapement of the South African education system. After many years under the Apartheid governance, South Africa committed itself to democracy for all in 1994. The Constitution (Act 108 of 1996) founded South Africa's democracy on the values of "human dignity, the achievement of equality and the advancement of human rights and freedoms" (Section 1a). The above mentioned values encourage "all citizens to take up the responsibility and challenge of building a humane and caring society, not for the few, but for all South Africans" (Department of Education 2001:11).

Hay and Beyers (2000) provide three main reasons for why inclusion was embraced in South Africa. Firstly they believe that after 1994, South Africa had to "disentangle itself from the isolation of the apartheid era, and thus had to align itself with international trends" (Hay and Beyers, 2000:1). Secondly after 1994 many African National Congress exiles returned from overseas bringing with them "the most recent educational ideas" (Hay and Beyers, 2000:2). Thirdly prior to 1994 there were eighteen departments of education and the "concept of inclusive education fitted neatly with the new policy of a unitary education system where racial classification as well as disability are no longer used to differentiate departments" (Hay and Beyers, 2000:2).

The eighteen departments of education have now been combined into nine, each representing one of the official provinces throughout South Africa. Each of these provinces are now accountable to the National Department of Education and "the governance of special schools has now been moved to the provincial departments and no longer administered through a separate, centralized department" (Hay and Beyers, 2000:2).

In order for segregated education system to transform into one that meets the needs of all South Africans the Bill of Rights in the South African Constitution was created. This bill states, "that everyone has the right to a basic education" (Constitution, 1996, Section 29 (1), "which commits the state to the achievement of equality" (Constitution, 1996, Section 9 (2) and "which commits the state to non-discrimination" (Constitution, 1996, Section 9 (3) (4) (5), which does not exclude Deaf learners.

This new inclusive system of education "must be based on equality, on redressing passed imbalances and on progressive raising of the quality of education and training" (Department of Education, 2001:11). Inclusive education in South Africa according to Naicker can be seen as "a system of education that is responsive to the diverse needs of learners" (1999:19). According to Collair (2001) the past education system was based on the medical discourse model. This model linked disability to impairment and extrinsic deficits causing learners with disabilities to be "excluded from mainstream schools and full participation in the social and economical life of the community" (Collair, (2001: 1). This new inclusive policy requires learners with disabilities to move from their segregated educational institutions into classrooms with their non-disabled peers, which are seen as being:

> the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building an inclusive society and achieving education for all, moreover they provide an effective education to the majority of children and improve the efficiency and ultimately the cost-effectiveness of the entire education system (Salamanca Statement, UNESCO, 1994: ix).

Having said this, the Department of Education has also made exceptions for some learners to remain in separate educational facilities. These learners would be accommodated in Special Schools which "will move systematically away from using segregation according to categories as an organizing principle for institution" (Department of Education, 2002:18). Rather than enforcing that all disabled learners be separated into differing disability groups and thus differing separate specialized schools, the focus would be on what level of support each individual learner requires and which facility would best accommodate the learners. This would mean that, "traditionally defined categories of disabilities for example, deafness, blindness, intellectual and physical disability are not regarded as referring to homogenous groups" (Department of

Education, 2002:18). There are three main differing levels of support, namely low, medium and high levels support and are rated where 1 is low and 5 is high. Learners requiring low and medium levels of support will receive it in ordinary schools while Special Schools as Resource Centres will only accommodate learners requiring high levels of support. Having said this, the process is dynamic meaning that learners may move from a Special Schools to an ordinary school after receiving the support needed. *White Paper 6* (Department of Education, 2001) states that separate Special Schools provide "critical education services to learners who require intense levels of support" (Department of Education, 2001:21) but it emphasizes that there are learners presently being accommodated in these institutions that require less support. Many of these learners do not require the extensive support provided in theses schools and can function adequately in regular schools with support. Therefore if a learner's individual needs are not adequately met in a regular classroom, she should be given the option of remaining in "vastly improved special schools" (Department of Education, 2001:3) where her individual needs will be best accommodated.

In order to move toward a Deaf inclusive system, a shift in ones own thinking needs to be made and thus prevent the barrier *negative attitudes to and stereotyping of difference.* In order to achieve this, a paradigm shift needs to take place, a shift from viewing Deaf learners from a clinical pathological paradigm, therefore as being disabled, toward a socio-cultural paradigm of deafness. Secondly, "barriers to learning in the system need to be identified and interventions needs to be made" (Department of Education, 2002:17). One needs to look at what barriers exist within the system that prevent access to learning.

The following section will examine the important role schools for the Deaf play in the fostering and development of South African Sign Language, Deaf Culture as well as social, linguistic and emotional development. It will also identify the possible barriers that Deaf learners in these schools experience with regards to learning and development as made explicit in *White Paper 6* (Department of Education, 2001:7 &18).

3.5 Schools for the Deaf in South Africa

With the policy of inclusion being introduced into South African schools, there is a misunderstanding that schools for the Deaf in South Africa will close (UNESCO, 1999:7). This is in fact not so as the *White Paper 6* (Department of Education, 2001) clearly states that learners are to be educated in the most appropriate, least restrictive environment, where barriers to their learning and development will be prevented. Professor Kader Asmal, the past Minister of Education, clearly states, "Special schools will be strengthened rather than abolished" (Department of Education, 2001:3).

This section will now provide reasons why schools for the Deaf should remain as an option for Deaf learners in South Africa based on a social, linguistic and emotional point of view.

The focus of inclusive education is on the individual learner and what will best suit her, rather than requiring the learner to change to fit into the environment. Deaf learners may be unable to hear but Deaf learners with no disability are capable of having the same achievements as hearing learner due to the fact that deafness is seen as a language issue rather than a disability. For this reason Deaf learners may be more suitably accommodated in separate schools using South African Sign Language (SASL) as medium of instruction for teaching and learning. The South African Bill of Rights (The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996) makes special reference to language and culture of all South Africans, including the Deaf, which can be seen in the following quotes: Learners have "the right to receive education in the official language or languages of their choice"(29 (1) & (2)), "Everyone has the right to use the language and to participate in the cultural life of their choice" (30) and

> Persons belonging to a cultural, religious or linguistic community may not be denied the right, with other members of that community to enjoy their culture, practice their religion and use their language; and to form, join and maintain cultural, religious and linguistic associations and other organs of civil society (31 (1 a & b).

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa's Education Act states:

> It should be noticed that schools providing teaching and learning through the medium of SASL are not considered to be a specialised learning context but rather a school identified by the medium of teaching and learning provided. Schools for learners who wish to learn SASL would therefore be provided (Department of Education: 1996:78).

The World Federation of the Deaf (WFD) states that "Deaf children have the right for education in Sign Language" (WFD, 1995 as quoted in the Deaf Federation of South Africa's Memorandum to the National and Provincial Departments of Education, 2003:18) while the Salamanca Statement (see chapter 2.4.3) clearly states,

> Education policies should take into account of individual differences and situations. The importance of sign language as the medium of communication among the Deaf, for example, should be recognized and provision made to ensure that all Deaf persons have access to education in their national signed language (UNESCO, 1994:18).

The UNESCO's Consultation Report, *Inclusive Education and the Deaf Child in South Africa*, differentiates between learners with disabilities and learners who are Deaf and states, that Deaf learners experience the language barriers of *Inappropriate language or language of learning and*

teaching and *inappropriate communication* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18) and not because they experience any physical, mental or emotional barriers. Deaf learners placed alongside hearing learners may experience barriers because of spoken language being used, but if Sign Language is used as medium of instruction and all communication then no barriers will be experienced by Deaf learners (UNESCO, 1999:6).

Schools for the Deaf are where many Deaf learners are exposed to Sign Language and Deaf Culture for the first time. This is due to the fact that over ninety percent of Deaf children are born to hearing parents, the majority of whom have never come into contact with a Deaf person before. For the majority of Deaf learners, spoken as well as hearing culture are inaccessible to them.

From the above it is clear that Deaf learners have the right to be educated in their language of choice (Sign Language) as well as belong to their linguistic minority group (Deaf Community) where they may enjoy their culture namely Deaf Culture with other members of the Deaf Community. Additionally, Foster (1989) described school as being the place where, in general, most children make friends and develop peer networks. Both of these are vital in a child's social and emotional development. One of the most important aims of an education is to promote social development, including effective relationships with both peers and adults. Peer relations are of great importance during adolescence. Belonging to a group and feeling accepted rather than rejected by other members of the group are very important. According to Stinson and Lang (2001:156), peer relationships contribute to the development of social skills that reduce the likelihood of social isolation, support the acquisition of attitudes, values, and information for mature functioning in society, and promote future psychological health. A sense of acceptance is of utmost importance to all learners especially during adolescence. This can be fostered through interaction with other students in educational settings. Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf will interact and socialise with other Deaf learners, which will assist them in developing socially and emotionally. Interaction with peers is crucial to a learner's overall development, just as interaction with significant others in the child's environment. Just like hearing learners need opportunities to interact with their peers who share their same language and method of communication, so to do Deaf learners. It is crucial that Deaf learners socialise at school with other Deaf learners who share the same language and mode of communication. Often Deaf learners in mainstream schools are the only ones with a hearing loss in the classroom, and for the majority of the time only one of only a few Deaf learners in the neighbourhood school (Kauffman, 1993). This does not promote a fully inclusive setting. Just as all learners with disabilities have the right to a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment, so to do Deaf learners.

According to Cambra (2002), there are many factors involved in the building of self-concept. These factors will influence a child's process of socialization and the moulding of her personality and can be divided into two separate sections. These two groups, namely intrinsic and extrinsic factors, can affect the formation of a child's self-concept. Intrinsic factors include the child's degree of hearing loss, linguistic level, communication skills, academic ability, social skills, age, sex and personality. Extrinsic factors on the other hand are formed by other variables related to the child's school and classroom factors, attitude of classmates, school, interpreters, teachers, availability and degree of educational support, parental involvement and acceptance of the child's deafness, social environment and acceptance, and lastly the availability of assistive devices (Cambra, 2002:38). Both intrinsic and extrinsic factors don't function in isolation rather interlink with each other to influence the learner's educational outcomes (Collair, 2001). There are those who "propose that members of a stigmatised groups will have higher self-esteem than those with weaker group identity" (Bat-Chava, 2000:421) meaning that many Deaf learners who are members of the Deaf Community may have higher self-esteem. The culture within a school for the Deaf facilitates the construction of deafness as a culture. "A person who has attended hearing schools, by contrast, is immersed in a hearing culture, and absorbs the view of deafness as a disability" (Bat-Chava, 2000:421). According to Cambra, "deafness per se does not shape the emotional and social development of the individual. It is rather, the attitudes of others that can do his or her personality irreparable harm" (2002:38).

If Deaf learners are placed in classrooms with hearing learners they may feel different from their hearing peers, unable to communicate, not able to socialise with other Deaf learners and thus isolated. Deaf learners who are placed in schools for the Deaf will have the opportunity to interact with other Deaf learners and this will develop a sense of belonging, commonality and Deaf Identity. Deaf learners placed in schools for the Deaf will be exposed to Sign Language and the emotional, social support of the Deaf community (Cohen, 1994; Tsvingstedt, 1998:406). They feel that schools for the Deaf encourage exposure to and participation in Deaf culture and that these Deaf learners would loose out on this opportunity if they were mainstreamed.

The Department of Educations document, *Curriculum 2005 Assessment Guidelines for Inclusion* (2002), refers to deafness and hard of hearing as

> a barrier related to hearing, which can be measured on a continuum of intensity. The barrier manifests either as an inability, or a serious problem in acquiring spoken/written language (including normal speech) through the usual auditory channels (Department of Education, 2002:12).

This quotation can be seen to link directly to the clinical pathological paradigm, once again focusing on what the learner cannot do (acquire spoken language and cannot hear) which can be

seen to be ironic as it is an inclusive document. Having said this, this document does however acknowledge that, Sign Language is a Deaf child's first language and that it is acquired naturally visually. The Department of Education further states that for a Deaf learner any spoken or written language needs to be considered as a second language, which will differ in language structure to that of Sign Language. In addition Deaf learners may experience difficulties in conveying knowledge by means of writing (Department of Education, 2002:12).

Due to the New Revised Curriculum acknowledging that learners are unique with differing strengths and weaknesses, Curriculum 2005 Assessment Guidelines for Inclusion (Department of Education, 2002) provides three alternative methods of assessment for Deaf learners. This is because regular forms of assessment use written and spoken forms of a spoken language, which is a second and inaccessible language to Deaf learners, which may result in barriers of communication and language occurring. The alternative assessment methods include the use of a Sign Language Interpreter, video recordings of questions as well as answers and lastly additional time for assessments, which will now be discussed.

- "Sign Language Interpreter: The interpreter writes down the answers given in Sign Language. The interpreter is an expert in understanding and using Sign Language as well as language in which the candidate responds to the assessment task.
- Video Recording: The task/questions are recorded on video by means of Sign Language and/or the spoken word (lip-reading). The video may be rewound. The candidate's responses in Sign Language are then recorded on video. A person who is conversant in Sign Language interprets the responses and writes them down. The person thus acts as an interpreter and scribe.
- Additional Time: All Deaf candidates should receive additional time up to a maximum allocation of 30 minutes per hour if necessary" (Department of Education, 2002:12).

The above examples demonstrate the adaptations that can be made to both the curriculum as well as assessment criteria for Deaf learners throughout South Africa so that Deaf learners may have equal access to learning and development. Having said this, the author of this study does not believe that Deaf learners need additional time, as if they have an interpreter signing the questions and transcribing their answers, there should be no need for additional time. If schools for the Deaf have Deaf learners with disabilities (such as cognitive disabilities) then these Deaf learners may benefit from additional time.

After examining the above it is clear that, from a linguistic, social, emotional and cultural view, Deaf learners may be most appropriately accommodated in separate schools for the Deaf. However before Deaf learners are placed in schools for the Deaf careful examinations need to be made in order to ascertain whether schools for the Deaf create barriers to learning and development. In order to achieve this, the author of this thesis designed a questionnaire, which aimed at obtaining an accurate view of the current educational situation in schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa with regard to the barriers to learning and development as made explicit in *White Paper 6* (Department of Education, 2001:7 &18).

The following chapter will examine the research design and methodology that was selected to be used in this study.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter will begin by examining the research design used in this study, namely qualitative and quantitative research and will provide an explanation as to why both forms of research have been used in this study. The following section will examine the methodology used and the data collection tools that are used. Both primary and secondary sources will be examined. Under the section on the collection of primary data, the questionnaire will be examined. This section will look at both the strengths and weaknesses of questionnaires and will provide reasons for this form of data capturing being used in this study. The next section will examine secondary sources of data collection. Secondary data collection uses information already compiled by previous authors that include government or other publications, earlier research, personal records and media reports published in newspapers. To conclude the chapter, differing forms of data analysis will be explored.

4.1 Quantitative and Qualitative Research

There are many ways of collecting and understanding information, and research in its many forms is one of the avenues available. Kumar distinguishes between differing types of research namely, pure and applied research, descriptive and exploratory research, correlation and explanatory research and lastly quantitative and qualitative research (1999:8).

As the aim of this research is to provide an in-depth view of the current situation in schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa, examining whether these schools follow the principles of inclusion as described in *White Paper 6* (Department of Education, 2001). In order to achieve this the author of this study decided to use the form of qualitative research supplemented with quantitative research in order to provide a holistic view of schools for the Deaf.

Qualitative and Quantitative research are seen as being on the opposite ends of the research continuum. Quantitative researchers work with few variables and many cases, while qualitative researchers on the other hand rely on a few cases and many variables (Ragin, 1987). Quantitative research involves the use of statistics, 'yes/no/how many' type of questions in questionnaires or interviews, which helps to narrow down or quantify a situation or phenomenon. Qualitative research on the other hand can be defined as:

> an inquiry process of understanding based on distinct methodological traditions of inquiry that explore a social or human problem. The researcher builds a complex, holistic picture, analyses words, reports detailed views of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting (Creswell, 1988:7).

Qualitative researchers are interested in examining how or what questions, to explore a topic, to develop a detailed view, to take advantage of access to information, to write in expressive and persuasive language, to spend time in the field, and to reach audiences receptive to qualitative approaches. Using qualitative research methods will assist the researcher in gaining an in-depth, holistic view into the topic. Denzin and Lincoln state that, "qualitative researchers employ a variety of strategies and methods to collect and analyse a variety of empirical materials" (1994:4).

According to Coffey and Atkinson (1996) qualitative data can occur in a variety of forms, as there isn't one single type. They further state that, "data can take the forms of field notes, interview transcripts, transcribed recordings of naturally occurring interaction, documents, pictures, and other graphic representations" (1996:4). These are just a few of the many tools that can be used to gather data and, according to Tesch, (1999), there are no less than 26 analytic strategies and of these, all 26 can be applied to qualitative data. Qualitative research "cannot be done in a spirit of careless rapture, with no principled or discipline thought whatsoever" (Coffey and Atkinson 1996:5). One needs to have a goal or a focus in order to have some direction in one's research. There needs to be a link, a common thread that gets weaved though the entire research as a whole.

Having earlier said that qualitative and quantitative research are on opposites ends of the research continuum, there are those who believe that both are "inextricably intertwined, not only at the level of specific data sets but also at the levels of study design and analysis" (Miles & Huberman, 1994:41). Some researchers believe that qualitative and quantitative forms of data should be linked (Rossman & Wilson, 1984, Green, Caracelli & Graham, 1989; Firestone, 1987).

Rosmann and Wilson (as quoted in Miles & Huberman 1994:41), suggest three broad reasons for the linking of qualitative and quantitative data. Firstly to "enable confirmation or corroboration of each other via triangulation," secondly "to elaborate or develop analysis, providing richer detail" and lastly " to initiate new lines of thinking through attention to surprises or paradoxes, turning ideas around and providing fresh insight" (Miles & Huberman, 1994:41).

Sieber (1973) as quoted in Miles and Huberman believes that that linkage between these two forms of data is a good idea.

> Quantitative data can help with the qualitative side of a study during *design* by finding a representative sample and locating deviant cases. It can help during the data collection by supplying background data, getting overlooked information, and helping avoid "elite bias". During analysis quantitative data can help by showing the generality of specific observations, correcting the "holistic fallacy", and verifying or casting new light on qualitative findings (Miles & Huberman, 1994:41)

The following section will look at the two forms of data collection that are available to researchers wanting to gain insight into a situation, namely primary and secondary data collection.

4.2 Data Collection

According to Kumar (1999:104) there are two differing approaches to collecting information about a situation, namely the use of both primary and secondary data sources.

4.2.1 Primary Data Sources

Primary sources of data provide first-hand information about a topic or subject. Interviews, observation, surveys, and questionnaires are primary sources of information. The following section will provide information on the questionnaire as it relates to primary data collection, as this was the primary form of data collection selected to be used in this study.

4.2.2 The Questionnaire

A questionnaire can be defined as "a written list of questions, the answers to which are recorded by respondents" (Kumar, 1999:110). The respondent receives the questionnaire, reads the questions, interprets what is required and then writes down her answers. It is crucial that the questions asked are easy to read, understand and follow, as unlike in an interview situation, the respondent cannot ask questions or receive answers immediately. According to Kumar (1999:113), there are three differing ways of administrating questionnaires, namely collective administration, administration in a public place and mailed questionnaires and in this study a mailed questionnaire was chosen due to the wide geographic location of schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa.

There are also differing types of questions that are available for the use in questionnaires, namely open-ended or closed-ended questions. Open-ended questions provide the opportunity for the respondent to answer the question in his/her own words. These questions are used when one is "concerned with process and meaning rather than cause and effect" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992:156). In closed-ended questions the respondent is provided with a choice of responses to choose from with a space to select the most appropriate answer. Before choosing which type of questions to use, one needs to be clear on how one plans to use the completed data. Closed-ended questions are useful if one requires statistical, factual information. The data obtained is easy to tabulate and analyse but has its disadvantages as well. The information obtained lacks insight, variety and depth and there is a higher chance of "investigator bias" and the findings may not be truly reflective of the respondent's opinions (Kumar, 1999:119).

Open-ended questions are good “for obtaining opinions, attitudes and perceptions” (Kumar, 1999:118) and provide a more holistic, in-depth view of a situation. The respondent is allowed to express his feelings freely which provides a wider variety of information and eliminates the chance of investigator bias. Having said this, open-ended questions require more time to respond and the respondent may feel uncomfortable with sharing their opinions. Analysis of this form of questions involves more time and skill.

A second method of questionnaire administration is known as collective administration. This form of obtaining results takes place wherever there is a group of people in a place for a specific reason such as “students in a classroom, people attending a function, participants of a program or people assembled in one place” (Kumar, 1999:113). A reason for the high rate of responses is due to you “having personal contact with the respondents and being able to explain the purpose, relevance and importance of your study” Kumar (1999:113). You are also able to clarify any issues and answer questions. It is also the quickest way to receive data and is cost effective, as one does not have to pay for postage.

Questionnaire administration data capturing involves handing out questionnaire in a public place such as in a school or shopping centre. This method is only relevant if a wide variety of individual respondents is needed. One can either approach potential respondents or wait for them to come up to you. The purpose of the study is explained to each respondent, which can be time consuming. This method “has all the advantages of administrating a questionnaire collectively” (Kumar, 1999:113). This form of data capturing was not used in this study, as it would not be financially viable to travel to each of the 47 schools for the Deaf across South Africa due to the wide geographical location of these schools.

The mailed questionnaire is the most common method of collecting information. The postal address of each respondent is needed and it is advised to include a self addressed envelope with a stamp together with the questionnaire, as this may result in a higher rate of questionnaires being returned to you. It is crucial that a covering letter outlining the intent and relevance and any specific instructions needed be included with the questionnaire (see addendum A: Covering Letter). As mentioned earlier, it is important to be as clear as possible as the respondent cannot always contact you immediately to clarify or ask questions. While questionnaires are less expensive than interviews and offer greater anonymity there are many disadvantages such as the following. They are limited only to those who can read and write, and there is a low response rate. There is a self-selecting bias as not every one who receives them completes and returns them. There are no opportunities to clarify issues. The responses may be influenced by the response to other questions as most respondents read through all of the questions before answering them.

There is also the chance that respondents may discuss or consult other people before providing an answer, which may not be their own.

4.2.3 Secondary Data Sources

Secondary sources of data collection use information previously compiled by other sources. These include official documents such as internal documents (memos, minutes of meeting etc), external communication (newsletters etc) as well as personal records and personal files. Other secondary data sources include earlier research, photographs, mass media such as reports published in newspapers, as well as personal documents such as personal letters, diaries and autobiographies. Secondary data may also use organisations' databases such as the results of a census to find out how many people are living in an area, the use of church records to gain information on birth and deaths of a generation etc. People choosing secondary data sources do so for reasons including gaining insight into historical events where people have already passed away or live too far away to be interviewed, for example.

Just as there are problems with using any form of data collection, there are difficulties when using data from secondary sources. The shortcomings of using secondary data sources include the validity and reliability of the information, which may vary. Availability of data can also be a problem as it is not always easy to find the data you need immediately.

To conclude, secondary data sources use 'second-hand' information already gained by other people. It can be a useful way of gaining information already discovered by other researchers in order to verify ones own findings about a similar phenomenon.

4.3 Data Collection used in this Study

As stated in Chapter Two, the intent of the author is to gain insight into current schools for the Deaf examining whether they are following the principles of inclusion and whether barriers to learning and development, as made explicit in *White Paper 6* (Department of Education, 2001), are occurring in these schools. To achieve this it is important to gain an overview of global and local trends in the education of Deaf learners and examine what lead to the adoption of inclusion across the globe as well as in the South African education system. This was achieved by examining policies, documents and research from around the globe to gain a holistic, overall view, namely through the use of secondary data sources.

In order to gain an in-depth view into schools accommodating Deaf learners in South Africa, a questionnaire was compiled. The questions for the questionnaire were based on barriers to

learning and development identified in the Department of Education's *White Paper 6* (2001:7 & 18). The questionnaire was sent via post to each principal in the 32 schools accommodating Deaf learners in South Africa in order to gain insight into the current situation in these schools (see Addendum B). The reason for this particular study taking the format of a mailed questionnaire is due to the wide geographical distribution of the 32 schools for the Deaf.

Accompanying each questionnaire was a covering letter (see addendum A), which has been based on Kumar's outline (1999:113), giving an explanation of the focus of the study as well as instructions on completing the questionnaire. It also provided contact details of the author if the principal needed clarity, wanted to comment or needed further information into the study.

The questionnaire made use of both open-ended and closed-ended questions as this would result in gaining both a holistic overview of the principal's personal opinions as well as some information to provide statistical data (see addendum B). Open-ended questions included what changes the principals feel are necessary to facilitate the best education for Deaf learners in their schools while closed-ended questions included what language is used for teaching and learning. The principals were requested to complete the questionnaires in as much detail as possible and return it. A few schools that did not respond to the questionnaire were contacted via telephone and later a fax of the questionnaire was sent. The author of this study contacted a few of the principals via the telephone in order to clarify data and to make sure the question was understood by the principal and that the answer was understood by the author. Once returned, the completed questionnaires enabled the author to examine whether barriers to learning and development, as identified in *White Paper 6* (Department of Education, 2001), are currently being experienced by Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa. The recommendations made by the principals have been combined with those made by the Department of Educations' *White Paper 6* (2001); DEAFSA's *Memorandum to the National and Provincial Departments of Education* (2003); UNESCO's *Consultation Report, Inclusive Education and the Deaf Child in South Africa* (1999) as well Johnson, Liddell and Erting's *Unlocking the Curriculum: Principles for Achieving Access in Deaf Education* (1989), which will provide possible ways of combating barriers to learning and development in schools for the Deaf. It is hoped that by combining both policy and data on the present occurrences with regard to inclusion in currents schools for the Deaf, a holistic overview will be achieved.

The following section, data analysis, will examine the processes one needs to follow while working within the qualitative framework once data has been collected.

4.4 Data Analysis

Data analysis can be defined as a "complex process of selection, sharpening, sorting, focusing, discarding and organising in order to make sense of the data, draw conclusions and verify the data" (Collair, 2001:38). It can also be called 'data reduction' as it refers to the "process of selecting, focussing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the data" (Miles & Huberman, 1994:10).

4.4.1 Data Coding, Reduction and Analysis

In qualitative analysis one needs to identify key themes and patterns in order to link concepts. According to Coffey and Atkinson (1996:26) all researchers need to be able to organise, manage, and retrieve the most meaningful bits of data. Analysis involves "working with data, organising them, breaking them into manageable units, synthesising them, searching for patterns, discovering what is important and what is to be learned, and deciding what to tell others" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992:153).

Data needs to be condensed into manageable chunks by creating categories. This process is known as data coding and reduction, which can be seen as generating concepts from and with data, using coding as a tool of achieving this. It needs to be understood that coding is just a part of the process of analysis as coding amalgamates a variety of different approaches to and ways of organising qualitative data.

Data coding and reduction is important in qualitative research as it links different areas of data together that share a common property or element, which are then categorised. Coding and data reduction takes ideas, reduces the data to related sections and links them together to create meaningful related data. Each segment is related to the other and a follow-through can be seen when the data is put together. Data can be seen as pieces of a puzzle. Each piece of data has two roles. Firstly it is an isolated piece and secondly - when combined with other individual pieces - completes the picture as a whole. Each piece of data is important and if missing, will leave gaps in the research. It is important that one keeps checking that the data is directly linked to the topic and that it fits with the rest of your data. According to some researchers codes represent the decisive link between the original 'raw data,' meaning the textual material such as interview transcripts or field notes, as well as the researcher's theoretical concepts. Data coding and reduction can be thought of as a range of approaches that help with the organisation, retrieval, and the interpretation of data. It is a process that assists the researcher to identify meaningful data and set the stage for interpreting and drawing conclusions. Data coding and reduction can be seen as data simplification or reduction. Raw data is condensed revealing only the bare facts, reducing

data to meaningful portions that are more easily managed. It can be used to expand and flesh out data, which may aid to opening up more diverse analytical possibilities. This is known as data complication (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996:29), which is used to expand the conceptual frameworks and dimensions for analysis. It is about using the data and coming up with questions to create theories and frameworks.

Data coding and reduction is not separate from analysis, rather it is a part of analysis.

> The researcher's decision – which data chunks to code and which to pull out, which patterns best summarise a number of chunks, which involving story to tell – are all analytic choices. Data reduction is a form of analysis that sharpens, sorts, focuses, discards, and organises data in such a way that the "final" conclusions can be drawn and verified (Miles and Huberman, 1994:11).

In this study, certain barriers identified in *White Paper 6* (Department of Education) were linked together (such as the barriers *inappropriate languages or language of learning and teaching* and *inappropriate communication* as both could be linked to communication methods and language). Certain sections of the data obtained from completed questionnaires where grouped together and a general discussion and recommendations were made as they related to each other. To conclude, data coding and reduction may be used as a tool to reduce or expand data. On the one hand it is used to condense, segment and refine data while on the other it can be used to expand data in order to create questions and understanding. In this study data coding and reduction was used in order to group areas together.

4.5 Ethical Considerations

Before you commence your research you have to look at whether ethically your study is sound. In order to do this it is crucial that the following series of ethical issues need attention.

To begin one needs to make sure that your study worth doing, that it will contribute to a worthy cause and that its values are important to you. If not you could "become complicitous and dishonest" (Miles & Huberman, 1994:291). Secondly you need to make sure that you are competent and experienced enough to carry out the study in good quality. If this is not the case then one may be left with "accumulation of large amounts of poorly collected, unanalysed data; and superficial and hasty conclusion drawing as deadlines loom" (Miles & Huberman, 1994:291). This is often the result of researchers who do not seek the assistance and skills from more knowledgeable sources such as lecturers, experts and friends. Thirdly, it is imperative that you gain informed consent from all participants in your study. If you collect information without the respondent knowing, without her willingness and expressed consent you may be seen as being unethical. Informed consent:

> implies that subjects are made adequately aware of the type of information you want from them, why the information is being sort, what purpose it will be put to, how they are expected to participate in the study, and how it will directly or indirectly affect them (Kenmar, 1999:192).

The respondent's decision to participate in the study needs to be a voluntary decision - one that was made without any form of pressure. The respondent also needs to be made aware that she has the right and freedom to choose not to assist you in your study as well as choosing to pull out of the study at any time if she so wishes.

Fourthly, you need to make sure that no harm or risk comes to the participants in your study. This could come in the form of "blows to self-esteem or 'looking bad' to others, threats to one's interest, position, or advancement in the organisation, to loss of funding for a program, on up to being sued or arrested" (Miles & Huberman, 1994:292). The participant should not be exposed to "risks that are greater than the gains they might derive" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992:53).

Trust and honesty are also crucial in your study. You need to make sure that you depict the whole truth and don't leave out valuable information or leave statements open to speculation. The above areas go hand in hand with privacy, confidentiality and anonymity. The following definitions may be useful in distinguishing the differences between each:

> Privacy: control over others' access to oneself and associated information; preservation of boundaries against giving protected information or receiving unwanted information. Confidentiality: agreements with a person or organization about what will be done (and may not be done) with the data; may include legal constraints. (Sieber, 1992 as quoted in Miles & Huberman, 1994:293).

It is important that the identities of the participant and the organizations/situation that they are involved in are, as far as possible, protected. Anonymity should be provided and any information that would indicate which individuals or organizations the data was obtained from should be avoided.

In this study a covering letter (see addendum A) was sent together with each questionnaire, which explained the following: information about the author (name, university and degree completing); the focus of the study; the reasons for the study being conducted; the need for the participants input; what the questions from the questionnaire were based on the barriers to learning and development from *White paper 6*, (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18); the fact that participation in the study was voluntary and that as far as possible, the identity of the school as well as the principal would be kept confidential. To conclude contact details were provided so that if the participant wished to ask questions, comment, make recommendations or need further clarification they would be able to.

4.6 Limitations of this Study

The limitations of this study can be grouped into sections. Firstly the questionnaire that was sent to each principal in schools for the Deaf were returned to the author before the end of September 2003. This resulted in the questions related to the education qualifications school leavers were departing with being uncertain as these learners had not written and thus not obtained their results, which would only have been available after the completion of their final exams in November 2003. For this reason the question was rephrased to the expected educational exit levels principals felt their school leavers would depart with.

Although the response rate of returned questionnaires from schools for the Deaf were relatively high (78%), the author would have liked to have had more responses to ensure that an accurate account was provided.

The names, addresses and contact telephone numbers of the thirty-two schools that accommodate Deaf learners were obtained from the Deaf Federation of South Africa's 2003 booklet. After contacting each of the schools it became clear that some of details in this booklet were incorrect. Some had amalgamated with other schools (Deaf Child Centre Classes now amalgamated with Mary Kihn School for Partially Hearing Pupils), changed name (Katlehong School for the Deaf is now S'nethemba School for the Deaf and Blind) and moved location or changed contact details.

Due to time constraints, workload of educators as well as location of schools for the Deaf the author requested that principals rather than educators completed the questionnaires. The limitation of this is that some principals do not have contact with Deaf learners in the schools and thus a more accurate view of the school would have been acquired from educators who teach Deaf learners and have to implement policies etc. Another limitation is that principals may want to portray their school in a good light and therefore may not provide any information that may be seen as being negative.

To conclude the author of this study is aware that there may be other Deaf learners being accommodated within hearing classes throughout South Africa, but presently neither the Department of Education nor the Deaf Federation of South Africa (DEAFSA) are able to provide the names and contact details of these schools or the number of Deaf learners.

The following chapter will present the findings from the completed questionnaires that were based on *White Paper 6's* Barriers to learning and development (Department of Education, 2001: 7 & 18), which principals in schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa completed.

CHAPTER FIVE

BARRIERS, RESEARCH FINDINGS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To begin, the barriers to learning and development, as made explicit in *White Paper 6* (Department of Education, 2001: 7 & 18) are discussed, as each of the questions in the questionnaire were based on these barriers and thus form the base of this study. General qualitative data, such as location, educator/learner ratio, subjects and grades offered, are then presented. Research findings follow and have been divided into three sections, namely research findings, discussions and recommendations. The research findings present both the barrier to learning and development that the question was based on, as well as the findings from the study. A discussion around these findings is then presented and recommendations, which provide possible solutions to prevent barriers to learning and development from occurring, are provided.

5.1 Barriers to Learning and Development

As mentioned in the literature review, education is a fundamental right, which extends equally to all learners throughout South Africa and it is the responsibility of the education system to develop and sustain learning. The *Draft Conceptual and Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of Inclusive Education* (2002) states that, "a complex and dynamic relationship exists between the learner, the centre of learning, the broader education system and the social, political and economic context of which they are all part" (Department of Education, 2002:130). Each of these plays a major role in whether effective learning and development occur. If a problem takes place in any of the above components,

> it impacts on the learning process, causing learning breakdown or exclusion. Thus, if the system fails to meet the different needs of a wide range of learners or if problems arise in any of these components, the learner or the system may be prevented from being able to engage in or sustain an ideal process of learning (Department of Education, 2002:130).

The factors that lead to learning breakdown and prevent learners from reaching their full potential are known as barriers to learning and development. *White Paper 6* identifies the following as barriers to learning and development (Department of Education 2001:7 & 18):

1. Negative attitudes to and stereotyping of differences
2. Inflexible curriculum
3. Inappropriate languages or language of learning and teaching
4. Inappropriate communication
5. Inaccessible and unsafe built environments
6. Inappropriate and inadequate support services
7. Inadequate policies and legislation

8. Non-recognition and non-involvement of parents
9. Inadequately and inappropriately trained education managers and educators

The questionnaire (see Addendum B) that was sent to all principals was based upon the above barriers to learning and development, in order to ascertain whether Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf experience any of the barriers and whether these learners have access to the most appropriate least restrictive, barrier free education.

The Department of Education's *Draft Guidelines for the Implementation of Inclusive Education* (2002), identifies other indicators for factors impacting learning environments as being caused by: "Socio-economic situation, attitudes to difference, culture of the school, curriculum/learning programmes, communication, accessibility and safety of built environment, support from school/district, parental involvement, capacity amongst educators, capacity amongst senior management, general dysfunctionality of school, assistive devices, availability of learning support materials/resources and violence/abuse" (Department of Education, 2002:84).

It needs to be made explicit that an inclusive education approach is not only aimed at learners with disabilities or special needs but rather at <u>all</u> learners. There are learners who experience barriers to learning caused by "children living in poverty, children from ethnic and linguistic minorities, girls (in some societies), children from remote areas and so on" (UNESCO, 2002:22). Deaf learners would be included as a linguistic minority group as Deaf people do not see themselves as disabled, rather as members of a linguistic minority group who use Sign Language (and SASL in South Africa) and are part of the Deaf Community.

5.2 Research Findings, Discussions and Recommendations

The data in this study has been divided into sub-sections, each devoted to a separate area in the questionnaire. The beginning of each section will begin by providing the question that was asked in the questionnaire and the identified barrier to learning and development (Department of Education, 2001: 7 & 18) that the question was based upon. The responses from principals in schools for the Deaf will be grouped according to provincial location (Eastern Cape, Free State, Gauteng, KwaZulu Natal, Mpumalanga, Northern Cape, Limpopo, North West and lastly the Western Cape Province).

To begin, questions one to five required the principals to provide quantitative information about their school. Question one required the name of the school, which for privacy reasons cannot be disclosed as the principals were guaranteed that the name of their school would not be revealed. This was in order to gain accurate answers without principals feeling pressured into providing

'correct' answers. Questions two to five were required in order to provide statistics on the geographical location, the learner-educator ratio and lastly to provide the grades offered at each school for the Deaf throughout South Africa (see Addendum B for a copy of the questionnaire).

5.2.1 Provincial Location of Schools for the Deaf

Presently there are a total thirty-two schools for the Deaf located throughout South Africa which accommodate learners who are Deaf (DEAFSA, 2003). This number includes schools accommodating only pre-school learners, right through to schools accommodating learners in their twelfth year of schooling. The names and addresses of each of these schools were obtained from Deaf Federation of South Africa's (DEAFSA) information booklet (DEAFSA, 2003) and a copy of the questionnaire and permission letter were sent (See addendum A and B). The names and provinces of all the schools included in this study can be found in Addendum 4.




Figure number 3: Provincial Number of Schools for the Deaf

It is clear from the above that Gauteng and Kwazulu Natal provinces have the most number of schools for the Deaf (seven each) followed by the Western Cape with five schools, the Eastern Cape with four schools, three in Limpopo, two in both the North West and Free State, and lastly Mpumalanga and the Northern Cape which both have one school.

Of the seven schools for the Deaf in Gauteng, two accommodate both Deaf and hearing blind learners, with one including physically disabled hearing learners alongside the Deaf learners. KwaZulu Natal has a total seven schools for the Deaf none of which accommodate hearing

learners with disabilities. The Western Cape has five schools for the Deaf one of which only accommodate Deaf learners to Grade three. Out of the four Eastern Cape schools, one accommodates hearing blind learners together with Deaf learners. The Limpopo province has three schools for the Deaf. Of these one is a school for Deaf and hearing blind learners. Both the North West and Free State provinces have a total of two schools for the Deaf. One of the schools in the Free State accommodates both Deaf and blind learners separately. Lastly Mpumalanga and the Northern Cape provinces have one school for the Deaf each.

The above information was required in order to provide statistics on the distribution of schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa.

5.2.2 Response Rate of Schools

As mentioned, in order to gain an accurate view of the situation in schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa, and to see whether they follow the principles of inclusion, questionnaires were sent via mail to thirty-two schools for the Deaf in South Africa.




Figure number 4: Response Rate of Schools

The above figure shows the response rate of each school for the Deaf throughout South Africa. The national response result is as follows: twenty-five out of the thirty-two schools for the Deaf

responded, resulting in 78% of schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa being represented in this study.

5.2.3 Number of Educators and Learners

Question three A examined the total number of Deaf learners per province, while question three B examined the total number of educators per province in schools for the Deaf. The author of this study wished to examine the exact ratios of learner to educator in schools for the Deaf.

The total number of Deaf learners that are accommodated in schools for the Deaf that were included in this study totalled 4894.




Figure number 5: Number of Learners per Province (total 4894)

The total number of educators in schools for the Deaf included in this study equalled 602 (see figure number 6). This reveals that the educator/learner ratio in schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa is 1:8. (author's own calculation derived from figures obtained from principals).

Provincially Gauteng has the highest number of learners and educators (1302 learners and 168 Educators) which results in an educator/learner ratio of 1:8. KwaZulu Natal has 981 learners and 117 educators with an educator/learner ratio being 1:8. The Eastern Cape has 757 learners and 87 educators resulting in an educator/learner ratio of 1:9. The Western Cape has 614 learners with 99




Figure number 6: Number of Educators per Province (total 602)

educators resulting in an educator/learner ratio of 1:6, which is the lowest ratio in the country. Limpopo province has 571 learners and 69 educators resulting in an educator/learner ratio of 1:8.The Free State has 443 learners and 42 educators resulting in an educator/learner ratio of 1:10. The North West Province has 64 learners and 7 educators resulting in an educator/learner ratio of 1:9. The Northern Cape has a total of 38 learners and 2 educators resulting in an educator/learner ratio of 1:19, which is the highest in the country. Mpumalanga has 124 learners and 11 educators resulting in an educator/learner ratio of 1:11.

This question was asked to examine whether there is uniformity with regard to educator and learner ratio across the provinces, just as the ratio of educator to learners in hearing schools remains consistent with 1:35 in each province. It is clear from the findings that there are still differences in numbers between provinces (Western Cape with an educator learner ratio of 1:6 while the ration in the Northern Cape is 1:19).

5.2.4 Grades and Level of Education Offered

Question five examined the current grades that are offered as well as the highest level of education provided in schools for the Deaf, in order to see whether Deaf learners have access to education from pre school through to Grade twelve.




Figure number 7: Highest Level of Education Offered

It is positive to see from an early intervention point of view, that all but one school for the Deaf (twenty-four out of twenty-five schools) offer education at a grade R (learners aged 5 years old) level. It is crucial from a linguistic point of view to accommodate Deaf learners in a stimulating Sign Language rich environment from as early as possible so that Sign Language is most easily and naturally learned.

Two schools for the Deaf accommodate Deaf learners up to grade 3, one up to grade 6, while five others offer education up to a grade 7 level only. Four schools provide education to a grade 9 level and currently there are only four schools providing Deaf learners with access to completing the national grade twelve exams (none of which offer subjects on higher grade). Many of the schools listed above also offer vocational and technical subjects/courses, where Deaf learners are given basic practical skills to assist them once leaving a school for the Deaf ('National Levels' (N1, N2 and N3); 'pre-vocational' and 'vocational', 'technical', 'practical' etc). Additional courses offered in three schools for the Deaf accommodate Deaf learners with a range of disabilities. The remaining schools offer vocational and technical subjects/courses only.

Study findings with regard to the precise NQF (National Qualifications Framework) scale of the vocational and technical subjects/courses revealed that there is a lack of uniformity among many schools resulting in confusion in terms of categorisation. Many principals are not clear as to what

NQF level their practical, technical, pre-vocational and vocational, etc courses are, and thus there are no standardised levels among all schools for the Deaf. These above courses are included as 'other' in the above figure number 7.

5.2.7 Number of School Leavers and Standard of Education Departing with

This section has been divided into two, namely the total number of Deaf school leavers in schools for the Deaf in December 2003, and the level of education with which these learners are expected to depart.

The total number of Deaf school leavers who were expected to depart with a senior primary qualification (above Grade seven) equalled 175 (national number derived from completed questionnaires from principals in schools for the Deaf). The provincial distributions of these learners can be seen in figure number 7 below.

The Eastern Cape province has a total of thirty-two senior school leavers, twenty-five of whom are expected to leave with a Grade nine exit level, and three with an NSC and lastly four senior learners are hoped to leave with an exit level that the principal wished to be kept private (Principal number three).

The Free State province has a total of nine senior school leavers, four of whom are expected to depart with an exit level that the principal wished to be kept private (Principal number six). The remaining school is hoped to have one learner leave with an N3 qualification while the other four learners will depart with vocational skills training.

Of the schools in the Gauteng province, the total number of senior school leavers equalled forty-five. It is hoped that one senior school will have five learners departing, three with an N2 and two with an N3 exit level, while another school had sixteen learners leaving with a Grade twelve and vocational skills training. The remaining two schools have thirty-five Grade twelve learners combined, with one of the two schools having five learners hoping to leaving with vocational skills training. One principal requested that the number of Grade twelve learners departing from his/her schools remain confidential (Principal number twelve).




Figure number 8: Number of Senior School Leavers expected to leave above Grade seven

KwaZulu Natal province has a total of sixty-three senior school leavers. One principal did not provide the number of learners leaving the schools as he/she stated that, "We are a feeder school" (Principal number twenty-three) meaning that the Deaf learners cannot reach their twelfth year and thus complete their education in this school. It is hoped that two schools combined will have a total of forty learners departing with a Grade ten basic and technical exit level. One school has twenty school leavers hoping to depart with a Grade twelve and Pre-skills training course, while the remaining school are expected to have three school leavers departing with a Grade twelve Senior Certificate.

The only school for the Deaf in Mpumalanga only offers education up to Grade six and in 2003, which results the school having no school leavers (Principal number twenty-six). The only school in the Northern Cape accommodates Deaf learners from Grades R through to Grade three only so therefore has no senior school leavers at present.

The Limpopo province has two schools for the Deaf both of which offer education only up to Grade seven. The principal of one of the schools (Principal number thirty-one) requested that the number be kept private and thus did not complete the number of Grade sevens leaving in 2003, but the remaining school anticipated having fifteen learners departing with a Grade seven

education. The only school to respond to the questionnaire in the North West province only had one learner who was hoped to depart with an N3 in 2003.

Due to the fact that two out of the four schools do not accommodate high school learners, it was hoped that would be twenty-five senior school leavers departing from schools for the Deaf in the Western Cape in 2003. Out of these only eleven learners were expected to write the Grade twelve Senior Certificate Exam, while the remaining fourteen were anticipated to obtain either vocational or practical skills training certificate.

Discussion:

The results reveal that there are very few Deaf learners leaving schools for the Deaf (175) and of these learners, many are leaving schools for the Deaf with exit levels that are very low (only 54 Deaf learners wrote the National Grade twelve exams at the end of 2003). The majority of Deaf learners leaving these schools would not have access to further education and training institutions, as not one principal in any school for the Deaf stated that any of his/her learners had taken subjects on a higher grade level, and thus had no university exemption

It is interesting to see that there are schools for the Deaf in South Africa that only accommodate learners up until Grade seven. This raises the question as to where these learners are being accommodated once reaching the highest grade at their school. Other concerns include the level of education Deaf school leavers are departing with as well as the very low number of school leavers. Questions such as:

- What happens to the rest of the learners that do not reach exit levels at school, the 'drop outs'?
- Why are only practical 'N' skills/vocational course subjects and not academic higher grade subjects being offered in many of the schools?
- Are all Deaf school leavers 'practically' inclined? (Storbeck, 2004)
- Do the educators view the Deaf learners from a clinical-pathological Paradigm and treat them differently to hearing learners by not having the same educational expectations as educators have of their hearing learners (tertiary education etc)?
- Are the Deaf learners lagging academically behind the hearing learners and if so could this be due to language barriers between hearing educators and Deaf Sign Language learners?
- Do all Deaf learners "lack imagination and creativity" as quoted by a principal (principal number 17), and if so could this be due to parents and

educators not exposing Deaf learners to creative materials and experiences?

- Would the majority of Deaf learners be better accommodated in inclusive hearing schools where higher academic results are often achieved if learners have the support from their parents, educators, peers and interpreters?

DEAFSA's Memorandum to the National and Provincial Departments of Education provides further areas of concern, and stated that "Deaf learners who have been through the education and training system for 12-15 years can still not read or write a spoken language properly" (2004:8). This document further states that "even today, most Deaf learners leave school functionally illiterate because of language depravation and inappropriate teaching methods" (DEAFSA, 2004:8) and that "the majority of Deaf learners are leaving school with a reading and writing ability of an 9-year old" (DEAFSA, 2004:8). Thus Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf in South Africa do not have access to education on the same levels as hearing learners in hearing schools. "The tiny number of Deaf matriculants in the country, and even more miniscule number of Deaf graduates is testimony to this failure" (UNESCO, 1999:19).

A possible reason for the low levels of subjects offered of Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf may be caused by 'The Cycle of Low Expectations' by educators. This cycle may stem from educators who view deafness as a deficit (Medical Model) and feel that deaf children cannot perform as well as hearing children (Johnson, Liddell & Erting, 1989:12).

> If a teacher's students fail to improve their writing and reading abilities, it is always assumed to be the result of inadequacies in the children or the general difficulty of teaching English to deaf students. It is seldom suggested that the failure may actually result from a failure to communicate between teacher and children (Johnson, Liddell and Erting, 1989:12).

It is crucial that "Deaf children are not seen as 'defective models' of normally hearing children" (Johnson, Liddell and Erting, 1989:18), rather as learners who are capable of achieving the same outcomes as hearing learners. It is important that educators of the Deaf understand the need for change as their paradigm on deafness will have a direct impact on how the view and thus educate Deaf learners (see chapter two). "Many educators may still remain under the influence of the old paradigm. The question is do these educators understand the implication of the old paradigm and what it requires to make the shift to the demands of a more emancipated discourse" (Naiker, 2000:8).

Another possible reason for the low levels of subjects offered to Deaf learners could be due to educators teaching Deaf learners at a lower level than their hearing peers in hearing schools, giving them a watered down version of the curriculum. If an educator does not encourage and motivate her learners to achieve and experience challenging work, many learners will not achieve as they may feel that they are not capable. This is known as the 'ceiling effect.' On the other hand if an educator constantly challenges, motivates and expects her learners to achieve many learners will take up the challenge and obtain higher results. Previously in South Africa, "Fundamental Pedagogics and the traditional model of 'special education' were skewed toward a restricted pedagogy that set ceilings on learners" (Department of Education, 2002:12). In order to rectify the above, educators in schools for the Deaf need to set high expectations for their Deaf learners,

> educators need to assist learners reach their full potential. They have to measure progress against the previous achievements of a learner and not against those of other learners. Emphasis has to be placed on progress and experiencing success (Department of Education, 2002:75)

If educators move straight into schools for the Deaf after having completed their training, never having taught hearing learners, these educators may not benefit from seeing what the expected outcome levels of achievement are supposed to be and may teach at a lower level. Therefore educators need to be encouraged to either teach hearing learners in hearing schools before moving to a school for the Deaf, or to have inclusive links with both hearing schools and with educators teaching in hearing schools.

A possible way to alleviate the problem of low levels of subject choice would be to have 'cluster meetings' or 'focus groups' where educators in schools for the Deaf have regular meetings and workshops with other educators of the Deaf as well as with educators working in hearing schools. Educators working in schools for the Deaf would be able to offer assistance and their expertise with regard to areas such as deafness, Bilingualism etc, while educators of hearing learners would be given the opportunity to see what happens in schools for the Deaf and may be able to offer assistance with regards to new approaches, materials etc. "Meetings between the teachers and principals of the various schools should be held from time to time to exchange ideas and discuss common problems" (Department of Education, 2002:26). This would provide a platform for educators to share ideas, "exchange resources (facilities, information, etc), skills, technology, advisory support" (Department of Education, 2002:46), expertise, materials, experience and offer support and encouragement which may motivate educators to expect more from their learners (i.e. if hearing Grade one learners can achieve these outcomes why cant Deaf learners?). These meetings may also encourage educators to become more creative, positive and learner centred. These interactions would also facilitate the process of removing "the divisions between special

education and the mainstream system and bring special education out of its isolation into the mainstream of education" (Department of Education, 2002:26).

To conclude, the Department of Education does recognize that change is not an easy step for educators to undergo, "when educators are asked to change their ways of thinking, working and reflecting on their environment, they may tend to feel inadequate, insecure or frustrated. They may feel the need for training, information and support" (Department of Education, 2002:61). In order to assist educators make the necessary changes principals, the Deaf community, the Department as well as parents need to be involved in the training as well as offer support.

Recommendations:

In order to facilitate the process of change among educators the following recommendations have been made.

- "Training to alter attitudes must be linked and interlinked with other processes and developments which include linking training with dealing practically with learners who experience barriers to learning and achieving success" (Department of Education, 2002:27)
- Addressing barriers to learning and participation is at the heart of school based change and school improvement

5.2.6 Number of Hearing verses Number of Deaf Qualified Educators and Deaf Community Involvement

This section has been divided into three main sections, firstly the number of hearing versus the number of Deaf qualified educators, after the number of Deaf adults employed as well as the positions they hold and lastly Deaf Community involvement in schools for the Deaf will be examined. A general discussion will combine information on each section and to conclude, recommendations will be provided in order to prevent barriers to learning and development in schools for the Deaf.

As stated, question three examined the total number of qualified educators in schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa. This section further investigated this total number with reference to the number and percentage of qualified hearing verses Deaf educators employed in schools for the Deaf. Currently there are 602 qualified educators employed in schools for the Deaf. Of these 586 are qualified hearing educators and, according to principals, 16 are qualified Deaf educators, which results in 97% of the total number of educators in schools for the Deaf being hearing and only 3% being Deaf.




Figure number 9: Number of Qualified Deaf verses Hearing Educators

Question Eight examined the number of Deaf staff employed in schools for the Deaf and in what capacity they are being employed. This question was asked in order to see how many Deaf role models Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf are exposed to on a daily basis.

Figure ten illustrates that there are currently 16 qualified educators, 29 are assistants working in classrooms as teacher aids, 16 are cleaners, many of whom were past pupils, seven are house parents working in hostels, one is a kitchen aid and lastly one is a groundsman employed in a school for the Deaf. This results in a total of 70 Deaf employees being employed in the 23 schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa.

Question eighteen examined whether the Deaf Community are involvement in schools for the Deaf. Those principals who replied that the Deaf Community are involved in their schools were asked for the numbers how and in what capacity.

Twenty-four out of twenty-five principals in schools for the Deaf stated that the Deaf Community are involved in some way and at some time during the year in their school. Two principals mentioned that Deaf adults are only involved during Deaf Awareness Week, a week that falls annually in September. Many are involved as classroom assistants, cleaners, as Sign Language educators, on the school Governing Body, the running of tuck shops as well as house parents in school hostels. In most schools the Deaf Community are involved in social events such as “Social

Club" (principals numbers 6; 7; 39) as well as sporting events and church. One principal stated that, "they visit the school and see how we teach" (principal number 30), while another stated that "old learners frequent the school" (principal number 17). One principal stated that the Deaf Community are "involved in all decision making" (principal number 23) while another stated that the Deaf Community are involved "but not at an educational level" (principal number 32).




Figure number 10: Capacity of Deaf Adults

Discussion:

It is interesting to compare the amount of hearing verses Deaf qualified teachers that are currently employed in schools for the Deaf in South Africa. It is also interesting to see in what capacity other Deaf people are being employed in these schools. It is crucial that Deaf learners have exposure to Deaf adults in order to have positive Deaf role models as well as Sign Language and Deaf culture mentors. "Early acquisition of sign language from competent adults may provide an advantage in the acquisition of academic skills" (Johnson, Liddell & Erting, 1989:10). Because over 90% of Deaf children are born to hearing parents Deaf adults have an important role to play in the mediation and transmit ion of Sign Language as well as Deaf culture, both of which cannot be transmitted thoroughly via hearing parents, educators and staff. In a study compiled by Woodward and Allen (1987) which examined the use of Sign Language in classrooms in schools for the Deaf, found that "competent adult signers with whom the children come into contact are able to undertake a large part of the socializing process for the children of hearing parents" (Johnson, Liddell & Erting, 1989:10). The sooner a Deaf learner has contact with Deaf adults "the more complete and competent those children's ultimate command of the language will be"

(Johnson, Liddell & Erting, 1989:11). Many Deaf adults have come from schools for the Deaf and understand the frustrations of being educated via a spoken language by hearing educators. Deaf adults provide positive role models, they can understand what it is like to grow up in a hearing world and also know that Deaf people are capable of achieving the same outcomes as hearing learners.

Learners from previously marginalized and minority groups will benefit from having contact with positive adult role models from their same groups (UNESCO, 2002:92). Johnson, Liddell and Erting state that, "the best models for natural Sign Language acquisition, the development of social identity, and the enhancement of self-esteem for deaf children are deaf signers who use the language proficiently" (1989:16). In schools for the Deaf it is important that Deaf educators, who are Deaf role models, receive a high level of teacher training and support with regards to how to teach Deaf learners. Just because a Deaf adult is Deaf does not mean she should know how to be a successful educator of the Deaf. Deaf adults need regular teacher training qualifications or experience. In a hearing school, principals would not employ an ex-learner without the relevant teacher training qualifications or experience and skills. There are principals who will employ Deaf adults and expect them to provide Sign Language training to hearing educators and Deaf learners, without them having any training or support, which may lead to barriers being created within the education system. It is important that Deaf educators be given the choice of teaching in which ever learning area and phase they wish and that they are qualified to teach in and should not only be employed to teach Sign Language, practical skills courses or pre-school learners only in schools for the Deaf.

Hearing educators need to realize that Deaf educators are a resource and that if all schools for the Deaf follow the Bilingual-Bicultural Approach to literacy development, there needs to be both hearing and Deaf culture and language role models. Just as both languages and cultures are equal, so too are the Deaf and hearing educators' roles within a Bilingual-Bicultural Approach programme. There needs to be a partnership between Deaf and hearing educators. Resources, training, life experiences and skills need to be pooled and shared in order to provide Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf with the most appropriate, least restrictive, barrier free education possible. In order to address the issue of having Deaf role models the Deaf Community and Deaf organizations such as DEAFSA need to be involved in all aspects of schools for the Deaf, from the Governing Body through to the making of resources for Deaf learners, and not only during Deaf Awareness Week. The Deaf Community need to support schools for the Deaf rather than focus on the barriers that have been created. If this is achieved then Deaf learners will have access to positive Deaf role models who will mediate Deaf culture and Sign Language both of which are vital to the development of a Deaf learners Deaf Identity and self-concept.

Recommendations:

Principals need to ensure that there are Deaf adults employed in schools for the Deaf, as these adults act as role models and mediators of Sign Language and Deaf culture, both of which cannot be transmitted by hearing educators and parents.

- Ideally teachers of the Deaf should be Deaf, or near-native users of South African Sign Language (UNESCO, 1999:29).
- Principals need to employ Deaf adults in all areas of the school (qualified educators, assistants, Sign Language educators and specialists, cleaners, sporting coaches etc), which is supported by Johnson, Liddell and Erting who state, "there should be deaf adults present in all educational contexts" (1989:16).
- Hearing and Deaf educators need to work together
- Deaf educators should be employed to teach in all phases as well as learning areas
- Deaf educators should receive the same amount of pre and in-service training and support as their hearing colleagues
- The Deaf Community needs to be involved in all aspects of the school and not only during Deaf Awareness Week.

While principals in schools for the Deaf employ Deaf adults in their schools, their positions are largely menial and as such they provide exposure, but not specifically role model status. Deaf adults should be encouraged to upgrade their skills and qualifications, which can form part of in-service training. Deaf learners need to be encouraged to study academic subjects at tertiary institutions and not settle with being an educator assistant or cleaner as they can achieve higher status forms of employment if they believe they are as capable as hearing learners. They need to have contact with past pupils and other successful Deaf role models and members of the Deaf community (such as Tadgh Slattery the gold Paralympic medallist, Wilma Druchen the only Deaf member of parliament, Helen Morgans a Masters degree graduate and university lecturer at the University of the Witwatersrand etc).

5.2.7 Perceived Fluency in SASL and Access to SASL Classes for Educators

This section has been divided into two sections. The first section is based on the findings from Question eleven which examined the perceived percentage of fluency in South African Sign Language by principals among their staff members. Principals were asked to rate their staff on a scale of 100% fluency to 0% fluent in South African Sign Language. The second section examined whether educators in schools for the Deaf had access to Sign Language classes and whether these classes were compulsory. To conclude, a general discussion providing information

into both sections will be provided and recommendations will be given in order to prevent barriers to learning and development occurring.

The above questions were asked in order to see whether the barrier, as made explicit in the White Paper Six (Department of Education, 2001:7) *Inappropriate languages or language of learning and teaching* as well as *Inappropriate communication* are being addressed by educators in schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa.

Not one principal in a school for the Deaf across South Africa stated that his/her educators were 100% fluent in South African Sign Language (SASL). A total of three (12%) principals felt that, overall, their hearing staff were 80% fluent in SASL. Four (16%) of principals felt that, combined, their hearing educators had a fluency in SASL of 60% while six (24%) principals felt that overall, their educators had a fluency in SASL of 40%. Ten (40%) principals felt that generally their educators were 20% fluent in SASL while two principals (8%) did not provide an answer.




Figure number 11: Perceived Fluency of Educators in South African Sign Language

Question thirteen examined whether schools for the Deaf offer Sign Language classes, whether these classes are compulsory and who provides the classes. This is in order to examine whether educators in schools for the Deaf had access to South African Sign Language (SASL), which would assist them improve or learn SASL so that the barrier mentioned in section, *Inappropriate languages or language of learning and teaching* as well as Inappropriate *communication* would be prevented (Department of Education, 2001: 7 & 18).

Results revealed that educators in 83% of schools for the Deaf have access to Sign Language classes and of these classes 57% are compulsory. It is clear from the above that the majority of educators in schools for the Deaf are themselves not fluent in South African Sign Language, even though legislation states that South African Sign Language should be used for teaching and learning in schools for the Deaf in South Africa. This results in the majority of educators in schools for the Deaf creating the barriers *inappropriate languages or language of learning* and teaching *inappropriate communication* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18). Educators not being fluent in Deaf learners first language, SASL, create these barriers, thus barriers arise from inappropriate communication, as well as from inappropriate language usage.

Discussion:

If educators use a spoken language when educating Deaf learners this may result in Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf experiencing two barriers, namely *Inappropriate languages or language of learning and teaching* and *Inappropriate communication* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18). If educators are not fluent in SASL barriers may arise from inappropriate language usage and if these educators use a form of spoken language barriers may arise from *Inappropriate communication* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18) as spoken language is totally inaccessible to a Deaf person. *The National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training* (1997) identify language and communication blocks "which can be barriers to learning when the medium of instruction is not the first language of the learners; Sign Language is not provided for Deaf learners" (Department on Education, 1997:18). These barriers, as stated in the *Draft Conceptual and Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of Inclusive Education* (2002), can be

> particularly destructive for Deaf learners whose first language is Sign Language. Misperceptions with regards to the morphological, syntactic, discourse, pragmatic, 'phonological' and semantic structures of Sign Language, which are entirely equal in complexity and richness to that which is found in any spoken language, often lead Deaf learners being forced into learning through the so-called 'oral' methods, or having to learn through signed spoken languages. Being able to access Sign Language as the medium of teaching and learning enables these learners to develop bi- and multi-lingualism through Sign Language (Department of Education, 2002:139)

DEAFSA's Memorandum to the National and Provincial Departments of Education provides a possible reason for hearing educators still using inappropriate communication and teaching methods when educating Deaf learners. They state that "some teachers still use the oral method of teaching Deaf learners and have no motivation to learn Sign Language because the Department of Education does not expect educators at schools for the Deaf to have SASL skills" (DEAFSA, 2003:10). In South Africa, the majority of educators in schools for the Deaf cannot sign and

> maintain the belief that it is up to them to decide whether SASL should be used in these schools or not. Many are woefully unaware about the properties of SASL,

> and believe that Deaf children must learn spoken language in the area. Frequently, the learners are blamed and labelled because they are not able to do so. It is in this sense that they are disabled: by the teachers and by the system that does not recognize the language which is their basic human right, and without which they literally have no access to learning (UNESCO, 1999:10).

Not only are Deaf learners at a disadvantage but if educators in schools for the Deaf use spoken language when communicating and teaching, they are creating barriers as well as denying Deaf learners of their rights. The South African The Bill of Rights makes special reference to language and culture of all South Africans, including the Deaf, which can be seen in the following quotes: Learners have "the right to receive education in the official language or languages of their choice"(29 (1) & (2)), "Everyone has the right to use the language and to participate in the cultural life of their choice" (30), "persons belonging to a cultural, religious or linguistic community may not be denied the right, with other members of that community to enjoy their culture, practice their religion and use their language; and to form, join and maintain cultural, religious and linguistic associations and other organs of civil society" (31 (1 a & b). The UNESCO's Consultation Report, 'Inclusive Education and the Deaf Child in South Africa' states that,

> for Deaf people, the barrier to learning and development is a language barrier, rather than any physical, mental or emotional barrier. If Deaf learners are placed in classrooms with hearing peers they may experience barriers to learning and development because of the spoken language medium used. If Sign Language is used as medium of instruction and for communication, Deaf learners will not experience barriers to learning and development in the above-mentioned areas (UNESCO 1999:6).

The Salamanca Statement clearly states, "Education policies should take into account of individual differences and situations. The importance of sign language as the medium of communication among the Deaf, for example, should be recognized and provision made to ensure that all Deaf persons have access to education in their national signed language" (UNESCO 1994:18).

In order for effective teaching and learning to occur, effective communication is paramount. "For deaf learners, for example, Sign Language instruction and the training of parents, educators and support staff in Sign Language, are essential to enhance communication, relationships and education" (Department of Education, 2002:227). If educators in schools for the Deaf continue to educate their Deaf learners using Signed English/Spoken language, Total Communication and Oralism, they are, "creating severe barriers for Deaf learners because their specific language needs are not addresses. Consequently Deaf learners do not have equal access, equal opportunities and equal rights in their education and training system" (DEAFSA, 2004:2). In addition there is currently no Sign Language competency/fluency assessment requirements for educators wishing

to educate Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf (Storbeck, 2004; DEAFSA, 2003, UNESCO, 1999). This may be one of the reasons for the low level of Sign Language competency among educators of the Deaf.

To conclude it is clear that Deaf learners have the right to be educated in their language of choice (Sign Language) as well as belong to their linguistic minority group (Deaf Community) where they may enjoy their culture namely Deaf Culture with other members of the Deaf Community. Educators need to acknowledge that, "Sign language and spoken language are not the same and must be kept separate in both use and in the curriculum" (Johnson, Liddell & Erting, 1989:16) and that, "The learning of a spoken language (English) for a deaf person is a process of learning a second language through literacy (reading and writing)" (1989:17). In addition, educators need to follow the Bilingual Bicultural approach to literacy and "the hearing teacher must use SASL and what she knows about Deaf culture as a basis for introducing the Deaf child to literacy" (UNESCO, 1999:29).

Recommendations:

In order for schools for the Deaf to transform into inclusive schools and prevent barriers of *Inappropriate languages or language of learning and teaching* and *inappropriate communication* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18) occurring, the following recommendations have been suggested:

- All education managers and educators should be fluent in South African Sign Language.
- There should be unified Sign Language assessment criteria, which could be developed and used in interviewing processes for all schools for the Deaf.
- Educators of the Deaf need to acknowledge that the "first language of deaf children should be natural sign language" (Johnson, Liddell & Erting, 1989:15).
- Those educators who are not fluent need to attend compulsory Sign Language classes provided by fluent Deaf adults
- In addition to being fluent in Sign Language educators of the Deaf need to be "fully acquainted with Deaf culture" (UNESCO, 1999:29).

If the above-mentioned barriers are prevented then schools for the Deaf "will no longer be, as in the past, places where teachers who do not wish to learn to sign, can function. They will no longer have the option of using "total communication" (a misnomer), "simultaneous communication"

(which is neither simultaneous, nor communication), speech, manually coded spoken language, or any combinations of the above" (UNESCO, 1999:28).

5.2.8 Are Learners with Special Education Needs being Accommodated?

Question nine examined whether the schools for the Deaf accommodated both Deaf and hearing learners with special needs. The author wished to examine two specific areas. Firstly whether hearing learners with special needs are being accommodated in the same classes as Deaf learners and secondly whether Deaf learners with special needs were being accommodated in the same classes as Deaf learners with no special needs in schools for the Deaf. Principals who had either hearing special needs or Deaf learners with special needs were asked to name these needs. After which principals were asked whether educators who have disabled Deaf learners in their classrooms have had training in accommodating these learners. This was in order to gage whether schools for the Deaf follow the principals of including learners with special needs into all areas and aspects of their school.

Results revealed that 76% of schools for the Deaf accommodate learners with special needs and only 52% of educators in schools for the Deaf are trained and equipped to educate these learners.

In the Eastern Cape only one of the three schools for the Deaf accommodate learners with special needs. Principal from number 1 stated that his/her school accommodates "severely mentally handicapped" learners who are all Deaf. The principal further stated that none of his educators are trained or equipped to educate these disabled learners.

Both of the schools for the Deaf in the Free State are schools for the Deaf and blind and both accommodate learners with special needs which include: "dysphasic hearing learners, blind as well as learning problems" (principals from both schools). The Deaf and blind learners are accommodated in separate classes while the hearing dysphasic learners are in the same classrooms as the Deaf learners. Only one educator in one of the two schools has had any training and is equipped to accommodate learners with special needs.

Of the six schools for the Deaf in Gauteng all accommodate Deaf learners with special needs. Disabilities include learners with: "learning problems, slow learners, intellectually impaired (mild and sever), physically challenged, mild cerebral palsy, behavioural problems, autism, epilepsy, partially sighted, blind to name but a few" (Principals from Gauteng schools). Two out of the six schools had no educators trained and equipped to accommodate disabled learners while the remaining four have one educator who is.

Three out of the five schools in KwaZulu Natal accommodate learners with special needs and disabilities include: “Slight cognitive disabilities, physical disabilities, controlled epilepsy, intellectually challenged, cerebral palsy, mild autism and developmental delay” (feedback from principals). Only one out of the five principals stated that his educators are trained and equipped to deal with learners with additional special needs.

The only school for the Deaf in Mpumalanga accommodates Deaf, and hearing Intellectually Impaired, Cerebral Palsy and blind learners. The Deaf learners are educated separately from the hearing learners with special needs. The principal of the school stated that his educators are trained and equipped to accommodate learners with special needs.

The only school in the Northern Cape accommodates Deaf learners as well as blind, deaf-blind and physically disabled learners. The Deaf learners are educated separately. The educators educating the hearing learners with special needs are trained and equipped to educate these learners.

Of the two schools for the Deaf in Limpopo one accommodates learners with special needs as it accommodates blind learners while the other does not. Hearing blind learners are educated in the same classes with the Deaf learners. The principal from this school stated that the educators were equipped and trained to educate learners with special needs.

The only school for the Deaf in the North West does not accommodate learners with special needs and none of the educators in the school are trained or equipped to educate these learners.

In the Western Cape each of the four schools accommodate learners with special needs. The needs identified include the following: “Learning disabilities, multi-levels of cognitive disabilities, Cerebral Palsy, Muscular Dystrophy, ADHD (Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder), Physical disabilities” etc. (principals from the Western Cape) to name but a few. One pre school with a school for the Deaf has a class only for Deaf learners with special needs that range from physical, emotional and behavioural disabilities. Only one out of the four principals stated that his educators are trained and equipped to deal with learners with additional special needs. None of the principals stated that they had hearing learners with special needs in their schools.

Discussion:

It is clear that the majority (nineteen out of twenty-five, 76%) of schools for the Deaf in South Africa include Deaf learners with special needs into classes with Deaf learners who have no special needs, and five accommodate hearing learners with disabilities in their schools where a

combination of spoken language, signed English and gestures are used). It is interesting to see that some schools accommodate hearing learners with special needs (physical challenged, blind etc) learners together with Deaf learners in the same and separate classes. DEAFSA's Memorandum to the National and Provincial Departments of Education (2003) clearly states, "In some schools Deaf and blind learners attend classes together because of lack of staff. If the educator uses SASL, the blind learners miss out. If the educator uses speech the Deaf learner misses out. Educators are then often forced by these circumstances to settle for some speech and some signing. Such a teaching "method" discriminates against the Deaf learner" (2003:11). The barrier for these Deaf learners placed in the same class as hearing learners with special needs is one of access as the barrier for Deaf learners is spoken language.

On the other hand schools for the Deaf should not be restricted to Deaf learners only and should be "open to any child who wants instruction through the medium of sign language" (UNESCO, 1999:4). Children of Deaf Adults (CODA's) who are hearing children born to Deaf parents, whose first language is South African Sign Language may be better suited to a medium of instruction via Sign Language in a school for the Deaf. Other hearing learners who wish to be educated via the medium of South Africa Sign Language would be accommodated but it needs to be noted, sign language medium of instruction and not a form of Signed English for example would be used.

Recommendations:

In order for schools for the Deaf to be fully inclusive they need to incorporate Deaf learners with special needs into every aspect of their school.

- Any learner who is Deaf regardless of special needs should be given access
- Educators need to be provided with training in order to better accommodate Deaf special needs learners
- Hearing learners (such as CODA's) needs to be accommodated
- Hearing disabled learners requiring spoken language as medium of instruction would not be accommodated in the same classes as Deaf learners
- The medium of instruction for teaching and learning will be only in SASL as these schools will be in line with the South African Schools Act (Department of Education: 1996:78).

5.2.9 Are any Educators Trained to Educate Deaf Learners?

Question Eleven examined whether educators in schools for the Deaf are qualified to teach Deaf learners and if they are, principals were asked for information regarding the names of the

institutions that educators had gained qualifications in the education of Deaf learners. These questions were asked in order to examine whether the barriers made explicit in the White Paper Six, *inadequately and inappropriately trained education managers and educators* (2001:7) were applicable to educators in schools for the Deaf.

Out of a possible twenty-five schools only three principals in schools for the Deaf stated that none of their educators had received specific Deaf education training. Although the number is very high (86%) many of these educators have received training in methodologies such as Speech production, Oralism and Total Communication, Specialized Education, etc which fall under the clinical pathological paradigm. Very few educators had training in educating Deaf learners under the socio-cultural paradigm.

Discussion:

It is clear from the above findings that very few educators have had specific training with regards to Deaf Education from a socio-cultural view of deafness. Of the educators who received additional training, many were trained in areas such as speech production that have their roots in the medical model of deafness rather than the importance of Sign Language and Deaf Culture etc. This may result in the barrier, *Inadequately and inappropriately trained education managers and educators* and therefore many educators may be *inadequately and inappropriately trained* to educate Deaf learners (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18).

It is crucial that education managers and educators receive appropriate training with regards to educating Deaf learners in order for them to change their paradigm on deafness, which will result in a changed outlook toward their Deaf learners.

Recommendations:

In order to prevent the barrier of *inadequately and inappropriately trained education managers and educators* the following recommendations are suggested:

- All education managers and educators have access to training in areas such as Sign Language and Deaf Culture which should be compulsory
- In-Service training in deafness and Deaf related topics should be provided to all education managers and educators
- Bursaries should be made available for educators to upgrade their current level of education and should be encouraged to attend further training from institutions that provide courses in deafness from a socio-cultural paradigm.

5.2.10 Training of Educators, Implementation and Adaptations Needed for Deaf Learners in C2005

Question sixteen examined whether educators in schools for the Deaf had received training in implementing C2005. Those that had were then asked to rate the overall relevance and practicality to Deaf education. This question was based on the White Paper Six's identified barrier to learning and development, *Inflexible curriculum; Inappropriate and inadequate support services* and *Inadequately and inappropriately trained education managers and educators* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18).

The overall relevance of Curriculum 2005 to Deaf education as rated by principals in schools for the Deaf are as follows: Sixty percent (fifteen out of twenty-five) stated it was "poor," thirty-nine percent (nine out of twenty-five) stated it was "adequate," four percent (one out of twenty-five) chose "good" and not one principal in a school for the Deaf felt that the overall relevance of C2005 to Deaf education was excellent (see figure 12).




Figure number 12: Overall Relevance of C2005 Training to Deaf Education

Question eighteen examined whether principals in schools for the Deaf believed that their educators experience problems implementing Curriculum 2005 in their classrooms and possible reasons for implementation difficulties were then requested.

Out of the twenty-five schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa a total of twenty-one principals (84%) experienced difficulty with the implementation of Curriculum 2005 (C2005)

within their schools, three principals (12%) stated that they did not experience problems implementing, and no reasons were provided. The remaining one principal left the question blank and no response for this were given (4%).

Each one of the three schools for the Deaf in the Eastern Cape experienced problems implementing C2005 in their schools. Reasons that were provided include the following. Deaf learners experience difficulty in completing research projects on their own, as they "always need the teacher" (principal number 4).

Both of the principals in the two schools for the Deaf in the Free State experienced problems implementing C2005. One principal felt that the new signs for the content of the new learning materials are too difficult for Deaf learners to comprehend and that Deaf learners need more time to complete both tasks as well as the curriculum (Principal number 6). The other principal felt that the difficulty lies with "the pace at which the Deaf learners progress because of language problems" (principal number 7).

Each principal in each of the six schools for the Deaf in Gauteng stated that they experience difficulty with the implementation of C2005 in their schools. Reasons for the difficulty with the implementation of C2005 included the following. Two principals felt that there were many problems, "too many to detail" (principal number 15) as well as "Multiple problems such as language issues, lack of support etc." (principal number 11). Two principals identified the educators as experiencing the difficulties "teachers still struggling with it" (principal number 17) and ""resistance, fear of the unknown" (principal number 13). The last principal stated that the "curriculum is not adapted for the severely disabled" (principal number 16).

All but one principal in Kwazulu Natal felt that the implementation of C2005 was problematic. Reasons for the difficulties included: "Explaining many of the concepts involved. We cannot teach all the skills and concepts expected at the various levels" (principal number 20); "Curriculum above Deaf students understanding" (principal number 25); "Sometimes abstract for learners. Some refuse to use their imagination" (principal number 23) lastly one principal stated that the difficulties are related to "the training is not specific to the Deaf" (principal number 19). The only principal to state that implementing C2005 was not problematic (principal number 21) did not provide any reasons for his answer.




Figure Number 13: Implementation of Curriculum 2005 (C2005)

The only principal in a school for the Deaf in Mpumalanga province stated that he/she did not find implementing C2005 problematic but not reasons were given. The principal from the only school in the Northern Cape felt that implementing C2005 in his/her school was problematic "because it was not implemented as intended. No resources, support etc" (principal number 30). Both principals in schools for the Deaf in the Limpopo province stated that they found implementing C2005 difficult in their schools. Reasons such as "learner support materials not deaf friendly" (principal number 32) and "we cannot implement it through SASL" (principal number 21) were provided. The only principal in the North West province stated that he/she experienced difficulty with implementing C2005 because of two factors namely the "learners reading and language ability; and previous experiences are very limited" (principal number 36).

The responses from principals in the Western Cape were similar; all three agreed that the implementation of C2005 was problematic. Some felt that problems with regard to the implementation were being experienced in the senior and high phases and in one principals experience "Grade 9 is a night-mare" (principal from school number 40). Others felt that the quantity of work was too problematic, "a lot to teach in one year through South African Sign Language" (Principal number 42). Lastly one principal found the training to be inadequate and the trainers providing the trainers unable to understand and unequipped for LSEN learners (principal number 39).

Discussion:

The *Draft Conceptual and Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of Inclusive Education* (2002) identifies an inflexible curriculum as being "one of the most serious barriers to learning and development" which "can be found within the curriculum itself and relates primarily to the inflexible nature of the curriculum which prevents it from meeting the diverse needs among learners. When learners are unable to access the curriculum, learning breakdown occurs" (Department of Education, 2002:137).

Curriculum is not only what educators are expected to teach rather it includes "the style and tempo of teaching and learning, what is taught, the way the classroom is managed and organised, as well as material and equipment which is used in the learning and teaching process" (Department of Education, 2002:137). To summarise, curriculum is concerned with "what institutions teach, and with what, how and under what conditions learners learn" (Department of Education, 2002:221). Learning breakdown may occur when educators use teaching styles that do not meet the needs of the learners, which is often as a result of inadequate or nonexistent training. What is taught or the subjects which learners are able to choose may limit the learner's knowledge base or fail to develop the intellectual and emotional capabilities of the learner. What is taught through the curriculum may be inappropriate to the learners' life situation (making learning extremely difficult and ultimately contributing to learning breakdown).

Material used for teaching and learning which constantly reflect only one culture or life experience (may lead to learners from other cultures feeling excluded and marginalized)

Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf may experience barriers of an *inflexible curriculum* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18), from educators using inappropriate teaching styles (such as speech training methods), educators using a watered down curriculum and who not have high expectations of their learners, educators not including Deaf appropriate teaching materials etc.

In order to rectify the problem of an *inflexible curriculum*, the Department of Educations *Draft Conceptual and Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of Inclusive Education* 2002) states that Curriculum 2005 "provides a basis for a flexible curriculum" (Department of Education, 2002: 173). (In order for Curriculum 2005 to be implemented in all schools throughout South Africa, all educators and education managers were required to attend specific phase training workshops (Foundation Phase, Senior Phase etc). Although the Department of Education states that, "curriculum 2005 is a powerful tool in developing practices for inclusion with its outcomes-based approach" (Department of Education, 2002:73) principals in schools for the Deaf feel that

the overall relevance and quality of training received was inadequate, especially with regard to Deaf learners. The barrier *inappropriate and inadequate training* identified in White Paper 6 (Department of Education, 2001:7 and 18) was thus identified as being experienced by principals in schools for the Deaf. This is mirrored in the statement made by DEAFSA, "The educators at schools for the Deaf receive intensive in-service training in OBE from trainers who cannot answer one question regarding OBE and Deaf learners" (DEAFSA, 2003:11).

After educators and education managers received training they were expected to return to their schools and implement what they had been taught. While C2005 aims to prevent the barrier *an Inflexible Curriculum* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18) which may "lead to learning breakdown through lack of relevance of subject content and lack of appropriate materials, resources and assistive devises, as well as inflexible styles of teaching that do not allow for variation of individual difference" (Department of Education, 1997b:19), nineteen out of a possible twenty-five principals experienced difficulty with the implementation of Curriculum 2005 (C2005) within their schools.

In order to identify problem areas, Question fifteen in the questionnaire examined what adaptations to C2005 principals felt were needed in order to accommodate Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf. The adaptations that principals identified have been divided into the following groups:

Practicality: Many principals felt that C2005 needs to be adapted for Deaf learners by making the outcomes more practical. "Relevant topics, skill training, life skills to help them after school" (principal number 25), "Assessment of learners should be more practical" (principal number 39), "I feel it (C2005) must be explicit with skills development. Deaf learners must have something on hand by the end of the education process (more specific skills). We need periods for skills development, not implied periods" (principal number 23), "language adaptations, content relevance, more visual and skills based" (principal number 11).

Generalisations: Many principals made generalizations about Deaf learners and the adaptations identified by these principals were made after focusing on what Deaf learners cannot do. "Some learners fail to think abstractly. Therefore we need more resources to reduce abstract nature of curriculum" (principal number 23), "has to be made deaf friendly. We should be allowed to do sections that are suitable only" (principal number 13); "better reference work will aid our learners. This must be simplified too" (principal number 17), "we have to adapt materials and teach only the content and skills that the

children can cope with. We must have the freedom to adapt the curriculum" (principal number 20), "accommodation of learners with a limited language proficiency" (principal number 15).

Time frame: Three principals stated that more time is needed to cover the work that is expected with Deaf learners. "More time needed to practice skills" (principal number 40), "longer periods of time to cover syllabus" (principal number 21)

Assessment: A few principals felt that the assessment criteria within C2005 needs adaptations in order to better accommodate Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf. "assessment criteria should accommodate Deaf learners. External exam question papers should be language friendly" (principal number 6), "no inspectors (IDSO) understanding LSEN schools" (principal from number 12), the language (English) used in the material need adaptations, some items need rhymes and tones which may be irrelevant to the Deaf" (principal number 32).

Sign Language: Many principals identified Sign Language as being an area within C2005 as needing adaptations in order to accommodate Deaf learners. "Must be accessible through Sign Language. Must suit the needs of Deaf learners" (principal from school number 19), "it must be South African Sign Language adaptable" (principal from school number 31), "if Deaf learners can start with OBE from Grade 1 and taught how to read and write and communicate with Sign Language in the class situation it would help a lot" (principal from school number 32).

Educators of the Deaf: Lastly other principals felt that it is important to have educators of Deaf learners input with regards to C2005. "Involve teachers in decision making and work from bottom up" (principal from school number 30), "lots of thought by specialist teachers involved in the teaching of these children need to draw up SO's and AC's that can be implemented with varying disabilities and used at different levels. We need a mandate from national to do this,"

Discussion

It is important that Deaf appropriate learning materials be developed and made available to educators in schools for the Deaf as the *Draft Conceptual and Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of Inclusive Education* states that, "learning support materials must be developed in line with Curriculum 2005, and be adapted to meet the particular needs of disabled learners" (Department of Education, 2002:19). In the *Memorandum to the National and Provincial Departments of Education*, The Deaf Federation of South Africa (DEAFSA) demands that "South African Sign Language teaching and learning materials be developed" (DEAFSA, 2003:1).

It is crucial that all schools in South Africa follow the same curriculum, including Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf, "There will no longer be a separate curriculum as Curriculum 2005 and the NCS are considered to be flexible enough to allow for functional focuses in all learning areas" (Department of Education, 2002:28). It is also important to note that although the Department of education states that there may need to be adaptations to the curriculum for some learners "this does not mean a "separate" curriculum for learners with disabilities" (Department of Education, 2002:19). The Department of Education Directorate: Inclusive Education. Draft Conceptual and Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of Inclusive Education (second draft) clearly states that, "All learners must strive to attain all outcomes, and not automatically be subjected to a watered-down curriculum" (Department of Education, 2002:19). The shift from a medical model of disability results in, "interpreting a Deaf learner's difficulty to engage with the curriculum as a lack of responsiveness of the curriculum" (Department of Education, 2002:22), rather than a problem located within the Deaf learner.

Although it is important that educators in schools for the Deaf provide Deaf learners with skills to cope in a hearing world once they leave school, it is vital that if a Deaf learners be given subject/course and level choices. DEAFSA's Memorandum to the National and Provincial Departments of Education also comments on the standard of education Deaf learners have access to as being another barrier to Deaf learners learning and development. Due to the fact that many educators in schools for the Deaf

> still have limited SASL skills, SASL is not implemented fully as the medium of instruction. Therefore knowledge and skills are not effectively conveyed to Deaf learners. Consequently a very limited number of subjects are offered mostly at a Standard or Lower Grade. Very often it is the school that decides which subjects a Deaf learner may take. With the general low attainment levels (through no fault of their own) when leaving school, only a privileged few gain access to Higher Education (DEAFSA, 2003:8).

If a Deaf learner chooses to take academic subjects on a higher grade level that he/she has the choice and opportunity as currently most schools make the decisions on which subjects and levels to offer (resulting in decisions for Deaf learners being made by hearing educators). If Deaf learners leave schools with higher grade academic qualifications they will have access to tertiary institutions where they have more career options and thus will be able to become active, productive members of society.

Due to the New Revised Curriculum acknowledging that learners are unique with differing strengths and weaknesses, "Assessment practices must be in line with national policy guidelines and fully exploit the flexibility to accommodate diversity" (Department of Education, 2002:19). In order to accommodate Deaf learners, Curriculum 2005 Assessment Guidelines for Inclusion

(2002) provides three alternative methods of assessment for Deaf learners in order to address barriers in assessment. This is because regular forms of assessment use written and spoken forms of a spoken language, which is second and inaccessible language to Deaf learners, which may result in barriers of communication and language occurring. The alternative assessment methods include the use of a Sign Language Interpreter, video recordings of questions as well as answers and lastly additional time for assessments, which have already been discussed.

The Department of Education does acknowledge that they have a role to play with regards to training and support of educators with regards to curriculum adaptations "the focus of should be on supporting all teachers in curriculum adaptation and classroom management to support diversity" (Department of Education, 2002:26).

The above examples demonstrate the adaptations that can be made to the curriculum and assessment criteria, as well as the changes that educators in schools for the Deaf can make so that Deaf learners will have equal access to the most appropriate, least restrictive, barrier free education.

Recommendations:

The following recommendations have been suggested as ways of assisting the Department of Education with regards to the training of both Deaf and hearing educators; assisting educators implement Curriculum 2005 (C2005) within their schools and lastly the adaptations that are available for the assessment of Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf:

- All education managers and educators receive appropriate training with regards to the implementation of C2005 within schools for the Deaf
- Training is facilitated by trainers who have a clear understanding of deafness and Deaf related matters, who are able to answer questions with regard to Deaf learners
- The Deaf Community and Deaf educators be involved in the implementation of C2005 as well as in all training and decision making in this regard
- Education mangers and educators be informed that South African Sign Language does not need to be adapted in order to accommodate Deaf learners, rather C2005 is accessible only if educators use Sign Language
- Education mangers and educators need to realize that if they use SASL, longer periods of time will not be necessary to cover the expected syllabus and work should not be simplified/watered-down

- Until the Department of Education provides Deaf appropriate teaching and learning materials, educators together with the Deaf Community need to work together to create their own materials
- Education mangers and educators be made aware of the adaptations that are available in the assessment of Deaf learners (interpreters, video recording and extra time)

5.2.11 Do Current Policies and Legislation Reflect the Strengths and Needs of Deaf Learners?

Question seventeen examined whether principals felt that present educational policies and legislation reflect the needs and strengths and needs of Deaf learners. Principals who felt that Deaf learners needs and strengths were not being met were asked to provide areas needing change. This question was based on the Department of Educations White Paper Six's barrier to learning and development of *Inadequate policies and legislation* (2001:7).




Figure number 14: Do Present Policies and Legislation Reflect the Strengths and Needs of Deaf Learners?

The results show that seventy percent of principals feel that present policies and legislation do not reflect the strengths of Deaf learners in their schools. Changes noted include "Constitution and education policies must be implemented not just on paper but practically" (principal number 30), "Research has to be done on the needs and strengths of deaf learners, and curriculum adapted" (principal number 15).

Sign Language is an area that many principals identified as needing assistance with regard to legislation and policies: “Sign Language needs to be acknowledged as the first language of deaf people. Sign Language should also be acknowledged as a school subject for deaf learners” (principal number 16), “ Deaf learners should be taught in their first language i.e. SASL. SASL should be officially recognized as their first language. SASL taught as an exam subject” (principal number 6), “No person should be allowed by legislation to teach in a school for the Deaf if not fluent in Sign Language” (principal number 7), “Recognition of Sign Language as a subject. More support, like therapies. More time and teachers needed” (principal number 40), “ SASL needs to be an official subject. Sign Language teachers need to be trained and South African Sign Language developed and finalized. Recognition that special schools have different needs from mainstream”(principal number 20), “Educational requirements must provide for the Deaf too e.g. provision for writing exams, explanations to be compulsory in Sign Language” (principal number 17).

Some principals in schools for the Deaf felt that more specific training was needed, “train staff; provide resources that are appropriate for such learners; reduce teacher-learner ratios” (principal number 30), “ emphasis within the Gauteng Department of Education schools principal number 12), “those who make decisions about numbers of teachers and assistants would understand the needs in Deaf education” (principal number 20), “they need to employ Deaf teacher assistants” (principal number 26).

Twenty-two percent stated that they felt that current policies and legislation do reflect the needs and strengths of Deaf learners in their schools. One of these principals stated, “yes, but at the implementation level interpretation is not clear” (principal number 32). One principal stated that, “I am not sure if I am aware of the policy” (principal number 23) while the remaining principal did not answer the question or provide reasons for doing so.

Discussion

The above findings show that seventy percent of principals in schools for the Deaf feel that current policies and legislation do not reflect the strengths and needs of Deaf learners. This causes the barriers *Inadequate policies and legislation* as well as *Inadequate training and support* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18) to be evident.

As mentioned in the findings section of this areas, some principals felt that there was inadequate legislation and policies with regard to South African Sign Language which is mirrored in the statement, “Legislation on SASL medium of instruction in schools for the Deaf should ensure that

teachers of the Deaf have to learn SASL, and that they no longer consider it optional" (UNESCO, 1999:30).

It is important that educators in schools for the Deaf have regular meetings and workshops with other educators of the Deaf as well as with educators working in hearing schools. Educators working in schools for the Deaf would be able to offer assistance and their expertise with regard to areas such as deafness, Bilingualism etc, while educators of hearing learners would be given the opportunity to see what happens in schools for the Deaf and may be able to offer assistance with regards to new approaches, materials etc. This would provide a platform for educators to share ideas, expertise, materials, experience and offer support and encouragement which may motivate educators to expect more from their learners (i.e. if hearing Grade one learners can achieve these outcomes why cant Deaf learners?). These meetings may also encourage educators become more creative, positive and learner driven. "No longer will policy be to protect the system, the school, the teacher who believes that the Deaf child is inferior and must be dependent, or the professional whose job is dependent on perpetuating the disability of the Deaf child" (UNESCO, 1999:28).

Although the National Education Policy Act, 1996 (Act of 1996) states that, "for all educational purposes, SASL is regarded as an official language and that Deaf learners must be taught through the medium of SASL where possible, this had lead to very little if any official changes in the education and training of Deaf learners" (DEAFSA, 2003:2).

On the 7th of February 2003, the Deaf Federation of South Africa (DEAFSA) compiled a memorandum to the National and Provincial Departments of Education. The purpose of the memorandum was to bring to the attention of the National Department of Education, the urgent language needs of Deaf learners within an inclusive education system "which to date, has not been addressed. Furthermore, to appeal for your urgent attention and to demand a clear commitment in this matter" (DEAFSA, 2003:1).

DEAFSA made the following demands with regard to South African Sign Language and the education and training of Deaf learners:

- South African Sign Language (SASL) be recognized and implemented as an official language subject in the education of Deaf learners
- SASL be fully implemented as the official medium of instruction for Deaf learners in all special schools for the Deaf
- All educators of the Deaf receive compulsory in-service training in SASL

- SASL teaching and learning materials be developed (DEAFSA, 2003:1).

In the Department of Education's two documents, *National Curriculum Statement Grades 10 – 12 (Schools)* and *Quality and Assessment Policy Framework Grades 10 –12 (Schools)* (October 2002), "SASL is mentioned, but not accommodated or included in any specific way, nor in the true sense of the word" (DEAFSA, 2003:5).

DEAFSA states that both the past as well as the current education and training system is responsible for creating severe barriers for Deaf learners as their specific language needs are not being catered for, which results in Deaf learners not having "equal access, equal opportunities and equal rights in the education and training system" (DEAFSA, 2003:2). DEAFSA further states that education managers try to prevent barriers to learning and development but because the Department of Education has not officially supported SASL (South African Sign Language) and there are no short or medium plans to accommodate SASL which results in Deaf learners being penalized daily (DEAFSA, 2003).

Some teachers still use inappropriate communication methods such as the Oral method of teaching Deaf learners, Total Communication or Signed Exact English and have no motivation to learn Sign Language "because the Department of Education does not expect educators at schools for the Deaf to have SASL skills" (DEAFSA, 2003:10) and because they have not supported the Bilingual- bicultural Model to literacy development in the education of Deaf learners. "SASL is still not officially recognized as a separate learning programme for Deaf learners" (DEAFSA, 2003:11). Deaf learners are still forced by the Department of Education to either take two spoken languages or one spoken language provided that another subject is offered in lieu of one language that is not offered. Deaf learners can still take SASL as one of the languages.

Recommendations

In order to prevent the barriers *inadequate policies and legislation* as well as *Inadequate training and support* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18) the following recommendations have been proposed:

- The Department of Education be involved in schools for the Deaf
- SASL be recognized as an official language in South Africa and thus be an official language learning area subject
- The Department of Education enforce that SASL be the medium of instruction for teaching and learning in all classrooms in schools for the Deaf

- There be official changes in the education and training of Deaf learners based on a national institutional needs analysis of the strengths and areas of weakness identified amongst Deaf learners

5.2.12 Rate of Parental Involvement and Governing Body

This section has combined two questions from the questionnaire, question nineteen and twenty as both are directed at parental involvement in schools for the Deaf and are based on the barrier to learning and development as made explicit in the White Paper Six (Department of Education, 2001:7), *The non-recognition and non-involvement of parents*.

Question nineteen looked at whether schools for the Deaf have governing bodies and if so whom its members are and how they were selected. It aimed to see whether parents of Deaf learners were involved on the school governing bodies and thus in the running of schools for the Deaf.

All but one school for the Deaf that responded to this questionnaire stated that they had a Governing Body democratically elected according to the Department of Education regulations in their school (twenty-four out of the twenty-five schools). Only one school had no Governing Body resulting in the school for the Deaf being a Section Fourteen school where all funds and management responsibilities are run by the Education Department. One noticeable result was that only three principals stated that their school had a Deaf member on the Governing Body. This could be due to there either being no Deaf member or due to some principals not specifying whom their Governing Body members are i.e. “parents, teacher representatives, house parents” (principal number 26).

Question twenty was asked in order to gage the perceived level of involvement of parents and care-givers with Deaf children, by principals in schools for the Deaf.

The overwhelming response from principals stated that the parental involvement in their schools for the Deaf was “poor” (twenty responses equalling 80%). Responses such as “They don’t attend when called for meetings” (principal from school number 30), “staying far from school and ignorant about Deaf matters” (principal from school number 7), “staying far away from schools and socio economic factors” (principal from school number 6), and “socio economical status (life style). Disadvantaged education makes some parents apathetic as well as language barriers” (principal from school number 42), were provided as possible reasons for the poor involvement of parents in schools for the Deaf. Twelve percent (three responses) of principals in schools for the Deaf stated that the level of parental involvement in their school was adequate while eight percent

(two responses) stated that the parental involvement was good. Not one principal in any school for the Deaf throughout South Africa stated that the parental involvement was excellent.




Figure number 15: Parental Involvement in Schools for the Deaf

Discussion

If education managers and educators do not involve parents and care-givers, and if parents and care-givers to not involve themselves in all aspects of the school, in the barrier *Non-recognition and no-involvement of parents* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18) may be present in schools for the Deaf. Negative attitudes toward parents and care givers involvement may be caused by "a lack of resources to facilitate such involvement, lack of parent empowerment and support for parent organizations, particularly in poorer communities, all contribute to a lack of parental involvement in centres of learning" (Department of Education, 2002:140).

There needs to be a positive relationship between parents/care-givers of Deaf children and their educators in order to make the important link between school and home. "Caregivers and extended families are integral to the functioning of a full-service school in terms of fully making use the knowledge and skills of families" (Department of Education, 2002:57).

The quality of the interactions between parents/care-givers and educators is important. If educators only contact parents when "there are 'problems' to be solved or their child is causing 'concern' in the class" (Department of Education, 2002:57) which may leave the parents feeling

defensive when educators make contact with them. Rather there needs to be ongoing communication and a positive relationship, one where both parties feel unthreatened and comfortable to share both successes and challenges of the learner. Parents/caregivers need to feel "that they are valued and their efforts are not being undermined" (Department of Education, 2002:57).

Schools for the Deaf have an important role with regards to promoting positive interactions between parents/care-givers and educators as well as support, in order that parents/care-givers "acquire better understanding of their child's potential and progress" (Department of Education, 2002:57). Other responsibilities identified by the Department of Education in *Draft Guidelines for the Implementation of Inclusive Education* (2002) with regards to parents/care-givers include: "being responsible for their children attending school regularly, carrying out their homework assignments and other tasks" (Department of Education, 2002:61).

In order for parents and care-givers to be empowered to achieve the above, it is important that these parents/care-givers firstly accept that their child is Deaf, can read the homework instructions and assist their child with writing and most importantly be able to communicate through Sign Language. All of these skills and attitudes can be fostered and developed by educators in schools or the Deaf. They can run workshops on deafness, the importance of Sign Language and can help illiterate parents with adult literacy classes, all of which will empower parents and assist with the interactions between the Deaf learner, her parents/care-givers and the school.

Recommendations

- Parents and care-givers need to be involved in all aspects of the school
- Parents and care-givers be given the appropriate support and acknowledgement they deserve
- Parents, care-givers and educators work in partnership for the benefit of the child
- There be support structures, empowerment programs for parents and care-givers
- Parents and care-givers be active participants in the governance of the school
- There be regular communication between parents/care-givers and the school
- Parents and care-givers be empowered to support their child at home and at school
- Parent and care-givers be involved in decision-making, developing policies and resources for the school

5.2.13 Would Staff Benefit from In-Service Training?

Question twenty-one examined whether principals in schools for the Deaf felt that their educators would benefit from in-service training. It also asked for specific areas that the principals felt needed attention. This question was based on the barriers *Inadequately and inappropriately trained education managers and educators* and *Inappropriate and inadequate support services* (Department of Education, 2001:7)

Every principal in schools for the Deaf that responded to the questionnaire stated that their educators would benefit from in-service training. Specific areas that were identified as needing training and support were as follows:

South African Sign Language: The majority identified Sign Language training as a need (eleven principals). Comments such as "Sign Language needs upgrading" (principal from school number 1); "continuous Sign Language training" (principal from school number 6); "to be South African Sign Language fluent" (principal from school number 31), "South African Sign Language curriculum and culture" (principal from school number 42) were identified.

Outcomes Based Education and Curriculum 2005: Many principals identified OBE as needing attention Nine principals). Comments such as the following were made, "assessment criteria for Deaf learners" (principal number 6), "bring Sign Language and Curriculum 2005 together" (principal number 12), "Maths, science and other learning areas" (principal number 17), " there needs to be a realistic link between deaf education and Curriculum 2005" (principal number 20), "curriculum development for deaf students" (principal number 25), "teaching OBE to Deaf learners" (principal number 31).

Inclusion: Two principals mentioned inclusion as needing attention, "Inclusive education is going to need staffing and resource infrastructure that education in RSA is not ready for yet" (principal number 20) and "new trends in education that would benefit learners with disabilities" (principal number 11).

Bilingual Education: One principal identified Bilingual education as an area needing assistance, "There needs to be more clarity on the issues raised by bilingual policy in a school such as ours (English – SASL" (principal number 20),

HIV/AIDS and Social Service issues: Two principals identified HIV/AIDS as being an area needing training and support in their schools for the Deaf, "Training with regards to social and

emotional issues such as rape and HIV/AIDS that affect all learners in S.A. Counselling training as well as ongoing services from Social Services" (principal number 11).

Deaf Education: This was another area identified by principals in schools for the Deaf as needing training and support. Comments such as the following were made: "Deaf education, culture and their needs" (principal number 30), "workshops on deafness" (principal number 39), "teaching grammar" (principal number 6), "teaching reading skills to Deaf" (principal number 7), "Psychology of the Deaf" (principal number 23).

Audiology and methodology: Two principals in schools for the Deaf identified audiology as being an area they felt their educators need in-service training and support. "Educators who start with Deaf learners at a very young age need specialized training in areas such as Speech Therapy" (principal number 36).

Deaf Assistants: Two principals felt that their Deaf assistants needed training and support in two areas, "Hearing culture to help Deaf assistants" (principal number 42) and "strengthening of teacher assistant team work" (principal number 42).

Disabilities: Two principals that accommodate disabled learners in their schools for the Deaf stated that this is an area their educators need support and training. "New trends in education that would benefit learners with disabilities" (principal number 11) and "Disabilities, management of certain disabilities in the classroom situation" (principal number 16).

Discussion

It is crucial that all educators and education managers receive appropriate training, "The primary demands of an inclusive system will necessitate a major focus, at least initially, on the training, re-training and re-orientation of all personnel" (Department of Education, 2002:14). In order for educators and education mangers to support each other as well as their learners they will need new skills in curriculum differentiation, curriculum assessment, assessment of potential, collaborative teaching and learning, collaborative planning and sharing, reflection on practices and co-operation" (Department of Education, 2002:65). Education managers and educators need training and support with regards to implementing and

> translating C2005 and the RNCS learning programme guidelines into action relating to learners who require high, moderate and low levels of support to overcome behaviour, hearing, intellectual, language, vision and other barriers in all learning areas (Department of Education, 2002:28).

Education mangers and educators need assistance with regards to identifying and overcoming barriers to learning and development as well as "providing clarity and relevance within different contexts" (Department of Education, 2002:28). There needs to be "collaboration and exchanges of staff between ordinary, full-service and special/resource school" (Department of Education, 2002:25). To facilitate these interactions cluster meetings, where education managers and educators from all schools meet. These meetings

> should be held from time to time to exchange ideas and discuss common problems; it would be necessary to establish that interaction between mainstream and Special Schools as Resource Centres as a condition of employment of teachers (Department of Education, 2002:26).

These interactions would assist in bringing "down the barriers previously experienced between special education and mainstream system and bring special education out of its isolation into the mainstream of education" (Department of Education, 2002:26). There needs to be National and provincial consultations, workshops, further training etc with regards to implementation strategies of new policies with regard to South African Sign Language, bilingual education, literacy development etc which have to be in "full consultation with Department of Education (National and Provincial), learners, the adult Deaf community, principals and teachers of schools for the Deaf, teacher unions, parents of Deaf learners and other interested parties" (UNESCO, 1999:27).

There needs to be in-service training (INSET) for both education mangers and educators in the uses of South African Sign Language. Students in teacher training institutions wishing to educate Deaf learners need to be provided with South African Sign Language skills before entering schools for the Deaf at a pre-service (PRESET) level. Wherever possible, adult Deaf assistants need to be utilized in classrooms to ensure that communication takes place and that the learners are provided with information in sign language and that the teacher is assisted in her/his task. There needs to be support for all educators and education mangers, both Deaf and hearing. Hearing educators need assistance with learning about issues such as Deaf Culture and Sign Language, while Deaf educators and assistance need to know about hearing culture.

Within an inclusive education system, educators who educate Deaf learners with a disability such as a physical disability need to receive adequate training and support in order to best accommodate the learner. Schools for the Deaf need to be given training and support with regards to issues such as HIV/AIDS, bereavement, confidentiality, First Aid, drugs, rape and abuse etc from organisations such as the Department of social services, welfare, NGO's such as the Teddy Bear Clinic, Red Cross to name but a few. This is in order to empower and equip educators so that they can assist Deaf learners in challenging situations.

Recommendations

The following are recommendations that principals in schools for the Deaf can implement in order to prevent barriers to learning and development with regards to training of education mangers and educators in schools for the Deaf:

- Receive appropriate training in OBE and C2005 by competent, knowledgeable facilitators with regards to Deaf learners
- Cluster meetings/focus groups be held between education mangers and educators in schools for the Deaf and mainstream schools
- Adequate support needs to be given to both hearing and Deaf staff by principals, the Deaf community, the Department of Education and other language, education etc. specialists
- Provide compulsory Sign Language training in all schools for the Deaf and be run by competent Deaf adults who have undergone training
- Necessary training and support be given to educators who have a Deaf learner with a disability in order to assist the learner reach her full potential
- Have access to health, social and welfare training and support
- Be given training with regards to latest trends and developments in Deaf education and South African Sign Language

5.3 General Recommendations

This section will provide other important areas that need to be addressed in order to prevent barriers to learning and development occurring in schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa.

5.3.1 Inaccessible and Unsafe Build Environments

Inaccessible and unsafe built environments is another barrier identified in *White Paper 6: Special Needs Education. Building an Inclusive Education and Training System* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18). The Department of Education's *Quality Education for All* (1997b) states that inaccessible and unsafe built environments are "barriers when not adapted to the needs of learners with physical and/or sensory disabilities" (Department of Education, 1997b:20). The Department of Educations *Draft Guidelines for the Implementation of Inclusive Education* (2002) state that, "physical access and safety of the environment are social constructs that reflect our values concerning diversity" (department of Education, 2003:53).

As most of the schools for the Deaf, as well as the majority of other schools were designed and built before the National Building Regulations of 1996 where all buildings needs to take accessibility of all South African into account, many of them do not "adhere to the new building standards and accessibility needs to be enhanced" (Department of Education, 2002:53).

Accessibility needs to be viewed in terms of geographical location of the school, and a school for the Deaf should therefore be "situated in an area which is accessible to community members and should have essential services within easily reachable distance" (Department of Education, 2002:53). Other areas needing attention with regards to improving accessibility in schools for the Deaf are simple structural changes such as accessible toilets for physically impaired Deaf learners, electricity and running water, indicator lights for break times and emergencies, ramps for Physically Challenged Deaf learners etc.

Further physical furniture requirements and changes such as overhead projectors for educators (so they do not have to turn their backs on Deaf learners during teaching and learning), seating arrangements (arranging table and chairs into a semi-circle may assist Deaf learners in being able to see their peers and thus be able to fully participate in teaching and learning activities; as well as tables facing away from the door/busy passage as Deaf learners will be distracted by the vibrations people walking past and lighting changes as people walk they make shadows, changes in light etc.), good lighting (crucial for Deaf learners who need to rely on seeing what is being signed), wooden floors and light switches (Deaf appropriate ways of getting Deaf learners attention, stamping on floors and flashing of light switches) etc.

In order to "create a welcoming environment: learners and educators need to be safe on their way to and from school" (Department of Education, 2002:54) as well as in their school grounds which includes classrooms, playgrounds and hostels.

5.3.2 Research

It is crucial that ongoing research be conducted with regard to Deaf learners in areas such as literacy development, bridging the gap between school and the work environment, inclusion, internal motivation, "(i) the use of different kinds of technology that might facilitate the education of Deaf learners; (ii) an up-to-date review of the different approaches to Deaf education, e.g., the failures and successes of using the aural and spatial modalities in providing Deaf learners with equal access, and the extent to which each modality constitutes a barrier; and (iii) the issue of rights, specifically whether the learners' right to equal access may be overridden by other rights" (UNESCO, 1999:37) and other important areas. This will enable the Department of Education and organisations such as DEAFSA have an accurate picture of the situation in schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa.

5.3.3 Early Identification and Intervention

Another important area that will prevent barriers for Deaf learners, especially with regards to their identity, self-esteem and social adjustment, are early identification and intervention programmes for both Deaf children and their parents/care-givers. Often parents/care-givers of Deaf children experience feelings of anger, guilt, disappointment etc once diagnosis of deafness has been made, "families often experience great distress when they realise that their child has some particular difficulties, and this may lead to problems in the relationship with the child" (UNESCO, 2002:83)."Many parents have difficulty accepting a child with a disability. In a patriarchal society the mother is often to blame for the disability and fathers deny responsibility for the child" (Department of Education, 2002:137). These parents/care-givers need support and correct information about their child's deafness. "Fear and lack of awareness about disability among some parents and educators remain a significant barrier" (Department of Education, 2002:137) which results in Deaf learners experiencing barriers to their learning and development. In order to prevent barriers, schools "can encourage contact between the family and other families, or the family and the school in order to relieve stress, rebuild hope, and enable the child to experience family life (UNESCO, 2002:83

UNESCO's Open File on Inclusive Education identifies the need for parental involvement as being crucial to early intervention as, "families (particularly parents) have the most extended contact with children in the early years and are their more effective educators" (UNESCO, 2002: 123). Having said this it is also important that families are given support especially "when it comes to seeing and valuating the strengths of their child" (UNESCO, 2002:123) as well as be encouraged to see the importance of pre-school education.

It is crucial that Deaf learners are identified as being Deaf and appropriate intervention made as early as possible. Without early identification and intervention, barriers may develop.

> Lack of early intervention facilities and services also mean that many children, especially those with severe disabilities, are unable to receive the necessary intervention and stimulation, which will equip them to participate effectively in the learning process. This barrier not only leads in many cases to increased impairment, but also to decreased capacity to learn (Department of Education, 2002:132).

Although Deaf learners are not seen as having "severe disabilities"(UNESCO, 1993:3) from a socio-cultural paradigm, Deaf children and their parents/care givers need to have access to Sign Language as early as possible. Parents of Deaf children need to be enabled to make

> an informed choice about the educational options available to Deaf children. In order to make this information publicly accessible, input must be provided by the adult Deaf community, parents of other Deaf children, linguists, specialists in signed languages, literacy specialists, and educators knowledgeable in the use of

> signed languages, and local and international specialists on bilingualism and literacy must be provided (UNESCO, 1999:3)

The Consultation Report on Inclusive Education and the Deaf Child in South Africa, states "the Department of Education should develop its diagnostic capacity and ensure that early intervention methods are put into place to provide equal access for Deaf learners" (UNESCO, 1999:4). Programs need to be launched nationally for the early identification of Deaf children and training parents/care-givers of Deaf children are needed for equal access for equal outcomes. The building of partnerships between parents/care-givers and educators is

> a process, which cannot be expected to happen overnight. It occurs through carefully planned steps aimed to build up a trusting relationship with the school, with teachers and with other professionals. Through these initial steps, families can build their confidence in working in collaboration as equal partners. In the long term, this confidence building will produce a sense of empowerment and ownership which makes it possible for families to become 'partners' in the school in a meaningful sense (UNESCO, 2002:84).

To conclude, early identification and intervention are crucial as, "The support of families secured at this stage will prove a valuable resource throughout the child's education" (UNESCO, 2002:123).

5.3.4 Community Based Support

Schools for the Deaf together with local communities need to work in partnership, as both can benefit from working together. The community may include, members of the Deaf community and organisations such as DEAFSA, "special education teachers; learners; parents; community members; psychologists; health workers; available therapists; community organizations; parent organizations; governing bodies of schools; school management staff; social workers; departments of education personnel etc" (Department of Education, 2002:29-30). Each of these community members needs to work in collaboration to address barriers and address priorities. In order to prevent the barrier of "Negative attitudes to and stereotyping of differences" occurring through lack of knowledge and understanding on the part of the hearing community surrounding the school or homes of Deaf learners, schools for the Deaf can become a resource. These schools can make their "physical and human resources available to the community" (Department of Education, 2002:30) by running workshops on areas such as deafness, the importance of Early Identification and Intervention. Schools could also run evening Sign Language classes for people wanting to learn as well as hire out areas of their schools as a means fundraising (i.e. renting out of their school halls for conferences). This will, among other things, empower the local community and prevent stigmas towards deafness and Deaf people, while benefiting the school financially.

To conclude, if educators working in schools for the Deaf identify and make the necessary changes to prevent barriers to learning and development from occurring for learners who are Deaf, then schools for the Deaf may provide learners with the most appropriate, least restrictive barrier free education.

CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSION

Schools for the Deaf throughout South Africa are "in their current form, contrary to the spirit of inclusion" (UNESCO, 1999:16) because they neither prevent nor address barriers to learning and development. These barriers prevent Deaf learners from having equal access to education as that offered to hearing learners "provided in mainstream schools" (UNESCO, 1999:19), they do however provide Deaf learners with access to other Deaf learners as well as Deaf role models, both of which are crucial for their social and emotional development.

It is crucial that schools for the Deaf take proactive steps in transforming their schools into inclusive Sign Language medium education facilities (Storbeck, 2004). If they provide Deaf learners access to education in the language of their choice, namely through South African Sign language, Deaf learners will have access to education and school that cater to Deaf learners will be seen as "inclusive and equitable in the more complex use of the terms" (UNESCO 1999:8). Deaf learners will then have the option of attending these schools that offer sign language as the medium of instruction, which will be accessible and will foster learning and development.

Of all changes needed to take place in schools for the Deaf, the author of this study believes that a change in educator and education principal attitude toward Deaf learners is the most important as, "paradigms are the source of our attitudes and behaviours. We cannot act with integrity outside of them" (Covey, 2001:28) and they "include not only thinking, ways of seeing and evaluative judgments, but also, crucially, practices" (Naiker, 2000:5). Thus our paradigm on deafness will influence the way we view, treat, interact and educate Deaf learners and Deaf people around us. If education managers and educators view deafness as a disability, and thus place themselves within the clinical-pathologic paradigm, schools for the Deaf cannot transform into inclusive education facilities. Education managers and educators need to view deafness from the socio-cultural paradigm and see Deaf learners as being capable of achieving the same outcomes as hearing learners, the only difference being through the visual modality, namely through South African Sign Language. This change in attitude cannot be forced and can only occur once education mangers and educators realise that their current methods of communication, education and paradigm create barriers to learning and development for Deaf learners, and decide that they need to change for themselves. Education managers and educators and thus schools "providing Deaf learners with equal access to education, as opposed to constructing Deafness as disability, are inclusive and equitable in the profound use of the terms" (UNESCO, 1999:20).

If education managers and educators view deafness from a socio-cultural paradigm, they not only prevent the barrier *Negative attitudes to and stereotyping of differences,* they will automatically understand the need for being fluent in South African Sign Language to prevent the barriers *Inappropriate languages or language of learning and teaching* and *Inappropriate communication* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18) will also be prevented. Schools for the Deaf

> will no longer be, as in the past, places where teachers who do not wish to learn to sign, can function. They will no longer have the option of using "total communication" (a misnomer), "simultaneous communication" (which is neither simultaneous, nor communication), speech, manually coded spoken language, or any combinations of the above (UNESCO, 1999:28).

Education managers will make sure that they only employ educators who are fluent in South African Sign Language, and if this is not possible will ensure that there are compulsory Sign Language classes run by fluent Deaf adults. They need to encourage Deaf learners in their schools to become educators and other professionals. Education managers will see the enormous value of employing Deaf educators as well as staff such as hostel parents and assistance and including the Deaf Community in all areas of their schools, so that Deaf learners have positive Deaf role models. Hearing educators will no longer feel threatened by Deaf adults, rather seeing themselves and the Deaf adults as resources, both of whom have an equal status and responsibility in transmitting knowledge and skills within a Bilingual-Bicultural approach to literacy development.

Once education managers and educators acknowledge the need for change with regards to their communication and teaching methods, they will require further training with regards to educating their Deaf learners appropriately. Education mangers need to ensure that they provide training in appropriate areas such as Sign Language, Deaf Culture, Bilingual-Bicultural approach, First Aid, HIV/AIDS and counselling workshops etc for educators, assistants, parents/care-givers, hostel parents etc to better empower and equip them in order to communicate appropriately and effectively, and to assist Deaf learners in other areas. Education managers and educators wishing to upgrade their qualifications need to ensure that they attend courses and further education and training institutions that do not offer courses by people viewing deafness as a disability and thus from the Medical Model. This will enable education managers and educators to prevent the barrier *Inadequately and inappropriately trained education managers and educators* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18).

Education managers and educators will now follow the same curriculum that is followed in hearing schools, as they will now see Deaf learners as being able and capable of achieving the same standards as hearing learners. They will follow the Outcomes Based Education (OBE) principles and follow the guidelines found in Curriculum 2005 (C2005) and the New Revised

Curriculum Statement (NRCS), and make the relevant adaptations to teaching and learning as well as assessment without 'watering down' or simplifying the content and expected outcomes. If education managers and educators follow the above, the barrier *Inflexible curriculum* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18), will not be experienced by Deaf learners in schools for the Deaf.

Education managers and educators will now want to fight for the rights of Deaf learners and need to join and support organisations such as the Deaf Federation of South Africa (DEAFSA) and demand that barriers caused by *Inadequate policies and legislation* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18) *by* the Department of Education as well as the National Government of South Africa be corrected and prevented. They need to put pressure on the Government to include South African Sign Language as an official language of South Africa. Education managers and educators need to ensure that they receive appropriate support from relevant parties, rather than taking a passive role and waiting for others to take charge and make a difference. They need to form cluster groups with other interested parties, hearing schools and other schools for the Deaf, in order to motivate, challenge, support and uplift each other and thus improve the standard of education in schools for the Deaf. If this occurs, the barrier *Inappropriate and inadequate support services* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18) will be prevented.

Education managers and educators will now see the benefit of including parents/care-givers of Deaf learners in all aspects of the school and thus preventing the barrier *Non-recognition and non-involvement of parents* (Department of Education, 2001:7 & 18). Parents/care-givers will also see that they have a positive role to play in their Deaf child's life and schooling and will be empowered and motivated. Parents/care-givers and educators will work in partnership for the benefit of the Deaf learner. Both the hearing community as well as the Deaf Community need to be actively involved in all areas of schools for the Deaf, which will benefit the school by preventing stigmatism and barriers between the Deaf and hearing community as well as creating empowering networks.

In addition there needs to be further research conducted in areas such as South African Sign Language development and lobbying for it to be recognised as an official language in South Africa, community involvement, training of educators, sharing resources, the importance of early identification and intervention etc. This will help to create an awareness of deafness and related issues and prevent further barriers for Deaf learners in South Africa. Deaf learners will have access to education on a higher level and will thus be able to obtain a matric exception allowing them to enter tertiary institutions if they wish. Schools for the Deaf will recognise and accommodate Deaf learners with a diverse range of learning needs and will provide an "open,

lifelong high quality education and training system for the 21st century" (Department of Education, 2001:45).

If schools for the Deaf follow the principles of an inclusive education system, and prevent barriers to learning and development, these schools may "celebrate diversity through recognizing potential, increasing participation, overcoming and reducing barriers, and removing stigmatisation and labelling" (Department of Education, 2002:41). This will result in schools for the Deaf being the most appropriate, least restrictive, barrier free education system for Deaf learners in South Africa where Deaf learners once leaving these schools, will be productive members of South African society.

ADDENDUM A: COVERING/PERMISSION LETTER

The Principal

14 Cleveland Road
Claremont
Cape Town
7708

Dear Sir/Madam

My name is Emma Coop and I am currently undertaking my Masters in Education through the University of the Witwatersrand, which entails doing a research project.

The focus of my research is on the implementation of White Paper 6: Building an Inclusive Education and Training System (2001) within the Deaf Education context in South Africa.

Your input will provide an insight into the particular needs of your school, educators and learners, and will provide a platform for change initiation that is often omitted in current policies and documents.

Participation in this study is voluntary; if you do not wish to participate your decision shall be respected. As far as possible your name and schools identity will be kept confidential.

I would be grateful if you could complete the questionnaire in as much detail as possible and return it to my address before 30 September 2003.

Once my research has been completed I would be honoured to provide you with a copy of my thesis if you wish.

I can be contacted on (021) 671-3563(a/h) or on my Cel 083-347-9374 for any comments, queries or suggestions.

Thank you for your participation in this study

Yours Faithfully

Emma Coop

ADDENDUM B: QUESTIONNAIRE

Schools name ……..……..……

Province located …….....…

Number of learners ……

Number of educators ……

Grades offered ……

What standard of education will your current school leavers depart with at the end of this year and how many learners are there?…….

What is the medium of teaching and learning in your school?……..

What additional languages are used (if any)?……...

What percentage of your educators use the following for teaching and learning in the classroom?

a) Sign Language ……

b) Signed English/Spoken language ……

c) Total Communication ……

d) Other (specify) ……

Do you have hostel facilities and if so how many learners do you accommodate? ……

Do you accommodate learners with additional disabilities (such as physical, sight, social, emotional, cognitive, multiple disabilities etc)? If so please name …….

Are your educators trained and equipped to deal with learners with additional special needs?……

Are your educators trained to teach Deaf learners? If so through whom?.....…….
……...

Approximately what percentage of your educators are fluent in South African Sign Language?

a)100% b)80% c)60% d)40% e)20%

Do you have Sign Language classes for your educators and who offers them?……..……

Do your educators find implementing C2005 problematic? If so why?……...
……...

What adaptations (if any) do they feel needs to be made to C2005 in order to accommodate your learners?……

Have your educators had training in implementing C2005?
Yes)….. No)…..

If yes rate the overall relevance and practicality to the Deaf education context
a)Poor b) Adequate c)Good d)Excellent

Do you believe present policies and legislation reflect the needs and strengths of Deaf learners? If not what changes need to be made…….

Are the Deaf community involved in your school? If so how?……
……...

Do you have a governing body and if so who are its members and how were they selected?……. …..

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your assistance will provide great insight!

ADDENDUM C: SCHOOLS INCLUDED IN THIS STUDY:

Eastern Cape
Efata School for the Blind and Deaf
St Thomas School for the Deaf
Theodore Blumberg Pre-School for the Deaf
Sive Special School for the Deaf

Free State:
Bartimea School for the Deaf and Blind
Thiboloha School for the Deaf and Blind

Gauteng:
Katlehong School for the Deaf and Blind (now S'nethemba school for the Deaf and Blind)
MC Kharbai School for the Deaf
Sizwile School for the Deaf
St Vincent School for the Deaf
Transoranje School for the Deaf
Filadelfia Secondary School for the Deaf/Physical Disabled/Blind
Dominican School for the Deaf

Kwazulu Natal:
VN Naik School for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
Fulton School for the Deaf
Kwa Thintwa School for the Deaf
Kwavulindlebe School for the Deaf
Indaleni School for the Deaf
St Martin De Porres Comprehensive School
Vuleka School for the Deaf

Mpumalanga:
Ka Magugu Primary school for the Deaf and Blind

Northern Cape:
Retlameleng School for Disabled Children

Limpopo:
Bosele School for the Blind and Deaf
Tshilidzini School for the Deaf
Yingisani School for the Deaf

North West:
Kutlwanong School for the Deaf
North West Secondary School for the Deaf

Western Cape:
Dominican School for Deaf Children
Noluthando School for the Deaf
De La Bat School for the Deaf
Nuwe Hoop Centre for the Hearing Impaired
Deaf Child Centre Classes (now amalgamated with Mary Kihn school for partially hearing pupils)

REFERENCES

Aarons, D & Akach, P. (1999). *Inclusion and the Deaf Child in South African Education.* In the UNESCO Consultation Report. Inclusive Education and the Deaf Child in South Africa. UNESCO Pretoria Office: South Africa

Artiles, A. J. (1989). *The Dilemma of Difference: Enriching the Disproprtionality Discourse with Theory and Context*. Journal of Special Education. 32 (1)

Baker-Shenk, C. & Cokely, D. (1980). *American Sign Language: a teacher's resource text on grammar and culture*. TJ Publishers: Silver Springs

Bat-Chava, Y. (2000). *Diversity of Deaf Identities.* American Annals of the Deaf. Volume 145, No 5, 2000

Bellugi, U. (1989). *Clues from Similarities between Signed and Spoken Languages*. In Signed and Spoken Language: Biological Constraints on Linguistic Form, ed Bellugi and Studdert-Kennedy. Verlag Chemie: Weinheim and Deerfield Beach, Florida.

Bogdan, R.C & Biklen, S.K (1992). Qualitative *Research for Education. An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Second Edition. Allyn & Bacon: Boston.

Brown, P. M and Foster, S. B. (1991). *Integrating Hearing and Deaf Students on a College Campus.* American Annals of the Deaf. Vol. 136, No.1.

Cambra, C. (2002). *Acceptance of Deaf Students By Hearing Students in Regular Classrooms*. American Annals of the Deaf. Volume 147, No. 1.

Clark, C; Dyson, A; Millward, A & Skidmore, D. (1997). *New Directions in Special Needs: Innovations in Mainstream Schools.* Cassell: London

Coffey, A & Atkinson, P (1996). *Making Sense of Data- Complimentary Research Strategies*. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, California.

Cohen, O.P. (1994). *Implications and Complications for Deaf Students of the Full Inclusion Movement.* Gallaudet Research Institute Occasional Paper 94-2. Gallaudet University Press: Washington, DC.

Collair, L. (2001). *Indicators of Successful Inclusion of a Learner Who is Deaf in a Mainstream Class.* Unpublished.

Covey, S. R. (1992). *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People. Restoring the Character Ethic*. Simon and Schuster: London

Creswell, J.W (1988). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design Choosing Among Five Traditions*. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, California.

Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering Minority Students*. California Association for Bilingual Education: Sacramento, California.

Davis, H & Silverman (1960). *Hearing and Deafness* (Revised Addition). Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc: New York

Deaf Federation of South Africa (DEAFSA). (2003). *Memorandum to the National and Provincial Departments of Education.* 7 February 2003: Johannesburg

Denton, D. M. (1976). *Remarks in Support of a System of Total Communication for Deaf Children*. Communication Symposium. Maryland School for the Deaf: Frederick

Denzin, N. K & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Sage: Thousand Oaks, California

Department of Education. (October 2002). *Draft Guidelines for the Implementation of Inclusive Education (Second Draft*). Directorate: Inclusive Education: Pretoria

Department of Education. (2002). *Curriculum 2005 Assessment Guidelines*. Department of Education: Pretoria

Department of Education. (July 2001). *Education White Paper 6. Special Needs Education. Building an Inclusive Education and Training System*. Government Printer: Pretoria

Department of Education. (2000). *Draft White Paper 5 special needs education*. Government Printer: Pretoria

Department of Education. (1997). *Quality Education for All. Overcoming barriers to learning and Development.* The Report of the National Commission on Special Needs in Education and Training (NCSNET) & National Committee for Educational Support Services (NCESS). Government Printer: Pretoria

Department of Education (1996). *South African Schools Act No 84 of 1996.* Department of Education: Pretoria

Donald, D; Lazarus, S and Lolwana, P. (2002). *Educational Psychology in Social Context*. 2nd Edition. Oxford University Press: Cape Town.

Duffy, A; Warby, L & Phillips, J. (1993). *Nothing For My Mind: Key Issues in Literacy and Numeracy for Adults Who are Deaf or Hearing Impaired*. Adult Education Centre: Sydney

Dyson, A. (1997b). *Inclusive Education: A Theoretical and Comparative Framework*. Paper Presented at the Conference on Inclusion: Brisbane, Australia

Engelbrecht, P; Green, L; Naiker, S & Engelbrecht, L. (1999). *Inclusive Education in Action in South Africa.* Van Schaik: Pretoria

Evens, L. (1982). *Total Communication* in Constructing Deafness. Authors Gregory, S & Hartley, G.M. Open University.

Ewoldt, C. (1996). *Deaf Bilingualism: A Holistic Perspective.* Australian Journal of Educators of the Deaf. Volume 2, Number 1, 1996.

Firestone, W. A. (1987). *Meaning in Method: The Rhetoric of Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Educational Researcher, 16(7)

Foster, S and Brown, P. (1989). *Factors Influencing the Academic and Social Integration of Hearing Impaired College Students*. Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability. Volume 7. Numbers 3 and 4.

Foster, S and Emerton, G. (1991). *Mainstreaming a Deaf Student: A Blessing or a Curse?* Journal of Disability Policy Studies. Vol. 2 No.2. Rochester Institute of Technology, National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

Foster, S. (1999). *Social Alienation and Peer Identification: A study of the Social Construction of Deafness*. Human Organisation, Vol. 48, No. 3.

Foster, S. (1989). *Reflections of a group of Deaf Adults on their Experiences in Mainstream and Residential School Programmes in the United States.* Disability, Handicap and Society, Vol. 4, No. 1.

Gannon, J. (1981). *Deaf heritage: A narrative history of deaf America*. National association of the Deaf. Silver Spring, MD

Garretson, M. D. (1976b). *Total Communication*. In a Bicentennial Monograph on Hearing Impairment, Trends in the USA by Frisina, R (eds). Volta Review, 78

Government of South Africa (1996). *The constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act 108 of 1996)*. Government Printer: Pretoria.

Gibbons, J. D. (1992). *Nonparametric Statistics (Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences Series, No 90).* Sage: Newbury Park, California

Greene, J. C; Caracelli, V. J & Graham, W. F. (1989). *Toward a Conceptual Framework for Mixed Method Evaluation Designs*. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11(2)

Gregory. S. (1989). *Issues in Deaf Education.* David Fulton Publishers, London

Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of Language: The Debate on Bilingualism*. Basic Books, New York

Hay, J and Beyers, C. (2000). *Apartheid's Contribution to South African Inclusive Education Policy*. International Special Educational Congress 2000. University of Manchester 24th – 28th July 2000.

Inglis, J (2004). *Course materials*. Advanced Certificate in Education Specialised Education. University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

Innes, Joseph J. (2001). *Full Inclusion and the Deaf Student: A Deaf Consumer's Review of the Issue*. American Annals of the Deaf. Volume 139, No 2.

Johnson, R. E & Cohen, O. P. (1994). *Implications and Complications for Deaf Students of the Full Inclusion Movement.* A Joint Publication by the Conference of Educational Administrators Serving the Deaf and the Gallaudet Research Institute. Gallaudet Research Institute Occasional Paper 94-2. Gallaudet University Press: Washington, D. C

Johnson, R. E; Liddell, S. K & Erting, C. J. (1989). *Unlocking the Curriculum: Principlas for Achieving Access in Deaf Education*. Paper 89-3. Gallaudet University Press: Washington, D. C.

Kauffman, J. (1993). *How we might achieve the radical reform of special education*. Exceptional Children. Vol 60:6-16.

Klima, E & Bellugi, U. (1979). *The Signs of Language*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge

Komersaroff, L. (1996). *Removing Barriers in Deaf Education. The Role of AUSLAN in the Education of Deaf Children in Australia*. Australian Journal of Education of the Deaf. Vol 2 No 1

Kumar, R. (1999). *Research Methodology. A Step-By-Step Guide for Beginners*. Sage Publications: London

Kumsang, M & Moore, T. (1998). *Policy and Practice in the Education of Deaf Children and Young People* in Gregory S., Knight, P., McCracken, W., Powers, S. & Watson, L. (Eds). 1998. Issues in Deaf Education. David Fulton Publishers Ltd: London.

Lane, H. (1984). *Why the Deaf Are Angry*. In Constructing Deafness by Gregory & Hartley (eds). Open University: London

Levine, E. (1965). *Youth in a Soundless World: a Search for Personality*. New York University Press: Washington Square, NY.

Livingston, S. (1997). *Rethinking the Education of Deaf Students – Theory and Practice from a Teacher's Perspective*. Heinnemann: Portsmouth.

Lou, M. W. P. (1988). *The History of the Education of the Deaf in the United States*. In Language Learning and Deafness by Strong, M. Cambridge University Press: New York

Luckner, J and Muir, S. (2001) *Successful Students Who Are Deaf In General Education Settings*. American Annals of the Deaf. Volume 146, No 5, 2001.

Mayer, C and Wells, G. (1996). *Can the Linguistic Interdependence Theory Support A Bilingual-Bicultural Model of Literacy Education for Deaf Students?* Oxford University Press.

Mead, G.H. (1934). *Mind, Self and Society*.The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.

Mertens, D. M. (1988). *Research Methods in Education and Psychology. Integrating Diversity with Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Sage Publication: California

Mertens, D and Kluwin, T. (1986). *Social development for hearing-impaired high school youth*. Paper presented at the 1986 meeting of the American Educational Research Association: San Francisco, California.

Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis. An Expanded Sourcebook.* Sage Publications: London

Moores, D.F. (1987). *Educating the Deaf: Psychology, Principles, and Practices*. Third Edition. Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston.

Moors, D.F. (1992). *An Historical Perspective on School Placement*. In Cohen ,O.P. (1994). Implications and Complications for Deaf Students of the Full Inclusion Movement. Gallaudet Research Institute Occasional Paper 94-2. Gallaudet University: Washington, DC.

Murphy, D. (1996). *Implications of Inclusion for General and Special Education*. The Elementary School Journal, 96(5)

Naiker, S.M. (2000). *From Apartheid Education to Inclusive Education: The Challenges of Transformation...* Paper presented at the International Education Summit for a Democratic Society. Wayne State University. Detroit State University. June 26 – 28, 2000

Naiker, S.M. (2001). *A Brief Description of the Changes Taking Place in South Africa to the Shift from Special Education System to an Inclusive System*. Department of Education: Pretoria

National Government of South Africa. (November 1997). *White Paper on an Integrated National Disability Strategy*. Office of the Deputy President: Pretoria.

Paul, P. V & Quigley, S. P. (1990). *Education and Deafness*. Longman: New York

Paulston, C. B. (1977). *Research in Bilingual Education*. Current Perspectives, Vol. 2: Linguistics. Centre for Linguistics. Washington, D.C.

Petitto, L. A. (1994). *On the Equipotentiality of Signed and Spoken Languages in Early Ontogeny*. In Post-Milan ASL and English Literacy by Snider, B (ed). Issues, Trends, and Research. Gallaudet University Press: Washington, D.C.

Ragin, C. C. (1987). *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. University of California Press: Berkeley

Rawlings, B (1973). *Characteristics of Hearing Impaired Students by Hearing Status: US 1970-71*. Series D., No. 10, Office of Demographic Studies. Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C.

Reich, C; Hambleton, D and Houldin, B. (1977). *The Integration of hearing-impaired children in regular classrooms*. American Annals of the Deaf, 122, pp. 534-543.

Rossman, G. B & Wilson, B. L. (1984). *Numbers and Words: Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in a Single Large-scale Evaluation Study*. Evaluation Review, 9(5)

Sacks, O. (1991). Seeing Voices. *A Journey into the World of the Deaf*. Pan Books: London

Schildroth, A. N & Hotto, S. A. (1994). *Deaf Students in Full Inclusion: Who Wants to be Excluded?* A Joint Publication by the Conference of Educational Administrators Serving the Deaf and the Gallaudet Research Institute. Gallaudet Research Institute Occasional Paper 94-2. Gallaudet University Press: Washington, D. C

Schlesinger & Meadow (1972). *Sound and Sign: Childhood Deafness and Mental Health*. University of California Press: Berkeley, Ca.

Schmulian, D. (2002). *Choosing the Oral Route*. In Challenges and Choices by Hugo and Blumberg (eds). Van Schaik: Pretoria

Sieber, S. D. (1973). *The Integration of Fieldwork and Survey Methods*. American Journal of Sociology, 78(6).

Smith, J. D. (1998). *Inclusion- All schools for All children*. Wadsworth Publishing Company: Belmont.

Smuts, E. (2002). *Schools – Deciding on a School for the Deaf.* In Challenges and Choices by Hugo and Blumberg (eds). Van Schaik: Pretoria

Stinson, M. S & Antia, S. (1999). *Considerations in Educating Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Students in Inclusive Settings.* Oxford University Press: London

Stinson, M. S & Lang, H. G. (2001). *Full Inclusion: A Path for Integration or Isolation?* American Annals for the Deaf. Volume 139, No 2.

Stokoe, W. (1974). *Motor Signs as the First Form of Language*. In Language Origins by Stokoe, W (ed). Linstok Press: Silver Spring

Storbeck, C. (2000). *Bilingual Education for the Deaf in South Africa – Can it Work?* The South African Journal of Communication Disorders. Volume 47, 2000. Special Edition.

Storbeck, C & Morgans, H. (2002). *Communicating: Choosing Sign Language*. In Challenges and Choices by Hugo and Blumberg (eds). Van Schaik: Pretoria

Storbeck, C. (2003). *The Irony of the Deaf education perspective*. Human Rights, Disability & Higher Education Conference. Are graduates disabling? 25 to 26 January 2003. Cramer Building University of Cape Town

Storbeck, C. (2004). Paper presented at the 'Building Bridges to Access' International Conference on Deaf Education Conference. September 2004. Park Hyatt Hotel, Rosebank, Johannesburg

Tesch, R. (1999). *Qualitative Research: Analysis Types of Software Tools*. Falmer: New York

Tsvingstedt, A. (1998) *Classroom interaction and the social situation of hard-of-hearing pupils in regular classes.* In Weisel, A. (Ed), 1998: Proceedings of the 18th International Congress on education of the deaf. Vol. 1 407-411. Tel Aviv

United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (June 1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education*. World Conference on Special Needs Education: Access and Equality: Salamanca, Spain.

United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2002). *Open File on Inclusive Education. Support Materials for Mangers and Administrators*. UNESC Inclusive education: Paris, France

United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (1994). *Framework for Action on Special Needs Education:* Paris, France

United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (1999). *Inclusive Education and the Deaf Child in South Africa*. UNESCO Consultation Report. UNESCO Pretoria Office: Pretoria

U.S. Department of Education (1999). *To assure the free appropriate public education of all children with disabilities: Twenty-first annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Ac:* Washington, DC.

Vicars, W. (2003). *Literacy and the Deaf*. American Sign Language University. www.lifeprint.com

Webster, A & Wood, D. (1989). *Special Needs in Ordinary Schools. Children with Hearing Difficulties*. Cassell: London

Western Cape Education Department. (2003). *Inclusive Education. A Historical Overview of Special Education and Inclusive Education in South Africa*. http://curriculum.wcape.scool.za

Woodward & Markowicz (1975). *Some handy new ideas on pidgins and Creole languages*. Paper presented at the 1975 International Conference on Pidgin and Creole Languages: Honolulu.

World Federation of the Deaf (WFD). (1993). *World Federation of the Deaf Report on the Status of Sign Language.* World Federation of the Deaf Publications