

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN  
SOUTH AFRICA AND THE  
DEVELOPING WORLD

This page intentionally left blank

# INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA AND THE DEVELOPING WORLD

The Search for an Inclusive  
Pedagogy

BY

Sigamoney Manicka Naicker  
*University of Western Cape, South Africa*



United Kingdom – North America – Japan  
India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited  
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2018

Copyright © Sigamoney Manicka Naicker.  
Published under exclusive licence by Emerald Publishing  
Limited.

**Reprints and permissions service**

Contact: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by The Copyright Licensing Agency and in the USA by The Copyright Clearance Center. Any opinions expressed in the chapters are those of the authors. Whilst Emerald makes every effort to ensure the quality and accuracy of its content, Emerald makes no representation implied or otherwise, as to the chapters' suitability and application and disclaims any warranties, express or implied, to their use.

**British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data**

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British  
Library

ISBN: 978-1-78754-130-6 (Print)

ISBN: 978-1-78743-690-9 (Online)

ISBN: 978-1-78743-962-7 (Epub)



ISOQAR certified  
Management System,  
awarded to Emerald  
for adherence to  
Environmental  
standard  
ISO 14001:2004.

Certificate Number 1985  
ISO 14001



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

*This book is dedicated to Allengary, my wife, for her love and support. Thanks to Sai for always guiding me.*

*To Veeran Haren and Mira, my children, for their constant support and love. I would also like to thank Ashwin Willemse and Saleem Badat for their intellectual guidance and friendship.*

This page intentionally left blank

# CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xiii
1. Inclusive Education in the Developing World	1
2. The History of Special Education and the Challenges for Inclusive Education	27
3. Changing Consciousness	57
4. The Education Landscape of Developing Countries and the Need for the Ideology of Inclusive Education: Barriers to Learning	93
5. Practical Recommendations for Developing an Inclusive Education System	115
<i>Bibliography</i>	159
<i>Index</i>	175

This page intentionally left blank

## FOREWORD

In this book, Professor Naicker offers valuable insights and a sociological imagination when we look at the education of children who operate in the margins of our schooling system. The book offers a framework to developing countries on how theories, assumptions, practices and tools need to change to develop a truly inclusive education and training system. Both local and international attempts using a piecemeal approach to transform educational systems have not been successful nor have they led to the transformational changes proposed. In particular, Naicker states that only a ‘rupture’ in the traditional model of special education can create the necessary conditions for the development of a systemic and comprehensive approach to inclusion.

Developing countries all over the world are often at a loss when it comes to providing a quality education to working class children and the vulnerable. He argues that in order to provide that quality education, vulnerable children and working class children should be brought to the centre of the education system. In other words, to effect systemic inclusion, the mainstream education system should not delegate these functions to some unit within the organisation but take total responsibility of the challenge. Mainstream education systems should take ownership of the challenges facing vulnerable children as they constitute the majority of the schooling population in developing countries.

International research suggests that developing countries are opting for a performance culture at all costs, and the consequence of such thinking is that only top performers benefit. Our research also tells us that the majority of children in developing countries are working class and vulnerable. Therefore, by opting for a performance culture, vulnerable and working class children are alienated. The option that Naicker suggests is an inclusive culture that takes on board the diversity that developing countries are confronted with. He observes that ultimately the key to the success of this proposed transformation rests squarely on the mainstream educational system taking the ownership of the process.

Research also tells us that developing inclusive education systems is a complex task and must take into consideration multiple factors. Naicker lucidly explains that the history of special education must be taken into consideration and should become common knowledge to all mainstream educationists and educators. The important point here is to move away from the psychologisation of failure and standardised tests with a view to understanding the levels of support learners require. Naicker also emphasizes the ideology of barriers to learning in system change. Mainstream systems of education should rupture traditional thinking by not looking at individual deficits but rather what barriers prevent learners from learning.

The two important considerations in Naicker's treatise is that we need to understand history and examine the systemic challenges that are posed to learners. If the mainstream system understands the barriers it presents to children in accessing education, more children will flourish in education systems.

This book captures the social portrait of developing countries and reveals the large number of barriers learners

experience. In a sense these conditions are very compatible with what inclusive education has to offer. The diverse range of barriers in learners' experience in developing countries suggests that inclusive education as an ideology and practice becomes very relevant.

For inclusive education to be successful in developing countries, mainstream systems of education should socialize ordinary teachers on the theory of inclusive education and the shift from the medical model. If all teachers understand the theory and practice of special education and the shift towards inclusive education, it creates space and possibilities for the majority of learners to succeed.

We know that literacy and numeracy performance is one of the biggest challenges faced by developing countries as well as the throughput rate. If we examine the barriers that learners face in numeracy and literacy in the formative years, for example, the lack of a print and numerate culture in the homes, much can be done to ameliorate the situation by understanding those barriers. Inclusive education programmes can very easily address literacy and numeracy if the history of special education and the ideology of barriers to learning is familiar to all teachers and educationists in the system.

A comprehensive and systemic process of inclusion that promotes the development of full-service schools and the training of all teachers in inclusive education in developing countries can place the majority of the children in the mainstream of education. However, it is important that curriculum development is contextualized within the specificities of developing countries. One historical pattern is that developing countries follow developed countries or use 'colonial' models at the expense of vulnerable and working class children. This book offers much promise for ameliorating the

literacy and numeracy challenge by placing working class and vulnerable children at the centre of educational reform.

Dr Todd Fletcher  
*Department of Disability and Psychoeducational Studies,  
The University of Arizona, USA*

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge Via Afrika for giving me permission to include substantial material from two chapters of my previous book (presented as Chapters 2 and 3 in this volume): Naicker, SM, 1999 *Curriculum 2005: An Introduction to Inclusive Education. A Space for All*, Tafelburg Publishers, Cape Town.

This page intentionally left blank

# CHAPTER 1

## INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD

Despite the rhetoric of inclusive education in the developing world, South Africa is the only country that has introduced a White Paper 6 on Special Needs Education: Building an Inclusive Education and Training System at a national level. Thus, South Africa, despite several shortcomings, has made a significant attempt to change the system towards an inclusive education system. Many interventions have taken place in other developing countries (Juma & Lehtomäki, 2015; Juma, Lehtomäki, & Naukkarinen, 2017; Mukhopadhyay, Nenty, & Abosi, 2012; McConkey & Mariga, 2011; Pather & Nxumalo, 2012; Westbrook & Alison, 2015). These interventions are often the result of international co-operation agreements that focus on piecemeal changes in the system. Whilst these interventions can be appreciated and the enthusiasm and commitment of the international consultants are admirable, they have not resulted in transforming many of these countries sufficiently. In fact, the major challenge is that these interventions have not taken the theory and practice of inclusion seriously. In these countries which include

Ethiopia, Tanzania and Zanzibar which form a part of Tanzania, Botswana and Swaziland, there is a close association with special education which is a serious impediment to inclusive education. For inclusion to take place in these countries and South Africa, the special education model has to be ruptured. The central theme of this book deals with the theory and practice of inclusive education. It offers a framework to developing countries on how theories, assumptions, practices and tools need to change to develop a truly inclusive education and training system. Chapter 1 includes an analyses of inclusive education in the developing world with major focus on South Africa. Chapter 2 speaks to the issue of the importance of understanding the history of special education in attempting to deliver an inclusive system, making specific reference to South Africa. Chapter 3 explains the ideology of inclusive education and how the poor and vulnerable children can be brought to the centre of the education system. Chapter 4 discusses the issue of paradigm shifts and the theory of inclusive education. Chapter 5 makes practical recommendations with regard to developing an inclusive education system.

### 1.1. WHY INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IS IMPORTANT TO DEVELOPING CONTEXTS

Very little has been done in mass education systems since it was introduced for working class children and vulnerable children in developing and poor countries. When developed nations plan, they plan for the middle class because they are the majority. Developing countries, following this model, also plan for the middle class, but the majority of children in developing countries are working class, poor and vulnerable. This action further marginalises the working class. Whilst this

chapter is contradictory in suggesting a first world inclusive model, the position of this book is that you cannot throw the baby out with the bathwater. There is enormous merit in following the inclusion model as it holds promise for working class children and vulnerable children who constitute the majority population in developing countries schooling systems.

## 1.2. WHAT ARE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES?

Developing nations are those with low, lower middle or upper middle incomes. Common characteristics of developing countries are low levels of living characterized by low income, inequality, poor health and inadequate education; a general sense of malaise and hopelessness (Nielsen, 2011).

Developing countries are poor. By definition, GDP and Per Capita Income are at a low level. The general living standard of people in these countries is very low. Poverty is visibly disturbing every aspect of life. General health services for people is insignificant. The life expectancy at birth does not exceed 60 years in many countries. As a result, the living standard of the people of such countries is also very low. People have difficulty in consuming even daily necessity (Nielsen, 2011). South Africa's average salary data are skewed by large levels of inequality, and exclude the large informal sector. For example, domestic workers, of which there are over 1 million employed in South Africa, earn approximately R2,500 per month – this equates to just over \$5,160 per year. Stats SA's (2017) latest data also show that South Africa has more domestic workers in employment than it has professionals, currently making up 6.2% of the country's 16.2 million person workforce. Professionals make up 5.5%, with the gap between the two groups widening every

quarter. South Africa also has an incredibly high unemployment rate, with 27.7% of workers out of a job – and by the broader definition putting it over 36%.

South Africa has largely followed developed models of education which have a totally different pupil composition. Planning for the poor and working class can be done effectively if we use the concept inclusive education as a framework of thinking and practice. The underlying principle of inclusive education is to examine what barriers exist in the system that prevent learners from learning and address those barriers in planning rather than psychologizing failure. There is scope in education during the formative years to take into consideration different intelligences that learners possess. In the current system, anyone who fails is regarded as having deficiencies. The argument of inclusive education is what barriers exist in the system that prevents success, and each of these barriers requires an assessment in order to create the conditions for learners to learn. The mainstream of education should take ownership of inclusive education and commit to system change. Whilst the White Paper was introduced in South Africa and inclusive pedagogies were introduced in other developing countries, there has not been a systemic change. It is only with systemic change that the benefits of inclusive education can be realized.

The main thrust of this book is that developing countries should embrace an inclusive ideology that results in radical changes to theory, assumptions, models and practices. Developing countries have not brought the marginalised and alienated to the centre of the education system including South Africa. For example, in many African countries, pilot projects and changes to teaching practices has been the norm (McConkey & Mariga, 2011; Juma et al., 2015). In South Africa, a White Paper has been launched on inclusive education. In South Africa, special education units that are called

inclusive education components implement inclusive education. The point of departure of an inclusive system is that the mainstream of education should own the transformation. The mainstream of education should examine every barrier to learning and find solutions for that, for example, disaggregate the various effects of poverty, establish how language can be an impediment to learning, develop responses to poorly educated parents and curriculum development should be contextualized within the specificities of countries. There should be a clear understanding of how the history of special education has psychologized failure and influenced the thinking of mainstream bureaucrats and educationists. Vulnerable children in South Africa remain in the margins and will continue to occupy positions in the margins of society in the developing world.

Inclusive education must be accompanied by structural change and programmatic changes. This type of transformation will assist in embracing large numbers of children who are alienated from the mainstream as a result of socio-economic challenges and challenges related to the performance culture that is driven by the World Bank, OECD and other supra national organisations (Liasidou, 2016). The performative culture encouraged by these organisations create the conditions for instability, violence and conflict-ridden societies. Too many children in developing countries become part of high attrition and perform poorly in literacy and numeracy because the focus is on top performers. To build better and more stable societies, we need to develop a nurturing supportive culture in education instead of our obsession with performance. Developing countries cannot compare themselves with other countries in the Western world. In those countries, children in the margins are experiencing great difficulty in school and often are placed in special education facilities. Unfortunately, in developing countries, as

mentioned earlier, there is a substantial number of children who are sitting in the margins. Ideas from the World Bank and related organisations often do not hold in developing nations. We need to develop a safety net for children as this is not possible in many of their homes. For example, children who constitute ‘the other’ are overrepresented in special education in the UK and many accuse the US education system of creating schools as a pipeline to prison.

My sense is that developing countries should examine their contexts and find ways to keep children in school so that they do not become victims of the brutal neo-liberalism economic system where the majority of people struggle to find jobs. Responses should be found for children to succeed in reading and writing, especially, in the formative years so that conditions are created for children to graduate from school. We know that if children do not learn to read by the age of 6, they are unlikely to complete schooling. When developing nations opt for a performative culture, they tend to take care of the top performers and the more privileged learners in the schooling system. The weak and vulnerable will be lost and never find a place in mainstream economic and social life. We have to develop a safety net for vulnerable children in the formative years Grade R to Grade 4.

Now what is an inclusive ideology and what are the assumptions, models and tools that are associated with this practice?

According to Pather et al. (2012), inclusion is a term that emerged in the late 1950s in response to criticisms of segregated institutions by disabled people, which resulted in separation of disabled children from their family, peers and local communities (Hodgkinson, 2016). However, we are not only talking about disabled learners here, we are referring to all learners, particularly those who are working class and find it difficult to interact with a middle class curriculum. The

disability movement as a political movement aided by a growth of disability studies to aid this movement led to a subsequent shift in thinking from a medical model of viewing impairment as the only cause of educational difficulties to a social model of examining social processes and factors which result in difficulties (Norwich, 2013). The focus is on addressing cultural, ideological and material forces, which generate and legitimate policies and practices on exclusion for all learners (Armstrong, Armstrong, & Barton, 2000). The shift is away from categorizing and pathologising some learners, for example, those with socio-economic challenges, as being the 'other' and to focusing on all forms of marginalization and exclusion based on gender, ethnicity, cultural background, sexuality and physical, cultural and material recourses (Nind & Vinha, 2003). Inclusive education therefore calls for 'restorative practice', school transformation and renovation to address exclusion and not simply move children into unchanged institutions (Slee, 2011).

If we apply the notion of inclusion to learners who struggle in the mainstream, we can revolutionise our schooling systems. We know that learners who do not experience success in the mainstream find their lack of success psychologized. Instead, every developing country should examine all the barriers in the system that make it difficult for learners to succeed.

It follows from the discussion above that changing to an inclusive education system requires a paradigmatic shift from a dual to a single system. South Africa has developed a white paper but has put into place special education units to take control of inclusive education. Instead, the mainstream of education should have taken responsibility. In this way, education planning would have taken responsibility for all vulnerable children. At this time, vulnerable children remain at the margins of schools and society.

### 1.3. SOUTH AFRICA

South Africa is a developing country with huge disparities derived from the apartheid dispensation. Many people do not have adequate educational qualifications and relevant skills, unemployment is very high and large numbers live in poverty. To contribute to breaking the cycle of disadvantage, there is a need to ensure that all children receive quality education from a very early age. Impoverished families are generally unable to provide adequate resources at home for their children to achieve school readiness. Poverty, combined with parents' low level of education, contributes to learner underachievement. One of the White Papers launched in South Africa was Education White Paper 6 on Special Needs Education: Building an Inclusive Education and Training System. However, this paper was not implemented at a structural and programmatic level leaving many poor learners in the same situation they were when arriving at school on the first day. Planning and development of the inclusive system should bring the vulnerable child to the centre of the system and planning should take place accordingly. Planning and delivery should be based on the barriers to learning framework that is discussed later on in this book.

The Western Cape has been selected as a suitable example in this discussion as it is the second richest province. A closer look at the education profile in the Western Cape, the second wealthiest province in South Africa, provides a bleak picture. According to the Human Capital Development Strategy (2007, p. 10) developed by the provincial Department of Education, only 23.4% of the population of learners in the Western Cape complete Grade 12. Over a third (36.5%) drop out during the secondary school phase; a small proportion complete primary education (7.9%). Fifteen per cent (15.2%) of the latter figure drop out during the primary

phase. At least 5.7% of the total learner population have no schooling at all. Enrolment and completion of schooling by the age of 17 years is highest amongst white learners (100%); the enrolment and completion rate is lower amongst the African population, and the lowest amongst coloured learners. For those learners currently at school, only 37% of learners at Grade 3 level achieve grade-appropriate literacy and numeracy levels. At Grade 6 level, numeracy performance drops to 15%, and literacy performance to 35%. These statistics are alarming if we consider that the education sector receives 38.1% of the total provincial budget (Human Capital Development Strategy, 2007, p. 10).

Against the backdrop of the apartheid legacy, it is evident that the most disadvantaged learners are black and thus experience the least success in the education system. Yet, after 15 years of funding education on a pro-poor basis with the emphasis on equity, it seems very little has been achieved. According to the OECD (2008, p. 53), three international learning assessments of the outcomes of South African schooling, the Monitoring Learning Achievement (MLA) project conducted in 1999, Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) conducted in 1995, 1999 and 2003 and the Southern Eastern African Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SAQMEC) completed in 1991, confirm that South Africans are performing poorly and the education system is not delivering quality education. The high dropout rate and the low pass rates in literacy and numeracy suggest that much still has to be done. A guiding principle of the National Curriculum Statement for South African schools is social justice (DOE, 2001). Both literacy and numeracy are social justice issues, as a lack of literacy and numeracy excludes one from mainstream economic and social life (Bearne & Marsh, 2007). Teaching young children literacy and numeracy through ECD establishes a sound base

for learning and is an important strategy to reach the goal of social justice.

The socio-economic conditions in families determine, to a large extent, the quality of learning environment at home. Statistics that focus on the Western Cape illustrate this point. According to the Provincial Economic Review and Outlook research (2007, p. 5), 25.5% of people in the Western Cape are unemployed. A further analysis of the data indicates the following:

- Between the ages of 15 and 24, 49.1% are unemployed.
- Between the ages of 25 and 34, 23.7% are unemployed.
- Between the ages of 35 and 44, 18.1% are unemployed.
- Between the ages of 45 and 54, 13.1% are unemployed.

Thus, a large percentage of younger parents who are likely to have young children are unemployed. These homes have limited educational resources and lack a print culture, and early literacy is minimal. This implies few books, little interest in school work and a lack of a reading and oral language culture.

Changing from a dual system of education (special and ordinary) to an inclusive system of education requires substantial change in terms of thinking and practices. After 20 years of implementing Education White Paper 6 (DOE, 2001), it is very important that theories, assumptions, practices, models and tools are put under immense scrutiny for the inclusive policy to work. The single system of education should develop the capacity to address barriers to learning if it wants to include all learners into the education system. What are the main barriers that deprive learners access to a single system of education and what changes should take place so that a truly inclusive system can be created? These

include (1) language, (2) negative attitudes, (3) socio-economic factors, (4) parental attitude, (5) lack of appropriate and clear policy, (6) access to the curriculum and (7) lack of access to a print culture. These barriers are discussed as an ideological framework as a chapter later on in this book.

South Africa introduced seven white papers in education but they were all implemented in ways that were not entirely influenced by the theory and practice of inclusive education. Inclusive education requires of the system to change at a structural level so that the mainstream of education takes ownership of the ideology and practice of inclusive education. This should bring about consistency in relation to other white papers, for example, curriculum development, early childhood education, adult education and other areas of education. This chapter suggests that in implementing inclusive education, South Africa did not take seriously the various barriers, such as the curriculum in providing access to learners who experience barriers.

The social portrait of South Africa based on its second richest city suggests that a substantial part of the pupil population could benefit from an inclusive education system. Too many learners in the country remain in the margins of society as a result of historical factors such race and class.

#### 1.4. DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Inclusive Education, according to McConkey, Mariga, and Myezwa (2014), is perceived as being practically challenging in low-income countries like those in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). In 2011, nearly 30 million children in SSA were not attending school at all and over half of those children who attended primary school did not learn the basic reading and writing skills by Grade 4 (UNESCO, 2013, 2014).

Concerning inclusive education, many countries in this region benefit from foreign donors who are involved in micro inclusive education projects. There is no systemic change and formal national inclusive policy that results in system change at a country level. The position of this book is that given the socio-economic and related challenges, developing countries will benefit tremendously from a single inclusive system. This inclusive system could have enormous benefits for literacy and numeracy levels, throughput and access to teaching and learning.

### 1.5. ETHIOPIA

Pather and Nxumalo (2012) sum up the situation of inclusive education in Ethiopia. There appears to be a few inclusion projects in Ethiopia but there is an overwhelming special education practice. The question remains: has 'Ethiopia's SNE strategy pushed beyond the boundaries of integration to offer a world of inclusion' (Franck & Joshi, 2017, p. 357), and the answer appears to be no because of the attitudes of the community and teachers and the lack of material and technical resources (Franck & Joshi, 2017). There is not sufficient evidence as there is a dearth of literature on inclusive education and its implementation in Ethiopia. However, some of the challenges highlighted in the few available sources point to the resistance of teachers to include children with disabilities into mainstream classrooms (Beyene & Tizazu, 2010). They believe children with disabilities are better served in separate institutions with specialist teachers. Mainstreaming has also not been accompanied by reorganization of the mainstream school, its curriculum and teaching and learning strategies (UNESCO, 2005, as cited in Tilahun, 2007). Lack of training, availability of support, materials and equipment and

large class sizes all contribute to the challenges. Negative community attitudes towards disability and inclusive education also compound the issue (IDDC, 1998, as cited in Tirussew, 1999).

In recognition of the constraints and challenges facing the inclusion of children in schools, the Special Needs/Inclusive Education Strategy proposed a model which included Support Centres/Resource Centres (RCs) to improve schools' competencies to manage individual differences and support needs as well as through inter-sectorial cooperation. The Special Needs Strategy had a target of establishing 800 RCs in Ethiopia by the end of the year 2020, and the 2008–2012 project funded by the Finnish government established nine Resources Centres across four regions as well as a Special Education Teacher Training Centre in Sebeta. Based on a review of this project, a subsequent project was designed with two strategic options focusing on the implementation of the new SNE/IE strategy of 2012 and supporting implementation of SNE/IE in RCs and schools in selected regions. The subsequent project from 2013–2017 developed a further nine RCs amongst schools and three RCs in the Colleges of Teacher Education and hoped to strengthen the existing seven in three regions – Addis Ababa, Oromiya and Southern Nations, Nationalities, and People's Region (SNNPR). This was part of a bilateral cooperation project titled 'Enhancing Inclusive Education Capacity of Teacher Education and Resource Centers in Ethiopia' between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Finland and the Ministry of Education in Ethiopia. The RCs were supported by itinerant teachers employed at each RC and three regional advisors employed on the project, each taking responsibility for the RCs in the three regions.

Similar to other developing countries below, isolated projects have enjoyed relative success. The lack of a systems approach

poses major challenges in terms of teacher training, common understanding, physical, human and material resources.

## 1.6. TANZANIA

Both Krohn-Nydal (2008) and Westbrook and Alison (2015) offer contrasting positions on inclusive education in Tanzania. What is not disputed is the relevance and importance of inclusive education in this poor context.

According to Krohn-Nydal (2008), in Tanzania, the culture of African socialism points towards a culture of inclusiveness. This is according to Mmbaga (2002) demonstrated through the norms and values of the Tanzanian society, where every person regardless of the differences has dignity, equal opportunity and respect. Many of these norms and customs originate in indigenous traditions and beliefs (Kisanji, 1995). Research indicates that both non-formal and formal education roots in indigenous education and the principles of indigenous education will still apply in today's formal education (Kisanji, 1999). Kisanji further argues that African indigenous education was, and is, inclusive. He argues that the list of principles below that talk about universality, relevance, functionality and community localisation are very important to develop an inclusive educational system. Different forms of indigenous education are '(1) Absence or limited differentiation of space, time and status: indigenous customary education was available and accessible to community members, where ever they were during waking hours (2) Relevance of content and methods: the content of education was drawn from the physical or natural social environments, both of which were intricately tied to the religious/spiritual life of the people (3) Functionality of knowledge and skills: all the knowledge, attitudes and skills embodied in the curriculum

was based on cultural transmission, knowledge creation and transformation and (4) Community orientation: all educational content and practice was based on and within the community' (Kisanji, 1999, p. 11). Tanzania as many other countries of the South is not capable of providing education for children with special needs. Special need schools have, in fact, never been accepted in the general education system and are not included in official policies. The inclusive classroom in Tanzania is more or less non-existing. Pupils who are not able to follow the education provided because of special needs are labelled 'slow' or stupid and are ignored (Mmbaga, 2002). Nevertheless, according to Mmbaga (2002), the inclusive school is embraced in Tanzania, but its development suffers from social, economic and administrative constraints. An international initiative, which has focused on different implications for improving the headway towards inclusion, is the UNESCO flagship.

Both Krohn-Nydal (2008) and Westbrook and Alison (2015) studies point to the potential for inclusive education in Tanzania but the limitations of a centralized approach systemic approach. According to Westbrook and Alison (2015), overall, despite the constraints of class size and curriculum, the findings of our study show that these Tanzanian teachers are willing and able to learn how to teach inclusively. There may be a need within teacher education, curriculum development and policymaking to depersonalise the debate from the perception that the problem is either in the children (the medical model of disability) or with the teachers (deficit model of teachers) or that the problem lies in a lack of resources (true but unlikely to change substantially in the next 10 years), to a more interactionist perspective whereby the problem is understood as being located between teachers, learners and the curriculum and resources provided by higher levels of the education system. This is not new but warrants restating at

the present time (Tomlinson, 1982). The teachers in this study understood this interactionist perspective as their explanations of the source of children's learning difficulties and their sense of responsibility for helping children learn demonstrate. In other words, it may be more constructive to focus on inclusive pedagogy as a developing interactive process rather than something special that teachers either do or do not practice. In this case, the questions are differently framed: What can we do to improve teaching? What can we do to improve learning? Specific resources or additional teaching may well be the right answer for some disabled learners at some times but these can be compatible with an inclusive rather than exclusive approach in which all teachers are responsible for and capable of teaching all the children in their class (see Westbrook & Alison, 2015, for a fuller discussion). The teacher's descriptions of how they learnt to teach offer guidance for the improvement of teacher education and development, particularly in contexts such as Tanzania where there are large numbers of teachers needing training. Although the practices of the teachers in this study may not appear inclusive to some audiences, their overall positive attitudes, sharp understanding and awareness of their learners lend support to an inclusive pedagogy, thereby normalizing practices that help all learners to learn. In this respect, they are already enacting UNESCO's recommendations to strengthen teacher attitudes and provide appropriate teaching for those having difficulty learning (UNESCO, 2011). They are doing much of what is possible within their local schools and, in the larger context of the global learning crisis, they offer reasons to hope rather than to despair. The challenge of inclusion is not to be underestimated, but the numbers of children with relatively moderate impairments point to the need to address this challenge primarily with mainstream teachers in mainstream classes. Although these teachers are

just beginning to teach inclusively, consider what they might do if such attitudes and methods were integrated into their initial teacher education courses right from the beginning as the key lens through which they viewed teaching and learning, and their students. This glimpse of what could be, as presented in this chapter, would be simply what all teachers do but better and more consistently.

The isolated projects in Tanzania will not help solve the challenges of poverty in Tanzania. A literate schooling contribution can create the necessary conditions for a flourishing society. It seems inclusive education if adopted at a systemic level can make this contribution.

### 1.7. ZANZIBAR

Zanzibar is an archipelago on the coast of Tanzania, consisting of two main islands – Unguja and Pemba – and several small islands. With a population of just under 1 million, an estimated 60% of whom live in poverty, the average life expectancy is 56 years. Although primary education is free and the gross net enrolment rate is close to 100%, attendance rates are around 70%, with over 130,000 children of school-going age outside of the educational system. The government is committed to Education for All but faces many infrastructural challenges in achieving this target by 2015, including an acute shortage of classrooms, inadequate and poorly trained teachers, large classroom sizes and high teacher–pupil ratios (1:40 officially but extending to 1:80 in under-served areas) and inadequate teaching/learning materials as most expenditure goes on teacher salaries. International donors contribute around 70% of the education budget. Formal provision for children with special educational needs began in 1998 with the formation of a Special Education Unit in the Ministry of

Education and Vocational Training, and the establishment by 2004 of five special units attached to mainstream schools. However, the most recent policy document emphasises the importance of inclusion within mainstream schooling: ‘Children with disabilities and others with special needs, shall to the greatest extent possible, be able to attend local schools where they will receive quality education alongside their peers without disabilities or special needs’.

After the revolution of Zanzibar in 1964, education was proclaimed ‘free’. Since then, there have been attempts to improve issues of access, equity, and quality (MoEVT, 2006). The 1991 Zanzibar education policy was reformed in 2006 to incorporate international conventions and declarations such as the 1990 Jomtien Declaration, Education for All (EFA) and the 1994 World Conference on Special Needs Education, Access, and Quality (MoEVT, 2006). In line with the EFA goals, the Salamanca Statement and Framework of Action on Special Needs Education call for the promotion of Inclusive Education, Zanzibar introduced Inclusive Education in its education system whereby all children are expected to attend a school closer to their home. In addition, the 2006 education policy reforms included a new structure of formal education system. The structure of formal education system consists of five levels, namely (1) two years of pre-primary education, (2) six years of primary education, (3) four years of ordinary level secondary education, (4) two years of advanced secondary education and (5) a minimum of three years of higher education (MoEVT, 2006).

The starting point for this inquiry on changes in education in Zanzibar is the period after the Zanzibar Revolution in 1964, when education was declared free of charge to all Zanzibaris, irrespective of their races, religions, tribes, socio-economic status, disabilities, or gender (Legal and Human Rights Centre, 2013a, 2013b; MoEVT, 2006). In 1988, the

Ministry of Education formed a Special Education Unit within the Ministry to offer educational services to children with disabilities in an endeavour to make sure that no child in Zanzibar was denied their right to education. In some schools, special units were introduced and became operational from 1991. By 2014, there were nine special units: six for children with developmental disabilities, two for children with hearing impairments and one for children with visual impairments (MoEVT, 2013). The origin of Inclusive Education in Zanzibar can be traced back to the early 2000s as a result of a visit to Lesotho made by the Ministry of Education and Culture officials. During the visit, the Zanzibar delegation was inspired by the implementation of inclusion in Lesotho schools. In 2004, an Inclusive Education project, funded by the Norwegian Association for Persons with Developmental Disabilities (in Norwegian: NorskForbund for Utviklingshemmede, NFU) and Operation Day's Work (ODW), was introduced. The Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MoEVT) and the Zanzibar Association for People with Developmental Disabilities (ZAPDD) have been collaborating with national and international partners such as Ministry of Health, Department of Disability Affairs in the First vice-President's Office, NFU and Sight Savers International to run the project. The aim of this project was to ensure that learners with special educational needs had access to education. The project began with 20 schools, and by 2014, it had reached 119 schools (MoEVT, 2013, 2013, 2014; Jumaa & Lehtomäki, 2015).

Despite all the developments in inclusive education, the mainstream of education has not owned the transformation to a single system. The tinkering of the system is not good enough with so many poor children in the system. Once again, micro projects and the focus on a few pilot schools as well as some dedicated units in special education as part of

the ministry of education intervention does not impact significantly on creating an inclusive education system. The mainstream system has not taken ownership and located inclusive education at the centre of the education system.

### 1.8. SWAZILAND

According to Pather and Nxumalo (2012), inclusive education in Swaziland was given impetus by an international declaration at the International Conference on SEN in Salamanca in 1994 which followed Jomtein, it is accepted that the term 'inclusive education' and indeed 'inclusion' in educational terms has been associated with SEN (Special Education Need). It is an association which has continued to cause tension in the field and challenged shifts in thinking as well as developments towards focusing on a wider agenda for inclusion rather narrowly being concerned only with learners categorised as having special educational needs and/or disability (Dyson, Kalambouka, Farrel, & Kaplan, 2004, cited in Ainscow, Booth, & Dyson, 2006; Clough, 1999). Given this association, it is worth turning to the origins of special education within Southern African countries to contextualise more recent challenges facing efforts to transform attitudes and create more inclusive rather than segregated systems. Unsurprisingly, the developments of special provisioning for children with disabilities in countries of the South resembled the trajectory of special education in the North as in the UK (TDA, 2009). Many developing countries endorsed and were signatories to major international declarations such as Salamanca and Jomtein. Developing countries should move not regard inclusive education as the opposite to SEN. Rather given the number of children who are in the margins of the system as discussed in the case of South Africa, developing

countries should make an attempt to create inclusive education systems at a centralized level.

According to Pather and Nxumalo (2012), in the case of Swaziland, the segregationist model for education of children with disabilities can be related to the history of special education and its related structures within this context. Special Education in Swaziland was a charitable initiative of missionaries, in particular the Catholic Church. In 1967, the education of physically disabled children was initiated in mainstream classrooms at St Josephs' Mission. In the same year, 1967, steps to establish a Resource Centre for the Blind were taken and the centre was officially opened in 1969. In 1978, integration of mentally challenged at Zama Centre within St Joseph's Mission was initiated. In 1975, another school, Ekwetsembeni Special School for children who had learning difficulties was established by two American Peace Corps volunteers – the initiative came from the Society for the Handicapped. In the same year (1975), the School for the Deaf was started by Catholic nuns at Enjabulweni Orphanage Home in Manzini. In 1976, the school moved to Siteki (with only six students) and the Ministry of Education and Training took over from Home Affairs which had all along been responsible for the institutions. In 2007, the first High School for learners who are Deaf was established 32 years after the primary school was established. Presently, there are four special schools in Swaziland catering for about 372 students with learning disabilities, hearing and visual impairment, intellectual disabilities and physical disabilities. In terms of training, Special School teachers, in particular those from the school for the Deaf, did their initial training in Malawi where they obtained certificates in special education. They furthered their studies in the UK in the University of Birmingham, Manchester and Newcastle. This has therefore had an impact on the development of special and subsequent

inclusive education in Swaziland. The tendency has been to push for implementation of new ideas on special education learnt and or observed abroad without closer consideration of the uniqueness of the cultures that influence the local education system.

Inclusive Education in Swaziland has a close association with special education need but no system change at a centralized level. Unlike South Africa, there was no White Paper on Inclusive Education and the development of inclusive education was largely the result of initiatives from individuals and organisations within the country as well as consultants from the West.

## 1.9. BOTSWANA

According to Mukhopadhyay et al. (2012), educating learners with disabilities began about 40 years ago in Botswana. Missionaries from the Dutch Reformed Church started the first school for children who were blind or had severe visual impairments in 1969, and missionaries from the Lutheran Church opened the first school for children who were deaf or had severe hearing impairments in 1970. Botswana developed its first policy on education in 1977 which is commonly known as Education for Kgahisano (Government of Botswana, 1977); it recommended that each child should have the right to education regardless of his/her disability, race, ethnicity, culture or background, but it was not enforced consistently (Government of Botswana, 1993; Otlhogile, 1998). The Second National Commission on Education was established in 1992 to review the education system in Botswana and to address its shortcomings. Following the submission of its report in 1993, the Revised National Policy on Education (RNPE) was formulated and approved by the National Assembly as Government

White Paper No. 2 of 1994 (Government of Botswana, 1994). The RNPE lists specific provisions for the education and training of all children and young people, including those with disabilities.

The Mukhopadhyay et al. (2012) study revealed that inclusive education is a relatively new concept in Botswana. Participating teachers had limited experiences managing learners with disabilities. However, some teachers were highly enthusiastic about the goals. One of them said, 'I think it's a good idea. Previously, learners with disabilities did not have opportunities to attend normal schools; they were mostly hidden and were isolated. The little experience that I gather teaching these students, I think some of them could be successful in our school provided we are ready to support them. They need lots of support. Some children are especially difficult; including children who use sign language (we don't know sign language). They may be better placed in special schools' (Teacher, rural school).

Such comments suggest that teachers prefer selected categories of learners with disabilities. The majority of teachers preferred students with learning difficulties to those with any other disability. Teachers reported less preference for learners with physical disabilities, deafness or blindness and those with emotional problems. The reason for this preference for learners with learning disability was expressed as learning disability 'is easy to manage and accommodate'. Mobility impairment was the category next most frequently endorsed by teachers. It emerged from the data that learners with mobility impairments did not create serious demands on the part of teachers in the lines of instructional accommodations.

The least preferred categories were visual or hearing disabilities and students with emotional disorders. Participants of the study believed they could not effectively accommodate

these learners in regular classrooms. It could be deduced that the teachers preferred selective inclusive practices rather than the fully inclusive model.

During the focus group discussions, some teachers were concerned with the practicalities of including learners with disabilities at the classroom level: 'It is very difficult since most of them cannot write; some of them are very playful and disruptive. They even fight with other learners. They need attention all the time. It is not easy to teach them in a regular class' (Teacher, urban).

*Teaching students with disabilities is quite challenging; first of all, you have to ensure that the child is safe, and accepted by others; meaning one has to collaborate with parents, students and others; it means extra work. Moreover, we are not trained. I don't have adequate knowledge and skills to manage such children. (Teacher, semi urban)*

In the last few decades, educational provisions for learners with disabilities have changed. More learners with special needs are studying side by side in regular school with their peers who do not have disabilities. This concept is commonly known as inclusive education. It is based on the principle that all children regardless of ability or disability have a basic right to be educated alongside their peers in their neighbourhood schools (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, 1994). This concept was implemented in Western countries in the 1980s, and it has become a matter for the global agenda (Singal, 2005). As one of the signatories of 'Education for All', Botswana is committed to enhancing access to education to all her citizens, and inclusive education

is perceived to be the most effective approach in reaching this goal (Mukhopadhyay et al., 2008).

Botswana has not made significant progress concerning building an inclusive system of education. Many of the interventions is a result of projects completed by foreign governments and there is an association between special education need and inclusive education.

Developing countries are all signatories to the international declarations. Besides that, there has not been much done to transform these systems. There are a few clear signals about inclusive education in developing countries. These include (1) an association between special needs and inclusion, (2) all these countries have a significant levels of poverty, (3) there is no limited centralised ownership of inclusive education and (4) many of the countries except South Africa have a national policy on inclusive education. Given the above developments in South Africa and other countries discussed above, this book attempts to provide a broad framework on how a system can become truly inclusive instead of the piecemeal developments that does not bring about radical change. Chapter 2 speaks to the issue of the importance of understanding the history of special education in attempting to delivery of an inclusive system. This chapter suggests that special education has a major influence of inclusive education and there is a need to be mindful of this influence so that the special education model can be ruptured to create the conditions for inclusion. Centralised ownership of inclusion is central to helping vulnerable and working class children. Chapter 3 explains the ideology of inclusive education and how the poor and vulnerable children can be brought to the centre of the education system. This chapter explains the various barriers to learning and how one can overcome these barriers. Chapter 4 discusses the issue of the theory of inclusive education.

The chapter suggests that every teacher in these countries should understand the theory. Chapter 5 makes practical recommendations with regard to developing an inclusive education system. This includes advice for the planning in the mainstream, central government taking ownership and development of full-service schools.