SCHOOL-BASED SUPPORT TEAM MEMBERS' UNDERSTANDING OF CURRICULUM DIFFERENTIATION AND ENHANCEMENT IN RURAL SOUTH AFRICA: A NARRATIVE INQUIRY

Dipane Hlalele, Zakhokuhle Jiyane & Sibusiso Radebe

ABSTRACT

Curriculum differentiation remains an inevitable, significant, inherent and desirable element in dealing with our schools' responsiveness to diverse learning needs. The school-based support teams (SBSTs) add value by facilitating the implementation of inclusive learning and care. This study explores and documents SBST members' understanding and enhancement efforts concerning curriculum differentiation at a rural school where learners are regarded as underachievers, progressed and/or untrainable. A case study design utilising purposive (intentional) sampling was employed for the selection of participants based on the fact that they were implementing the curriculum differentiation directives as required by the Education White Paper 6 (EWP6, 2001) as well as the policy on inclusivity. Drawing from appreciative inquiry, this qualitative case study gleaned data from six participants, each representing a different portfolio committee of the SBST. The participants included a parent/caregiver, teacher, head of department (HOD), deputy principal, and therapists, who were prompted to provide written/spoken narratives for data generation purposes. The interpretations of these narratives involved dissecting their understanding and enhancement plans concerning curriculum differentiation at their school. Using this narrative analysis frame, data analysed yielded rich findings. It was found that a differentiated but complementary understanding of curriculum differentiation resulted from differentiated enhancement endeavours. It is recommended that a concerted, collaborated and cohesive understanding of curriculum differentiation be inculcated in all roleplayers in order to add value to teaching, learning and support; hence optimising the impact and responsiveness SBSTs may have in addressing barriers to learning and development.

Keywords: Curriculum differentiation, Barriers to learning, School-Based Support Teams, Narrative analysis

INTRODUCTION

School Based Support Teams (SBSTs) who are the main support structure at school level are responsible for driving inclusion through the identification and addressing of the needs of the school, teachers, as well as the learners (DoE, 2001). The SBST has three main portfolio committees (DBE, 2014a; DoE, 2001). These portfolio committees are: Whole School Development (WSD) responsible for determining the needs of the entire school (DBE 2014a; KZNDoE, 2009; DoE, 2001); the Learner Support Portfolio (LSP) which is responsible for early identification of needs and provision of precise intervention for all learners experiencing barriers to learning; thirdly, the EWP6 states that Educator Support Portfolio Committees (ESPs) should

provide support in the form of professional development to educators as well as identifying other needs to eradicate barriers in the teaching-learning process (DBE, 2014a). There are also inclusive education policies; namely, the Education White Paper 6 (EWP6), and Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support (SIAS) which act as guidelines for the implementation of inclusivity. The latter (SIAS) is a processing tool within the education system which was developed to facilitate the development and implementation of support plans for addressing the needs of all learners (DBE, 2014b).

Additionally, there are documents promoting the implementation of diverse learning needs in the classroom. These act as guidelines to ensure quality education and support in special schools and special school resource-centres to celebrate our differences. A guide to differentiated lesson planning and guidelines for responding to learner diversity in the classroom is included in the National Curriculum Statements (NCS) which are incrementally developed as envisioned in the EWP6 framework. Curriculum differentiation is one of the key components as explained in the SIAS policy which states that curriculum and assessment need to be adapted to allow learners with numerous levels of functioning to access the curriculum and assessment at the level that best suits their needs (DBE, 2011). This differentiation or diversity is supposed to be done at school at classroom level and facilitated by SBSTs. It is mandated in the EWP6 and the SIAS that all schools should have SBSTs (DoE, 2001; KZNDoE, 2009; DBE, 2014a). Without the presence of a fully functional SBST, the implementation of curriculum differentiation cannot effectively take place since the SBST is the key structure in addressing diverse learning needs and styles (DBE, 2011; DBE, 2014b). This is because curriculum differentiation is done to present the same task at different levels so that learners can learn in his/her unique way. Differentiation of curriculum therefore creates learning opportunities that generate allowances for differences (Jackson, 2010; DBE 2011; DBE 2014b). This strategy comprises of adapting, modifying, changing, extending and varying teaching methodologies, teaching strategies, assessment strategies, as well as the content and learning environment of the curriculum (Jackson 2010; DBE, 2011; DBE, 2014b).

Barriers to learning are described as factors hindering the system of accommodating diversity; and this mainly leads to a breakdown of learning and teaching processes in terms of accessing educational provisions (DoE, 1997; DBE, 2014a). The Ministry of Education through the EWP6 asserts that one of the most stumbling factors to learning in special and ordinary schools, is the curriculum (DoE 2001). The barriers to learning arise from different aspects of the curriculum: content, medium of instruction, classroom organisation and management, methods and processes used during teaching, pace of teaching, time available to complete the curriculum, learning materials and equipment, and how learning is assessed (DoE 2001).

Westwood (2018) highlights that several submissions presented by Australian education researchers reveal that there is a pressing need to uplift and accelerate pre- and in-service training concerning special education by using innovative methods, including offering better specialist supports to such schools. This is because the findings divulge that children with disabilities in schools may be marginalised due to the fact that teachers lack skills or strategies on how to include them in their entire planning and execution of teaching-learning activities (Westwood, 2018). Furthermore, a study conducted in a South African Full Service School reveals that teachers have received limited or no support from the SBST and District Based Support Team [DBST] (Mnguni, 2017). Mnguni (2017) adds that this support was promised in the EWP6 (2001). This situation of non-support makes it difficult for teachers to translate policy into practice. Adequate and ongoing

support in the form of in-house workshops, cluster workshops, seminars and information-sharing networks are crucial for adding to the body of knowledge and skills which can assist teachers to gain additional or innovative strategies on differentiating curriculum that will benefit all learners. Tomlinson (2014) avers that classrooms embracing the philosophy of inclusion become differentiated classrooms that support learners who learn in dissimilar ways and who are different, and who bring to schools diverse talents and interests. Such classrooms cater for a wide range of learner-abilities with their unique needs, and does not advocate that one size fits all (Tomlinson, 2014). Teaching in deep rural settings evokes countless images of barriers, hardship and despair (Ebershn & Ferreira, 2012). One of the challenges would be the availability of different stakeholders to serve in SBSTs. In the eyes of the DBE, the SBST, previously referred to as the institution level support team (ILST), constitutes the core structure within the school for development of an inclusive education (DoE, 2001:48; DoE 2005; KZNDoE, 2009; DBE, 2014a, 2014b; Makoelle, 2014; Van Niekerk & Pienaar, 2018).

CURRICULUM DIFFERENTIATION

Curriculum differentiation aims at minimising barriers to learning. Mnguni (2017) contends that for true learner inclusivity, a learner-centred approach should be adopted one that is flexible in that it accommodates diverse needs of learners which leads to educational success. Curriculum differentiation as way of accommodating diversity relies profoundly on teachers' possession of essential and in-depth know-how (Westwood, 2018). Most effective teachers in differentiated classrooms are more in touch with their learners, and their teaching approaches are flexible and simplified to suit all learners' capabilities, in addition to modifying instructions to learners to accommodate their diverse needs (Tomlinson, 2014). The DoE (2012) mandated SBSTs in special schools to follow regulations and policy with regard to curriculum management by facilitating curriculum differentiation by designing simplified versions, special editions or lower grade levels of texts, and avail them where it is necessary (DBE, 2014). The SBSTs and teachers need ongoing support in the form of workshops, mentoring, and monitoring to assess the functionality of the SBST. More importantly, the provision of support in addressing barriers to learning by the departmental officials, is paramount. This is because the SA Ministry of Education via the EWP6 (2001) highlights the fact that for the building of capacity in education, all teachers need to receive professional development that will capacitate them in employing curriculum development and assessment principles (DoE, 2001). In a nutshell, the DBE (2014a: viii) sees curriculum differentiation as:

> *[A] key strategy for responding to the needs of learners with diverse learning styles and needs. It involves processes of modifying, changing, adapting, extending and varying teaching methodologies, teaching strategies, assessment strategies and the content of the curriculum. It takes into account learners' levels of functioning, interests and backgrounds. Curriculum differentiation can be done at the level of content, teaching methodologies, assessment and learning environment.*

Many attempts have been and continue to be employed to achieve the intended outcomes of inclusive education through curriculum differentiation. A differentiated curriculum provides "a variety of ways for learners who differ in abilities, knowledge, and skills to access the curriculum. According to the DBE (2010b: 22) and Mzizi 2014: 8), "teachers offer differentiation concerning

what learners learn (content), how learners learn (process), and how learners demonstrate what they have learned (product)".

APPRECIATIVE INQUIRY (IA) AS A FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING CURRICULUM DIFFERENTIATION

To couch this study, we draw from Appreciative Inquiry (AI) which is based on the premise that change can be achieved through focusing on strengths and successes, and moving away from delving in weaknesses and failures (Watkins, Mohr, & Kelly, 2011). Hence, AI assumes that every person has some unique talent and as such does something right some of the time. Second, it believes that images of the future are created by social interactions among group members, and once these images are articulated and understood, they can guide individual and group action. In addition, AI is presumed to thrive on the assumption that by focusing on the things that work, and by using positive thinking, imagery, and language, we can create a positive future (Fynn, 2013; Howieson, 2011). This article draws from the core principles of AI as stated below:

> *The constructivist principle accepts that there are multiple realities and people's realities are constructed through social interaction whilst simultaneity sees change and inquiry are simultaneous and inquiry can of itself create change. Thirdly, the poetic principle maintains that the individual story is a product of the continual narrative by the individuals and those who interact with them. Furthermore, imagining or anticipating a positive future can guide people towards that future in accordance with the anticipatory principle. A focus on the positive can create energy and hope for the future as espoused by the positive principle. The enactment principle complements the previous by asserting that positive change occurs when people create the future through their words, images and relationships. In addition, wholeness brings out the best in people, so sharing the whole story with the whole group and the whole of oneself can build a collective capacity for change as cherished by the wholeness principle (Howieson, 2011; Mohr & Watson, 2002; Watkins et al., 2011).*

METHODOLOGY

Case study design

This qualitative study adopted the case study design which may be defined as a "study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances" (Stake, 1995: xi; Stake, 2006:18; Simons, 2009:97; Yin, 2009; Yin, 2014). In addition, Merriam (2009:40) views it as "an in- depth description and analysis of a bounded system". It is conducted to gain an understanding of the issue in real life settings (Yin, 2014). The unit of analysis (case to ponder) in this study is a rural school called Ndundubala Special School (pseudonym), situated in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa, where learners are regarded as underachievers, progressed and/or untrainable.

Narrative inquiry (NI) as a data generation method

Narrative inquiry is employed as research design since it is regarded as a suitable method for capturing detailed stories or life experiences (in real-life settings) of single individuals or a small group of individuals (Niewenhuis, 2016; Creswell & Poth, 2018) who in this case, appear to be acting in a synergised, cohesive and complementary manner. Noting the caution by Rosenberg and Yates (2007:447) who purport that case study is "not assigned to a fixed ontological, epistemological or methodological position", we situated this qualitative study within the interpretivist paradigm.

The narrative approach acknowledges human experiences as dynamic entities that are in a constant state of flux (Lemley & Mitchell, 2011; Wang, Andre & Greenwood 2015; Wang & Geale, 2015). Clanindin and Rosiek (2007:35) state the following about NI:

> Narrative inquiry is a ubiquitous practice in that human beings have lived out and told stories about living for as long as we could talk. And then we have talked about the stories we tell for almost as long. These lived and told stories and the talk about the stories are one of the ways that we fill our world with meaning and enlist one another's assistance in building lives and communities.

Moreover, stories add value by making "the implicit explicit, the hidden seen, the unformed formed, and the confusing clear" (Chou, Tu & Huang, 2013; Wang & Geale, 2015; Wang, 2017). Also, narrative inquiry (NI) emphasises that the research process should be reflective where written narratives of participants' lived-experiences are analysed and authenticated. Larsen, London and Emke (2016) highlights two distinct types of reflections: reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action. Reflection-in-action refers to reflections where participants are aware of the process and events as they happen; and reflection-on-action is when participants reflect on past events (Larsen et al., 2016). In this study, participants were prompted to reflect on both *"on and in"* action situations. In line with this approach, the data for this study was collected using semi-structured narrative interviews consisting of (among others) open-ended prompts where the participants had to provide written and spoken narratives to generate in-depth data regarding SBSTs' understanding of curriculum differentiation and enhancement. These open-ended questions were suitable since they are flexible (Kumar, 2014; Cohen, Mansion & Morrison, 2018) as they can be modified to suit an array of research sites (Silverman, 2017; Cohen et al., 2018). Niewenhuis (2016) states that the use of open-ended questions in an interview enables the researcher to employ elaborative probes for simplicity or for requesting the participants to elaborate on their responses for getting a fuller picture for generating rich data, and in this regard the researchers visited the research site twice for the generation of data.

Research site

This research project drew participants from Ndundubala Special School (pseudonym), a school for the physically disabled and visually impaired, which is situated in a deep rural area of KwaZulu-Natal in South Africa. The school has an enrolment of approximately 250 learners before weighting. According to weighting each child with visual impairment has a weight of five learners, and each child who is physically impaired has a weight of four learners. Almost all (245) learners are boarders with only five learners in this school being day scholars since this is a school for the

visually impaired and the physically disabled. This school commences from Grade R to Grade 7, and learners are taught the same curriculum as mainstream learners. The maximum number of learners in each class is 12 to 15 learners. In this school, there are non-teaching staff which includes therapists and teaching staff (teachers).The school has five therapists (two speech therapists, two physiotherapists, and one occupational therapist), one nurse, and one social worker. However, this study only generated data from one speech therapist, one occupational therapist, one teacher, one head of department, and a deputy principal.

Participants

This research adopted the case study method that involved purposive selection, also described as intentional selection (Terrel, 2016). Participants were selected based on the presumption (Moser & Korstjens, 2018) that they implement and support curriculum differentiation as mandated by the inclusive policy of the DBE (2014). The team of participants was consisted of a parent/caregiver (P), a teacher (T), two therapists (T1, T2), a non-teaching staff member (NT), the deputy principal (M1), and a head of department (M2). Contrary to many other studies that use homogeneous groups of participants, this study benefited from the diversity and/or heterogeneity of participants. Heterogeneity/diversity with respect to participants offers a "complex and dynamic social context where a myriad of inputs is of great importance for the co-constructions of meaning (Femdal & Solbjør, 2018). Furthermore, according to Chowdhury (2019), the choice of heterogeneous participants is consistent with the interpretivist paradigm that allows for multiple/pluralistic realities (relativist ontology), socially constructed/fluid knowledge (subjective epistemology) and value-rich, particular and contextualised nuances (value-laden axiology).

NARRATIVE ANALYSIS

Narrative analysis was used to dissect and make sense of the generated data. Analysing the narratives involved the following: compilation, analysis of the content, discourse and the context of each narrative focusing on insights and understandings; comparison of narratives for similarities and differences in content, style, and interpretation; consideration of underlying background variations; and themes, patterns, insights, and understandings (Smith & Sparkes, 2013).

Narrative inquiry (NI) is based on the work of Clandinin and Rosiek (2007), Clandinin and Huber (2010), and Clandinin (2013). These scholars refer to analysis in NI as comprising of construction (narrative analysis) and deconstruction (analysis of narratives). In the process of narrative analysis, the generated data (field texts) is re-storied with the participants (the participants engage in member-checking and validation). In order to answer the research questions, the stories (narratives) are deconstructed and excerpts of the stories are used as evidence in the answering of the research questions (analysis of narratives).

In interpreting the narrative (storied) data and ensuring trustworthiness, cognisance was taken of the fact that narratives "are *re*-presented in ways that preserve their integrity and convey a sense of the 'irreducible humanity of the person' (Leggo, 2008; Kim, 2016). Narrative analysis treats stories as knowledge *per se* which constitutes "the social reality of the narrator" (Etherington, 2004:81) and conveys a sense of that person's experience in its depth, messiness, richness and

texture, by using the actual words spoken (Kim, 2016). All the ethical consideration procedures were followed. Permission and ethical clearance were sought and granted. Participants were asked for informed consent. Data in this research was analysed using the thematic research analysis technique. The data was scanned, synthesised, organised and then analysed using thematic coding (Vithal & Jansen, 2010). Through narrative analysis, inductive reasoning/logic allowed us to work back and forth between themes until comprehensive sets of themes emerged (Cresswell & Poth, 2018). Earthy and Cronin (2008) describe narrative analysis as an approach adopted to interrogate data that deals with understanding how and why people talk about their lives in the form of stories. Further, according to Sahito and Vaisanen (2018), narrative analysis depicts the human and personal dimensions of experience and provides an insight into the relationship between individual experience and the cultural context. In this study, data was coded and re-presented in three themes.

EMERGING THEMES

Theme one: The school boasts a functional SBST drawing from active, meaningful participation of all the members.

The *poetic principle* of AI states that an organisation's story is the product of the continual narrative by its members and those who interact with them (Howieson, 2011; Mohr & Watson, 2002; Watkins et al., 2011). In the school chosen as research site, participants mentioned the following:

> M1:   *Our school has a functional SBST and I am the chairperson of this SBST. We meet at least once a term. The role of the SBST is to assist the learners, teachers and parents.*

> M2:   *We have a SBST that is working, trying by all means to identify problems of learners and provide support to learners with different problems. We usually come together as the SBST to discuss cases for taking decisions concerning who needs to support a child, depending on the problem of the child.*

> T: *We do have a functional SBST, especially in addressing barriers of learning. Once a decision is taken at a meeting on the kind of support needed, it is then implemented.*

> T1, T2: *We are also part of the SBST. We are invited to the meetings where problems of children who struggle with their classwork are discussed. We contribute to case discussions based on assessment and intervention from a therapy point of view.*

From the above, we note a number of AI principles at play. They include the *poetic* principle which maintains that the individual story is a product of the continual narrative by the individuals and those who interact with them. In this school, the members project a consistent narrative that displays that their school has a functional SBST. Furthermore, they appear to imagine or anticipate a positive future consistent with the *anticipatory* principle. In addition, there is a clear focus on the positive. Such focus can create energy and hope for the future as espoused by the *positive* principle. The *enactment* principle complements the previous by asserting that

positive change occurs when people create the future through their words, images and relationships. Finally, we also wholeness tendencies which, according to AI, bring out the best in each of them, and in so doing there is increased propensity to build a collective capacity for change as purported by the *wholeness* principle.

Theme two: The SBST members show a commendable degree of appreciation and understanding of curriculum differentiation.

In this section we present data relating to participants' views regarding their understanding of curriculum differentiation. It is interesting to note that therapists (T1, T2) are aware of it, even though it is not part of their responsibilities. They mention the following:

> *T1, T2: Though curriculum differentiation is not our only concern, it*
> *is implemented by teachers who view it is being very good in theory, but*
> *in reality it seems to be very difficult to implement as they have large*
> *classes of children.*

As such, it is beneficial for the therapists to be aware of the challenges faced by teachers as it may enrich their participation. Other participants mentioned the following concerning curriculum differentiation:

> *M1, M2, T, P: [It] is about modifying lessons, tasks, teaching methods*
> *and assessments based on a learners' needs. For instance you will*
> *find a learner who is partially-sighted in class, but this learner will*
> *be accommodated by enlarging their work. In the case of a learner*
> *who is blind, a braille will be used to accommodate that learner in*
> *class. A child who is physically impaired will be accommodated by*
> *using a computer and having furniture designed to suit him or her.*
> *Learners with speech problems are assessment differently from others*
> *using the same assessment standards but in different ways.*

From the above, it is clear that each member of the team has a fair sense of the challenges, and each has the courage and skills to handle such obstacles.

Theme three: Enhancement of curriculum differentiation is guided by the desire to meet every learner's learning needs.

Udvari-Solner (1994) maintains that there is no recipe for differentiating the mainstream curriculum to meet each learner's needs. Each teacher, each learner, and each classroom is unique; and modifications are particular to each situation. This therefore means that the SBST needs to introduce individual differentiation strategies/plans for each situation. To enhance differentiation, participants indicated that the process entails the following:

> *M1:*   *It is varying your teaching strategies. For example, individualising,*
> *one-on-one, effective use of teacher-aides, peer or group teaching,*
> *and breaking down of tasks into discrete units.*
>
> *M2:*   *Using different teaching strategies; for instance; let peers help each*
> *other, or give individual attention to one learner, repeat instructions*
> *especially the CPs, and give instructions to peers to assist other peers.*

> T: *As a teacher I use different teaching strategies since in my class I have different types of learners. In our school learners are admitted throughout the year. You need to use different teaching strategies that will accommodate even the new learner. We let them learn at their own pace but in some cases their learning pace is too slow.*

From the above, there are indications of differentiation at various levels. According to Udvari-Solner (1994, 1995a & b, 1996), differentiating teaching and learning as well as providing multiple ways to assess allows more flexibility for learners to meet the standards and requirements of the class. Furthermore, the curriculum can be differentiated to ease accessibility through being flexible and accommodative. In addition, the data above shows some degree of consistency with AI's *free choice principle* which stimulates positive change and liberates personal and organisational power (Howieson, 2011). This principle also contributes to collective success due to its "generative capacity and collaborative strength" (Sim, 2018: 1).

Also, T points out that some programmes meant for improving academic performance at schools may not be implementable. The teacher mentioned the following:

> T: *You will find that the Jika Imfundo work programme is not implementable in our school since most of our learners are very slow. When mainstream learners are in week 6 of the Jika Imfundo[1] work programme, our learners are still battling in week 2. It takes them 2 to 3 weeks to grasp the work that should take one week. In some cases lesson plans for one class is not the same due to our learners' different cognitive levels.*

From the above, it is not surprising that teachers also feel that their school is missing out on what is enjoyed by a mainstream school. Even though this may appear as a disadvantage, the dedication shown is appreciated. Being aware of what is going on around you can only add value to one's existence.

DISCUSSION

In this article, findings revealed that the rural school under study boasts a functional SBST. Functional SBSTs afford rural schools the leverage to surmount barriers to achieving inclusive teaching and learning (Masango, 2013). This finding is inconsistent with the assumption that rural schools are characterised by pervasive negative influences that hamper the responsiveness to barriers in the quest for quality education. An understanding of the diverse learning needs constitutes a critical element (Hlalele, 2012; Makoelle, 2014; Mohangi, Krog, Stephens & Nel, 2016) in the struggle for quality rural education in diverse rural learning contexts. This finding also contradicts the deficit notions of rurality and upholds some of the AI principles.

Understanding curriculum differentiation is important for enhancement. Attempts at enhancement of curriculum differentiation afford learners access and necessary support within the school. Schools such as the one under study are expected to provide a high level of support or

---

[1] *Jika Imfundo* is an education intervention designed to achieve the improvements in learning outcomes across the system by simultaneously focusing on the capacity of different levels of the system in the KwaZulu-Natal Province.

specialised support which includes areas such as health, vision, hearing, communication, motor-impairment, cognition, and neurological impairments (DBE, 2014a). However, limited support to the school from the Department at District level was observed. It would have been really beneficial if some support emanated from District Based Support Teams [DBSTs] (DoE, 2001; DBE, 2014). Van Niekerk and Pienaar (2018) assert that there should be a close collaboration between the SBST and the DBST. Hay (2018) suggests that the shortage of specialist staff members is hampering inclusive education in rendering effective and efficient services. This is because such specialists are responsible to support all schools within the district, including mainstream and full service schools. This limited support might be due to the shortage of specialist staff members in the DBST itself, since policies concerning inclusion emphasise that the provision of support for the SBSTs is the responsibility of the DBSTs (DoE, 2001, 2005a; DBE, 2014a, 2014b; Hay, 2018). Though the schools receive minimal support from DBSTs, they are able to network to access additional support from "outside" stakeholders. Fourie (2017) further avers that SBSTs act a meso-level network for distributing tasks to achieve collectively a common goal with intragroup and intergroup relationships for meeting the needs of all learners within the school especially - those with special diverse educational needs. Furthermore, SBSTs need to embrace a holistic pro-active approach to learner-support to ensure that measures are in place to prevent and minimise barriers to learning (Rulwa-Mnatwana, 2014; Mapepa & Magano, 2018; Van Niekerk & Pienaar, 2018).

CONCLUSION

The research findings reveal that the school has a functional SBST with commendable levels of understanding curriculum differentiation who are able to implement it. The study further found the value of constant and reciprocal communication is both significant for and consistent with the functionality of SBSTs in a rural school contexts. In comparison to other schools that hold the view that they may not succeed in addressing and meeting the learning needs of all learners, this school provides hope that it is possible to include all learners. It is also important to reflect on some of the silences and/blind spots in this study. In the data, we note silences when it comes to acknowledging a variety of barriers including the need for financial and other resources. We conclude that the school displays a truly inclusive teaching and learning space where all are likely to feel a sense of acceptance and belonging.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

Chou, M. J., Tu, Y. C. & Huang, K. P. (2013). Confucianism and in character education: A Chinese view. *Journal of Social Science,* 9, 59-66.

Chowdhury, R. (2019). Embarking on a journey research in the social sciences: Understanding the

foundational concepts. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies*, 35, 99-113.

Clandinin, D. J. & Huber, J. (2010). Narrative inquiry. In: B. McGraw, E. Baker, & P. P. Peterson (eds.). *International Encyclopedia of Education*. New York: Elsevier.

Clandinin, D. J. & Rosiek, R. (2007). The Narrative Inquiry. : Clandinin, D. J. (ed.). *Handbook of Narrative Inquiry: Mapping a Methodology.* New York: Routledge.

Clandinin, J. D. (2013). *Engaging in Narrative Inquiry.* New York: Left Coast Press.

Cohen, L., Mansion. L. & Morrison, K. 201). *Research methods in th education* (7th ed.). London: Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. & Poth, C. N (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and the research design: Choosing among five approaches*. London: Sage.

Earthy, S. & Cronin, A. (2008). The Narrative analysis. : N. Gilbert (ed.). *Researching Social Life*. London: Sage.

Ebersöhn, L. & Ferreira, R. (2012). Rurality and resilience in education: place-based partnerships and agency to moderate time and space constraints. *South African Journal of Education, 31,* 30-42.

Etherington, K. (2004). *Becoming reflective researcher: Using ourselves in the research.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Femdal, I. & Solbjør, M (2018). Equality and differences: Group interaction in mixed focus groups of users and professionals discussing power. *Society, Health & Vulnerability,* 9, 1-10.

Fourie, J (2017). School-based support teams: A social network mode addressing special needs in South African mainstream schools. *African Academic Research Forum*, 1-9.

Fynn, A. (2013). Using Appreciative Inquiry (AI) to evaluate an education to support NGO in Soweto. *Psychology in Society*, 44, 64-83.

Hay, J. (2018). Educational and psycho-social services rendering by district based support team in two provinces of South Africa: Supporting inclusive education. *Inclusive Education South Africa*, 1, 4-8.

Hlalele, D (2012) Social justice and the rural education in South Africa. *Perspectives in Education, 30,* 113-118.

Howieson, J (2011). A constructive inquiry approach: A Blending of the Appreciative Inquiry with traditional research and evaluation methods. *Evaluation Journal of Australia*, *1*, 14-23.

Jackson, J. (2010). *Celebrating our differences: A guide to differentiated lesson planning*. Durban: MIET Africa.

Kim, J. (2016). The *Understanding narrative inquiry: The crafting and analysis of stories as research.* Los Angeles: Sage.

Kruczek, N (2016). A narrative inquiry into the experiences of practical nurses who graduate with private tutoring. Unpublished Master's Dissertation. University of Ontario, Oshawa.

Kumar, R. (2014). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners*. London: Sage.

Larsen, D. P., London, D. A. & Emke, A. R. (2016). Using reflection to influence practice: Student perceptions of daily reflection in clinical education. Published online. Doi: 10.1007/s40037-016-0293-1.

Leggo, C. (2008). The Narrative Inquiry: Attending to the art of discourse. *Language and Literacy,* 10, 1-21.

Lemley, C. K. & Mitchell, R. W. (2011). A *Narrative inquiry: stories lived, stories told*. Chichester:

Wiley.

Makoelle, T M (2014). The School-based support teams as the communities of enquiry: A case of developing inclusive practices in the Free State Province of South Africa. *International Journal of Educational Sciences*, 7, 67-76.

Mapepa, P.D & Magano, M. D. (2018). Support to address the barriers to learning for learners who are deaf. *Africa Journal of Disability*, 7, 1-8.

Masango, J. M. (2013). The roles of the principal and the SBST towards supporting teachers teaching inclusive education. Unpublished Master's Dissertation. Pretoria: University of Pretoria,

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mnguni, M. A. (2017). From inclusive education a policy to implementation: A case study of full service school in Umngeni District, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Pinetown: University of KwaZulu-Natal,

Mohangi, K., Krog, S., Stephens, O. & Nel, NM. (2016). Contextual challenges in the early literacy teaching and learning in grade R rural schools in South Africa. *Per Liguam, 32,* 71-87.

Mohr, B. J. & Watson, J. M. (2002). *The Essentials of an Appreciative Inquiry: A roadmap towards creating positive futures*. Waltham, MA: Pegasus Communications.

Moser, A & Korstjens, I (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 3: Sampling, data collection and analysis. *European Journal of General Practice*, 24, 9-18.

Mzizi, N. A. (2014). Curriculum adaptations for the learners' with the learning impairments in the foundation phase in Thabo Mofutsanyana Education District, Free State Province. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Bloemfontein: Central University of Technology.

Nieuwenhuis, J. (2016). Qualitative research design and the data gathering techniques In: K. Maree, J. W. Creswell, L. Ebersohn, I. Eloff, R. Ferreira, N. V. Nieuwenhuis, J. Pietersen, & V. L. Plano Clark (eds.). First steps in research (pp. 72-100) Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Rosenberg, J. P. & Yates, P. M. (2007). The Schematic representation of case in the study research designs. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 60, 447-452.

RSA. Department of Basic Education. (2010a). Care and support for teaching and learning. Durban: MIET Africa.

RSA. Department of Basic Education. (2010b). Guidelines for the Inclusive Teaching and Learning. Education White Paper 6, Special Needs Education: Building an Inclusive Education and Training System. Pretoria: Government Printer.

RSA. Department of Basic Education (2011). National Curriculum Statement (So. A) , Curriculum assessment policy statement: Guidelines for responding to learner diversity in the classroom. Pretoria: Government printer.

RSA. Department of Basic Education. (2014a). Policy on the Screening Identification, Assessment and Support. Pretoria: Government Printer.

RSA. Department of Basic Education. (2014b). Guidelines to ensure quality education and support in special schools and special school resource centres. Pretoria: Government Printer.

RSA. Department of Education. (1997). Quality education for all: Overcoming barriers to learning and development – Report of the National Commission on special needs in education and training (NCSNET) and National Committee on education support services (NCESS). Pretoria: Government Printer.

RSA. Department of Education (2001). Education White Paper 6: Special needs education Build Building an inclusive education and training system. Pretoria: Government Printer.

RSA. KwaZulu-Natal Department of Education KZNDoE. (2009). Education for all: A guide the building schools as inclusive centres of learning, care and support. Pietermaritzburg: MIET Africa.

Rulwa-Mnatwana, B. (2014). School-Based support teams' understanding and of experiences of inclusive education in the Western Cape. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Cape Town: University of Western Cape,

Sahito, Z. & Vaisanen, P. (2018). The Perception and Experience of Teacher Educators about their Motivation: A Case Study Approach. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research,* 9, 480-490.

Silverman, D. (2017). Doing qualitative research. London: Sage.

Sim, F. H. (2018). Exploring the Relational Leadership Potential of Appreciative Inquiry: A Case Study. *South Asian Journal of Business and Management Cases, Online*. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2277977918803217

Simons, H. (2009). Case study research in practice. Los Angeles: Sage.

Smith, B. & Sparkes, A. C. (2013). *Routledge handbook of a qualitative research in the sport and exercise*. London: Sage.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York: Guilford.

Terrel, S. R. (2016). *Writing a proposal for your dissertation: Guidelines and examples*. London: The Guilford Press.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). *The differentiated classroom : Responding to the needs of all the learners*. Alexandria: ASCD.

Udvari-Solner, A. (1994). A decision-making model for the use of curricular adaptations in cooperative groups. In: J. Thousand, R. Villa, & A. Nevins. *Creativity and collaboration: A practical guide to empowering students and teachers*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Udvari-Solner, A. (1995a). Designing effective adaptations for inclusive classrooms. *Network,* 4, 31-38.

Udvari-Solner, A. (1995b). A process for adapting curriculum in inclusive classrooms. In: R. Villa, & J. Thousand. *Creating an inclusive school*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Udvari-Solner, A. (1996). Examining teacher thinking: Constructing a process to design curricular adaptations. *Remedial and Special Education,* 17, 245-254.

Van Niekerk, C. E. & Pienaar, C. F. (2018). Guiding principles for the effective establishment and support teams. *Inclusive Education in South Africa,* 1, 9-12.

Wang, C. C. (2017). Conversation with presence: A narrative inquiry into the learning experience of Chinese students studying nursing at Australian universities. *Chinese Nursing Education,* 1-8.

Wang, C. C. & Gearle, S. K. (2015). The power of story: Narrative inquiry as a methodology in a nursing research. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences*, 2, 195-198.

Wang, C. C., Andre, K. & Greenwood, K. M. (2015). Chinese students studying at the Australian universities with specific reference to nursing students: a narrative literature review. *Nurse Education Today*, 35, 609-627.

Watkins, J. M., Mohr, B. & Kelly, R. (2011). An Appreciative Inquiry: A Change at the speed of imagination. San Francisco: John Wiley.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods.* Los Angeles: Sage.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

DIPANE HLALELE
School of Education
University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa
hlaleled@ukzn.ac.za

ZAKHOKHUHLE JIYANE
Educational Psychology
University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa
9303242@stu.ukzn.ac.za

SIBUSISO RADEBE
Inclusive Education
KwaZulu-Natal Department of Education, South Africa
9303242@stu.ukzn.ac.za