AN EXPLORATION OF THE INTERACTION BETWEEN INTEGRATION AND DISCIPLINE IN A FORMER MODEL C SCHOOL IN EAST LONDON

Research project submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts in Psychology (Counselling)

of Rhodes University

by

Heidi Smulders

December 1999

Department of Psychology
Rhodes University, East London Division

Supervisor: Eric Harris

ABSTRACT

Educators work in dynamic contexts which reflect the social and political circumstances of the time. Since the African National Congress was elected to govern in 1994, educators working in former Model C schools have been particularly affected by changes in the law regarding education. The South African Schools Act of 1996 prohibited discriminating in any way against learners applying for admission to schools. This has resulted in cultural and racial integration occurring at all former Model C schools. The use of corporal punishment in schools was also prohibited in 1996. This study attempts to obtain an understanding of the interaction between integration and discipline which was identified at a particular Model C school in East London. It also aims to obtain educators' understandings of the challenges of integration and discipline at this school. Following an in-depth pilot study of the school's detention records for 1998, twenty-two out of sixty educators at the school participated in the research by responding to written questionnaires. It is argued that two different approaches to integration are presently used by educators. These are identified and discussed, namely assimilatory education and multicultural education. The need for consistency between educators in their approaches to integration and discipline is also addressed.

Education and the varying contexts in which school educators work are dynamic and cannot be separated from political, social and economic changes occurring in society at large. These changes impact directly on educational structures and government policies regarding education. The contexts in which education takes place are therefore "determined by the society which it purports to serve" (Jarvis & Edley, 1995, p.12). Educators are also affected by the expectations which the government and society at large (particularly parents with school-going children) places on them, and the extent to which these forces govern the teaching profession from the outside. According to Nicholls (1995) these factors can either "empower teachers as individual professionals, or can restrict their effectiveness as educational practitioners" (p.31). In order to understand the nature of the contexts in which educators in South Africa are working at present, it is necessary to take into account the challenges which educators face as professionals in their work environments, as well as the social and political changes which have taken place in South Africa over recent years.

Educating as a profession

International studies on educating as a profession maintain that while it can be extremely satisfying and rewarding, it is also a high-pressure and potentially stressful profession. According to Veenman (1987), several studies from different countries indicate that both new and experienced educators face the following problems: "too large classes, lack of interest from parents, discipline problems, extra-school obligations, inadequate teaching materials, overloaded teaching task, too many administrative duties, [and] motivating pupils" (p.18). Nicholls (1995) mentions some of the difficulties which South African educators have to deal with while still being expected to function professionally. Some of these are: poor teaching conditions, inequitable salaries, large classes, inadequate facilities and poor educational management, all of which disempower teachers as professionals. One of the main difficulties which educators face, both nationally and internationally, relates to discipline. "Year after year, classroom discipline heads the list of teacher concerns. It produces more stress than any other aspect of teaching,

builds high levels of anxiety and frustration that sometimes lead to a sense of helplessness, and consumes monumental amounts of time intended for teaching and learning" (Charles, cited in Lewis & Lovegrove, 1987, p.23). Within a school context, discipline can be defined as a state of order which allows learning to proceed smoothly and productively (Badenhorst & Scheepers, 1995). Disciplinary procedures are actions used to control or guide behaviour so that this state of order can be maintained (Kruger & van Schalkwyk, 1997). Disciplinary procedures vary and can have different goals. Goduka (1999) refers to "positive discipline" (p.163) as a disciplinary practice which aims to guide or influence behaviour, rather than control it through punitive measures. The ultimate goal of positive discipline is to help a child develop self-control and self-discipline. Ways in which it can be practiced vary, eg. ignoring disruptive behaviour and praising positive behaviour. Another disciplinary procedure which is used is punishment, defined by Mwamwenda (1995) as "being subjected to a painful stimulus or having a pleasant one removed due to engaging in undesirable behaviour" (p.316). Punishment aims to control behaviour, and can take a variety of forms eg. detention, scolding, suspension and expulsion.

Discipline in a school context is deemed necessary by educators. Discipline is believed to be a prerequisite for effective learning to take place (Badenhorst & Scheepers, 1995; Kruger & van Schalkwyk, 1997; Mwamwenda, 1995). Learning is fundamental to education (Winch & Gingell, 1999) and "the effective teacher is one who can bring about intended learning outcomes" (Lyons, 1995, p. 116). Therefore, in order for educators to be considered effective, they need to be able to maintain discipline (ie. a state of order) in the classroom so that learning can take place. The findings of a Teacher Motivation Survey conducted in South Africa also show that children's behaviour is the most important factor affecting teacher motivation. "Teachers consider discipline as an indication of their professionalism and teaching experience. They see pupil behaviour as a challenge and a test of the teachers ability to maintain standards" (NUE Comment, 1999, p.20). Thus, the ability to maintain discipline in the classroom impacts on how educators are evaluated regarding their efficacy, both by others and by themselves.

Up until 1996, one way in which educators in South Africa have used punishment as a disciplinary procedure was by utilizing corporal punishment, mainly on boys and for serious misbehaviour. Attitudes towards the use of corporal punishment vary, and recent legislation has indicated a shift in the government s attitude towards the use of it in schools. The South African Schools Act, 1996 states the following in relation to the prohibition of corporal punishment:

> (1) No person may administer corporal punishment at a *school* to a *learner.*
>
> (2) Any person who contravenes subsection (1) is guilty of an offence and liable on conviction to a sentence which could be imposed for assault.
>
> (Government Gazette, 1996, p. 10)

While many educators have welcomed this change, it has also meant that they have had to come up with punitive measures alternative to the use of corporal punishment. What these alternative measures are, and whether or not they are effective in maintaining discipline in schools, will have an impact on educators' experiences of discipline as a problem faced by them as professionals.

Not only do educators face discipline problems daily in the workplace, but education itself is also a "politically contested terrain since it can be used as a vehicle for transforming the South African society" (Nicholls, 1995, p. 38). Educators are expected to play a role in the transformation of society, and for this to happen it is necessary for the nature of the educators' profession and role to be understood and redefined in conjunction with changes occurring in society. The prohibiting of the use of corporal punishment in schools is one example of such a change. Another change which has taken place and which has had a huge impact both on society and on educators is the end of forced segregation in schools.

Education in a social and political context

According to Nicholls (1995) "education is a powerful political mechanism that can be abused for political ends. This is why the apartheid regime carefully controlled both Bantu education and Christian

national education" (p.36). One way in which the National Party government used education for political purposes was by enforcing racial segregation at schools. Since 1948 the heterogeneous population of South Africa was segregated, according to the policy of apartheid, on "ethnic, cultural and language differences which resulted in a division of the population into four main groups, namely Whites, Blacks, Coloureds and Indians" (Vos & Brits, 1990, p.52). Government policy on education in South Africa up until 1991 was that education should be provided separately for each population group, and that "educational institutions for a particular population group can provide education to members of another population group by way of exception, as long as this does not jeopardize the character of the institution concerned and preference is given to members of the population group for whom the institution was established" (Bot, 1990, p.15). Social identity theory offers us a way of understanding the emphasis placed on differences between racial groups, not only in relation to the National Party s ideology but also in relation to how individuals construct social groups and categories in order to make sense of the world.

Social identity theory, as discussed by Hogg and Abrams (1988), proposes that society is made up of individuals, while at the same time it is configured into distinct social groups and categories (ie. the division of people on the basis of race, sex, class, nationality etc.). These social categories stand in power and status relations to each other. The groups to which people belong are extremely significant in determining their life experiences, and it is from these groups that people's views, opinions and practices are acquired. Hogg and Abrams (1988) state: "the central tenet of this approach is that belonging to a group (of whatever size and distribution) is largely a *psychological* state which is quite distinct from that of being a unique and separate individual, and that it confers *social identity* or a shared/collective representation of who one is and how one should behave" (p.3). Social groups are argued to be inevitable because of the functions they serve: they satisfy individual and societal needs for structure, simplification, predictability, etc. Transforming individuals into groups involves a cognitive process called categorization, which enables individuals to structure and therefore manage a

huge amount of stimuli into a manageable number of distinct categories. It is categorization which produces stereotypic perceptions, ie. "the perception or judgment of all members of a social category or group as sharing some characteristic which distinguishes them from some other social group" (Hogg & Abrams, 1988, p.19). Not only do individuals categorize others, they also categorize themselves in a process called self-categorization. Self-categorization highlights similarities between self and others belonging to the same group (ingroup), and differences between self and others belonging to different groups (outgroups). What is extremely important to note is that the origins of the beliefs that members of a certain group share the same characteristics can be found in the cultural history of the society in which one lives. In other words, the social categories which exist in a society and the beliefs surrounding the characteristics of members of particular groups cannot be separated from the historical and cultural nature of that particular society. Morrow (1989) explains how this has occurred in South Africa's educational context: "...a schooling policy deliberately designed to 'respect cultural differences' is highly likely to create differences which might not otherwise have existed, and certainly to accentuate, and perpetuate, the divisions in our society" (p.60).

While segregation in schools was supported by many white South Africans, it was strongly criticized for various reasons by South Africans who were opposed to apartheid. Economically and socially "...the system of separate development relegated better resources to white departments of education, in terms of finance, materials and qualified teachers, thereby providing white pupils with superior tuition and preparation for participation in tertiary education, or in the job market" (Kissack & Meyer, 1996, p.238). It was criticized most strongly, however, on moral grounds by those South Africans involved in the political struggle against the apartheid regime. "In education, sustained patterns of segregation and racially based unequal provisions resulted in gross inequalities between whites and other racial groups. This pattern of relative privilege for whites and unequal levels of oppression for Indians, coloureds and Africans reflected strict racial and power hierarchies that created hate and anger among the different racial groups" (Goduka, 1999, p.84). In response to protests about these issues, as well as increasing

national and international political pressure on the National Party government to end apartheid, changes in the education system started to take place. According to Goduka (1999), the government finally recognized that integration was inevitable, and that schools would have to prepare students to be able to participate in a diverse democracy. Previous restrictions on black student enrollment at historically white higher education institutions were lifted in 1990, and the criteria for admission to formerly white state schools (now called Model C, or former Model C schools) was left to be decided by the governing bodies of such schools. As a result, many Model C schools started admitting pupils from other racial groups into their schools, albeit in limited numbers. According to Badat (1998), however, the "racially segregated and ethnic structure of apartheid education remained essentially intact" (p.9). One reason for this was that Model C schools could still regulate admissions on a racial basis. A way in which this was done was by having admission tests which children wishing to attend Model C schools had to pass in order to be admitted (Nicholls, 1995). South Africa's first democratic election was held on 27 April 1994 and the African National Congress (ANC) party was voted into power. In 1996 the South African Schools Act was passed by the new government (Nzimande, 1998). According to this Act, "a *public school* must admit *learners* and serve their educational requirements without unfairly discriminating in any way" (Government Gazette, 1996, p.6). No tests relating to the admission of a learner are allowed to be administered, and no learners may be refused admission to public schools because their parents cannot pay the school fees, they do not subscribe to the mission statement of the school, or they refuse to enter into a contract whereby they (the parents) waive any claim for damages arising out of the education of the learner (Government Gazette, 1996). Before this law was passed some Model C schools resisted accepting learners from different racial groups for a long while by rejecting the applications of persons of other than white races to attend the schools (Nicholls, 1995). However, the integration of pupils from different racial groups has been occurring in some state schools since 1990, and in all (by law) since 1996.

Integration at a school level on such a scale is therefore relatively new in South Africa, where

segregation and separate development has been entrenched in society for many years. Coutts (1995) states that "more and more people who used to live in racially and culturally isolated communities are now living and working in close contact with people of other races and cultures" (p.63). It is important to note, however, that in South Africa culturally mixed communities exist mainly in larger towns and cities, while rural communities are usually populated by a single dominant culture. It is therefore at Model C schools that integration is taking place at any significant level.

While South Africans of all races and cultural groups are adjusting to the many changes which the end of the apartheid era has had and continues to have on their personal and social lives, educators are having to adapt to these changes in a very real way in their workplaces. They have to meet the challenges that integration places before them as individuals and as professionals. While attempting to negotiate integration themselves, their position in schools also calls for them to facilitate integration between learners. Educators are therefore having to deal with various challenges and experiences that integration in a school context has engendered. At the same time, they are also having to find ways of dealing with disciplinary issues alternative to the use of corporal punishment. It is clear that educators, due to the interactional nature of their profession, have found themselves working in one of the most dynamic contexts of the present time.

The school at which the research was conducted

The school at which the research was conducted is a co-educational, English-medium high school situated in a central, formerly "white" suburb in East London in the Eastern Cape. From 1990 learners from different racial groups started being admitted to the school. It now has a multi-racial learner body, although the majority of the learners are still white. Most learners come from middle-class families living in East London, although many of the black learners live in Mdantsane, a large township which was incorporated as a suburb of East London in 1997, and is situated on the outskirts of the city. In

1998 the school had 60 educators and 1035 learners. Of the learner population, 27% (301) were black and 73% (734) were white; of the 60 educators, one was black.

Educators at the school have always used detention as one form of punishment for learners. Since the banning of the use of corporal punishment in 1996, detention has become one of the main methods of punishment for both boys and girls at this school, and it is the only centralized system of punishment in operation. Detention takes place three times weekly, on Tuesday and Friday afternoons (one-hour sessions) and on Saturday mornings (two-hour sessions). The Saturday sessions are reserved for more serious offences and offenders. Learners placed in detention are usually required to spend the hour/s doing school work. Any educator placing a learner in detention is required to record the date, the name, grade and class of the learner, and the reason for placing him/her in detention in a record book which is kept in the staffroom. The research was conducted at this particular school primarily because of the conversations which had taken place between the researcher and a head of department about this school. The researcher also has access to the school due to previous involvement with it, both as a learner and as a temporary employee.

Pilot Study

Conversations with a Head of Department at this school around issues of racial integration and discipline led to concerns being expressed about the number of black[1] learners thought to be placed in detention at this particular school. The concern that black learners might be over-represented in detention raised the question of whether or not there might be an interaction between the integration of students in this former Model C school, and discipline.

The researcher decided to conduct a pilot study at the school in order to explore the possibility of there being an interaction between integration and discipline. The pilot study involved examining the school's detention records to determine whether or not the assumption that black learners were over-represented in detention during 1998 was accurate. The school's detention records from January to September 1998

[1]The term "black" is used in this paper to refer to all learners who were until 1996 were not allowed by law to attend Model C schools, ie. persons formally classified as black, coloured and Indian.

(the most recent, completed records available) were placed on a database and examined in depth. The records were studied from various angles:

Educators: how many educators utilized the detention system and how often they did so;

Learners: the extent to which learners from different grades and different racial groups are represented;

Offences: which offences are represented and to what degree; and whether or not certain offences are over or under-represented by a particular racial group.

The educators at the school were told that this data base is available for their examination upon request.

Results: Pilot Study (The Detention Records, January - September 1998)

The detention system is utilized by most educators to varying degrees throughout the year. Educators also have individual methods of dealing with discipline problems in the classroom. However, because no systematic records are kept of these methods, they were not able to be examined. The results of the pilot study therefore reflect the use of the detention system only. Aspects of the analysis of the detention records are now presented.

Table 1: Number of times individual educators used detention during 1998

Number of times detention used by educators per year	**Number of individual educators** (N = 60)
0	8 (13%)
1 - 10	30 (50%)
11 - 20	9 (15%)
21 - 30	2 (3%)
31 - 40	2 (3%)
41 - 50	1 (2%)
51 - 60	4 (7%)
60	4 (7%)
	Total: 60

Table 1 shows the number of educators who used the detention system during 1998. It also gives a reflection of the number of times that individual educators used it during the year. 52 out of 60 educators (87%) utilized the detention system at least once during the above time period. The minimum number of times that learners were placed in detention by a single educator was once; the maximum

was 127 times; the median was 8 times.

Table 2: Distribution of students in detention according to racial group

	Black	White	Total
In detention row % column %	168 41% 56%	241 59% 33%	409
Not in detention row % column %	133 21% 44%	493 79% 67%	626
Total	301	734	1035

Table 2 shows that 409 individual learners were placed in detention (for a total of 1026 times) during 1998. Of the individual learners placed in detention, 168 were black (4 1%) and 241 were white (59%), whereas the school population consisted of 301 black learners (29%) and 734 white learners (71%). This confirms that there was an interaction between race and detention at this school ($\chi^2 = 47.163$; $df = 1$; $p < 0.001$). Further examination of the standardized residuals shows that black learners had a greater chance of being placed in detention than white learners ($z = 4.498$; $p_{benferroni\ corrected} < 0.0025$, Hayes, 1994).

Table 3 (see Appendix 1) shows that at least 30 different offences were recorded in the detention record books, ranging from academic-related offences (eg. not doing homework, not bringing books to school, and cheating) to behaviour-related offences (eg. smoking, bunking, misbehaviour and assault). Black learners were most over-represented for bunking (school, sport and class combined): 117 black learners were placed in detention for this offence, compared to 96 white learners.

MAIN STUDY

The results of the pilot study confirmed that during 1998 there was an interaction between race and detention at the school, and that black learners were over-represented in detention. Based on this finding, the researcher decided to conduct the main study at the school in order to explore educators understandings of why black learners were over-represented in detention during 1998. The researcher also decided to use the main study to add depth to the results of the pilot study by exploring educators understandings of the challenges of integration and discipline at the school. Written permission was obtained in 1998 from the Acting Headmaster of the school to conduct the research project. The researcher attended a general staff meeting in order to explain the purposes and aims of the study to the educators. The researcher stressed that the study would not be evaluative in nature, but would focus on educators' understandings around certain topics and issues. Educators were informed that they were likely to be requested to participate in the study, but that individual participation would be voluntary.

Data Collection and Procedure

The collection of data involved three stages.

Stage 1: Questionnaires consisting of ten questions were given to each educator who had taught at the school during 1998. The educators were requested to respond to the questions in writing, using the spaces provided on the questionnaires or additional paper if necessary or preferred. The questions chosen were aimed to obtain a deeper understanding of how educators perceive and utilize the detention system, as well as their perceptions around integration at the school. The following questions were posed:

1. In your understanding, what is the function of detention? (Why is it used, and for what?)
2. What are the advantages of using detention as a form of discipline?
3. What are the disadvantages of using detention as a form of discipline?
4. How often do you use detention? Why?
5. What are your most frequent reasons for placing a student in detention?
6. My examination of the detention records shows that black students have a significantly greater chance of being placed in detention than white students. How do you make sense of this?
7. What do you think are the main challenges teachers are facing with regards to integration at this school?
8. Do you have any ideas which you think might facilitate integration in former Model C schools?

9. Do you have any ideas which you think are or might be useful in dealing with discipline issues?
10. Any other thoughts or comments relating to integration or discipline?

Educators were informed that their responses could be anonymous if they so chose. After two weeks the responses were collected for analysis. Eighteen educators out of approximately sixty responded. The lengths of the responses varied. Some educators gave brief responses, using single sentences to answer each question; others wrote detailed answers in paragraph form, sometimes giving concrete examples to illustrate individual experiences.

The small number of educators who responded and their self-selection in doing so presents possible limitations to the research findings. In particular, given the sensitive nature of the materials discussed, persons who chose to participate may not be representative in their responses. Participants may have chosen to respond for a number of reasons among which may be that they feel very strongly about the topic or have resolved the topic for themselves or are more aware of the topic than others, or simply had more time to respond. While this creates a potential for bias in responses there is no good reason to assume that all of the responding teachers did so for similar reasons and therefore the bias, if any, is not simple or uni-directional. The self-selection bias does however require that any generalisations from this data be approached with caution. It may have been useful had time permitted to gather information on participant's motives in responding to the study but the exploratory nature and essentially single questionnaire methodology precluded this strategy.

Concerns about bias accepted, it should be noted that all who responded utilized the detention system during 1998, and all the educators (about sixty) were given the opportunity to comment on or add to the researcher s initial reading of the questionnaires (see Stage 2).

Stage 2: Educators' understandings around the topic of integration (questions 6, 7 and 8 of the questionnaire) were combined, and similarities and differences of opinion were noted. Copies were made and distributed to all educators. This was to give them the opportunity to: give further comments or input; express agreement or disagreement with what other educators had said; respond to and correct any misunderstandings the researcher might have had in understanding and combining the data; and

give more educators the opportunity to express their views and understandings before doing the final analysis. The researcher collected these after two weeks. Only four teachers responded further.

Analysis of Questionnaires

According to King (1998) "an understanding of the experiences not only of our participants but also of ourselves as researchers constitutes a fundamental part of the research process" (p.175). Foster and Parker (1999) go on to say that a researcher has a "measure of power in the formulation of research questions, and in an observational study, experiment, questionnaire or structured interview, the "participant has no power to challenge the assumptions that frame the study" (p.66). They also state that a researcher, having prior assumptions or a stake in the research process, takes a moral position, and that this position needs to be made explicit. The questionnaire used in this study was designed to address the main research question: what are educators' understandings of the challenges of integration and discipline at this school? This question, the way in which the questionnaire is worded, and the data analysis are all influenced by the researcher's position. This position is informed by the researcher's belief that the research topic is sensitive in nature. Sieber and Stanley (as cited in Lee, 1993) define socially sensitive research as "studies in which there are potential consequences or implications, either directly for the participants in the research or for the class of individuals represented by the research" (p.3). The researcher believes that any research dealing with issues of race is sensitive in nature, particularly in South Africa where racial oppression by white South Africans has dominated our political history. In this project, white educators were asked, among other things, to give their understandings as to why black learners were over-represented in detention during 1998. This question might cause sensitivity on the part of the educators, as it can be understood to implicate that they either perceive black learners as being more poorly behaved than white learners, or they are discriminating against black learners through the use of punishment. The researcher is also aware of the demanding and often difficult position which educators at Model C schools are in, as they have to contend with the

changes and challenges of racial integration as it occurs in their workplace. The analysis of the questionnaires (the themes drawn out and the manner in which they are discussed) is therefore influenced by the researcher's desire to work with the data in ways which remain respectful to the views and understandings expressed by the educators who participated. The researcher has attempted to do this by using social identity theory to offer possible accounts for educators' views and understandings regarding race and integration, rather than producing an evaluation of their responses.

The research methodology follows the practices of grounded theory in that it has allowed the research process to be guided by the data gathered (Charmes, 1996; Glaser & Strauss, 1992). In the case of grounded theory, "what appears to be the 'discovery' or 'emergence' of concepts and theory is in reality the result of a constant interplay between data and the researcher's developing conceptualizations" (Pidgeon, 1998, p.82). This interplay was addressed in the following manner:

1. Category Headings and Coding: Category headings were chosen based on the three main topics explored in the questionnaire, and sub-categories were integrated with each main category (Richardson, 1998). The categories are: **integration** (the main challenges faced by educators regarding integration, and ideas to facilitate integration); **educators' understandings of the analysis of the detention records** (possible reasons for the emerging results, and educators' explanations and understandings informing them); and **detention** (the function, advantages and disadvantages of detention as a disciplinary measure, and ideas which might be useful in dealing with issues related to discipline). The data was then coded, which involved organizing it in such a way that meaningful bits were arranged under the category headings by linking concepts which were perceived by the researcher to fit together (Pidgeon & Henwood, 1998; Foster & Parker, 1999).

2. Thematic Analysis The data organized into these categories was subjected to repeated readings, focusing on concepts which appeared to be linked together (Foster & Parker, 1999). In each category, concepts which the researcher perceived as emerging most strongly were taken to constitute the major

theme. These themes (namely: culture and cultural differences; academic issues in relation to home conditions and social difficulties, and discipline) were explored in relation to:

a. Language: the language used by the educators, and how the use of certain language creates some meanings and suppresses other (Feldman, 1995).

b. Social Identity Theory: Hogg and Abrams (1990) propose that the main vehicle of social influence is social communication, and language can function as one of the most powerful symbols of identity.

The language used by the educators who participated is explored in relation to social identity theory, which offers an account of why and how certain understandings regarding group and individual identity might be held. The language used by the educators when discussing integration and race is focused on.

The themes are now presented and discussed. The words "educator/s" refer to those educators who responded to the questionnaire. Numbers in brackets indicate the number of educators referred to. All words placed in quotation marks are direct quotations from educators, unless otherwise specified.

RESULTS: MAIN STUDY

Culture and Cultural Differences

Many of the educators (7) stated that "cultural differences" are one of the main challenges faced by educators and learners with regard to integration and discipline at school, although no educator defines the word "culture". The language used by these educators places the focus on *differences* between cultures and people belonging to them, eg. "cultural differences"; "they talk loud (culture)", and "learning to be accepting of other cultures". Social identity theory offers us one way of understanding this focus on differences (and in this context, more specifically on "cultural" differences). When considered within the framework of social identity theory, the origins of the educators' focus on differences between cultures (as well as what these differences are perceived to be) cannot be separated from the political history of South Africa, particularly the years in which the policy of apartheid was firmly entrenched in society. According to Vos and Brits (1990) "the policy of apartheid stems from a

philosophy of life (ideology) which stresses the particular (differences) and neglects the general (common)", (p.13). The education system in South Africa under the National Party was based on this ideology, and followed the policy of separate development. Vos and Brits (1990) explain that "the heterogeneous population of the Republic of South Africa (RSA) was separated and segregated on ethnic, cultural and language differences which resulted in a division of the population into four main groups, namely Whites, Blacks, Coloureds and Indians" (p.13). The policy of apartheid and the ways in which it was enforced in society and in schools created contexts which were designed to create and then highlight differences between South Africans. At the same time, most apartheid laws deprived South Africans of opportunities to work and socialize together, and thereby decide for themselves the nature of, and the extent to which differences might exist. In other words, while social categories exist in all societies out of necessity (according to social identity theory), in South Africa the National Party Government and white South Africans determined which differences were to be stressed, and then accentuated them through laws and segregation. A possible consequence of this strong focus on differences is that culture - and in turn, cultural behaviours and attributes - is perceived to be fixed. In other words, members of a specific "cultural" group are *expected* to behave and think in certain (and "different") ways. Also, if members of the same racial group are automatically assumed to belong to the same culture and therefore "cultural" group (as the previous government expected us to believe), specific behavioural expectations will fall on all persons belonging to the same race, regardless of their individual sense of group membership.

As already mentioned, statements which focus on differences can also lead to categorizations. Educators were asked for their understandings of why black learners are more highly represented in detention than white learners. One educator states: "They are not as disciplined as white students." This statement, which involves categorization, could be understood in the following way: even the most well-disciplined black learner at the school is less disciplined than the least-disciplined white learner. The problem with categorizing in this way is that people are put into "them" and "us" categories, which

might close alternative ways of attempting to understand behaviours. Since integration has been taking place, educators teaching in Model C schools have had the opportunity to either confirm, challenge or change their own beliefs around differences. What is clear though is that differences - particularly behavioural differences - are perceived to exist by most educators, and many of these differences are clearly attributed to culture and "cultural differences". Some of these behaviours are deemed to be "unacceptable", which implies that educators have certain expectations regarding behaviour, and that these are required to be met by all learners at the school regardless of their culture. In this situation, the educators are calling for the learners to change. An example of "unacceptable" behaviour is as follows: two educators note that they have experienced black learners displaying behaviours which are perturbing to them. Both educators explain further:

> It often happens that black children, the boys in particular, will laugh raucously in circumstances which we may find embarrassingly inappropriate, eg. I found it very disturbing, when I showed a Grade 11 class a video on Hitler and some of the black boys reacted to the sight of piles of naked emaciated bodies of Jews with roars of laughter. It also caused angry reactions from some of the other pupils.
>
> Many black learners laugh at things which teachers consider inappropriate to laugh at (eg. History videos where people are tortured or shot) and often the laughter is extra loud and often seems unnatural - almost forced.

Both educators consider these behaviours to be inappropriate and unacceptable. They also find them disturbing, which suggests that they are cause for concern. It is likely that if white learners reacted in this way, educators would be worried about their psychological well-being. According to Social Identity theory, "people tend to accentuate similarities between outgroup members more than between ingroup members" (Hogg & Abrams, 1998, p.73). Thus, these educators might consider disturbing or unusual behaviours of members of their ingroup as more likely stemming from individual differences, whereas the same behaviours of members of an outgroup are likely to be understood in terms of group differences. It is also of interest that both educators sense that these extreme reactions are in some way

forced and "unnatural". This indicates the possibility that they are related to anxiety, which is evoked by watching acts of violence. This is not necessarily to say that the behaviour of these learners is the result of their having experienced or witnessed violence in their own lives, but to point out that alternative, plausible ways of understanding this behaviour do exist.

Many educators (9) mention other behaviours which are considered to be unacceptable. These fall under a broad category of "poor behaviour", for example, not being punctual, being "boisterous", "lazy" and "disruptive". Although some educators (3) attribute these behaviours to cultural upbringing, there is no indication given by any that they are permissible or will be tolerated. In other words, although the educators' explanations for these behaviours are based on (cultural) group differences, their response to them is individual. This raises the possibility that in this school context, the members of an outgroup (ie. black learners) are expected to behave in ways which conform to the behaviours of members of the ingroup (ie. white learners).

Two specific behaviours mentioned, however, evoke conflicting views. Many educators (6) say that they experience black learners as speaking very loudly. One educator elaborates:

> The Anglo-Saxon group is probably -apart from the Japanese - the quietest body of people on earth. Teenage music aside we tend to keep our voices to a level just necessary for the person with whom we are having a conversation to hear. The African does not! The voices of the Black girls especially, when they talk to each other send constant shock waves through the nervous system!

This statement shows categorization being used to account for perceived differences in the levels of noise made by people belonging to different groups. What is interesting is that some educators (3) say that loud talking and being noisy is one of the reasons why black learners are over-represented in detention, thereby indicating that the behaviour is unacceptable and that the learners should change. Three others talk about greater noise levels being one of the main challenges which educators face regarding integration: "The noise level really worries us teachers. It's difficult to accept that the modern classroom is a noisy place"; "[one challenge is] to get used to/accept a greater 'noise level' both in

classrooms and corridors". For these educators, it is themselves who are having to change, rather than the learner.

Another behaviour raising contradictory responses is the use of Xhosa in the classroom. Three educators state that they find this to be problematic. One explains further:

> What I **don't** like is when the pupils chat to each other in Xhosa - sometimes quite loudly. I have not said anything this year, but in the past I've been known to say that this as an English speaking school and that I expect to hear English spoken in the classroom. Maybe I'm worried about what they're saying?

A different educator explained that when integration started occurring at this school, Xhosa-speaking learners were told that they were expected to speak only English at school in order to facilitate the development of their verbal skills. More recently there has been no stated requirement that only English be spoken, but the attitude of many educators remains the same: the more that Xhosa-speaking learners practice speaking English, the faster their fluency in the language will develop; this attitude is reflected by 3 educators. Another educator, however, believes this expectation to be unreasonable and suggests that educators should make an effort to achieve a basic understanding of Xhosa. Here again is a voice which suggests that educators themselves might also need to change in some ways in order to facilitate integration. What is also interesting is the shifting attitude and behaviour of the educator quoted above. Despite this educator clearly not liking it when Xhosa is spoken in the classroom, s/he has in more recent times allowed the behaviour to continue. While this educator seems to feel that it is necessary for learners to speak English, s/he has also offered an alternative possible explanation for why the use of Xhosa is not encouraged in the classroom (ie. his/her own unease with it). A different educator feels strongly that despite any personal feelings, the primary concern should be for the learner (and their own language development) rather than the educator. The use of Xhosa in the classroom is clearly a contested issue and the degrees to which it is tolerated by educators differ.

What emerges from the sometime disparate responses of the educators regarding behaviours and their acceptability or unacceptability are two different fields of thought regarding integration. These are identified and elaborated upon in the discussion.

Academic Issues in Relation to Home Conditions and Social Difficulties

The majority of the educators (12) say that there are academically-related reasons which account for why more black learners are placed in detention than white learners. "Not doing homework" is the most frequently mentioned reason, referred to by all twelve (see Appendix, Table 3). Others mentioned are "a poor work ethic" and being "academically weak", factors seen to lead to certain behaviours or offences which are punishable eg. failing tests, having notes in exams, and poor behaviour in the classroom due to boredom. Of the twelve, nine educators elaborate on their understandings as to why many black learners are battling to cope academically and to meet requirements such as completing homework and projects on time. All of these understandings are based on the educators' perceptions of the home conditions and social difficulties faced by many black learners. A major difficulty which many black learners have to deal with - especially those who live in Mdantsane - is that of transport. Learners have to "depend on unreliable public transport", and "many hours are wasted waiting for taxis, or parents who often work out of town". It is well known that many black South Africans have to rely on taxis for transport, and that episodes of taxi violence can result in an indefinite cessation of this form of public transport. Minibus taxis are also mostly privately owned and do not run according to time schedules. The general system of picking up and dropping off passengers at individually requested places means that the time taken to complete a route varies according to passenger demand, so the wait for a taxi can be indefinite. The researcher has also personally observed black learners waiting outside the school until as late as 6:30 pm to be fetched by parents. By this time the school building is normally locked, and learners are unable to wait inside. One educator talks about the consequence of this: "many of them wait until quite late for lifts home and therefore have a poorer record as regards completion of

homework". Four other educators also say that transport problems account directly for why many black learners often do not do their homework.

Other difficulties mentioned by educators relate to home conditions: "home situations [are) often not conducive to homework"; "crowded homes - no private work space at home - so no work done"; "many pupils have chores to do when they get home - cooking, helping with younger family members"; "[some have) parents who work far from home and are not there to supervise homework, or come home too late"; and "some children live with relatives who may not show as much interest in them as their own parents do". The political history of South Africa has had major consequences on the socio-economic status of many black persons, whom for years have had to endure conditions such as crowded housing and disadvantaged living situations. Although many black South Africans have managed to raise their standard of living and socio-economic status and have moved into previously "white" suburbs, even more are trapped in old circumstances. Learners attending the school seem to come from both situations: there are those who are attending the school because it is seen to fit in with their more "westernized" way of life, and there are those who are sent to the school because their parents believe that their children will have better opportunities in life if they receive an education at a Model C school.

The above indicates that many educators seem to have an in-depth understanding of the various difficulties faced by a lot of black learners, and how these impact on their academic work. The extent to which educators make allowances for learners because of these difficulties is uncertain, but most educators discuss these issues when accounting for why they think black learners are over-represented in detention. This means that some black learners are being punished for things resulting from circumstances which they cannot change. In other words, although the educators believe that certain academic problems occur due to social difficulties experienced by members of a specific group, their response to the occurrence of them is to treat them as individual problems rather than as a group problem. Questions relating to this which remain unanswered are: Why is this happening? Are there

alternative ways of dealing with these problems? Are educators reacting this way because alternative ways of dealing with them do not, or are not perceived, to exist? While these questions remain unanswered, or until options to address them in different ways are found, some learners will continue to be punished for things over which they are perceived *by educators* to have no control.

Discipline

It has already been noted that maintaining discipline is believed to be necessary for learning to take place, and that school discipline is one of the largest problems experienced by educators, contributing considerably to the stress of teaching. The detention records show that there is an interaction between punishment and integration (detention being a punitive disciplinary measure), and educators have shared their understandings as to why this might be happening. What has emerged is that many educators experience black learners as behaving "differently" in some ways. Some educators are in the process of determining which of these "different" behaviours are acceptable and which are not. At the same time they are having to contend with these behaviours and make decisions about how to deal with them. Other educators have already decided which behaviours are unacceptable to them, and they are disciplining learners in the ways which they feel are the most effective. The extent to which all of these educators are able to cope with discipline issues, as well as the effectiveness of the disciplinary measures available to them, will impact on their confidence as educators as well as their measure of control in the classroom and at school (NUE Comment, 1999). Because the detention system is the only centralized disciplinary system in place at the school, educators were asked for their opinions about its function, its advantages and its disadvantages as a form of discipline.

Function: Most educators (16) see the function of detention as being a "form of punishment" for different behaviours. One educator elaborates: "Detention is used to punish pupils who do not abide by the rules and neglect to do their given tasks (eg. homework) and neglect duties (eg. miss practices)." Detention is therefore viewed as a disciplinary procedure which aims to control behaviour through

punishment, rather than influence or guide behaviour through "positive discipline" (Goduka, 1999, p.163). The behaviours aimed at are not only those which impact directly on learning taking place. Detention is also used as a punitive measure for behaviours which effect the smooth running of the school as an institution (eg. missing sports practices) and behaviours which are unacceptable in light of the school's code of conduct (eg. smoking).

Advantages: A third of the educators (6) say that one of the advantages of detention is that it is a time when learners can catch up with work. To other educators (3) an advantage is that it is "nonviolent", and "a more sophisticated form of restraint [than corporal punishment]". Other advantages are mentioned by individual educators only: "[it is] a stress-release for teachers"; "[it is] a tool through which certain educators threaten learners"; "the teacher can be seen to be doing something in the classroom"; "it is effective against minor first time offences" and "some students benefit as they don t enjoy detention". The first three advantages mentioned indicate that detention is useful for educators, while the other two indicate that detention is useful for learners - and even then, only *some* learners. Six educators state that detention has no advantages.

Disadvantages: Every educator who responded (18) mentioned at least one disadvantage of detention. The disadvantage most commonly mentioned (8 times) is that placing a learner in detention is an inconvenience for educators. "It penalizes the staff both [with] regards to time and administration". Words used to describe the administrative process are "labourious", "bothersome", "a burden" and "a nightmare". One educator describes the procedure: "Get the form, fill in the labourious form, take it to the staffroom, find the DT Book (often not in its rightful place), find a suitable space/date, return the form to the student". Another disadvantage frequently mentioned (7 times) is that it is not taken seriously by learners: "pupils see it as a joke"; "kids laugh it oft" . Five say that it is not severe enough: "It does not have an effect on the kids (just sit and work - so what)"; "one hour is too short"; and "[it is] not tough enough". Other disadvantages are mentioned by individual educators: "the punishment comes long after the crime"; "someone else - not that teacher - sees to the punishment"; "[it is] not

effective for serious offences and regular offenders"; and "it falls short when sports matches take preeminence. That completely breaks down the system".

The disadvantages of detention are clearly perceived to be greater than the advantages. It is used to punish learners, but in its present form many educators find it to be an inconvenience. Educators generally feel that it is not taken seriously by learners, and that it is not effective enough. Individual educators give suggestions for making it more effective: "Make detention a 3-hour punishment (one hour is nothing - sometimes learners have to wait at school for an hour before their sport practice begins)"; "do not allow anyone to play in any sport match if they have had detention that week"; and "[make the learners do] manual labour eg. cleaning classrooms, mowing fields, weeding etc.". In suggesting alternative ways of dealing with discipline issues, half of the educators (9) state that corporal punishment should be brought back again. The use of corporal punishment is, of course, a highly contested issue. Thus the call by educators for it to be unbanned suggests that it was experienced by some as being more effective than the measures available to them now. Although bringing back corporal punishment would not necessarily solve the discipline problem, this is a good example of how external structures (particularly society, the government and parents) can impact directly on educational structures, leaving educators feeling powerless (unless alternative measures deemed to be equally effective are made available). Three educators comment on how new laws make it almost impossible to suspend or expel learners. One educator writes: "[the] government needs to lighten up on the restrictions made against schools regarding suspension [and] expulsion". Learners are only suspended or expelled for extreme violations of school rules or codes of conduct. Even so, the legal processes involved make it extremely difficult for a suspension or expulsion to be implemented. Another external source which impacts on discipline is that of the parents. One educator says that parents should be held "more accountable" for their children's behaviour. Another states that "the root of the problem is lack of discipline in their homes". A third educator believes that: "parents should have the responsibility of instilling basic good manners, honesty and respect in their children and then

primary schools should nurture these qualities". According to Nicholls (1995) society at large tends to hold educators accountable for any problems or deficiencies in education. What these educators are suggesting is that parents also take some responsibility for the effectiveness of education, because the more time and energy that educators have to spend on dealing with discipline problems, the less time they are able to devote to educating.

It is the perception of educators that they are lacking three things with regard to discipline. First, they do not have any punitive disciplinary measures which are deemed to be *effective* by the majority of educators at the school. Second, they are lacking the *support of the government* in implementing certain disciplinary procedures. Thirdly, they do not generally have *support from parents*, who are also seen to have a role to play in disciplining their children. Four educators call for more parental involvement at a school level, saying that parents should be more informed about their children's behaviour. As one educator says: "They should be contacted more often so that we discipline as a united team".

Discussion

It has already been mentioned that what emerges from the responses of the educators are two different schools of thought regarding integration. The first is that black learners should be *assimilated* into the dominant culture prevailing at the school. Model C schools have certain academic and behavioural requirements, and these have developed over the decades during which only white learners attended these schools. The principles and values upon which they are based strongly reflect a Christian, "westernized" approach to moral and intellectual development. Black learners who have *chosen* to attend a Model C school are therefore expected to behave in ways which are congruent with the existing behavioural and academic expectations. One educator says that in order to "facilitate integration" it is important to "keep the pressure on the black pupils to conform to the standards we expect". The use of the word "conform", however, strongly suggests that it is *assimilation* which is aimed for rather than integration. Four educators say that black learners who have attended Model C schools from primary

school fit in at the school better than those who did not. One says, "pupils from any race that have come up through the system from Grade 1 know what to expect and therefore have no problems with regard to language, punctuality, work ethic etc". Educators who support this school of thought perceive integration to be a dynamic process, but one in which black learners only are expected to change (ie. assimilate) in order to fit in with the prevailing philosophies of the school.

The second school of thought which emerges is that integration is a dynamic process which calls for change on the part of all the parties involved. This approach does not come through as strongly as the first one discussed, but there are voices which represent it. These are the voices of educators who believe the following: that some differences between learners need to be accepted; that the present expectations of educators might need to change; and that educators need to be open to this change.

Coutts (1995), in identifying models of schooling "which might serve to bring South African children from different cultural backgrounds together in the same classrooms," discusses "assimilatory education" and "multicultural education", approaches which have been used extensively overseas for similar purposes (p.64). Assimilatory education is where cultural minorities are absorbed into the dominant Western culture. This approach when used overseas has been met with strong resistance by cultural minorities, and has usually resulted in the introduction of multicultural education. This is also the approach which many educators seem to be taking at the school (and in this micro context, the black learners are still generally the minority).

Multicultural education is based on a liberal philosophy which prizes or at least tolerates individual freedom and diverse viewpoints and values. When used in conjunction with a human rights orientation (Coutts, 1995) this model of education does not necessarily sanction all values, but believes that diverse values should be discussed and appraised in the classroom. Without this human rights orientation a potential problem with multicultural education is that it is vulnerable to misuse if differences or diversity are highlighted at the expense of what Coutts calls the "constitutive element", ie. the things

which all children share (1995, p.66). Some educators at the school seem to be taking a multicultural approach to education, to varying degrees.

What is of concern are the possible consequences resulting from educators differing in their approaches to integration. Two of these might be: that learners do not have a clear enough understanding of what is expected of them, especially if different educators respond to a particular behaviour inconsistently; and that this inconsistency leaves individual educators with a lack of support from other educators. Consistency is of major importance when dealing with discipline problems (Mwamwenda, 1995; Goduka, 1999), and three educators highlight the importance of consistency. One states, "consistency is very important. All the teachers must have the same punishment for certain 'crimes'. If they [the learners] get away with something in one class, they will laugh at the next teacher - it only confuses them". This type of consistency does not seem to exist between the educators at the school at present.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The following factors relating to integration and discipline have emerged and been discussed:

1. The study found an interaction between integration and discipline at the school: black learners were over-represented in detention.

2. Educators at the school perceive differences to exist between white and black learners, who, consistent with social identity theory are members of different social categories.

3. Some of these differences as they relate to behaviours are viewed as being acceptable while others are viewed as being unacceptable. The degree of acceptability of certain behaviours is contested by some educators.

4. Educators at the school are currently following two different models of schooling in their efforts to educate learners from different cultural groups, namely assimilatory education and multicultural education.

5. Discipline is considered to be a problem at the school, and educators seem to be lacking three things

in relation to disciplinary procedures: punitive disciplinary measures which are deemed to be *effective;* the *support of the government* in implementing certain disciplinary procedures; and *support from parents.*

6. Consistency between educators regarding behavioural rules and disciplinary procedures is important for various reasons, one of which is clarity of the school rules for the learners. At present this type of consistency does not seem to exist at the school.

Based on the above factors, educators at the school might want to consider the following options in order to help address some of the main problems and challenges faced by them at present:

Different models of schooling (eg. assimilatory and multicultural education) can be discussed and evaluated and the model deemed to be most fitting with the goals and philosophy of the school regarding education can be decided upon. The educators would have to negotiate between themselves exactly how the chosen approach would be implemented and facilitated by themselves.

Differences in behaviours displayed by learners from different social categories can be discussed and evaluated in order to determine which are "acceptable" and which are "unacceptable" within the school context. This can be done by the educators alone, or between the educators and the learners, depending on which approach to schooling is chosen. If it is done by the educators alone, the resulting decisions need to be shared with the learners so that it is clear to them what is acceptable and what is not. Ideally, learners would need to know this before entering the school.

Educators can discuss issues relating to discipline so that they can be consistent between themselves as to how they deal with specific behavioural and academic offences.

Lastly, all of the educators can commit themselves to implementing the agreed-upon procedures, so that this can be done with maximum consistency.

In conclusion one educator makes a final comment on integration:

> Integration of different cultures makes every educational situation more challenging. Most teachers feel a frustration in this - as do parents and learners. No facilitating of these problems as to solutions has been forthcoming. [This] needs to be a priority from schools and departments and governing bodies.

This educator believes that external structures which have an impact on education also need to be exploring and introducing ways of facilitating the process of integration. However, until this occurs the only context in which educators can make sure that this process happens is in their own school. If educators do this, even small measures of success will lessen some of the frustration felt by educators who are having to work in such challenging but difficult contexts. Coutts (1995, p.64) leaves us with a word of hope and of caution:

> The presence of a culturally diverse pupil population in a school offers the competent teacher enormous empowerment in the creation of a more just, compassionate and tolerant society. However, the mere presence of children from different cultural backgrounds does not ensure a positive outcome. A great deal of energy, knowledge and insight will be needed on the part of all teachers if success is to be achieved in welding culturally different communities into a unified whole.

APPENDIX 1

Table 4: Number of times learners placed in detention for particular offences

Offence	**Number of times: black learners** (column % in parentheses)	**Number of times: white learners** (column % in parentheses)	**Total** (column % in parentheses)
absent	11 (2%)	10 (2%)	21 (2%)
appearance	23 (5%)	48 (9%)	71 (7%)
art - missed practical	0 (0%)	8 (1%)	8 (1%)
assault	7 (2%)	0 (0%)	7 (1%)
bunking (school, sport, during school)	117 (25%)	96 (17%)	213 (21%)
cheeky	0 (0%)	3 (0.5%)	3 (0.3%)
dishonesty	10 (2%)	5 (1%)	15 (1.5%)
disobedience	11 (2%)	7 (1%)	18 (1.8%)
DT misdemeanours	2 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.2%)
failed test	11 (2%)	5 (1%)	16 (2%)
falsifying	3 (0.6%)	0 (0%)	3 (0.3%)
homework	116 (36%)	258 (46%)	424 (41%)
late (class, school)	11 (2%)	12 (2%)	23 (2%)
library books late	5 (1%)	0 (0%)	5 (0.5%)
losing daily report	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.1%)
misbehaviour	47 (10%)	70 (12%)	117 (11%)
misdemeanours	6 (1.3%)	5 (1%)	11 (1%)
notes in exam	2 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.2%)
obscenity	1 (0.2%)	2 (0.5%)	3 (0.3%)
PT - no clothes	14 (3%)	19 (3%)	33 (3%)
serious crimes	3 (1%)	0 (0%)	3 (0.3%)
smoking	4 (1%)	6 (1%)	10 (1%)
(unclear in record book)	6 (1.3%)	9 (2%)	15 (1.5%)
TOTAL	461	563	1,024

REFERENCES

Badat, S. (1998). Educational Politics in the Transition Period. In P. Kallaway, G. Kruss, A. Fataar, & G. Donn (Eds.), *Education after apartheid. South African education in transition* (pp. 9-33). Cape Town: UCT Press (Pty) Ltd.

Badenhorst, J., & Scheepers, L. (1995). *School management training.* Pretoria: Kagiso.

Berg, B.L. (1998). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences.* Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.

Bot, M. (1990). *The blackboard debate. Hurdles, options and opportunities in school integration.* Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.

Charmaz, K (1995). Grounded theory. In J.A. Smith, R. Harre & L. Van Langenhove (Eds.), *Rethinking methods in psychology* (pp. 27-49). London: Sage Publications.

Coffery, A. & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making Sense of Qualitative Data. Complementary Research Strategies.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Coutts, A. (1995). Human right education in a culturally diverse school class. In A. Coutts (Ed.), *Empower the teacher* (pp. 62-76). Halfway House: International Thomson Publishing.

Feldman, MS. (1995). *Strategies for interpreting qualitative data.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Foster, J.J., & Parker, I. (1999). *Carrying out investigations in psychology. Methods and statistics.* Leicester: Biddles Ltd.

Goduka, M.J. (1999). *Affirming unity in diversity in education: healing with ubuntu.* Kenwyn: Juta & Co, Ltd.

Greenstein, R. (1996). Education, identity and curriculum policies in the new South Africa. In *In pursuit of equality. Kenton 1995* (pp. 1-15). Kenwyn: Juta & Co.

Gubrium, J.F., & Holstein, J.A. (1997). *The new language of qualitative method.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hays, W.L. (1994). *Statistics.* Fort Worth: Brace College Publishers.

Hogg, M.A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications. A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes.* London: Routledge.

Jarvis, B., & Edley, D. *(1995).* The socio-political context of education in South Africa. In A. Coutts (Ed.), *Empower the teacher* (pp. 12-30). Halfway House: International Thomson Publishing.

Kallaway, P., Kruss, G., Fataar, A., & Donn, G. (Eds.), (1998). *Education after apartheid. South African education in transition.* Cape Town: UCT Press (Pty) Ltd.

Kendall, F.E. (1996). *Diversity in the classroom. New approaches to the education of young children.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Kissack, M., & Meyer, S. (1996). Vantages of a new horizon. Knowledge, judgement and the concept of quality in the 1995 White Paper. In *In pursuit of equality. Kenton 1995* (pp. 233-247). Kenwyn: Juta & Co.

Klein, G. (1997). *Education towards race equality.* London: Redwood Books.

Kruger, A.G., & van Schalkwyk, O.J. (1997). *Classroom management.* Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik Publishers.

Lee, R.M. (1993). *Doing research on sensitive topics.* London: Sage Publications.

Lewis, R., & Lovegrove, M.N. (1987). What students think of teachers classroom control techniques. In N. Hastings and J. Schwieso (Eds.), *New directions in educational psychology. 2 Behaviour and motivation in the classroom* (pp. 93-114). Barcombe: The Falmer Press.

Lyons, P. (1995). Some diverse roles of the teacher in the classroom. In A. Coutts (Ed.), *Empower the teacher* (pp. 116-126). Halfway House: International Thomson Publishing.

Morrow, W. (1989). *Chains of thought.* Johannesburg: Southern Book Publishers (Pty) Ltd.

Mwamwenda, T.S. (1995). *Educational psychology: an African perspective.* Durban: Butterworth Publishers (Pty) Ltd.

Nicholls, G. (1995). Empowerment or disempowerment? The teacher in the system. In A. Coutts (Ed.), *Empower the teacher* (pp. 31-50). Halfway House: International Thomson Publishing.

Nzimande, B. (1998). Foreword. In P. Kallaway, G. Kruss, A. Fataar, & G. Donn (Eds.), *Education after apartheid. South African education in transition.* Cape Town: UCT Press (Pty) Ltd.

Pidgeon (1998). Grounded theory: theoretical background. In J.T.E. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research methods for psychology and the social sciences* (pp. 75-85). Leicester: Biddles Ltd.

Pidgeon & Henwood (1998). Grounded theory: practical implementation. In J.T.E. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research methods for psychology and the social sciences* (pp. 86-101). Leicester: Biddies Ltd.

South African Schools Act, 1996. Government Gazette, Volume 377, No. 17579. Republic of South Africa.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology. An overview. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 273-285). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications.

Veenman, S.A.M. (1987). Problems as perceived by new teachers. In N. Hastings and J. Schwieso (Eds.), *New directions in educational psychology. 2 Behaviour and motivation in the classroom* (pp. 11-22). Barcombe: The Falmer Press.

Vincent, C. (1996). *Parents and teachers. Power and participation.* London: Falmer Press.

Vos, A.J., & Brits, V.M. (1990). *Comparative education and national education systems.* Durban: Butterworths Professional Publishers (Pty) Ltd.

What teachers want to achieve. (1999, April). *NUE Comment, 2* (1), p. 20.

Winch, C., & Gingell, J. (1999). *Key concepts in the philosophy of education.* London: Routledge.