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ABSTRACT

The country of Botswana has passed laws to support the human rights of their citizens. In accordance with the UN’s guidelines, Botswana’s human rights initiatives, and the international movement towards inclusive education, inclusive educational reform is taking place. In this ethnographic study, the researcher has examined the inclusive practices currently in place to support junior secondary students with learning disabilities (LD) in Gaborone, Botswana over a four-month period. Participants included administrators, general and special education teachers, and students with LD. The themes of routine, academic activities, classroom life, and accommodations for students with LD emerged upon analysis and are discussed in detail. In addition, the themes of school culture, policy implementation, and dissemination emerged from interviews and observations of teachers and administrators and are discussed in detail. Implications for practice and recommendations are provided, based upon the current status in this one school observed, for consideration of further supports for junior secondary students with LD in Botswana.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Prior to choosing the nation of Botswana for the location of this dissertation, the researcher established criteria for research locations. The criteria included human rights initiatives that aligned to the UN policies and a developing or middle-income nation with an emerging special education program. The researcher defined an “emerging” special education program as one with policy written, that has been implemented in schools, with special education research being produced in the country. After the initial list was created, other factors such as government stability, language, and economic stability were considered. Because basic needs such as clean water, food, and health care needs are funded before human rights initiatives, economic stability was considered. Countries from Eastern Europe, Africa, and South America were potentially considered for this study if a country met the required criteria.

Based on this criterion, the researcher determined Botswana met the criteria as a country. Also, the country of Botswana was selected because the University of Central Florida’s College of Education and Human Performance had a previous relationship with the University of Botswana (UB) through international education programs headed by Professor Karen Biraimah. Professor Biraimah helped to establish a connection between the researcher and the University of Botswana. Due to this connection, the researcher found mentorship with Professor Chigorom Abosi and Professor Sourav Mukhopadhyay of the Faculty of Special Education at the University of Botswana. Both professors are now Graduate Faculty Scholars at the University of Central Florida.

Statement of the Problem

Special education in Botswana is a new and developing system, which began with students with disabilities being permitted to attend school in 1994, and today includes the
creation of an inclusive education system (Abosi, 2000; Dart, 2007; Mukhopadhyay, Nenty, & Abosi, 2012). As the special education system evolves in Botswana, more classifications of disabilities are being recognized, including students with learning disabilities (LD; Abosi, 2007).

Since the onset of Botswana’s special education system in 1994, the country has experienced the growing pains typical of many developing African countries trying to adopt a westernized educational concept. Although the government of Botswana has striven to uphold the values and human rights of the United Nations’ Salamanca Statement (Abosi, 2000), Botswana’s special education program has experienced a lack of resources, limited teacher education programs, and cultural conflicts between traditional and modern values, leading to what Abosi (2007) refers to as the discrimination of people with disabilities.

Past studies on Special Education in Botswana have included investigations of teachers’ perspectives on inclusion (Mukhopadhyay, 2013), services provided to students in inclusive settings in primary schools (Mukhopadhyay et al., 2012), and perceptions of seven university students with visual, physical, or speech disorders in higher education (Moswela & Mukhopadhyay, 2011). While recent studies have examined the way services are provided to elementary students with more profound disabilities, few studies in Botswana have examined the services or perceptions of junior secondary students with LD in inclusive settings. This study focuses on this untapped area of students with LD at the junior secondary level in an attempt to add to the existing body of literature on special education in Botswana. In this study, the term junior secondary includes Forms 1, 2, and 3 in Botswana. A form refers to a level of school in Botswana, equivalent to a grade level. This junior secondary school included three, different levels of students.
Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework used to guide the analysis of this study is *The Model of Inclusive Schooling* by Winzer and Mazurek (2012). Although *The Model of Inclusive Schooling* by Winzer and Mazurek (2012) was developed in Canada using westernized ideals, the authors designed the model to not only examine the use of inclusion in a culture but to examine the factors within the culture, contributing to the acceptance or failure of inclusive schooling within a country.

The focus of the framework is social justice, which is central to the other four themes. Winzer and Mazurek (2012) describe the worldwide movement of inclusion as part of the human rights movement. At the core of the inclusive movement is the claim that the person with a disability is striving to enjoy the same human rights as other individuals in that culture, including the right to an education. To better analyze the concept of inclusion as social justice, Winzer and Mazurek (2012) delineate four themes: policy and outcomes, dimensions of time, school transformation, and cultural parameters, which all center on social justice. Policy and outcomes refers to the policies being enforced by the government. For example, nations often pass inclusive education policies that are not implemented. Dimensions of time refers to the time for a culture to embrace or reject a policy, and the time the introduced system develops within that culture. School transformation involves the reorganization of traditional school practices. In this theme, typical classroom teachers are required to change their teaching methods and incorporate new instructional practices, teaching strategies, and accommodations. Cultural parameters involve the acceptance of inclusion in the culture. Components of the culture which can affect the acceptance of inclusion in a society are traditional values, religion, and the educational system (Winzer & Mazurek, 2012).
Winzer and Mazurek's (2012) theoretical framework guided the core concept being examined in this ethnographic study of school culture. The definition of culture used to frame this study’s findings is “complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, laws, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by [a human] as a member of society.” (UNESCO, 2017, para. 1).

Purpose Statement

Botswana has made significant strides in the development of their special education program. Through policies like the Revised National Policy on Education (Ministry of Education Botswana, 1994) and the Inclusive Education Policy (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014), students with disabilities are now able to attend school and receive accommodations to their exams and curricula.

The implication of these policies extends even to the university. The University of Botswana has an Office of Disability Services to assist students at the university with accommodations. The Revised National Policy on Education requires all teacher candidates to complete coursework in their teacher education programs (Ministry of Education Botswana, 1994). Special education is now a major at the University of Botswana since 1997, and the demand for special education teachers in Botswana has continued to grow (Abosi, 2000).

The purpose of this ethnographic study is to further the research on the topic of observed supports, practices, and perceptions of the inclusive culture used to support junior secondary students with LD in Gaborone, Botswana. A qualitative approach was selected because it “can enhance awareness of challenges that might be encountered when implementing a new approach and provide insights into contextual variables that influence its effectiveness” (Moore, Klingner, & Harry, 2013, p. 658). The researcher in this study explored the daily routines, the perceptions
of others, and the perceptions of junior secondary students with LD in inclusive settings, specifically in Gaborone, Botswana. The location of Gaborone, Botswana was chosen because the country of Botswana has human rights initiatives that are aligned to the United Nation’s (UN) policies, is a developing or middle-income nation, and has an emerging special education program. The researcher defines an “emerging” special education program as one with a written special education policy that is being implemented in schools, and special education research is being produced in the country.

To ensure cultural validity, the researcher was provided guidance from Professors Okey Abosi and Sourav Mukhopadhyay, Faculty of Education at the University of Botswana. Professor Mukhopadhyay conducted similar research, and his work served as a basis for this study. Professor Abosi read the proposed research prior to the researcher’s arrival and located a research site, which fit the criteria of the study. He consulted with gatekeepers and arranged a meeting with the stakeholders and the researcher. While the researcher conducted the study, Professor Abosi met with the researcher twice a week, so he could discuss any questions or concerns from the research site.

In addition, Professor Abosi assisted in the IRB process at UB. One of the requirements of the IRB at UB was to hire a research assistant to ensure the researcher understood the culture. The research assistant needed to be Motswana, schooled in Botswana, and to speak Setswana and English. Professor Abosi found a research assistant who met these requirements. The research assistant was able to answer questions about culture while in the field and verify accuracy of translation of research across languages.
Research Questions

The primary question answered in this study is: What are the observed supports, practices, and perceptions of the inclusive culture in a junior secondary school setting in Gaborone, Botswana to support students with LD?

Sub-questions

1. What are the daily routines, academic activities/accommodations, and classroom life for students with LD within the school’s culture?
2. How do students with the identification of LD in Gaborone, Botswana view themselves in the culture of an inclusive setting?
3. How do teachers and administrators view the inclusive education program?
4. What accommodations, adaptations, or instructional strategies do teachers use to support students with LD?

Significance of the Study

The examination of special education in Botswana is important to gain a perspective of special education on a global level. Dukes, Darling, and Gallagher (2016) challenged researchers to take a more international approach in the examination of special education (Dukes et al., 2016). The goal of this researcher was to take on that challenge by exploring school culture within an ethnographic profile of another country while still respecting the uniqueness of the culture and attempting to represent the voice of junior secondary students with LD in Botswana.

Botswana’s research in special education is in its infancy but is continuing to develop with support from the government and researchers in higher education. Special education
researchers in Botswana are examining a number of relevant topics as this field continues to grow and develop in their society. The researcher hoped to contribute to the existing special education research in Botswana by providing data on the perceptions and daily experiences of junior secondary students with LD in an inclusive setting, a topic currently unexplored. The researcher, being a past teacher of students with LD and a person with LD herself, was well situated to look through a unique, dual lens at the overall practices for students with LD at the junior secondary level. This study could contribute to policy, practice, and research, in Botswana and abroad, related to inclusion, teacher preparation, and junior secondary students with LD in inclusive settings.

**Organization of the Study**

The researcher examined the research question and subquestions through a classical ethnography. Students, administrators, and teacher participants were recruited from a junior secondary school in Gaborone, Botswana. A combination of interviews, observations, and documents were analyzed through the theoretical lens of *The Model of Inclusive Schooling* framework of Winzer and Mazurek (2012). This framework was developed to enable researchers to examine inclusion in all cultures. The operational framework by UNESCO (2017) was used as the definition for cultural grounding of observations of inclusive practices and targeted practices provided to students with LD in Botswana.

**Operational Definitions**

Since this study is situated in Botswana, terms unique to the country, culture, and people are used in this dissertation. To assist the reader, words that are unique to the culture are defined for easier reading.
Groups of people from the country of Botswana are referred to as Batswana. A singular person in the country is called a Motswana, and this term is gender neutral. The national language of the country is Setswana, and the official language is English (The Linguist Chair, 2016). When describing something in Botswana, the adjective Tswana is used (Main, 2010).

In respect to both the cultures of the United States (US) and Botswana, both American and British English spellings are used in this dissertation. American English is used when discussing a study, practice, or policy from the US, and British-English spellings are used in any document used in Botswana.

It should be noted people of many cultures reside in the country of Botswana, and it is difficult to use the term “Tswana culture,” when the culture of Botswana is made up of so many unique and diverse groups. No single definition can be used to define the culture of the many people of Botswana. Thus, when the author discusses the culture of the people of Botswana, it is a broad statement that may not apply to all or may apply to only a subset of the people of the country.

Other educational terms and definitions found in this dissertation are provided as follows:

**Accommodation:** “Any change to a classroom environment or task that permits qualified students with a disability to participate in the classroom process, to perform the essential tasks of the class or enjoy benefits and privileges of the classroom” (Horton & Hall, 1998, p. 8).

**Culture:** “Complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, laws, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by [a human] as a member of society.” (UNESCO, 2017, para. 1).

**Disability:** “Impairment is defined as: Any loss or abnormality of psychological, physiological, or anatomical structure or function” (Oliver & Barnes, 1998, p. 15).
**Emerging special education program:** For this study, the researcher defines an *emerging special education program* as a country with a written policy being implemented in schools and with special education research being produced in the country.

**Form:** This term is used to describe a student’s grade level.

**House:** A house is a subdivision within a school, common to the British School System. A student is placed in a house when they enroll and remain in the house until they leave the school (Dierenfield, 1975).

**Inclusive Education:** “Includes, and meets the needs of all, including those with special educational needs, whatever their gender, life circumstances, health, disability, stage of development, capacity to learn, level of achievement, financial or any other circumstances. No one should be excluded from education” (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014, p. 4).

**Junior Secondary:** Forms 1, 2, and 3 (approximate ages of the students: 11-17)

**Kagisano:** A word for social harmony; it is the underlying goal of all policy written in Botswana. The national principles of Botswana are democracy, development, self-reliance, unity, and *bothos*, a tenet of African culture. *Bothos* describes a person who has a well-rounded character and is courteous, disciplined, and works to empower others. All of these principles uphold the national philosophy of *Kagisano* (Presidential Task Group, 2016).

**Learner-centered approach:** Pedagogy where students are the center of the classroom focus rather than the teacher (Tabulawa, 1998).

**Learning difficulty:** This term is used in Botswana in place of the term learning disability.

**Learning disability (LD):** The term LD means a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, that
may manifest itself in the imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations, including conditions such as perceptual disabilities, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. (U.S. Department of Education, 2004, para. 10). No definition of LD is used in Botswana. The researcher sought to use a definition for LD from UNESCO, the UN, UNICEF, or the World Bank; however, no definition could be found. The researcher chose to use the US definition of the term LD because the US has a singular definition.

Policy borrowing: Guidelines that are created by developed nations with a one-size-fits all approach to educational globalization, not taking into account the cultures and values of developing countries (Steiner-Khamsi, 2010)

Reasonable accommodation: “Necessary and appropriate modification and adjustments not imposing a disproportionate or undue burden, where needed in a particular case, to ensure to persons with disabilities the enjoyment or exercise on an equal basis with others of all human rights and fundamental freedoms” (UNGA, 2006, Article 2, para. 4).

School culture: “Complex webs of stories, traditions, and rituals budding over time as teachers, students, parents, and administrators work together to deal with crises and accomplishments” (Deal & Peterson, 2016, p. 8).
Botswana

The country of Botswana is located in southern Africa and borders South Africa, Zimbabwe, Zambia, and Namibia. According to the CIA World Factbook, the total population of Botswana in 2016 is 2,209,208 (CIA, 2017). The capital of Botswana is Gaborone, and according to the 2011 census, the population is 231,592 (Statistics Botswana, 2014).

Botswana is a diverse nation with many ethnic groups. The Tswanas make up the majority of the population at 79%, followed by the Kalangas at 11%, the Basarwa at 3%, and other smaller groups (CIA, 2017).

Most people (77.3%) in Botswana speak Setswana as their first language (CIA, 2017). However, some Batswana’s first language is Sekalanga (7.4%), Shekgalagadi (3.4%), and English (2.8%). Even though the majority of people speak Setswana as a first language in Botswana and the national language is Setswana, English is the official language of the country (Government of Botswana, 2011b). Business is conducted in English in government offices and businesses.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

International Development of Special Education

Background

Franklin D. Roosevelt coined the term United Nations (UN) on January 1, 1942 after 26 nations pledged to continue to fight the Axis Powers of World War II (WWII). The joint efforts of these original 26 nations began discussions to form the collaboration now known as the UN. The UN was officially formed in 1945 with 51 Member States (United Nations, 2016c). The primary responsibility of the UN is to develop International Law to serve as a framework for governments to create policy (United Nations, 2016b).

Table 1 provides an overview of the role of the UN in creating international laws for people with disabilities. In 1948, in a direct response to the atrocities of WWII, the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) wrote the Declaration of Human Rights. Article 1 of the Declaration of Human Rights (1948) stated, “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood” (p. 2). The wording of Article 1 set the tone of the declaration and was written in response to the prosecution of Nazi War criminals in the Nuremberg Trials held from 1945-1949 (Library of Congress Researchers, 2014). Article 26 of the document was written to declare, “Everyone has a right to an education” (Article 26, para. 1) and proclaimed education as a human right (UNGA, 1948). Declaring education as a basic human right opened the door of education for all students worldwide, including those with disabilities (United Nations, 2016b).
### Table 1

**International Policies and Developments that Influenced Special Education Globally**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Policy/ Development</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Franklin D. Roosevelt coined the term</td>
<td>Twenty-six nations pledged to continue to fight the Axis Powers of WWII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Formation of the UN</td>
<td>Primary responsibility of the UN to develop International Law to serve as a framework for governments to create policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td><em>Declaration of Human Rights</em></td>
<td>“All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>International Year of Disabled Persons</td>
<td>The UN General Assembly adopted the <em>World Programme of Action concerning People with Disabilities.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td><em>World Programme of Action concerning People with Disabilities (WPA)</em></td>
<td>The WPA was used as a method to increase global disability prevention, rehabilitation, and equality. Defines impairment, disability, handicap, prevention, and rehabilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td><em>Education for All Act</em></td>
<td>Six goals: (1) Expand early childhood care and education; (2) Provide free and compulsory primary education for all; (3) Promote learning and life skills for young people and adults; (4) Increase adult literacy; (5) Achieve gender parity; and (6) Improve the quality of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td><em>Convention of the Rights of the Child</em></td>
<td>Article 2, non-discrimination, Article 23, care of children with disabilities, and Article 28, right to an education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td><em>Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities</em></td>
<td>Twenty-two rules concerning the health, education, and equality of people with disabilities and served as a guide for policymakers worldwide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td><em>Salamanca Statement</em></td>
<td>Goal was to provide a framework for governments to base special education policy. Urged governments to adopt policies, which provided men and women with disabilities an inclusive education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td><em>Dakar Framework for Action</em></td>
<td>Six goals: (1) expansion of early childhood care and education, (2) ensuring girls have access to free and compulsory education, (3) ensuring the learning needs of all young people and adults are met through appropriate learning, (4) achieving 50% improvement in literacy levels, (5) eliminating the gender gap in primary and secondary education, and (6) improving education so measurable outcomes are achieved by all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td><em>Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</em></td>
<td>Goal of ensuring the quality of life of all human beings Article 5. Requests governments recognize people with disabilities as equal; Article 6. Demands governments protect women and people with disabilities; Article 7. Demands governments protect the rights of women and people with disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite the UN’s 1948 declaration, it was not until 1981 that the International Year of Disabled Persons was declared. The UN General Assembly adopted the document of the *World Programme of Action Concerning People with Disabilities* (WPA) in 1982, increasing global disability prevention, rehabilitation, and equality. The World Health Organization (WHO) adopted the WPA and included definitions of impairment, disability, and handicap. The document also defined the terms prevention, rehabilitation, and equalization creating a more standardized definition for the global community (United Nations General Assembly, 1982).

The WPA created a springboard for further evolution of disability services and policies being presented and adopted globally. In 1990, the *Education for All* document was written by UNESCO, UN Development Programme (UNDP), UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF), and the World Bank, all divisions of the UN were created to reduce world illiteracy and expand primary education for all nations. *Education for All* contained six goals, listed in Table 1, under the *Education for All Act*.

The passage of *Education for All* was paired with the ratification of the *Convention of the Rights of the Child* (1990), which expanded upon the six goals and contained specific actions for children with disabilities. Articles 2, 23, and 28 specifically relate to children with disabilities. Article 2 calls for all children to live a discrimination-free life, including those with a disability. Article 23 states children with disabilities have the right to special care to live independent lives. In Article 28, the right to an education is described in terms of everyone being encouraged to reach their highest potential (UNGA, 1990).

The push for additional rules and standards for children with disabilities continued to be emphasized by UNESCO through the *Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities*. The UNGA adopted these rules and standards in December of 1993.
The *Standard Rules* consisted of 22 rules concerning the health, education, and equality of people with disabilities and served as a guide for policymakers worldwide. Rule six of this document called for children and adults with disabilities to be afforded an education. Rule six was then broken into nine subsections, which is described in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsection number</th>
<th>Subsections of Rule Six</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>General education is responsible for the education of persons with disabilities and should be a part of curriculum planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Education in regular schools should provide appropriate accommodations, modifications, accessibility, and support services to serve people with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Parents and organizations for those with disabilities should be involved in the student’s education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>In countries where education is mandatory, all students: male, female, and those with the most severe disabilities, should be provided with an education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Attention should be given to adult education and early childhood education for those with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Countries should provide professional development, materials for educators, and have clearly written policies in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Community-based programs should complement education and countries should encourage local support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>In locations where typical school and full inclusion is not available, special education may be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Students who are deaf and blind could be prepared for the typical school in special classes to meet their communication needs but should result in the student’s independence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions of Disability used in UN Documents

Within the UN documents reviewed, the definition of disability varies. Many of these documents refer to disability as a broad term. However, specific definitions are given to define mobility disorders, intellectual impairments, blindness, and deafness, but definitions for students with mild disabilities, like LD, are not provided. Much like in the UN documents reviewed, disability policy based upon the UN guidelines in Botswana recognizes some disabilities and not others. A definition is provided for the term disability in Botswana, but not for specific disabilities, such as LD.

The Salamanca Statement

In an effort to continue the commitment to the Education for All Act of 1990, a delegation representing 92 governments and 25 organizations met in Salamanca, Spain, in June of 1994, with the goal of furthering inclusive education on a worldwide basis. The Salamanca Statement: Framework for Action on Special Needs Education was written to further expand the special education initiative of Education for All (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1990).

The goal of the Salamanca Statement was to provide a framework for governments to base special education policy. The writers of the UN statement urged governments to adopt these policies, including providing children with disabilities an inclusive education. In Article 7 of the Salamanca Statement, the fundamental principle of inclusive school is defined as:

All children should learn together, whenever possible, regardless of any difficulties or differences they may have. Inclusive schools must recognize and respond to diverse needs of their students, accommodating both different styles and rates of learning.
ensuring quality education to all through appropriate curricula, organizational arrangements, teaching strategies, resource use and partnerships with their communities.

There should be a continuum of support and services to match the continuum of special needs encountered in every school. (UNESCO, 1994, p. 11)

This definition was not created to eliminate the need for the special schools or special classrooms, but Article 9 states students should be served in the regular classroom unless the student is unable to make progress in the regular setting. Article 9 of the Salamanca Statement states that in countries with existing special education programs, staff in special units or special schools can be used for preparing general education teachers to work with students with special needs in the typical school. The statement adds that some special schools may be needed.

Article 19 asserts, even students who are better served in special schools should be given the opportunity to attend the typical school part-time. Students who are deaf and blind are an exception to this rule. Because of the communication needs of students who are blind and deaf, Article 21 places an emphasis on learning proper communication skills and that in the case of these students, a specialized school may be more suitable for this unique population. Article 25 allows for flexibility of coordinating services to meet each student’s needs and may include special schools, ordinary or typical schools, non-government organizations (NGO), health, employment, and social services (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1994).

The Salamanca Statement (1994) delegates power to governments to monitor inclusive practices, and data should be taken in the following areas: number of students enrolled in special schools and typical or regular schools, equipment used by students with disabilities, types of professionals needed to meet the needs of students with disabilities, and the finances being used
nationally on this population. In addition, international partners and aid agencies are to monitor the usage of funding to support special education practices.

Schools, both urban and rural, within states using these guidelines, are encouraged to communicate practices through the development of inclusive policies. The government is to ensure schools discourage prejudice of those with disabilities by cultivating an environment of inclusive practices for all, including inservice preparation for staff, faculty, and the public to promote awareness of best practices for serving children with disabilities (UNESCO, 1994).

The changes described in the Salamanca Statement were not exclusive to students with disabilities but also were created to enhance the special education initiatives of Education for All. Education for All directed schools and governing bodies to adopt a child-centered approach to education. A child-centered approach was defined as a flexible and adaptive curriculum, which met the needs of all learners and also met the student’s needs and interests. Students with special needs in this policy are to receive additional instruction, but the content should be the same as their peers without disabilities. In order to better motivate all students, the content should be aligned to the student’s interests and experiences. Teachers should monitor the progress of students by regularly using formative assessments. For students with disabilities, a continuum of services should be provided, which may include external resources and the use of appropriate and affordable technology to be used for mobility, communication, or learning (UNESCO, 1994).

The Salamanca Statement defined an inclusive school as all children learning together and the school delivering instruction to meet the needs of all students (UNESCO, 1994). The writers of the Salamanca Statement encouraged flexible management of schools to allow for a variety of learning options to be deployed and teams of professionals to be formed. The
responsibility lies with the school administrator to encourage students with disabilities to participate in the school and the community and to create an environment of acceptance within both. The entire community is encouraged to be accountable for the success of each child rather than solely the classroom teachers (UNESCO, 1994).

The writers of the Salamanca Statement encouraged research-based practices to be used in the classroom. Special education research and development is to be integrated into national universities and centers for curriculum development. Teachers are encouraged to conduct action research to evaluate their instruction, and the data gathered is to be used to make choices for further instruction (UNESCO, 1994).

The Salamanca Statement provides a platform for teacher-preparation programs to take a positive approach in instructing preservice teachers to work with students with disabilities by providing them with instruction in assessing learning, adapting curriculum, using assistive technology, and individualizing instruction for all students, including students with disabilities. In addition, professional development on special education is to be provided for all staff and faculty at schools. Universities are to take a major role in creating this professional development, linking research to practice.

Traditional schools are to consider the use of external support personnel for students with disabilities. These supports are to include educational psychologists, speech pathologists, occupational therapists, and/or advisory teachers. The use of school clusters, which allows professionals to work with students in a zone of schools rather than only in one school, also is suggested as part of the Salamanca Statement.

Sections E and F of the Salamanca Statement are identified as priorities in the field of global special education. Section E emphasizes the need for early childhood education in
addition to the early identification of disabilities, girls’ education, and transition to adulthood. Section F of the *Salamanca Statement* reminds the international community that special education is not only the responsibility of the Ministry of Education, but the entire community, including the public, families, and nongovernment organizations (NGO). Parental partnerships are emphasized as critical for the well-being of the child. Parents are encouraged to participate in their children’s education, and schools should explain the progress of a student with disabilities in clear, jargon-free language. Communities also are to provide both in-school and out-of-school activities for students with disabilities. Neighborhood centers, youth clubs, or other organizations are to help with homework assistance for families who cannot assist their children. Local governments or NGOs are to provide these services. The role of NGOs is to assist in special education programs by supporting new ideas and extending these ideas into the community. Moreover, section three encourages NGOs and governments, both at the local and international level, to join forces to educate students with disabilities.

**After Salamanca**

In 1995, one year after the UN General Assembly accepted the *Salamanca Statement*, UNESCO conducted a survey of 63 countries. Of the countries surveyed, the Ministry of Education was still responsible for special education in 96% of them. Funding primarily came from governments, but some came from private sources, parents, and NGOs. Many country leaders acknowledged that funding special education is a financial hardship on an already strained budget (UNESCO, 1999).

In 1999, UNESCO’s *Five-Year Report on Salamanca* (1999) stated *Education for All* (1990) was still not a reality for many students across the globe. Many students were still
excluded because of race, poverty, gender, location, or political turmoil. Students with disabilities were widely excluded from traditional or regular schools. It explicitly stated, “Education for All strategies and programmes are largely insufficient or inappropriate with regard to the needs of children and youth with special needs” (p. 10). 

To support the efforts of Education for All and the Salamanca Statement in better meeting the needs of students with disabilities, UNESCO formed the Inclusive Schools and Community Support Programmes (1995) project with donor countries. The committee supported inclusion and small-scale efforts to further the goals of Education for All and the Salamanca Statement. As a result, countries were able to fund teacher preparation programs, create adaptations to existing curricula, attempt to change attitudes regarding people with disabilities, create leaders, and engage human resources at the regional and national level (UNESCO, 1999). In effect, UNESCO developed preparation programs for countries and practitioners around the globe.

In 2006, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) was assembled with the goal of ensuring the quality of life of all human beings. The Convention was established to assist people with disabilities in becoming more established in the mainstream world and to help combat discrimination against people with disabilities. The Convention addressed accessibility, mobility, health, education, employment, housing, and rehabilitation. With 82 countries signing the Convention on the Right for Persons with Disabilities, the Convention had the highest number of signatories in UN Convention history (United Nations, 2016a)

Specific to education, Article 24 of the CRPD states, “Parties shall ensure an inclusive education system at all levels and life long learning” (UNGA, 2006, Article 24, para.1). The
second section of this article includes persons with disabilities who should be able to receive free, quality, general education, with reasonable accommodations. The third and fourth sections state that appropriate communication be taught to students who are deaf or blind. The final section discusses the need for accommodations in vocational and adult education (UNGA, 2006).

To further *Education for All* and the *Salamanca Statement*, the *Dakar Framework for Action* (2000) was created. The *Dakar Framework for Action* committed to six goals: (1) the expansion of early childhood care and education, (2) ensuring girls have access to free and compulsory education, (3) ensuring the learning needs of all young people and adults are met through appropriate learning, (4) achieving 50% improvement in literacy levels, (5) eliminating the gender gap in primary and secondary education, and (6) improving education so measurable outcomes are achieved by all. In addition to these goals and coinciding strategies to attain the goals, six regional frameworks for action were created based on the needs of the region (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2000). The *Dakar Framework for Action* was the first UN document to address the needs of specific areas of the world and within the *Dakar Framework for Action*, the *Sub-Saharan Africa Framework* was created.

The *Sub-Saharan Africa Framework* within the *Dakar Framework for Action* (2000) introduced the idea of the “the new vision of the African Renaissance” (UNESCO, 2000, p. 27). The framework states the four primary areas of focus for the region are access and equity, quality and relevance, capacity building, and partnerships. Access and equity refers to the commitment to review and develop policy, restructure government finances and develop a close relationship among government, schools, communities, and parents. The creators of the *Sub-Saharan Africa Framework* emphasized a need for special attention to be paid to street and working children, children in conflict areas, minority groups, refugees, and HIV/AIDS orphans. This framework
emphasized girls should be included in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)-related fields. Goals were created to improve the quality and relevance of educational changes in curriculum to include life skills such as dealing with HIV/AIDS. The writers focused on the improvement of teacher education, specifically in the areas of inclusion and technology, and created a minimum level for teacher education. Goals also were created for the improvement of cost-effective learning materials for schools. Focus statements for institutional and professional capacity-building for greater efficiency and effectiveness were strengthened along with gender friendliness. Some of the areas listed as priority for improvement in the Sub-Saharan Africa Framework are social, cultural, and economic development of Africa, the assurance of a basic right to food, shelter, security, and health and the involvement of teachers’ unions in developing the teaching profession. The authors of Sub-Saharan Africa Framework recognized the need to improve the partnership between the federal government and a selection of groups and organizations and identified the need to collaborate with NGOs, communities, parents, teachers’ associations, and ministries (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2000).

UN Millennium Development Goals

In 2002, the secretary-general of the UN wanted to create a plan to reduce the effects of poverty worldwide. The plan came to be known as the Millennium Development Goals. Goal two of the Millennium Development Goals is dedicated to universal primary education for everyone, including students with disabilities (“United Nations Millennium Development Goals,” 2016). Sub-Saharan Africa has made the most significant improvement in school enrollment with an increase of 20 percent from 2000-2015 (United Nations, 2015).
Africa

The *Salamanca Statement* provided a framework for developing countries to create or enhance special education programs. Inclusion was one suggestion given to governments to provide a low-cost solution and still provide services to students with disabilities (UNESCO, 1994). After the *Salamanca Statement* was written, governments worldwide began to implement special education programs and in many cases, more inclusive models. In Africa, many countries have adopted the concept of inclusion.

South Africa adopted an inclusive policy arguing that inclusion aligns with constitutional values in *White Paper Six: Special Needs Education* (Department of Education of South Africa, 2001), the framework for South Africa’s inclusive system (Walton, 2011). Since *White Paper Six: Special Needs Education* was implemented in South Africa, progress has been hindered by a lack of compliance and resistance (Walton, 2011).

Zimbabwe passed a policy on special education in 1980 (Chitiyo & Chitiyo, 2007). Prior to 1980, students with disabilities relied on NGOs for education (Chitiyo, 2006). Although Zimbabwe has a special education program and has laws to encourage inclusion, it is still a struggle to enact due to economic woes (Chitiyo, 2006). Chitiyo and Wheeler (2004) stated inclusion in Zimbabwe is more closely related to integration, where the school places the student in an inclusive setting, but it is the child who must make the accommodations in school (Mushoriwa, 2001).

Though Ethiopia developed a special needs education strategy for inclusive education in 2006, few special education options exist in the country. Special schools and classes are provided for those students with physical, sensory, or intellectual disabilities, but no other services, assessments, or interventions are being provided (Teklemariam & Fereja, 2011).
Like many African nations, Nigerians view people with disabilities as evil or as a curse against the family. Nigeria has attempted to change cultural perceptions of people with disabilities by “normalizing” them in society. This normalization has been called inclusive intervention; however, the government has not passed laws to support people with disabilities (Obiakor & Tabugbo Offor, 2011). The lack of progress of inclusion in Africa is not solely a policy issue, since societies’ response to disabilities, race, and gender determines the effectiveness of the implementation of inclusion (Winzer & Mazurek, 2009).

Though several African countries such as Botswana, Nigeria, Zambia, and South Africa have the philosophy of equal education for all, including those with disabilities, these philosophies are not always put into practice due to the curriculum being set for the above average learner (Abosi, 2007). Because students with mild disabilities do not have physical manifestations or many of the mental characteristics societies label as “disability,” they may not receive the services they need in many African nations (Abosi, 2007).

Botswana’s Disability Policies and Practices

Unlike many nations with emerging special education programs, Botswana has the financial backing and social conscience to implement special education. However, Botswana has shared many of the same difficulties as its African neighbors in the implementation of special education programs (Abosi, 2000). The laws and policies outlined by UNESCO have created the foundation for many nations, including those in the African country of Botswana. Botswana’s constitution was written to protect the rights and freedoms of every individual (Constitution of Botswana, 1966). The government has worked to incorporate the philosophy of Kagisano, or social harmony, in all policies (Presidential Task Group, 2016). In line with this ideology, many
of the policies of Botswana have focused on human rights. The “national principles of democracy, development, self-reliance, and unity” are infused into all development plans (Presidential Task Group, 2016, p. 4-5).

Botswana’s peaceful history plays a key role in its interest in human rights. Formerly called Bechuanaland, Botswana was a British Protectorate in south central Africa which gained independence from the United Kingdom in 1966 (Main, 2010). A protectorate is defined as, “the relation of a strong state towards a weaker state or territory that it protects and partly controls” (“Protectorate,” 2016, para. 1). Botswana enjoyed a peaceful transition to independence from the United Kingdom, but at that time, Botswana was one of the poorest countries in the world (The World Bank, 2016).

Botswana has demonstrated the drive to create human rights initiatives, such as special education, and is able to finance these initiatives through the diamond industry. Diamonds were discovered in 1967, and the economic trajectory of the country changed. The term “blood diamond” or “conflict diamond” has been used to describe the diamond mining industry in many African nations. The UN defined a “conflict diamond” as, “rough diamonds used by rebel movements or their allies to finance armed conflicts aimed at undermining legitimate governments” (The Kimberley Process, 2016, Section 1). However, “conflict diamonds” have not fueled the economy of Botswana (Fortin, 2012; Jasasmie, 2015; Koinange, 2006) because of its emphasis on human rights, and Botswana was one of the original governments to take part in drafting the Kimberley Process (Fortin, 2012; The Kimberley Process, 2016). This process governs the fair trade of diamonds. De Beers, one of the largest diamond mining companies in the world, entered into a joint venture with the government of Botswana, creating a 50% split of profits (Koinange, 2006; Nocera, 2008). In return, De Beers sold the government of Botswana
15% of the De Beers Company (Nocera, 2008). Since De Beers’ arrival in Botswana, the government has partnered with the company to create a number of initiatives, such as building roads, creating HIV prevention programs, and government supplied anti-retrovirals which have benefited both parties (Koinange, 2006; Nocera, 2008). Botswana’s governmental stability and strong democracy has enabled the country to become one of the fastest growing economies in the world (The World Bank, 2016). Botswana has been investing in education, health, and infrastructure and is now considered an upper middle income nation with a stable democracy, free elections, and a constitution providing fundamental rights to all (The World Bank, 2016). These events, the rise in democracy, and financial stability of the government have created the impetus for social programs such as special education.

With diamonds financing many of Botswana’s infrastructure, health, and social programs, Botswana has been able to study its people to better meet their needs. Until 1991, people with disabilities in Botswana were not counted by the census, thereby not allowing policymakers to fully understand the need for special education for their citizens. According to the 2011 Census, the population of Botswana was 2,024,904 people (Statistics Botswana, 2014). Initially, Botswana had used the WHO’s estimate of 10% of the population are people with disabilities (World Health Organization, 2015). Since 1991, people with disabilities have been counted in the census, and the census from 2011 had the number of people with disabilities identified at 59,103 (2.92%; Statistics Botswana, 2014). The definitions used to define people with disabilities includes the following:

- long-term impairment, be it physical, mental intellectual, or sensory, whether congenital or acquired which, when combined with environmental and societal barriers limits the person’s ability to function in society on an equal basis with others who have no
impairment. The limitations include inability to carry out activities of daily living independently. (Statistics Botswana, 2014, p. 204)

Impairment is defined as any loss or abnormality of psychological, physiological, or anatomical structure or function. (Oliver & Barnes, 1998, p. 15).

Secondary Education in Botswana

Since Botswana has developed social programs and financed them through the use of income from the diamond mines, education in Botswana seems well-funded. Botswana spent 9.5% of their gross national product on education in 2009, which made it the fifth highest ranking country for money spent on education as a percentage of their gross national product in the world (Statistics Botswana, 2014). Botswana provides free, compulsory education for ten years (Government of Botswana, 2011a).

Students in Botswana study nine subjects: Math, English, Setswana, Science, Social Studies, Agriculture, Creative and Performing Arts, Physical Education, and Moral Studies. Students are required to attend primary school for 7 years, from ages 6-13. Primary school is divided into lower and upper levels (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2011). At the end of primary school, students take the Primary School Leaving Examination, after which they then enter compulsory junior secondary school for an additional three years (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017).

Upon completion of junior secondary school, students take another exam, the Junior Certificate Examination (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2011). Depending on the student’s Junior Certificate Examination score, they may then apply to enter a senior secondary school. School fees are, however, required for this level, and the
admission process can be quite competitive. Students who have not passed the examination given at the end of junior secondary school may attend a vocational school.

The traditional model of junior secondary and senior secondary can be adapted for students with disabilities. In keeping with the government of Botswana’s ideals of Kagisano, or social harmony, the secondary school curriculum offers learning options to students of all academic levels, such as students with LD, and teachers are encouraged to use a learner-centered approach in classes. Secondary school is to prepare students for the world of work or university entrance (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2011).

To be eligible to attend a university, a student must have passed the Botswana General Certificate of Secondary Examination (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017). However, Botswana Technical Education Programmes offer nine vocational programs and have been expanded to include students of all ages and students with mild disabilities (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2011).

Evolution of Policy Reform and Special Education in Botswana

Even though Botswana has enjoyed much prosperity, it still experiences problems typical of developing nations. Like other African school systems, Botswana has had a history of inconsistencies such as frequent policy and curriculum changes. Some teachers have not been provided with preparation in educating students with disabilities. The typical class size is 40 students with a range of abilities. School infrastructure is poor, and some schools in rural areas are still held outside. Students often are affected by HIV/AIDS and poverty, which can account for a lack of student motivation (Abosi, 2007).
Besides these problems, students with disabilities have experienced mistreatment or abuse at the hands of their teachers. Shumba and Abosi (2011) conducted a study using a convenience sample (N=31) of students with varying disabilities ranging in age from 16-20. Researchers surveyed the students on forms of abuse they received from teachers. The students reported teachers required them to wash pots and pans (70%), to sell freezits (popsicles) or sweets (54%), or called them names (71%). Seventy-four percent of female students reported having their breasts touched or knew of another student who had their breasts touched by a teacher. Fifty-four percent of the students surveyed were forced to have sex with their teachers. When asked why, 45% of students said because there was a belief that young girls with disabilities were believed to be virgins, and thus free of HIV/AIDS (Shumba & Abosi, 2011). Many people believe people with disabilities are virgins, so they often fall victim to sexual abuse. Although there were limitations to this study due to the small sample size and because participants were all from the Gaborone area, the study still revealed beliefs teachers and society in general might have about students with disabilities.

Botswana has tried to develop policies to address the problems stated with perceptions and treatment of people with disabilities. The government of Botswana developed the first National Policy on Education in 1977, which gave all children access to an education, but did not include special education. The National Policy on Education white paper outlined the problems of the educational system at the time as not having enough emphasis on primary education, not enough preparation for the world of work, little opportunity for non-traditional students, gaps in education quality in rural schools, and private, for-profit schools, which are often inferior to government-funded schools. After outlining these problems, the government described strategies for improvement in each area. An emphasis was placed on the improvement
of primary schools, teacher preparation, the abolishment of school fees for primary school, and literacy instruction occurring in Setswana and English. Goals also changed for secondary education. Junior secondary schools were established, and nine years of free public education was created (Ministry of Education Botswana, 1977). Although the government made great strides with the *National Policy on Education*, special education was not included in these forward movements (Mukhopadhyay et al., 2012).

In 1993, the Government of Botswana assessed the problems they faced in educating students with disabilities. Although Botswana is a middle-income nation, educational resources have not always been provided to schools. The government found issues such as a lack of trained staff, not enough placement opportunities, no specific curricula, not enough reliable data, and poor early intervention and identification across school sites (Dart, Didimalang, & Pilime, 2002). Government policies since have been written in Botswana to try to alleviate the problems in schools serving students with disabilities.

Historically, special education in Africa was provided by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and church-affiliated groups (Abosi, 2007; Dart, Didimalang, & Pilime, 2002) with few written policies existing to protect or educate people with disabilities. Similar to much of Africa, church groups started educating students with disabilities in Botswana in 1969 when missionaries from the Dutch Reformed Church began to educate the blind and the Lutheran Church began to educate the deaf in 1970 (Brandon, 2006; Mukhopadhyay et al., 2012). Initially, only students with disabilities that were visible in society, such as physical impairments or intellectual disabilities, were served. Students without a visible disability, such as students with LD or emotional behavioral disorders, were educated in the general population with no accommodations provided.
The march towards special education continued in 1981-1982, when the Swedish International Development Agency assisted Botswana in creating the first special education unit in the Ministry of Education (Dart et al., 2002). In 1984, Botswana developed its first policy on special education by promoting early assessment and equal opportunity (Dart et al., 2002). The National Development Plan VI (1985) recommended mainstreaming students with disabilities (Dart et al., 2002).

Even with the resistance of some Batswana, in 1996, the government of Botswana furthered their approach to working with people with disabilities to enhance lives through the National Policy on Care for People with Disabilities, based on the guidelines of the United Nations World Programme of Action Concerning Disabled Persons (United Nations General Assembly, 1982). Several of these guidelines focused on education for students with disabilities. Through this policy, the responsibilities of agencies involved in the care of people with disabilities were outlined, beginning with the Responsibilities of the State. The Government of Botswana proposed to “prevent the social, emotional and physical deprivation of an individual” (UNGA, 1982, p. 6). The Office of the President was to increase policies for the welfare of students with disabilities and advocate for public and private resources for students with disabilities. The Ministry of Education was, and still is, expected to establish and maintain special education programs, policy, guidelines, and support for NGOs working in education. The Ministry of Health is expected to continue prevention services, introduce rehabilitation facilities, assist NGOs working in health care, and continue to support the medical professionals who work with people with disabilities in education and training (Ministry of Health Botswana, 1996).
Botswana instituted the *Revised National Policy on Education (RNPE)* in 1994, which recommended the inclusion of students with disabilities in public schools (Ministry of Education Botswana, 1994). The *RNPE* (1994) has many similarities to the *Salamanca Statement* (1994). The policy established special education teacher preparation facilities at the University of Botswana and Tlokweng College of Education and began requiring preservice general educators to take classes in special education practices (Abosi, 2000). Since then, additional legislation has been passed, demonstrating the government’s commitment to educating all students. The *RNPE* of 1994 changed Botswana’s education system, in part by adding special education. The government of Botswana continues to guide policymaking with the four national principles of democracy: self-reliance, unity, and development, pursuant to the national philosophy of *Kagisano* (Tabulawa, 1998).

In September of 2014, the Ministry of Education created the Inclusive Education Policy. The Ministry’s goal for this policy was to provide equal access to an inclusive education regardless of “gender, age, life circumstances, health, disability, stage of development, capacity to learn, or socio-economic circumstance” (p. 1). The term inclusive education in this policy was defined as:

> An Inclusive Education system is defined as one that includes, and meets the needs of all, including those with special educational needs, whatever their gender, life circumstances, health, disability, stage of development, capacity to learn, level of achievement, financial or any other circumstances. No one should be excluded from education. The Ministry of Education and Skills Development takes the lead in developing an inclusive education system but the proper development of such a system relies on high levels of coordination and cooperation with other Ministries, Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and
private providers who will be responsible for their own services which form part of the inclusive education system. (Ministry of Education and Skills Development of Botswana, 2014, p. 4)

The government of Botswana has stated the rationale for this policy is to comply with the international human rights policy and to ensure each member of society has the right to thrive.

**Special Education in Botswana**

Currently, Botswana uses two definitions of disability. The first has been adapted for use in Botswana from the definition of disability from the World Health Organization (WHO):

“restrictions in the use, or loss of body limbs, sight, intellect, speech, etc.” (Statistics Botswana, 2014, p. 203). The adapted definition by WHO and the definition by Oliver and Barnes (1998) are used interchangeably in the 2011 Census (2014), as are the terms “impairment” and “disability” as indicated here:

Long term impairment, be it physical, mental intellectual, or sensory, whether congenital or acquired which, when combined with environmental and societal barriers limits the person’s ability to function in society on an equal basis with others who have no impairment. The limitations include inability to carry out activities of daily living independently. (Statistics Botswana, 2014, p. 204)

“Impairment is defined as any loss or abnormality of psychological, physiological, or anatomical structure or function” (Oliver & Barnes, 1998, p. 15).

Botswana’s Ministry of Education has recognized six categories of special education: visual impairment, hearing impairment, speech and language difficulties, intellectual disabilities, learning disabilities, and physical disabilities (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017).
officials have begun to reference the term autism. The category of emotional behavioral disorder has not been used in Botswana.

Abosi and Otukile-Mongwaketse (2017) stated students in Botswana are diagnosed with a disability by a team of professionals located at the Central Resource Centre (CRC). The CRC provides assessments for the entire country of Botswana. A student can be referred for testing through a parent/guardian, school officials, or health officials. The CRC staff members complete the initial evaluation when they are traveling to schools.

Much like other nations, students with disabilities in Botswana must be assessed prior to receiving an Individual Education Programme (IEP), which provides them services (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017; Mangope, Bawa Kuyini, & Major, 2012). However, Botswana does not have clear policies on the assessment of students with disabilities (Mangope, Bawa Kuyini, & Major, 2012). Mangope et al. (2012) conducted a study of the CRC, the sole entity for evaluation in Botswana, and found they were aware of their inability to reach all students who needed assessments in the country, as they are limited by location and staffing. Mangope et al. (2012) also stated that many schools’ faculty members might not have the preparation to know when to refer students for testing. Limited information is available to determine the instruments the CRC uses to evaluate a student with disabilities. Government guidelines or definitions for the six categories of disabilities used in Botswana cannot be found online.

Inclusion in Botswana

Botswana is trying to promote inclusion of students with disabilities in schools. Although inclusion is mandated in Botswana, not all groups of students are included. Botswana’s policy now mandates that students with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities and
LD be engaged in the inclusive system (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014). Students with other types of disabilities are to be educated in special schools or special education units attached to schools (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017). The practices and studies provided in this section are based on current publications and research in K12, teacher education, preservice teachers and students with disabilities.

Preservice Teachers

Concerns about inclusion have not only been limited to working teachers but also to preservice teachers who have had similar concerns. In a survey of 202 university students in Ghana and Botswana, preservice teachers were worried about their ability to provide equal attention to all students, the severity of the disability, and funding (Kuyini & Mangope, 2011). However, as the students’ levels of education increased, the attitudes of preservice teachers became more positive. Forty-seven postgraduate diploma education students enrolled in a special education course at the University of Botswana and were given a pre and post questionnaire. The pretest/posttest results of students’ perceptions of inclusion revealed a statistically significant change in attitude after the course was complete. Students’ scores increased from pretest ($M = 59.06, SD = 6.71$) to posttest ($M = 63.70, SD = 5.59$) by the end of the course with an effect size of 4.29 using Cohen’s $d$. The students’ results provided a picture of comfort and confidence in teaching students with disabilities in their classes (Otukile-Mongwaketse & Mukhopadhyay, 2013).

Dart (2006) evaluated preservice teachers’ attitudes regarding people with disabilities in his Special Needs Awareness course at Molepolole College of Education. Eighty-seven student reflections were analyzed into themes and subthemes. Many of the university students Dart
polls believed people with disabilities were cursed by God or were the result of parents who were witches. Some students expressed fear of people with disabilities and others suggested that students with disabilities were not able to learn. One student’s reflections discussed the use of a stick to control people with disabilities, though later the student stated they realized their behavior was wrong (Dart, 2006). This discrimination against people with disabilities has been prevalent in many forms in Botswana.

In a qualitative study, 18 student teachers in their fourth year of their special education program at the University of Botswana were selected to participate in focus groups to discuss their experiences with inclusion. Themes that emerged from the analysis of these data included student teachers feeling unprepared to serve all populations of students with disabilities. Student teachers were worried about working with students with disabilities because of student behavioral problems, though teachers in the school expected the preservice teachers majoring in special education would be able to solve all student behavior problems. Students revealed they felt oppressed by other faculty and students at UB, and they were made to feel as if their chosen field was unimportant (Mukhopadhyay, Molosiwa, & Moswela, 2009).

Teacher Education

Since the University of Botswana graduated the first group of special education teachers in 1997, the demand for special education teachers in Botswana has continued to grow (Abosi, 2000). A persistent shortage of special education teachers exists in Botswana, and the distribution of teachers has not been even throughout the country (Abosi, 2000). The law mandates each primary school to have a Senior Teacher of Learning Difficulties; however, few schools actually have filled the position (Dart, 2007). Because of this increased need for special educators, the University of Botswana has created an in-service diploma for working teachers
and a preservice double major. Special education majors are expected to choose one of four specialization categories: learning difficulties, visual impairment, hearing impairment, or intellectual disabilities (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017).

Teachers in Botswana may opt for one of three types of teaching degrees: the Primary Teaching Certificate, the three-year program only offered at teacher’s training college, and the four-year bachelor’s degree offered at the University of Botswana (Mukhopadhyay, 2015). As part of the RNPE of 1994 all teacher education programs require special education classes.

University students are being educated to challenge traditional beliefs. However, some of the general public still believe people with disabilities are cursed. Modernization is a new concept in Botswana and with modernization have come new ideas which seem liberal and often confusing to the Motswana who have moved from rural areas (Livingston, 2005). Even though policies have changed regarding special education in Botswana, many people have received misinformation about students with disabilities. Due to the university courses in special education, preservice teachers’ attitudes on teaching students with disabilities have been changing (Otukile-Mongwaketse & Mukhopadhyay, 2013).

Currently, degrees in special education can only be obtained from the University of Botswana in Gaborone in the areas of intellectual disability, learning disability, visual impairment, and hearing impairment. Five other teacher-training programs exist in Botswana, three focusing on primary and two on secondary education (Otukile-Mongwaketse & Mukhopadhyay, 2013).
Many teachers in Botswana have had difficulty embracing the new idea of inclusion, and survey research found that Family and Consumer Science teachers polled felt very negatively about the inclusion of students with physical disabilities in their classes (Brandon, 2006). In 2010, researchers expanded this study to survey 103 teachers, who taught all levels of students in different subjects in five geographical areas, both urban and rural, in Botswana. Overall, the survey showed most participants had a somewhat negative attitude towards inclusion. Specifically, teachers did not want to include students who were blind, deaf, or had behavioral problems. Teachers also expressed not wanting to change or adapt the curriculum for students with disabilities, but they expressed a more positive perception of students with language or physical disabilities. Teachers were most concerned about disruptive students and students with disabilities lagging behind their peers (Chhabra, Srivastava, & Srivastava, 2010).

Likewise, in a qualitative thesis by Nthitu (2011), eight participants (four “ordinary” teachers and four special education teachers, from two primary schools in southeastern Botswana) were interviewed on the subject of inclusion. Teachers in special education units felt belittled and looked down upon by other teachers. They stated they felt trivialized by the other teachers. The “ordinary” teachers felt they did not have the proper curriculum to support students with disabilities. Most of the teachers interviewed cited class size as a problem, and they were not sure if it was possible to add students with disabilities and still meet their needs according to their IEP. Teachers revealed students with disabilities were included with “ordinary” students in assemblies and break times. When teachers were asked about “ordinary”
students’ perspectives, they felt a sense of acceptance by the students in the school and mentioned they encouraged students to accept students with disabilities (Nthitu, 2011).

In a multiple case study investigation, Mukhopadhyay, Nenty, and Abosi (2012) collected data from students with disabilities in regular schools, students with disabilities placed in a class with students without disabilities, school administrators, and general education teachers with experience teaching students with disabilities in six primary schools in the South Central Region of Botswana. When researchers asked general education teachers about inclusive classes, they reported a preference for teaching students with LD. The teachers disclosed students with LD were “easier to manage and accommodate,” but they were reluctant to teach students with physical disabilities, deafness, blindness, or emotional problems (Mukhopadhyay et al., 2012). Teachers and administrators believed class sizes were too large to provide the attention needed for students with disabilities, and both groups expressed concerns about not having appropriate materials or infrastructure to teach so many students. Regardless of the problems mentioned by teachers and administrators, the researchers noted primary school students did not seem to have problems playing, eating, or working together in classes (Mukhopadhyay et al., 2012).

In a mixed-mode study, Mangope and Mukhopadhyay (2015) surveyed and interviewed 86 participants from ten zones in the country to obtain teacher perceptions on the topic of professional development and the topic of inclusion. The researchers concluded few general and special educators collaborated regularly, and most general educators felt they were unprepared to teach students with disabilities in an inclusive setting. School Intervention Teams (SIT), mandated through the RNPE (Ministry of Education Botswana, 1994), are to consist of groups of professionals at each school in Botswana, led by a head special education teacher who meets to discuss the IEPs of students with disabilities (Abosi, 2000). In Mangope and Mukhopadhyay’s
study, most teachers felt their school’s SIT was largely dysfunctional and did not provide adequate professional development for the needs of students with disabilities. The researchers recommended on-going, school-based professional development programs to be formed to address this issue.

In a qualitative study by Mukhopadhyay, Nety, and Abosi (2012), primary education teachers discussed the implementation of inclusion in their schools through researcher-led focus groups. The teachers expressed opinions regarding the lack of preparation, difficulty in dealing with student behavioral problems, large class size, and lack of facilities and resources. Moreover, many senior teachers, who have taught for many years, may have not had any courses in special education. This lack of educational focus for the type of instruction suggested by the Ministry of Education of student-centered learning and for inclusive education could be limited based on these current findings.

Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Higher Education

Inclusive educational practices in Botswana have been extended beyond secondary school into the higher education setting. Yet, discrimination against students with disabilities exists even in higher education. Universities in Botswana endeavor to become inclusive and have begun providing Disabled Student Support (DSS), but discrimination still exists and supports have not been adequate for all types of disabilities. Researchers at the University of Botswana conducted a study with seven undergraduate students identified with a disability (Moswela & Mukhopadhyay, 2011). Through focus groups, participants revealed their experiences while studying at the university. Many students discussed discrimination they felt when asking professors for academic accommodations. Some revealed they had to go to DSS to
ask for help in dealing with discrimination. Some participants with physical disabilities discussed the need for building ramps in order to go to class. Participants reported positive interactions in the counseling center in assisting them with discrimination. As a result of this study, researchers have suggested policy changes for students with disabilities to include academic accommodations, improving physical access, training for staff and faculty, and allowing the voices of students with disabilities to be heard by leaders of the university (Moswela & Mukhopadhyay, 2011).

Learning Disabilities

Students with disabilities in Botswana also have been reported as having difficulties in school (Abosi, 2007). Students with LD have had a very different set of problems in the inclusive setting compared to their peers without disabilities. A very clear definition of an inclusive classroom has been written into the *Inclusive Education Policy* (2014) with Botswana officials recognizing people with LD are to be incorporated into the inclusive classroom. However, no available definition is used as criteria for eligibility of a student with LD. Disability often has multiple definitions within cultures and societies, and often it is the people of the society who define the disability. “Discrete disabilities”, such as students with LD, take many cultures longer to create a standardized definition (Winzer & Mazurek, 2011). The term LD originated in the United States (US) by Samuel Kirk in 1963 (Kirk, 1981), and although the definition has changed throughout the years as more research becomes available, all revisions to the definition remain clear and consistent in the use of the term in the US. In contrast, in Africa, no such criterion exists for LD; therefore, the term has been defined using the original westernized definition presented by Kirk (1971) and parts of the US definitions written in the
**Individuals with Disabilities Act** (IDEA, 2004). Generally, African educators use the term LD for a student who experiences learning difficulties without a physical disability, but in most African nations, including Botswana, no firm definition of LD exists (Abosi, 2007). African educators are reported to believe a student with LD can learn, but it may take them longer to comprehend (Abosi, 2007).

In a pilot study, Yoder and Kibria (1987) attempted to use teacher rating scales, behavioral rating scales, a test of visual-motor skills, a test of academic aptitude, and school performance to identify students with LD in primary schools. Their evaluation tools, although varied, were not designed for the culture of Botswana, so they were adapted to meet the cultural needs of the population. The study participants were gathered from four primary schools in the Gaborone area. All participants were in standard five and seven. Two of these schools used Setswana as a medium of instruction for the first five years, and two of the schools used an all-English medium. According to the measures employed, 11% of standard five and 8% of standard seven students in the Setswana medium schools met the criteria for a learning disability, and in the English medium schools, none of the students in standard five met the criteria for LD. However, 12% percent of the students in standard seven did (Yoder & Kibria, 1987). Since this study in 1987, no definitions, guidelines, or evaluation tools to determine eligibility for students with LD have been identified in Botswana.

Abosi (2007) outlined problems that have faced students with LD in Botswana’s school system. He explained large class size, poor classroom management, and frequent educational reforms have led to changes in the school routine and structure, while curriculum changes and new grading schemes leave many students with LD struggling to keep up. Promotion to the next grade level has been determined by either examination or automatic promotion. In either
situation, students with LD often feel discouraged because they did not pass the examination, or because they feel they were promoted without knowing the skills necessary for the next class level (Abosi, 2007). Moreover, with only two tracks in Botswana’s school system, special school or regular school, many students with LD in between the two levels have fallen behind their peers (Raditoaneng, 2011).

The Curriculum Development Division of the Ministry of Education has recommended changes to improve the learning of all students, including a recommendation for less “chalk and talk” and more differentiated instruction such as the use of Universal Design for Learning (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017). These changes can only enhance the classroom experience for students with LD, but general education teachers do not feel prepared to teach students with LD and have shared their concerns about the changes in the structure of the typical classroom. They also feel they lack professional development on inclusion and teaching students with LD in the typical classroom (Mangope & Mukhopadhyay, 2015). Yet, what professional development is needed, especially for students with disabilities, is yet to be determined. Themes found in the literature related to practices in Botswana are provided for consideration of future professional development of teachers aligned with inclusive practices.

**Instructional Practices in Botswana**

Most instructional approaches in Botswana are similar to other nations, and most classrooms typically use whole class instruction because of large class size, which is typically not a favorable learning method for students with LD (Otukile-Mongwaketse, Mangope, & Kuyini, 2016). In a qualitative study by Otukile-Mongwaketse et al. (2016), teacher participants in Botswana revealed the use of the following accommodations in their primary school classes:
reduced assignment size, adapted or repeated instructions, extra time with the teacher after school, and differentiated instruction.

The Salamanca Statement suggested research-based practices should be used for students with disabilities; yet, currently no specific practices are identified for students with LD (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1994). One tool created and validated for observation of students with disabilities in Botswana was created by Mukhopadhyay (2009). This tool was used as the semi-structured, non-participant observation guide for the present study. Mukhopadhyay (2009) presents a list of research-based accommodations, adaptations, and instructional strategies to be observed in inclusive classes in Botswana. The objective for the use of this observation tool in this study is to identify the types of accommodations and/or instructional strategies being used in schools to support students with LD. Mukhopadhyay's (2009) tool is further enhanced by looking at the current literature for students with LD and used to modify the existing tool. The accommodations identified can be found in Table 3.
Table 3

Accommodations, Adaptations, or Instructional Supports and Corresponding Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodations, Adaptation, or Instructional Strategy (Mukhopadhyay, 2009)</th>
<th>Research to Support and Researcher Recommendations for Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repeat/ rephrase</td>
<td>Horton &amp; Hall, 1998; NCLD, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching strategies (mnemonic devices)</td>
<td>Bulgren et al., 1988; Deshler et al., 2008; Schumaker &amp; Deshler, 1988; Scruggs &amp; Mastropieri, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td>Bauwens, Hourcade, &amp; Friend, 1989; Scruggs, 1994; Dieker &amp; Murawski, 2003; Magiera, Smith, &amp; Zigmond, 2005; Murawski, 2006; Scruggs, Mastropieri, &amp; McDuffie, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>Dieker, 2013; NCLD, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted instruction</td>
<td>Dieker, 2013; NCLD, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative assignment</td>
<td>Dieker, 2013; NCLD, 2006; Tomlinson, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided notes</td>
<td>Anderson et al., 2004; L. Dieker, 2013; Horton &amp; Hall, 1998; LDAA, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced assignment length</td>
<td>Horton &amp; Hall, 1998; LDAA, 2013; Maccini &amp; Gagnon, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended time for assignments and/or tests</td>
<td>Dieker, 2013; Horton &amp; Hall, 1998; LDAA, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Instruction</td>
<td>Tomlinson, 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of the literature to support the use of these tools for students with LD is provided in the section below. The research reported is mainly from US literature, but per discussions with the creator of this tool, these references provide a conceptual understanding as to why these proposed strategies are being observed in inclusive settings for students with LD in Botswana. This tool follows recommendations in the Salamanca Statement (United Nations
Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1994) for the use of research-based practices for students with LD.

**Peer tutoring**

The strategy of peer tutoring is considered an effective practice for students with LD (see Table 3) because peer tutoring was created specifically to improve the academic performance of students with LD and/or disadvantaged backgrounds in the typical classroom (Delquadri et al., 1983). Arreaga-Mayer (1998) defined a peer tutor as a classmate who is trained to correct errors, provide feedback, and work with their partners in a variety of academic areas. In a study by Maheady, Sacca, and Harper (1987), peer tutoring was found to be effective for students with LD in secondary settings.

**Repeat/Rephrase**

Repeat or rephrase is a typical accommodation to help with retention of information used with many students with LD at all grade levels (see Table 3). An accommodation is “any change to a classroom environment or task that permits a qualified student with a disability to participate in the classroom process, to perform the essential tasks of the class, or enjoy benefits and privileges of the classroom” (Horton & Hall, 1998, p. 8). Often repeat/rephrase falls under the accommodations category of presentation on the Individualized Education Program (IEP) and can be defined as oral instruction provided for a student using different wordings (NCLD, 2006) or simplified directions (Dieker, 2013).
Teaching strategies (mnemonic devices)

Mnemonic devices are recommended for students with LD to help with recall of facts or to remember processes in education (see Table 3). A common trait of students with LD is a deficit in memory (Kirk & Kirk, 1971). A mnemonic is a “device, procedure, or operation that is used to improve memory” (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1990, p. 271). The authors further clarify a mnemonic device can facilitate memory retrieval by using keywords, the pegword method (rhyming), acronyms, reconstructive elaborations, phonic mnemonics, spelling mnemonics, and number-sound mnemonics. Mnemonics are commonly used in many teaching strategies for students with LD in secondary school (Bulgren et al., 1988; Deshler et al., 2008; Schumaker & Deshler, 2009).

Co-Teaching

An effective teaching method to support students with LD in inclusive settings is co-teaching (see Table 3). Co-teaching is a practice that typically involves a general and a special education teacher working together (Bauwens et al., 1989; Cook & Friend, 1991, 1995; Dieker, 2013; Magiera et al., 2005; Scruggs et al., 2007). In this model, the teachers are expected to co-plan, co-instruct, and co-assess (Dieker, 2013; Magiera et al., 2005). This strategy is used to support students with LD in the general education settings in secondary schools (Dieker, 2013).

Small group

Another very typical accommodation on an IEP for students with LD is the use of small group instruction, which is usually found under the setting category (see Table 3). Small groups
can be used for classroom instruction (Morocco, Clay, Parker, & Zigmond, 2006), test taking (NCLD, 2006), or peer tutoring in a variety of academic areas (Berkeley, Scruggs, & Mastropieri, 2010).

**Adapted instruction**

Some students with LD may require adapted instruction to allow them to meet the same learning standards through an alternate pathway. Adapted instruction can take many forms in a classroom setting (see Table 3). What Works Clearinghouse (2013) recommends the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol as one method for teachers to adapt planning and delivery to increase student vocabulary while teaching academic content. Dieker (2013) recommends the use of an alternative textbook that covers the same content but at a different reading level. A common accommodation used for most secondary students with LD is extended time given on tests or assignments (NCLD, 2006).

**Alternative assignment**

Alternative assignments have been successful in working with students with LD by allowing them to demonstrate understanding through an area of strength (see Table 3). Secondary students with LD may require the accommodation of a different type of assignment. An alternative assignment may require the student to practice the same content but not in the same format as other students in class. The student may create or complete a project or respond verbally rather than in writing (Dieker, 2013; NCLD, 2006).
**Reduced assignment length**

The reduction of assignment length is a common accommodation on the IEP for a student with LD (see Table 3) because it allows for the student with a processing disorder to complete the same standards as their peers without requiring an overly labor-intensive assignment (NCLD, 2006). This approach to the same standard can be achieved by a reduction in the number of answer choices in an assignment or fewer assigned problems (Dieker, 2013).

**Guided notes**

The strategy of guided notes allows more time for a student with LD, who struggles to write, to process information during a class lecture rather than having to concentrate on getting all the notes down (see Table 3). Guided notes are class notes with missing information given to students by the teacher. As the teacher moves through a lecture, students fill in the missing information on their guided notes sheet. Students with LD often benefit from guided notes because they provide structure and help students learn note-taking skills (Dieker, 2013; Konrad, Joseph, & Itoi, 2011).

**Extended time for assignments and/or tests**

Many students with LD, of all age levels, receive extended time on class assignments, homework, projects, and tests (NCLD, 2006). Some students with LD may have auditory or visual processing disorders, poor memory, reading or writing problems, shortened attention spans, or poor memory (Learning Disabilities Association of America, 2013), which can affect a student’s ability to perform on a timed test.
Differentiated Instruction

Students with LD have benefited from the use of differentiated instruction (DI; see Table 3) due to the various learning styles of students with LD (Tomlinson, 2001). Tomlinson (2001) describes DI as providing students with options on “acquiring knowledge, processing or making sense of ideas, and developing products so that each student can learn effectively” (p. 1). The use of DI has been successful for mixed ability learners, of all ages, and in a variety of settings (Tomlinson et al., 2003).

Universal Design for Learning

The principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) are cited as a recommended source in the Common Core’s Applications to Students with Disabilities (2016). Universal Design for Learning can benefit all students, not just students with disabilities. The principles of UDL can be infused into all subject areas. The concept of UDL divides learning to activate areas of the brain and to motivate different types of learners. There are three areas of UDL: Engagement, Representation, and Action and Expression. By presetting multiple methods for students to complete assignments, teachers allow the student the option to make the proper choice to suit their learning needs (Rose & Meyer, 2000).

Overuse of Accommodations

The use of research-based strategies and accommodations can help students with LD to level the educational playing field with their peers. Appropriate use of accommodations is important to ensure success, but overuse can also create learned helplessness. While UDL and
other types of accommodations support students with LD to become more successful in their classes and on examinations, overuse of accommodations can create a sense of learned helplessness. Learned helplessness is when a human learns they can do little to improve their situation, so they become helpless (Arnold, 1997). Learned helplessness has been linked to students with LD through repeated academic failures (Thomas, 1979). As a result of learned helplessness, students with LD tend to minimize the importance of effort in academic settings (Canino, 1981). Providing a student with LD with an accommodation, when a student is capable, is an example of how a student can learn to be helpless.

Bullying of Students with Learning Disabilities

Besides students with LD becoming dependent on overused accommodations, students with LD often face the problem of bullying at school. Bullying is addressed in the Inclusive Education Policy (Mangope, Dinama, & Kefhilwe, 2012; Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014; Tjavanga & Jotia, 2012). However, few studies have been completed on this topic in Botswana, and the researcher did not find any studies about bullying and students with disabilities. However, this prevalent issue is one mentioned by teachers and students. Survey research was used to determine if students were being bullied at school in Botswana. Of the 91 surveys returned, all 91 affirmed there was peer victimization in their schools. Fourteen percent of those polled listed disability as the reason they were victimized (Moswela, 2005). Also, bullying of students in Gaborone’s junior secondary schools was examined in a study by Mosenki (2006). The researcher found a significant relationship between low academic achievement and students being bullied. The government of Botswana has acknowledged bullying as a problem by including it in the Inclusive Education Policy in statement 9.c.
Schools will develop anti-bullying policies and practices to ensure that children with special educational needs are safe and happy in the school environment. (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014)

Conclusion

Though students with LD have not been incorporated into many of the UN documents on disability, LD is now a category in Botswana’s education policies (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017). Inclusion is also mandated for students with LD (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014). Researchers have examined many areas of inclusion in Botswana’s schools including teacher perspectives, preservice teacher perspectives, preservice teachers’ level of preparedness, professional development for teachers, and parents’ perspectives (Chhabra et al., 2010; Kuyini & Mangope, 2011; Leyser & Kirk, 2004; Mangope & Mukhopadhyay, 2015b; Mukhopadhyay, 2009, 2013). Perspectives of students with LD at the secondary level have not been examined. Research on junior secondary students with LD in Botswana has been limited with the majority of studies focused on primary students. The researcher in this study examined the supports, practices, and perceptions of junior secondary students with LD within an inclusive setting.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this ethnographic study is to explore the organizational factors in school culture in Botswana for students with disabilities, specifically students with learning disabilities (LD), in relation to instructional and inclusive practices through the lens of key stakeholders’ perspectives in Gaborone, Botswana. The term culture has been defined by UNESCO as a “complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, laws, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by [a human] as a member of society” (2017, para. 1). The term school culture has been defined as “complex webs of stories, traditions, and rituals budding over time as teachers, students, parents, and administrators work together to deal with crises and accomplishments” (Deal & Peterson, 2016, p. 8).

The researcher was unable to locate the definition for LD in Botswana. Several researchers in Botswana, through discussions, shared that typically the accepted definition is the US definition. Therefore, the term LD has been defined for this study using the definition from the Individuals with Disabilities Act from the United States (US):

Specific learning disability means a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, that may manifest itself in the imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations, including conditions such as perceptual disabilities, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia (U.S. Department of Education, 2004, para. 10).
This definition is used to guide the researcher in the observation of students identified as LD in a secondary school in Botswana. The researcher realizes the context of this definition is not grounded in a formal definition accepted in Botswana, but lead researchers in the country suggested this definition is used by teachers and researchers until a formalized definition is adopted or provided by the Botswana government.

The supports, practices, and perceptions of students with LD in inclusive settings were explored using ethnography. Ethnography is qualitative research using nonexperimental methods to answer questions about human behavior within systems and to determine what governs this behavior (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2013). Qualitative research can infer causation and can lead to understanding of phenomena within a particular context (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2013). This proposed study was conducted with the intent of understanding the phenomena of junior secondary supports, practices, and perceptions of students with LD throughout the school system.

In this study, the researcher explored the inclusive and instructional practices provided to students with LD in the school and classroom to provide academic, emotional, and social support. This in-depth analysis includes a review of the criterion for diagnosis such as school, student, and teacher daily routines, students’ views and perceptions, and faculty members’ and administrative leaders’ perceptions of this population of students.

Ethnography was used to understand the social life and culture of secondary students with LD in Botswana. The researcher was embedded in the culture to record beliefs, motivations, and behaviors of students with LD (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2013). Because ethnography is derived from anthropology, the hallmark of the ethnography is fieldwork (Fetterman, 2010). The most important part of fieldwork is the researcher gathering data while
being immersed in the culture, all the while asking questions and writing down anecdotes during observations. Lastly, the triangulation of data must take place (Fetterman, 2010). Therefore, in the tradition of the classical ethnography, the researcher was immersed in the culture and collected data in an inclusive, junior secondary school in Gaborone, Botswana over four months from multiple sources.

This research expands upon an existing body of special education research in Botswana by contributing to the understanding of the culture for junior secondary students with LD in special education in Gaborone, Botswana. The outcomes of this study have potentially provided a better understanding of the special education system for students with LD in Botswana and may broaden the current research on topics such as bullying for students with LD, academic struggles students with LD may experience in junior secondary schools, evaluation procedures in Botswana, and teacher and administrator perspectives on inclusion. This study may bring awareness to the current practices for students with LD in junior secondary school in Gaborone, Botswana. Additionally, this research also may bring to light the accomplishments Botswana has made in their special education programs with regard to both policy and implementation at the junior secondary school level in Gaborone and may be used as an example for other emerging special education programs at a global level. Research has been conducted on the topics of special education, inclusion, and students with disabilities, including those with LD in Botswana, but in elementary settings. Until this study was conducted, research was void on the supports, practices, and perceptions of students with LD in a junior secondary inclusive placement.
Research Support

To understand the instructional and inclusive practices for students with LD, this ethnographic study took place over a period of four months. During this time, the researcher collaborated directly with lead faculty members and researchers at the University of Botswana on this topic to ensure her lens and views reflected the culture of the country.

Since ethnographic research relies on the collection of data in the organic environment of the participant, the researcher spent extended time in the country to glean as much understanding and information as possible from both collaboration with lead researchers and from grounding her work in ongoing and sustained visits to schools and classrooms in Gaborone, Botswana. Typical forms of data collection found in ethnographic research such as interviews, observations, and document analyses were gathered over four months of observation with member-checking following the collection of data (Creswell, 2007). In-depth observations over the course of the study allowed the researcher to grow accustomed to the daily routines and activities and to formulate a deeper understanding from multiple perspectives. In direct interviews with participants, following human subjects approval procedures from the researcher’s university and the University of Botswana, the researcher learned more specific details of the participants’ thoughts, feelings, and perceptions. During the interviews and in classroom observations, the participants’ body language, comments, and overall interactions were noted. Documents analyzed during school and classroom visits were class assignments, textbooks, psychological evaluations, grade reports, and postsecondary opportunity flyers, regarding students with LD.

The researcher was provided direct guidance on this work from Professor Okey Abosi and Professor Sourav Mukhopadhyay, Faculty of Education at the University of Botswana. Professor Abosi has conducted many studies on special education in Botswana and abroad and
has been published in numerous international journals (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017; Abosi & Kandjii-Murangi, 1996; Abosi, 2000; Abosi, 2007). Professor Abosi placed the researcher in a public, junior secondary school, which meets the specific requirements of this research design. Professor Mukhopadhyay has conducted and published studies in the area of inclusion in Botswana, and his work has appeared in many international journals (Mukhopadhyay, 2009, 2013, 2015; Mukhopadhyay & Moswela, 2010; Mukhopadhyay et al., 2012). Professor Abosi provided ongoing mentorship while research was being conducted in Botswana.

Research Question

The primary question answered in this study is: What are the observed supports, practices, and perceptions of the inclusive culture in a junior secondary school setting in Gaborone, Botswana to support students with LD? In the development of this question, the theoretical framework created by Winzer and Mazurek (2012) was used. To better understand all of the facets of the primary question, multiple sub-questions were created. In the development of these subquestions, the definition of culture written by UNESCO, the “complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, laws, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by [a human] as a member of society” was used (UNESCO, 2017, para. 1).

The following are the specific sub-questions used:

1. What are the daily routines, academic activities/accommodations and classroom life for students with LD within the school’s culture?

2. How do students with the identification of LD in Gaborone, Botswana view themselves in the culture in an inclusive setting?
3. How do teachers and administrators view the inclusive education program?

4. What accommodations, adaptations, or instructional strategies do teachers use to support students with LD?

**Research Strategy: Appropriateness of Design**

**Ethnographic Design**

An ethnographic, qualitative study was conducted to answer the research question and subquestions. In the qualitative tradition, the voice of the participant has emanated as the centermost focus of the study and provided a beginning understanding of the students with LD in Botswana in this particular secondary school (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Brantlinger, Jimenez, Klingner, Pugach, and Richardson (2005) note qualitative research is a commonly used platform to understand people with disabilities. The classical ethnographic process has been derived from anthropology (Creswell, 2007; Grbich, 2007) and provides a description or interpretation of a social group or system (Brantlinger et al., 2005). The culture-sharing group explored in this study is junior secondary students with LD in Gaborone, Botswana. This ethnography focused on this culture-sharing group and identifies significant patterns, such as ideas, beliefs, rituals, and customary behaviors (Creswell, 2007). The ethnographer used observations, interviews, and document analyses to understand the nature of education of students with LD in Botswana in a junior secondary school (Brantlinger et al., 2005; Creswell, 2007; Fetterman, 2010). This ethnography employed the tenets of classical ethnography by providing descriptions of the social norms of the culture-sharing group of students with LD in an inclusive, junior secondary school setting.
The most popular form of ethnography, a realist account of the culture-sharing group (Van Maanen, 1988) was used. The result of the realist form of ethnography is a researcher’s account of “specific, bounded, observed cultural practices” (Van Maanen, 1988). The researcher followed the three important tenets of realist design: narration in the third person; thick, rich description; and “interpretative omnipotence” (Van Maanen, 1988, p. 51). Van Maanen (1988) defines “interpretive omnipotence” (p. 51) as the design in which the researcher reports her findings, generally in an impersonal manner. The researcher was guided by the observed practices in the culture and participant interviews, thus following the tenets of realist design to provide a full, complete description of the culture of inclusion in the classroom setting for junior secondary students with LD.

A goal of this researcher is to portray the school experience for students with LD in junior secondary schools by examining inclusive practices, culture of the classrooms, and teacher interactions. To best depict the experiences of adolescences with LD, the researcher removed “I” statements in the narration. Implementing this procedure decreases the readers’ assumption of author bias (Van Maanen, 1988). Van Maanen (1988) notes, by writing the qualitative narrative in third-person, the reader is better able to understand the author’s account of the daily activities in the culture.

The term “thick, rich description” has been used to depict typical writing in ethnography (Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and is used in this study. In the description, literary devices were used, such as writing in the speech pattern of the speaker and utilizing dialogue, to better illustrate the culture of students with LD (Fetterman, 2010). Van Maanen (1988) wrote, typically in a realist ethnography, the author is removed from the narrative by using third-person. The voice that has been portrayed through this writing is that of all stakeholders involved in the
educational system surrounding students with LD, and this voice is grounded in the students’ perceptions of the same.

The term “interpretative omnipotence” (p. 51) in ethnography allows the researcher to present the culture in the style or wording they see fit (Van Maanen, 1988). In this study, the researcher interpreted from a lens that looks at the inclusive practices used in the culture of the classroom and the teachers’ interactions with adolescents with LD. The realist design allowed the researcher to offer the facts gathered from the cultural lens of the researcher (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2013), yet grounded in a specific viewpoint where various viewpoints are presented. The researcher presents data gathered to the extent possible through the voice of the adolescent with LD.

Framework for Data Analysis

The use of a framework reflecting both inclusive and instructional practices guided the researcher in data collection. For inclusive practices, the researcher reflected upon what is observed within the framework of Winzer and Mazurek (2012). These authors discussed the worldwide movement of the inclusion of students with disabilities into traditional schools and created a model to examine inclusive schooling. The Model of Inclusive Schooling was developed with the concept of social justice as the overall focus. The many elements that contribute to this change towards a more inclusive approach to education were observed for junior secondary students with LD.

Many policies in Botswana are guided by the principle of Kagisano, or social harmony, which includes social justice. Winzer and Mazurek (2012) note the center of an inclusive system is social justice because inclusion of all people is a human right (UNESCO, 1990). In their
model, Winzer and Mazurek (2012) developed four themes surrounding social justice in an inclusive setting. These four themes have framed the data collection.

Around the center of social justice, Winzer and Mazurek (2012) first described the dimensions of time section of the framework as important in evaluating an inclusive system. The authors postulated the evaluation of an inclusive system requires longitudinal data, and evaluation occurs in slow increments. Reform, such as Botswana’s inclusive movement, occurs in three phases: slow growth, explosive growth, and burnout (Steiner-Khamsi, 2010). With all reform, including inclusion, it is the people who will view the new policy through the lens of their culture; therefore, it is through the people’s acceptance of the reform that change occurs. Policy is a catalyst for change, but the success or failure of that policy depends on the people of the culture (Winzer & Mazurek, 2009). It is important to investigate the perceptions of the members of the culture to examine if inclusion has been accepted. The cultural member’s acceptance of inclusion has affected the experiences of students with LD in the school’s culture. In this study, the theme of dimension of time is used in answering all research sub questions.

The theme cultural parameters includes religion, education systems, and traditional values (Winzer & Mazurek, 2012). If inclusive education is embraced in the school’s culture, students with LD will be more accepted by peers, teachers, and school staff. The theme of cultural parameter has been used in answering all research subquestions.

Winzer and Mazurek (2012) identified the theme school transformation as consisting of influences in globalization, legislation, and economic conditions. Many countries developed a special education policy after the UN drafted the Salamanca Statement. Yet, in many nations, services for students with disabilities still do not exist in schools, even though a policy is in place (Winzer & Mazurek, 2012). In this study, the researcher examined the policy and the
transformation of policy in the junior secondary classroom for students with disabilities through interviews of key stakeholders and observations of actual practices. The theme of school transformation was used to answer all subquestions.

The final theme of the framework is policy and outcomes. This theme refers to leadership, teacher preparation, or early intervention (Winzer & Mazurek, 2012). Through the examination of interviews and observations, the researcher ascertained the stakeholders’ perspectives on the implementation of inclusive practices for students with LD. The researcher used the theme of policy and outcomes to frame all research subquestions.

Research Method

Researcher as an Instrument

I come to this project with a plethora of both personal and international experiences related to the proposed topic. I entered this study and research with two lenses that are unique in my work in the junior secondary setting in Botswana. One very unique lens I provided is from the perspective of a person who has received various levels of support as a student with LD. My journey began in third grade when I was diagnosed with LD. I was tested for giftedness, and although my full scale IQ was two points below what was required to be classified gifted, I scored two standard deviations below my full scale IQ in mathematics. Thus, my specific LD was identified to be a processing disorder in the area of mathematics. In elementary school, I was served in a resource room. I was pulled out of the traditional classroom to receive remediation in reading and math, and I also was pulled out of the traditional class for occupational therapy several times a week. The occupational therapy was to strengthen poorly developed fine motor skills. I did not like school or my regular class because sitting in my seat
and completing assignments was an arduous task for me, so being removed from class for occupational therapy for physical activity was fun. I enjoyed leaving my traditional class setting. However, I did not like going to the resource room. The resource room was a one-on-one setting where I was unable to hide from academics but was forced to complete the assignments I hated most. In middle school, I was in a co-taught setting where a special education teacher followed a group of us from class to class to provide extra help in all academic classes. I had no feelings about being followed from class to class, not viewing the experience as positive or negative. I did not and still do not feel I benefited from the class design. In middle school, the counselor for special education told my mom I would not graduate high school, and she should look for alternative plans for me. In high school, almost all of my academics were in self-contained, special education classes where we did not have the same coursework as the typical classes. By high school, I did not care about school. I did, however, like going to work. I had a job for all four years of high school, so I left school early to go to work. I did not take any traditional elective courses in high school. By high school I did not want to be in school, except for the social aspects, and work provided an outlet for movement. I hated to sit at a desk, but while I was at work, physical movement was a part of my day. By the end of high school, my teachers began to tell me they believed I was capable of going to community college. As I matured, I began to care more about schoolwork and became less of a disciplinary problem. In reflecting upon my own education, I can view my experiences in special education as both positive and negative.

After obtaining my Bachelor of Science degree in special education with a focus on specific LD, I became a high school English teacher for students with LD and emotional behavioral disorders for 15 years in three different schools within the same district. During this
time, I not only began to understand the educational struggles of adolescents with LD, but I began to understand my own LD diagnoses. I was a successful teacher, and because I was willing to tell parents, students, administrators, and other teachers about my own disability, I found more people were willing to ask questions. Other teachers began feeling comfortable asking my advice about students with disabilities in their classes. At the high school where I taught, being LD was no longer a taboo discussion. By 2010, I was the Teacher of the Year. I was the department head of the Special Education Department. In 2006, I won a grant to study British Literature during a summer at Oxford University. In 2004, I was awarded a grant to continue my education at UCF. I returned to the university to obtain my Master’s degree in education in special education, and I am currently working on my Ph.D. in special education. And now, here I am, a student who never liked school, never wanted to sit in a seat, and who experienced school failure the vast majority of my life. However, those experiences shaped me to be a successful teacher. I would be remiss to believe my experiences as a student with LD and a teacher of students with disabilities do not affect my lens as a researcher.

My international teaching experiences also influenced the lens of my analyses. My mother tells me, as young as preschool age, I would ask about international and political events on the news each night. By third grade, I remember telling my mother I would not always live in this country, because there was so much to see and experience outside the US. My grandparents fostered this when I was a child by taking me throughout Canada, South America, and the Caribbean. It was innate curiosities that lead me to teaching abroad.

During my career as a teacher, I spent five summers abroad. I picked an organization in the world that needed assistance from someone with my qualifications and volunteered my time. I have taught in Chilé (2009), Peru (2010), Argentina (2011, 2012), and South Africa (2013).
First, I worked with an organization supported by Chilé’s Ministry of Education and the UN. My assignment was to teach English to secondary students in a public high school for mining in La Serena, Chilé. The neighborhood where my school was located was considered a low-income area. The school had poor infrastructure. For example, since the school had no climate control or screens in the windows and doors, class doors remained open, and often, stray dogs walked into the classroom. Even though the school’s buildings were not modern, the school did not lack resources. All teachers were provided a laptop by the government, and the school had Wi-Fi. Teachers carried their laptops from class to class. The school had computer classes in a computer lab. Like many South American countries, English is required for all ages of students. Each of my classes in Chilé served about 40 students of all educational levels. Since the objective of my presence at the school was to teach with the accent of a native speaker, the English teacher and I would often work together to break the class into smaller groups to ensure all students were able to work closely with me. I had a classroom, which was unique, because in Chilé, most teachers switch classes and the students remain in one room. I made my classroom look “American” by creating bulletin boards, hanging posters, and posting class rules. The English teacher and I broke the classes into small groups (20 students), and we divided the classes between the two classrooms. I taught English pronunciation, grammar, writing, reading, and public speaking.

My experiences in Chilé had a profound effect on my life. I was taken in and nurtured by a family, who not only ensured my safety, but also ensured I understood the typical social and family life in Chilé. My co-English teacher, who had been a Fulbright teacher in Los Angeles, taught me about the school, students, daily life, culture in Chilé, and being a strong, powerful, and educated woman in her culture. I found myself admiring her strength and wisdom. Prior to
my experience in Chilié, I had dreamt of living in another culture, but it was from Chilié and the people of Chilié, I recognized so many lessons I could learn outside of the US and so many people to teach them, if I was willing to listen.

I gained the confidence I needed in Chilié to venture out in the world again. This time, I chose Peru. In Peru, I worked with an organization called Supporting Kids in Peru (SKIP). Much like in Chilié, the objective was to teach English using the native accent. I taught in a very impoverished neighborhood in Trujillo, Peru. Most of my students were descendants of the Incas. Many of my students did not have electricity or running water in their homes. It was normal for the school to take responsibility for teaching life skills such as using a toothbrush, hand washing, and other, related tasks because the culture did not place an emphasis on the need for hygiene. I was placed in two elementary schools. I taught English to students in the US equivalent of third grade. I taught two days a week in each elementary school to a typical class size of 40-50. Both schools had few resources and were in disrepair. The school campus was shared with the secondary school. Elementary students would attend school until noon, and at one in the afternoon, secondary students arrived to use the campus. In the afternoon, I would work in the library at the SKIP Centre, a community center for all students and parents. The SKIP Centre provided a number of services such as adult and student English, computer classes, homework help, reading help, sports programs, and microloans for parents.

My experience in Peru made me view poverty differently. Like many Americans, I felt I understood poverty from my cushioned sofa in my air-conditioned living room in the US. I understood we have poverty in the US, and many of my students at the high school were considered to be in poverty. Then, naively, I believed Chilié was probably the most poverty I would ever know. My experience in Peru made me realize true poverty where you light a
cooking fire, take your clothes to the river to wash, and walk to a well for water. It was also in Peru where I learned social programs, like special education, are not a priority when there is a lack of clean water, food, and basic medical care.

My next visit to a country was to teach in Argentina. There I taught in Los Pibes, a community center in the low-income neighborhood of La Boca in Buenos Aires. Even though this was a low-income neighborhood, the community center was well supplied with technology, food, toys, clothes, and people to assist. The center was bustling with adults and children most hours of the day. Adults would take computer or English classes and work in the center to “pay” for their classes. Many programs were offered for children as well, but my job was to work with the adult education English classes. These students were advanced, and we worked on English grammar and pronunciation.

Also in Argentina, I worked in San Carlo de Bariloche located in the Andes in northern Patagonia. Much like in Buenos Aires, I worked in a community center in an impoverished neighborhood. This community center only served children. My job at the community center was as an English teacher for the students’ ages 5-10 enrolled in the after-school program. Besides the traditional English classes, I taught crafts and sports in English.

Like Chilé, poor people lived in Argentina too, but the poverty was not as widespread as in Peru. Also, like Chilé, immigrants flock to Argentina for the prosperity it can provide. The culture of Argentina is a flourishing mix of Italian and Spanish cultures, which produced a lively, European-like culture in the heart of South America and lured me back a second year. My work in Argentina taught me about the role the community center could play in a neighborhood and gave me admiration for the adults who worked so hard to learn English on their own time.
Next I taught in South Africa. I taught at the Fellowship Christian Bible School in the suburb of Ottery in Cape Town, South Africa. Fellowship Christian Bible School served students with Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (FAS). The school was developed on the grounds of a farm, and during apartheid, parents of the students who attended the school worked on the farm. During apartheid, the Dops System allowed farmers to pay their employees with alcohol, resulting in increased alcoholism and many children being born with FAS. Fellowship Christian Bible School had received grants from all over the world allowing it to provide students with two meals a day. The pastor and principal had made arrangements for all students to receive medical care from the University of Cape Town Medical School. The school made use of cargo containers to create classrooms, but all classrooms were well-stocked with age-appropriate supplies. The school had a computer lab and Wi-Fi. My job was working with 6 students, ages 10-14, with emotional behavioral disorders and other disabilities due to FAS. My students often engaged in fighting and came from homes where violence was typical. Students would not only hit each other, but also me. All of my female students had been raped, some of them more than once.

Cape Town was enveloped by violence, and in the news you would see murders reported every night. Rape was so commonplace billboards dotting the highway announced, “Rape is a Crime.” I learned from the pastor who ran the school the reason all of my female students were raped was because many people believed if you raped a virgin girl, you could be rid of “the disease.” The disease of HIV/AIDS is still an epidemic in Southern Africa (United Nations Children Fund http://www.unicef.org/esaro/5482_HIV_AIDS.html, 2009).

I learned about another cultural tradition leading to HIV/AIDS from the pastor at my school and from interviews on the news with Nelson Mandela discussing his book, Long Walk to
Freedom: The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela (Mandela, 1995), which many of my male students would endure. Boys form the Xhosa tribe, as a rite of passage, are taken into the bush for a month of study and isolation (Duell, 2013). As a part of this ritual, a “traditional surgeon” (Duell, 2013), without anesthetic or sterile instruments, circumcises the boys (Al Jazeera, 2013). Many boys are sickened by the unsanitary conditions and some will be infected by HIV/AIDS from the “surgeon” using the same surgical instrument on many boys. Some will die as a result of this ritual (Al Jazeera, 2013).

My experience in South Africa taught me more about apartheid than a book or television program could ever teach. I learned about sexual assault and violence derived from apartheid, the effects of the Dops system on a generation of students, and the effect of HIV/AIDS on the South African population. I value the lessons I learned about the culture, students, and struggles they continue to have as their society evolves.

It is because of these experiences as a person with LD, as a general and special education teacher in the US, and my experiences teaching internationally that I view the importance of education, but moreover, special education programs and the rights of students with disabilities, from a global perspective. It is through these lenses my data were viewed and analyzed.

Settings

The researcher collaborated with professors at the University of Botswana, Faculty of Education, who have conducted multiple studies in the area of special education in Gaborone schools. The study was designed to occur in an inclusive, junior secondary school setting, which serves students with LD. A purposive sample (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007) was used to select
teachers, administrators, and students with LD in an inclusive setting in a public, junior secondary school in Gaborone, Botswana.

The first week in Botswana was spent at the university with Professor Abosi. The researcher was given full access to the facilities at the university, including the library, Wi-Fi, and an office in which to work. The researcher worked at the university two days a week and checked in with Professor Abosi to discuss the progress of his research during this time. The discussions with Professor Abosi helped to clarify the researcher’s cultural questions and problems that arose.

A public, junior secondary school was selected as the location for this research. Professor Abosi facilitated a meeting between the researcher and the school head. At the initial meeting, Professor Abosi, the school head, deputy school head, special education teacher, guidance and counseling teacher, and the researcher were present. The researcher was asked to explain the research objectives and the type of participants the researcher would need for the study. A schedule was agreed upon. The researcher would visit the school three days a week. This school was selected because it was a public, inclusive, junior secondary school with students who were diagnosed with a LD. The researcher was given full access to go to any class, assembly, or examination invigilation (exam proctoring). The researcher was able to conduct a formal observation in any classroom or ask anyone for an interview.

The School

The research location chosen for this study was an English medium, public, junior secondary school. This means all classes were taught in English and in a public school setting. In public schools in Botswana, students do not pay school fees to attend; therefore, a public
school contains a range of students from different socioeconomic backgrounds. The school was centrally located in Gaborone and had about 700-800 students enrolled at the time of research.

Participants

This study involved gathering data from administration, general education teachers, special education teachers, and students with LD through interviews and observations. Participants were chosen by their potential impact to the study, and due to time constraints, participants were selected because they were available for an interview. All participants needed to have exposure, either as an administrator or in their classes, to students with LD. Table 4 lists the target participants and describes their value to the study.
### Table 4

**Target Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Value to study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Head</td>
<td>Must be the school head of an inclusive school</td>
<td>Leadership strategies needed to manage an inclusive school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Special Education Teacher</td>
<td>Must be the deputy school head of an inclusive school</td>
<td>Leadership strategies needed to manage an inclusive school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department (HOD)</td>
<td>Must be a Head of Department of an inclusive school</td>
<td>HOD is familiar with the students and teachers in their houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and Counseling Teacher</td>
<td>Must be a guidance and counseling teacher of an inclusive school</td>
<td>Social and emotional needs of students with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Teacher</td>
<td>Must have students with LD in their classes</td>
<td>Use of accommodations in a general education setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td>Must be a special education teacher for students with LD in an inclusive school</td>
<td>Interworking of special education system in the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with LD</td>
<td>Must be a student with diagnoses as LD by the CRC at the junior secondary level in an inclusive school</td>
<td>Their successes and failures within the atmosphere of the inclusive school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following approval by University of Central Florida Internal Research Board (IRB) of the research protocol, all adult participants were given informed consent in English, as were all of the participants who worked at the school (see Appendix M). The researcher explained the research orally and answered participants’ questions. The researcher explained to all adult participants that they could leave the study at any time and for any reason.

All student participants in this study were diagnosed as LD by the CRC. The research team gained written consent from parents for all student participants, explained all study procedures to the parents, and answered any questions parents had about the study (see Appendix
Parents were told they could request a consent form translated to Setswana (see Appendix O). Parents and students were told they could withdraw from the study at any time. Parents were informed that if student participants displayed any signs of emotional turmoil during the interview, the interview would cease. All participants were selected because of their characteristics and value to the study (see Table 4). All participants in this study were given participant codes. Participant codes are explained in Table 5. The participant’s actual names have not been used in this manuscript.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Code</th>
<th>Participant Type</th>
<th>Participant Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>School Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSH</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Deputy School Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCT</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Guidance Counseling Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Special Education Teacher for students with LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>General Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>General Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student with LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student with LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student with LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student with LD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrators

The junior secondary school had three levels of administration: DSH, HOD, and SH. Table 6 lists administrator demographics. The DSH has had a long career in education. She taught home economics and science in junior secondary school for six years prior to becoming an administrator. She has been working as an administrator for 17 years. She earned a diploma in education. A diploma is a three-year teacher education program, most often completed at an education college.
The research school had three HODs. An invitation to participate in the study was given to all of the HODs, but only one HOD replied. The participant HOD has been an administrator for fifteen years. She taught junior secondary students as an English teacher for ten years. Her current job is a Head of Department, Pastoral Care, or Head of House (HOD; See Table 6).

Table 6
Administrator Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Years of Teaching</th>
<th>Years of Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSH</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bachelors of Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Diploma/ Bachelors/ Honors Degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The house system is often used in Commonwealth counties. Houses are subdivisions of schools. Students are placed in houses when they are enrolled. Students are to remain in their houses throughout their education at the school. Historically, the house was used in boarding schools to create a sense of belonging among the members of each house. The head of the house acts as an informal counselor who also monitors students’ progress and social development. Many times houses compete in athletics and academics (Dierenfield, 1975).

The house system in Botswana is used much like the description by Dierenfield (1975). It is the HOD’s responsibility to look after the students’ health and social wellbeing. These responsibilities can include addressing students with problems relating to drugs, alcohol, or
romantic affairs. The HOD will often talk to parents of students in their house, and the HOD also supervises the teachers assigned to their house.

Participant SH is the school head. She taught social studies, Setswana, and guidance and counseling for twelve years before becoming an administrator. She has been an administrator for ten years. The SH has a Diploma in Education and a Bachelor’s degree with Honors. An honors degree is a certificate program in addition to a Bachelor’s Degree (see Table 6).

Teachers

One special education teacher (SET) is assigned to work with and oversee the services for students with LD at the research school. The SET is a trained special education teacher. She has a Diploma in Education and a Bachelor’s Degree in Special Education with a focus on LD. The SET has taught for 15 years. Upon arrival at the research site, she had a full course load of Moral Education, and her work as a special educator was to be completed when time permitted. Her duality of roles changed over the course of the study as she was given a full-time, special education position at the end of the research time period for the remainder of the school year. Table 7 lists teacher demographic information of each teacher observed throughout this ethnographic study.

Table 7

Teacher Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Years of Teaching</th>
<th>Subject Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SET</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Diploma Bachelors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Moral Education and Special Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCT</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Guidance and Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Diploma/ Degree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ST is a general education teacher teaching integrated science. Integrated science consists of physics, chemistry, and biology. He teaches all grade levels in junior secondary school. He has a Diploma in Secondary Education and has taught for five years (see Table 7).

The research school has one guidance and counseling teacher (GCT). The GCT has taught for 16 years. She has a Diploma in Secondary Education. She teaches Guidance and Counseling. Guidance and Counseling is a mandatory class for all students in public school where skills such as sex education, postsecondary school options, healthy relationships, and other life-related topics are taught. The GCT also has an office, which is open to the students and parents who need counseling (see Table 7).

The math teacher (MT) has a Diploma of Secondary Education and a Bachelor’s Degree in Mathematics. He has been teaching for sixteen years. He teaches all grade levels in junior secondary school (see Table 7).

Students

Four students with LD participated in this study. Table 8 lists basic student demographic information.

Student 1 was a 16-year-old student with LD at the research site. He was diagnosed with LD in Form 1 at the approximate age of 14. He was a tall, neatly dressed young man. He wore an ironed uniform shirt, tie, and black pants, and he sometimes would wear the formal jacket with the school crest. The uniform required black shoes. Student 1 had nice shoes, but a beat up, dusty backpack he carried his supplies in daily. Although he looked put together and clean, he was not from a family of means. He lived with his grandmother and older sister, and his mother would leave during the week for her employment.
Student 1 had many friends and was considered popular by other students. He exuded confidence and cool when he walked around campus, and often was heard singing American hip-hop lyrics around campus. Although S1 was very confident around his friends, privately, he had difficulty accepting his LD. He would look each way to see who was around when he went into the trailer that was used to work with students with LD. Once, prior to the researcher and research assistant observing his class, he asked us not to talk to him during the class observation because he did not want to be associated with anyone who dealt with the Special Education Programme. The GCT told us that he had asked her many times to leave the Special Education Programme, and he did not want any accommodations given to him. He was specifically embarrassed about taking his exams away from his class. He made it clear he did not want to go to a separate room to take the exams.

Student 2 was a 16-year-old boy who was diagnosed with LD in Form 1. His facial appearance was unique from his peers, but his speech, physical features, and behaviors were typical and age-appropriate. He complied with uniform regulation, but sometimes, the researcher or research assistant would notice stains or rips in his shirt. Yet, his family would not be considered of a low-socio-economic status.

Student 2 was the quintessential student every teacher wants to have in his or her class. He was respectful, helpful, raised his hand to answer questions, and was involved in every lesson. He would readily share his materials with students who did not have them. He would ask his peers if they needed help. Teachers would tell the researcher and research assistant just how much they loved S2. On one occasion, a teacher stopped the researcher after an observation. The teacher explained that S2 was perfectly capable of passing the National Exam
for Science. He was just concerned he would not have enough time. He asked the researcher if it was possible to make sure S2 received extended time on the exam.

Unlike S1, S2 was not as confident with his peers. He was friendly to them, and in front of adults, they were friendly to him. However, he told a very different story when he was with adults only. Because S2 looked a bit different, he described being bullied by students frequently.

Student 3 was 15 and diagnosed with LD in Form 2. Student 3 was a quiet, shy, and soft-spoken boy. He was neat and clean, and he wore a neat, ironed uniform daily. However GCT and SET told the researcher and research assistant they have had to discuss his hygiene on several occasions.

Student 3 had no identifying physical features to distinguish that he had a disability. However, he was slow to process questions in class, and he needed questions and instructions repeated. His lack of organizational skills was apparent. The researcher and research assistant would watch him dig through his backpack to find a material he had left at home. By the time, he figured out he left it at home, the lesson moved on, and he was lost.

Student 3’s parents were very involved with his education; parent involvement is not typical of the culture, as most parents left education to the professionals. His father even told the researcher he had asked government officials about special education help for his son, and they paid for private tutoring.

Student 3 struggled intensely in school, both academically and socially. He appeared sad and withdrawn most of the time. The researcher and research assistant noticed he would walk alone during breaks and lunches. He chose to stay in his classroom to complete assignments because he took so long to finish. Student 3 told the researcher he did not have friends, and he was made fun of and bullied often.
Student 4 was the only female student participant. She was 14 years old, and unlike the other participants, she was diagnosed with LD in 2008 after an accident.

Student 4 was neat and clean. She wore small stud earrings, which are permitted in the dress code, and she had short cornrow braids, which is an approved hairstyle.

Student 4 was quiet and shy in front of adults. She was respectful and pleasant most of the time. However, teachers reported she had become slightly argumentative, and the GCT stated she seemed more interested in boys than before.

Student 4 said she did experience bullying, but she would not elaborate. She often was giggly, and she looked as if she was in high spirits most of the time. Student 4 was the only student participant who discussed having average to above average grades all of the time. She did not have problems with organization or homework completion.

Parents of the students were contacted for permission for their child to participate in the study. However, the parents were not participants.

### Table 8

Students with LD Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Age of Diagnosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nonparticipant Teachers**

The school head was the primary gatekeeper. The SH gave the researcher permission to observe in any classroom in the school. While interviews took place with specific participants as
stated in Table 4, observations also took place in many classrooms throughout the school day. The only criterion for a class to be observed was a minimum of one student with LD in the class. These students may or may not have been participants. Due to scheduling conflicts, classes selected for observations were selected by the times and days of the class meetings. The gatekeepers gave the researcher freedom to come and go as she pleased, which allowed the researcher to observe many different teaching styles and subject areas. Table 9 presents basic demographic information about the nonparticipant teachers observed.

All teachers observed in this study were required to have a minimum of a Teaching Certificate from a teacher’s training college (Mukhopadhyay, 2015). However some teachers observed in this study have either a Bachelor’s or Master’s degree (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017).

Table 9

Nonparticipant Teacher Observation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonparticipant Observation Teacher</th>
<th>Observation Code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Teacher 1</td>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Teacher 1</td>
<td>O2</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Procedures</td>
<td>O3</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (Lab) Teacher 1</td>
<td>O4</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Education Teacher 1</td>
<td>O5</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Teacher 1</td>
<td>O6</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Teacher 1</td>
<td>O7</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Teacher 2</td>
<td>O8</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (Classroom) Teacher 1</td>
<td>O9</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Teacher 2</td>
<td>O10</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedures

Initiating a Partnership with the University of Botswana

The researcher discovered the work of Professor Abosi at the University of Botswana when completing the literature review for this dissertation. Originally, the researcher emailed Professor Abosi regarding questions about his research. In narrowing the topic of this dissertation, the researcher sent an email to discuss conducting research in Gaborone. With the help of Professor Karen Biraimah at UCF, who has worked with the University of Botswana, a collaborative partnership was created to support this research study. To further this collaboration, Professors Abosi and Professor Mukhopadhyay were asked to apply to UCF as Graduate Faculty Scholars. They were granted positions in recognition of their expertise in the field of education (see Appendices P-Q).

Institutional Review Board

The researcher submitted this study protocol to the UCF Institutional Review Board (IRB) and was approved on October 11, 2016 (see Appendix K). The UCF IRB approved the Adult Consent (Appendix M) and Parent Consent (Appendix N) forms. Adults in this study were defined as administrators and teachers. All of the students in this study were under the age of 18, so all required parent permission.

The researcher submitted this study protocol to the University of Botswana, Office of Research and Development, IRB upon arrival in the country. The procedure set forth by the University of Botswana’s IRB required three printed copies of chapters one through three of the research proposal, along with various forms, and could not be completed online in advance. The
proposals were given to three board member readers from different colleges in the university. The University of Botswana granted the IRB approval with comments on November 18, 2016, which means approval to start the study, but additional information had to be submitted. At this point, the researcher was able to enter the school and begin data collection. However, the term “with comments” meant the researcher had to address these comments through scheduled meetings with the IRB board readers. The subject of the comments the committee wanted addressed was the term LD. Due to cultural differences in the use of the term LD, the researcher was asked to provide more explanation on the term. The term LD, Learning Difficulty, is used in Botswana. However, it is new and since the readers of the IRB committee were not from the Faculty of Education, they were unfamiliar with the term LD. Although IRB approval was given in November of 2016 and the research could begin, the researcher did not receive the official letter of approval until February 6, 2017 (see Appendix L).

The IRB at the University of Botswana made several requests of the researcher prior to conducting this study. All comments of the IRB readers needed to be addressed. All study research instruments were translated into Setswana (see Appendices F-J), and the parent consent form was translated into Setswana (see Appendix O). The IRB requested a research assistant be hired. The research assistant needed to be a local person who spoke Setswana and attended school in Botswana. The research assistant was to attend each visit to the school research site with the researcher. Professor Abosi suggested a research assistant with the requirements stipulated by the IRB. The research assistant held a Bachelor’s Degree in Mathematics from the University of Botswana and attended every interview and observation, both informal and formal, at the research site.
Timeline

Prior to the researcher’s arrival in Botswana, the researcher emailed the defended research proposal to Professor Abosi, which included a research timeline. Upon arrival to Botswana, the researcher met with Professor Abosi to complete paperwork for the University of Botswana, which included a Visiting Researcher Fee. The fee allowed full access to all university facilities, including the library and Wi-Fi. The researcher also was given an office in which to work. During phase one of the research, the IRB was submitted to the Office of Research and Development, and Professor Abosi arranged a meeting with the gatekeepers at the research location.

In phase two, the researcher continued to work with the Office of Research and Development on the IRB process. The researcher met with Professor Abosi twice a week to discuss updates. The researcher and the research assistant attended school three days a week in a volunteer capacity. This presence at the site allowed for the researcher to understand the procedures and routines in the school prior to data collection.

In phase three of the study, the researcher obtained consent from student participants and adult participants. Interviews with each participant were scheduled and conducted at school. The school head gave the researcher permission to attend and observe any class in the school. The researcher continued to meet with Professor Abosi twice a week until the end of the study. Table 10 depicts the study timeline.
Table 10

Estimated Timeline of Proposed Study Including Phases, Setting, Participants, Procedures, and Estimated Time Necessary for the Collection of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Estimated Time</th>
<th>Procedures/Data Collection</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | October 6, 2016-October 13, 2016 | Arrival in Botswana  
Meet with Professors at the UB and complete the necessary paperwork for UB  
File IRB at UB  
Introduction to school and gatekeepers with Professor Abosi | **Procedures/ Data Collection**  
Arrival in Botswana  
Meet with Professors at the UB and complete the necessary paperwork for UB  
File IRB at UB  
Introduction to school and gatekeepers with Professor Abosi |
| 2     | October 13, 2016-November 18, 2016 | Identification of students with LD in research site  
Continue working with UB Office of Research and Development on IRB  
Introduction to research assistant | School faculty  
Identification of students with LD in research site  
Continue working with UB Office of Research and Development on IRB  
Introduction to research assistant |
| 3     | November 18, 2016, 2016-February 8, 2017 | Schedule observations and interviews  
Obtained informed consent from participants  
Interview with teachers  
Interview with school administrators  
Interview with students  
Classroom observation | Teachers, school administrators, students  
Schedule observations and interviews  
Obtained informed consent from participants  
Interview with teachers  
Interview with school administrators  
Interview with students  
Classroom observation |

Data Collection

The researcher explored the supports, practices, and perceptions of the inclusive culture of secondary students with LD at a junior secondary school location in the Gaborone area. Data
consisted of observations conducted using field notes, semi-structured interviews, and document analyses (Brantlinger et al., 2005). Students with LD were observed across academic classes, social opportunities that occur during the day (e.g. free time, lunch, assemblies, exams), interactions with peers and adults, and instruction and independent academic work. Semi-structured interviews took place with students, administrators, and teachers. All interviews were transcribed (see Appendix A, B, C and D) using an outside transcription service. Documents that were analyzed included student work, a student report card, pictures of routine school activities, staff and department meeting agendas, flyers of postsecondary programs, government policy statements, and any other documents relevant to the inclusive and instructional practices of students identified as LD.

 Interviews

Semi structured interviews were conducted with participants, which included the SH, DSH, HOD, GCT, SET, ST, and students with LD (see Appendices A-D). The researcher or the research assistant scheduled the interviews. All interviews took place at the research site. Since this is an English medium school, the interviews were conducted all in English. However, the Setswana-speaking research assistant was present in all interviews. He was asked to clarify in Setswana in one interview of a teacher.

The researcher explained the purpose of the study to the adult participants and provided a copy of the Adult Consent form (see Appendix M). The researcher also explained an iPad would be used to record the entire interview, so the researcher would not forget or miss important statements.
The student participants were chosen for this study based on a diagnosis of LD by the CRC. Students received an explanation of the study and their role as participants. The Setswana-speaking research assistant was present to clarify in Setswana if needed. Student participants were given a Parent Consent Form to bring home to their parents or guardians. The forms were in English, but the students were told they could be given a form in Setswana if they preferred. Four students were chosen for interviews. All four returned a signed Parent Consent Form. The researcher explained an iPad would be used for recording the interview so nothing would be missed.

During the interviews with the adults and students, an iPad was used for recording. The researcher and the research assistant took notes on body language, tone, and content.

Observation

All observations were conducted using the observation protocol adapted from Mukhopadhyay (2009; see Appendix E). The researcher was given open permission to observe, which provided for a variety of opportunities throughout each day. Since the school was considered to be an all-inclusive school, all classes that contained a student with LD met the criteria for observation.

Data Analysis

Method of Analysis

Data analyses were conducted using Wolcott’s (1994) categories: description, analysis, and interpretation. Wolcott described analysis as, “the identification of essential features and the systematic description of interrelationships among them” (p. 12). The use of thick, rich
description was used when writing details of interactions (Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) in inclusive practices for students with LD in the junior secondary setting. Interview data were transcribed using an outside agency. Member checking was conducted through the use of a research assistant in Botswana. All data were entered into Nvivo Software and analyzed through the identification of themes. Likewise, observation data, field notes, and relevant documents were entered into Nvivo for coding and analyses. Initial themes were derived from the theoretical framework developed by Winzer and Mazurek (2012) and the research question and subquestions were aligned with both the theoretical and observational frameworks (see Table 1 and Figure 1).
## Table 11

**Blueprint for Analysis of Primary Research Question and Subquestions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Sub Questions</th>
<th>Theoretical framework/ sub-unit of analysis- Inclusion (Winzer &amp; Mazurek, 2012)</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do students with LD view themselves in the culture of an inclusive setting?</td>
<td>School Transformation Dimensions of Time Cultural Parameters Policy and Outcomes</td>
<td>Student, teacher, administrator</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do teachers and administrators view the inclusive education program?</td>
<td>School Transformation Dimensions of Time Cultural Parameters Policy and Outcomes</td>
<td>Teachers, Administrators</td>
<td>Interviews, Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What accommodations, adaptations, or instructional strategies do teachers use to support students with LD?</td>
<td>School Transformation Dimensions of Time Cultural Parameters Policy and Outcomes</td>
<td>Student, teacher</td>
<td>Interviews, Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the daily routines, academic activities, and classroom life for students with LD within the school’s culture?</td>
<td>School Transformation Dimensions of Time Cultural Parameters Policy and Outcomes</td>
<td>Student, teacher, administrator</td>
<td>Observations (school and class), Interviews, Doc. Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Use of the UNESCO definition of culture (UNESCO, 2017, para. 1), Model of Inclusive Schooling (Winzer & Mazurek, 2012), and Observation Protocol (Mukhopadhyay, 2009)
**Instrumentation**

Semi-structured Interview Protocol

Semi-structured interview protocols were developed for administrators, special education teachers, general education teachers, and students with LD (see Appendices A-D). In the development of the semi-structured interview protocols, a thorough literature review was conducted of all relevant research. The goals of Botswana’s *Inclusive Education Policy* (2014), depicted in Table 12, were aligned to the protocol (Appendices A-D). Figure 1 shows the alignment of the theoretical framework of Winzer and Mazurek (2012) to the interview protocol. The design of the semi-structured interview protocols was adapted from Mukhopadhyay (2009), who validated these protocols through a pilot study, where questions were given to a panel of teachers and researchers in special education in Botswana who rated the questions relevant or not relevant.
Table 12

Goals of the *Inclusive Education Policy* (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Goals</th>
<th>Policy Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All learners will complete basic education and progress where possible to senior secondary and/or tertiary education or to vocational training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teachers will have the skills and resources to enable children of different abilities to learn effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Out-of-school education programmes will be further developed and strengthened to ensure the inclusion in education and skills development of those children, young people and adults whose needs cannot be met in the formal system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Schools will be supportive and humane establishments, which embrace and support all their learners and value their achievements so that children will attend school regularly, behave well and work hard at their studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>All relevant Governmental, Non-Governmental and private organizations will work in harmony to develop and maintain an inclusive education system in Botswana.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation Protocol

Mukhopadhyay (2009) created an observation tool that has been successful with students with disabilities of research-based instructional practices and typical accommodations. In the creation of the observational tool used in this study, the researcher has adapted the observational tool created and validated by Mukhopadhyay (2009) for students with LD in junior secondary school (see Appendix E). Table 3 describes the use of typical accommodations, adaptations, or instructional supports used on the observation tool (see Appendix E) and the corresponding research to support the accommodation, adaptation, or instructional support.

This classroom observation protocol was developed to align with the *Inclusive Education Policy* (2014) and adapted from the observation protocol designed by Mukhopadhyay (2009) (see Table 12 and Appendix E). This tool guided the researcher and research assistant’s note-
taking during observations. Data obtained using the observation protocol and interviews were analyzed into themes directed by the theoretical framework of Winzer and Mazurek (2012) and the overarching UNESCO (2017) definition of culture shown in Figure 1 and Table 11.

Prolonged Engagement in the Culture

The hallmark for the classical ethnography is the researcher’s work in the field (Brantlinger et al., 2005; Creswell, 2007; Fetterman, 2010). It is the researcher’s duty to identify significant patterns, such as ideas, beliefs, rituals, and customary behaviors in the culture being explored (Creswell, 2007).

The researcher was in Gaborone, Botswana for four months. This timeframe allowed the researcher to become accustomed to the cultural differences of the country, and the researcher was able to become a member of the school community. This prolonged exposure to the culture in conjunction with study participants at the research site ensured the researcher had the opportunity to build rapport with the participants (Krefting, 1991).

Trustworthiness

Lincoln and Guba (1985) stated the importance of trustworthiness. Trustworthiness has been defined as truth, value, applicability, consistency, and neutrality (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). It was important in this study to consult with mentor professors at University of Botswana to ensure the cultural validity of the data collected. Data in this study were triangulated through the comparison of student interviews, teacher and administrator interviews, document analysis, member checking, Model of Inclusive Schooling (Winzer & Mazurek, 2012), and Observation Protocol (Mukhopadhyay, 2009; see Figure 1).
**Member Checking**

Member checking is when data interpretations are shared with the participants to ensure the participants’ voices are being conveyed accurately (Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Interview audio files were sent to an outside transcription agency. After transcriptions of the interviews were received, the researcher sent the documents back to the interviewee for validation of the transcription.

**Coding the Data Using Nvivo**

Creswell (2007) describes coding as categorizing text and visual data into smaller groups. From this coding, themes emerge (Creswell, 2007). The researcher used Nvivo (Nvivo for Mac, 2010) to code and recode data. The first set of codes were divided by research subquestion and then further divided by Winzer and Mazurek's theoretical framework, *A Model to Examine Inclusive School* (2012).

**Inter-Coder Agreement**

Inter-coder agreement took place to ensure the reliability of coding. Inter-coder agreement is when multiple coders analyze data (Creswell, 2007). This process ensures the reliability and stability of the codes created (Creswell, 2007). The second coder in this study was a doctoral student from UCF.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

In this chapter, the researcher presents the findings of this ethnographic study. The data are organized to address the four research subquestions and themes. This chapter is divided into five sections. The first section provides a rich description of the educational system in Botswana to provide a framing for the reader to understand the nuances provided in the rich, thick descriptions of the ethnographic summary provided to answer each of the research questions. The researcher then provides descriptive, triangulated findings aligned with the primary research question and four subquestions. The central research question addressed in this ethnographic study is this: What are the observed supports, practices, and perceptions of the inclusive culture in a junior secondary school setting in Gaborone, Botswana to support students with LD? The four sub-questions addressed are as follows:

1. What are the daily routines, academic activities/accommodations, and classroom life for students with LD within the school’s culture?
2. How do students with the identification of LD in Gaborone, Botswana view themselves in the culture of an inclusive setting?
3. How do teachers and administrators view the inclusive education program?
4. What accommodations, adaptations, or instructional strategies do teachers use to support students with LD?

Summary of Education in Botswana

The context for the research setting is provided at both the educational settings in the country and the specific school where the study took place in Botswana. These descriptions are
not readily available in the existing literature and emerged from multiple sources. The two levels of descriptions are to provide a context for the location where this ethnographic study took place. The overview of the country and school is then built upon using a thick, rich description of the factors that emerged as is required of an ethnographic study (Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). To fully understand the inclusive practices used to support junior secondary students with LD in Gaborone, Botswana, the school and classroom environments and routines for all students, including those with LD are provided. Additionally, a description of the classroom appearance; school and class structures; students’ assignments to form levels; procedures for examinations; instructional materials used; and behavioral expectations in the school and classrooms are described. The themes provided in relation to each research question were derived from semi-structured interviews with students with LD, general education teachers, the special education teacher, and administrators. In addition, the researcher gathered formal observations, informal observations, field notes, pictures, and documents on a daily basis. The amount and themes of the data gathered aligned to each type of qualitative data are provided in Table 13. Prior to sharing information on each theme, a description summary of the country, school, and classroom procedures and routines is provided to give the reader context and background knowledge of the system from which the themes emerged.

Table 13 is divided into the themes in the same method used for analysis. First, all data were coded and divided into the research question or questions. The research question is referred to as a theme family. Then, the data were further divided into the four themes from The Model of Inclusive Schooling created by Winzer and Mazurek (2012) called the parent theme. Finally, subthemes or child themes emerged under the parent themes.
Table 13 shows how the frequency data were separated into theme families, parent, and child themes. It also describes the frequency of each data source. For example, an abundance of data were collected in the area of background. These data were used to describe the setting in detail for the readers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Family</th>
<th>Parent Themes</th>
<th>Child Themes</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Informal Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student with LD</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background RSQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>431</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Parameters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Parameters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions about School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSQ3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13
Frequency Chart
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Family</th>
<th>Parent Themes</th>
<th>Child Themes</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Informal Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student with LD</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education and Professional Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Culture for Inclusion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSQ4</td>
<td>Policy and Outcomes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Organization in Botswana

Students in Botswana may choose any school they wish to attend. No direct school assignments are made or aligned with a district or catchment area. Most students select the school closest to their homes. The school year in Botswana begins in January and ends in November. Since Botswana is in the Southern Hemisphere, Christmas is in summer, therefore Summer Break, Christmas Break, and the end of the school year are all at the same time. In the British tradition, all students in Botswana are expected to wear a school uniform for primary, junior secondary, and senior secondary school in public and private schools, which is typical in most Commonwealth countries (Mortimore, 2013). Students must purchase these uniforms. Every school has a different school uniform with the school crest on the jackets. Policies on school uniforms and student appearance are strictly enforced.

School is compulsory and provided with nominal school fees for ten years. Students attend primary school beginning at approximately age six and ending at approximately age 13. Students begin junior secondary school at approximately age 13 and leave at approximately age 17. Students may decide to attend senior secondary school for an additional two years, but senior secondary school is not mandatory. If a student wishes to attend a university, they must attend secondary school. A school fee is assessed to attend senior secondary school. Student tuition at the university level is paid by the government (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017).

Primary School

Preschool is not typical in Botswana. Each level in primary school is referred to as a standard. Seven standards are to be mastered in primary school (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse,
Students in Standard 1 of primary school begin using English as a medium of instruction (Ministry of Education Botswana, 1994). In Standard 7, the student takes the Primary School Leaving Examinations (Botswana Examinations Council, 2017a). Yet, regardless of the score, all students are automatically promoted (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017).

**Junior Secondary School**

After seven years of primary school, students in Botswana are required to complete three years in junior secondary school. Each level in junior secondary school is referred to as a form (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017). Students are required to take nine classes in junior secondary school in Botswana. The compulsory classes are English, Math, Science, Social Studies, Setswana, Agriculture, and Moral Education. All of these classes have national examinations written by the Botswana Examinations Council (2017). In addition to these courses, Guidance and Counseling and Computer classes meet on occasion. Guidance and Counseling is mandatory, but no national exam is given for this class. At the end of Form 3, all students must sit for the Junior Certificate Examination (JCE; “Botswana Examinations Council,” 2017). A student must pass the JCE for entrance into secondary school.

Course curriculums in English, Math, Science, and Social Studies are standardized and students in Botswana are tested on international exams such as the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study and Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (Mullis, Martin, Foy, & Drucker, 2012; TIMSS & PIRL International Study Center, 2017). Therefore, these courses do not require explanation; however, other required courses such as Setswana, Agriculture, and Moral Education are unique to the culture of Botswana.
Setswana

The official language of Botswana is English and the national language is Setswana (Government of Botswana, 2011b). English is widely spoken in government offices and in businesses. However, only 2.8% of the population speaks English as a first language, while 77.3% of the population speaks Setswana (CIA, 2017). Speaking the language of Setswana is viewed by many Batswana as a sign of patriotism (The Linguist Chair, 2016). Setswana is a course required by the government in primary and secondary school and has a corresponding exam (Botswana Examinations Council, 2017a).

Agriculture

Agriculture is an important class in Botswana. Historically, Botswana has survived on income from beef farming. A family’s wealth was measured by the amount of cattle they owned. It is still a part of the pre-wedding tradition in Botswana for the male family members of the groom to meet with the bride’s male family members and negotiate a dowry, called a bogadi, consisting of cattle (Denbow & Thebe, 2006).

Due to the importance of cattle in Botswana’s culture, the researcher asked several sources at the university and the research site about cattle and agriculture. Many people have a cattle post. A cattle post is a plot of land, often outside the city, where you would keep your livestock. When a Motswana reaches adulthood, they register with the government to receive a plot of land to be used as a cattle post. All Batswana, both female and male, receive a cattle post from the government free of charge. Since all Batswana receive a plot of land and agriculture is such an important part of Tswana culture, an agriculture curriculum is provided to all students.
Moral Education

Based upon informal discussions with teachers and students and examination of the textbook used nationwide, the researcher learned the objective of Moral Education is to teach students appropriate behavior for living in the Tswana culture. This course includes typical teen topics such as drug and alcohol use, bullying, being a friend, respecting elders, and sex education. It also includes learning about the traditions and values in Tswana society such as the use of the kgotla, a traditional meeting to enforce laws in a village headed by a chief; or learning about a bogadi, the dowry payment of cattle paid by the groom’s family upon marriage.

The Role of Sex Education

Botswana has one of the highest HIV/AIDS populations in the world (Beaubien, 2012; Denbow & Thebe, 2006; Stover, Molomo, Moeti, & Musuka, 2008). Botswana was one of the first nations to address the HIV/AIDS epidemic in 2002 by asking the international community for help (Beaubien, 2012; UNDP, 2012). Since then, the government has steadily increased spending to manage HIV/AIDS treatments and education, and now all citizens of Botswana are given anti-AIDS treatments for free (Beaubien, 2012; UNDP, 2012). The HIV/AIDS education initiative is defined in the Botswana National Policy of HIV/AIDS (Botswana, 1998; Tsheko, 2012). Because the government has emphasized sex education, a singular class is not offered on the subject, but rather, it is infused into the curriculum of several subjects.

Electives

Each student also chooses two elective classes when they enter junior secondary school. Students will remain in these two elective classes for the three years they are in junior secondary school. The elective choices are Religious Education, P.E., Design and Technology, Office
Procedures, French, Art, or Home Economics. Each of these classes has a national examination (Botswana Examinations Council, 2017a).

Exams

National examinations are organized, distributed, and graded by the Botswana Examinations Council (2017). Exams in junior secondary school take place at the end of the first, second, and third semesters. The exams in the first and second semesters are a smaller version of the end-of-year exams in November. End-of-year exams in Forms 1 and 2 are mandatory, but students are promoted to the next form level regardless of course grades or exam grades (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017). Form 3 examinations are more high stakes. Students must have a certain exam score to be admitted to senior secondary school, which is required for entrance to a university. Exams are given in all required and elective courses.

Grades

The grading scale used throughout Botswana is as follows: A: 86+, B: 78-85, C: 60-77, D: 40-59, F: 26-39, U: 25-. Students receive report cards at the end of the school year (FN1, January 18, 2017).
Organizations of Research Site School

Infrastructure

Public schools in the capital of Botswana have a similar look. Buildings are made with red brick with an administration building at the front of the school. The building is divided with one half of the building housing offices for the SH, DSH, and office for all three HODs, and an office for the SH’s secretary. The other half of the building is for teachers. This half of the building consists of teacher mailboxes, a large table for teachers to eat or work, an area with small desks for anyone to use, a kitchen area, and restrooms. Teachers do not have desks or individualized work areas. This building is not air-conditioned. However, the offices for administrators have window unit air-conditioners (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

The campus consists of two-story, red brick buildings that house the classrooms. The grounds are dry with no vegetation because of the intensely dry conditions of the desert. The school has a cafeteria that also is used as an auditorium, but sometimes assemblies are held outside in the shade as shown in Figure 2.
The research site selected for this study is a public, junior secondary school, centrally located in Gaborone. The student population is approximately 800 students with 20 students with LD, and there were other students with visual impairments. Students are assigned to a house and a classroom unit, and the class unit has a specific assignment classroom. Teachers move to the classrooms, and the students remain within their assigned classroom location. See Figure 4 for the placement process and role of the hierarchy of adult leaders and teachers within the school setting for a student with a disability.

The assigned classroom typically consists of desks or tables, chairs, and a whiteboard or chalkboard without any other form of decoration or material on the wall. Classrooms do not contain teachers’ desks. Classrooms do not have air conditioning or heating though windows and doors open easily. Desks and tables in the classrooms are in disrepair. Some desks in the
Form 1 classroom are missing the tops of the desk as shown in Figure 3 (GENFN, February 7, 2017; P12, January 19, 2017).

The school has a computer lab, a library, and a cafeteria area where students can eat, though most choose to eat outside. Food is served outside. Students queue for tea and lunch breaks but still travel with their class unit (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

![Form 1 classroom desks](image)

Figure 3. Form 1 classroom desks

**School Behavioral Expectations**

Good behavior is a clear expectation in this school setting. Even though no school or classroom rules are posted on the walls or anywhere in the school, students seem to understand
behavioral expectations. A major emphasis beyond good behavior is an expectation of a positive personal appearance. Students must be in uniform and obey hair and jewelry rules daily. No exception is provided, and if a student comes to school not wearing a uniform, s/he is sent home (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

Uniforms at the Research Site

At the research site, students wore a light blue, button down, dress shirt with either long or short sleeves. Students wore dark grey pants, and girls had the choice of wearing pants or a dark grey skirt. All students wore a tie everyday and had a formal jacket with the school crest on the lapel they would wear on occasion. A blue hat could be used for outdoor activities but was not to be worn inside. On Wednesdays, students would wear their grey pants or skirts and their house polo shirts as shown in Figure 5 (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

Hairstyles also are mandated as part of the student uniform. Boys must have short hair, and girls must have hair neatly tied back in a ponytail, bun, or short hair. Girls cannot wear makeup to school. Boys are not allowed to wear jewelry, and girls can only wear stud earrings. Shoes must be black in color and flat (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

Other Disciplinary and Cultural Occurrences

Students often are left unattended in classes without a teacher. They will chat among themselves, but serious infractions such as fighting are rare. Students are expected to greet the teacher in unison when he or she enters the classroom. Students bring materials to school they will need for the classes assigned to them that day, including homework assignments (GENFN, February 7, 2017).
Other serious disciplinary infractions, such as drugs, alcohol, gang activity, and sex, do happen, but it is generally outside of school. Truancy is rare, and most students attend school daily (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

Punishment

Corporal punishment is used in primary, junior, and senior secondary school. An unnamed, reliable Motswana provided the following explanation of the use of corporal punishment in schools.

This is a culture in which a child is disciplined by the village. If the child disrespects someone older than them in that village, the child will be disciplined through beating. In the village, as well criminals are whipped for minor crimes. So our culture is beating to discipline. It happens in the homes as well. Parents beat their children to discipline them. This happens in most, if not all, African countries. (personal communication, April 4, 2017)

The word “beatings” is used to describe corporal punishments. Students are “beaten” for not bringing homework, talking out or playing in class, or saying something inappropriate. A “beating” is administered by the teacher and can be in front of the class, or the student can be taken outside the classroom. The teacher generally uses a wooden stick and will hit the student on the hand or buttocks though their clothes (S2I, January 18, 2017; S1I, January 23, 2017; S4I, January 20, 2017; S3I, January 25, 2017).
Classroom Teacher’s Behavioral Expectations for Students

Teachers at the research site had similar class expectations. The adult stakeholders in the culture valued student respect. During observations, the researcher noted students generally greeted their teacher when the teacher entered the classroom. In one class, all students would rise when the teacher entered, and when the teacher asked the class, “How are you?” the students replied in unison, “We are blessed and fortunate” (O8, January 23, 2017).

Student tardiness is considered a sign of disrespect. While observing in a Religious Education class, two students walked in late, and the teacher made them apologize to the class (O5, January 20, 2017).

Sleeping is another example of disrespect to teachers. In a Social Studies observation, a student fell asleep. Due to the overcrowding in the classroom, the teacher was unable to move to the student to wake him, so she pointed to the student sitting next to the sleeping student. The student poked the sleeping student. When he woke, the “teacher look” was given, and the student remained awake for the rest of the period (O1, January 16, 2017).

Students are expected to have their books and notebooks in class during the class period (GENFN, February 7, 2017). Homework should be ready to submit on the date the teacher has assigned. Students can receive corporal punishment for not submitting homework (S1I, January 23, 2017; S3I, January 25, 2017). One teacher, the researcher observed, required parents or guardians to sign and write their phone numbers on homework assignments (O3, January 18, 2017).
A bell rings at the end of the period signaling the end of the class. Students may go outside or to the wash closet between classes. Even after the bell rings, students will not move until the teacher dismisses them (GENFN, February, 7, 2017).

Hierarchy of Faculty Assignments

The chain of command was evident at the research site. The faculty members report student concerns and class problems to an immediate superior. The figure below describes the faculty structure and the supports for junior secondary school observed in and discussed in this ethnographic study (see Figure 4). Students with LD in this school were supposed to be served by the special education teacher, but since she taught Moral Education full-time, the GCT was the direct contact for students with LD.
School Head and Deputy School Head

The School Head and Deputy School Head oversee the houses and teachers.

Students are assigned to a class. For example, a student might be assigned to Form 1. The student will continue with that same class in Forms 2 and 3.

The Heads of Departments are in charge of the teachers’ curriculum and students’ emotional needs for their houses.

The Senior Teachers (ST) are subject area teachers who also are assigned to houses. STs have minor administrative duties and report any student concerns to the HOD both academic and instructional.

Teachers are assigned to houses and manage a class within the house. Teachers teach subjects to all students in all houses.

Figure 4. Hierarchy of faculty

School Head and Deputy School Head

The SH and DSH conduct all administrative duties in the school. This includes policy implementation and application of mandates given by the Ministry of Education (DSHI, December 6, 2016; SHI, December 7, 2017).

Head of Department

The structure of the junior secondary school consists of houses. A HOD is assigned to each of the three houses. The HOD acts as the leader of the house. The HOD is an administrative position, because the HOD is responsible for the teachers and students within each
person’s assigned house (Dierenfield, 1975). When a student enrolls in junior secondary, s/he is randomly assigned to a specific house. A house is a subdivision of the school to which a student is assigned and remains a member of until that student leaves school. The function of the house is to provide smaller groups within a larger school to provide guidance to the house members. The older students in a house are asked to look after the younger students. Teachers also are assigned to houses. The teachers are expected to motivate and look after their members both academically and emotionally (HODI, December 7, 2016). The research location consists of three houses. On Wednesdays, students wear a polo type shirt with their house color name on the back to show their association with their house (P1, January 19, 2017; P2, January 19, 2017; P3, January 19, 2017; P4, January 19, 2017; P5, January 19, 2017; GENFN, February 7, 2017; see Figure 6). Students in the house are further broken down into classes (forms) that they remain with as a class throughout junior secondary schooling, much like a cohort.

Senior Teachers and Teachers

Senior Teachers are classroom teachers who have minor administrative roles aligned with their houses. Teachers report concerns to their Senior Teacher first, and if needed, the Senior Teacher reports those concerns to the HODs.

Teachers are assigned a class to manage within their houses. The teacher acts as a support person for the students in their assigned house class. Besides their roles as support personnel in the house classes, teachers also teach a subject area to students in all forms and houses (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

The special education teacher at the school was not working in that capacity. Although she was a trained special educator, she taught Moral Education full-time. It was not until the last
two weeks at the research location that the SET was given a full-time, special education post. In the meantime, the GCT was in charge of the special education program. Though she was not trained in special education, she took it upon herself to learn more about students with LD and their needs.

Students

Besides being placed in a house, junior secondary students also are placed in a class. Class members are not house specific; classes are made up of members of all of the houses. Junior secondary school is divided into three forms: Forms 1, 2, and 3. Each form is further divided into classes labeled by the form and a letter (e.g. Class 1A, 1B, 1C). In Botswana, students are assigned to a class when they enroll in junior secondary school Form 1. The class remains together throughout their time in junior secondary school. For example, class 1A will become class 2A in the next school year. A teacher is assigned as a “class teacher” for each class. This teacher does not teach the students a subject but rather manages the students in the class.

Each class is assigned a classroom. The class is responsible for cleaning and taking care of the classroom. The students stay in this classroom for most of their classes. The students do not move, but rather the teachers come to the class to teach. Students may be alone in a classroom when a teacher is walking to class or if a teacher is absent, as no replacement is provided for a teacher who is absent for the day. Most all lessons are delivered in the classes’ assigned classroom, with the exception of classes that require labs or outdoor activities (e.g. computer class, P.E., agriculture lab, home economics, Design and Technology, etc.). Students with LD are located throughout the school in all forms, houses, and classes. They are not
assigned to just one class. Student participants who were in this study were from all houses and in Forms 1, 2, and 3 (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

**Typical Class Structure**

The typical class size for a subject area class is 40 students. Elective courses generally have fewer students. Classes typically began with a review of the last class, the homework, or both. The researcher observed several teachers who asked students to summarize what they had read for homework for the class (O3, January 18, 2017; O5, January 20, 2017).

The majority of classes are in a lecture format. Teachers talk and write notes on the board. Students are expected to copy the notes. Notes can be words, drawings, charts, or diagrams. Each student is expected to have the note-taking notebook for that course and write all of the notes the teacher has given in the lecture (O1, January 16, 2017; O2, January 18, 2017; O3, January 18, 2017; O4, January 18, 2017; O5, January 5, 2017; O6, January 20, 2017; O7, January 23, 2017; O8, January 23, 2017; O9, January 23, 2017, O10, January 25, 2017). Through conversations with the research assistant and faculty members at the school, the researcher learned handouts and worksheets are uncommon in Botswana because of the high cost of printing.

Sometimes during lectures, the teacher has students read orally in class while other students were to follow along. Many classroom teachers used small group presentations to teach parts of a lesson (O1, January 16, 2017; O2, January 18, 2017; O3, January 18, 2017; O4, January 18, 2017; O5, January 5, 2017; O6, January 20, 2017; O7, January 23, 2017; O8, January 23, 2017; O9, January 23, 2017, O10, January 25, 2017).
Open and closed-ended questions were asked of the students. The researcher noted the following questions being asked in a Social Studies class lecture, “What countries colonized Africa? Why? Who were they?” (O1, January 16, 2017). Sometimes teachers used question prompts like, “Any other reason?” (O1, January 16, 2017). Most of the time, the teachers required students to raise their hands to answer a question, though sometimes choral responses were given (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

Homework was given frequently in all classes. Homework assignments were typically written on the board, and students were to copy the assignment into their notebooks. Sometimes note-taking was given as homework. Pamphlets or short passages were given for students to copy into the notebook reserved just for note-taking. The pamphlet or passages were to be returned to the teacher for use with another group of students. Teachers also assigned exercises in the textbook for students to complete as homework. If there were not enough textbooks for each student, the teacher had the students copy the exercise from the textbook to their homework notebook, and the work was to be completed at home or in prep (O1, January 16, 2017; O2, January 18, 2017; O3, January 18, 2017; O4, January 18, 2017; O5, January 5, 2017; O6, January 20, 2017; O7, January 23, 2017; O8, January 23, 2017; O9, January 23, 2017, O10, January 25, 2017; GENFN, February 7, 2017).

Course Work

Required courses in junior secondary school are English, Math, Science, Social Studies, Setswana, Agriculture, and Moral Education. Another required course is Guidance and Counseling. However, this course meets sporadically and does not have an exam. The elective choices are Religious Education, P.E., Design and Technology, Office Procedures, French, Art,
or Home Economics. Students are required to pick two electives that they will continue all three years of junior secondary school. All nine subjects are taken for three years each, and all of the subjects have exams provided by the Botswana Examinations Council (2017). Accommodations are provided for students with LD on all exams.

English

Teachers in the English class taught British English. The curriculum included reading, essay writing, literature, grammar, and usage. English is taken all three years for junior secondary school (GENFN, February 7, 2017; “Botswana Examinations Council,” 2017). There are several English teachers in the school. The English teacher comes to the class’ home classroom to teach.

Mathematics and Science

Both Mathematics and Science courses were generic course titles. Science included elements of physical science, chemistry, biology, and physics. Mathematics was comprised of basic mathematics review, pre algebra, algebra, and geometry. Mathematics and Science were taken all three years for junior secondary school (MTI, December 7, 2016; STI, January 18, 2017; GENFN, February 7, 2017; “Botswana Examinations Council,” 2017).

Math teachers come to the home classroom to teach. Figure 5 is a picture from a math teacher’s lesson in a home classroom.
Science teachers have a lab setting, so students come to them for lessons. The science labs have tall tables and stools with a whiteboard or chalkboard at the front of the class. Classrooms are not decorated. Science teachers have a few supplies for demonstrations and experiments.

Social Studies

Social Studies was taught from a world perspective with more of an emphasis on Africa. Social Studies class included geography and some current events. Social Studies is taken all three years for junior secondary school (O1, January 16, 2017; GENFN, February 7, 2017; “Botswana Examinations Council,” 2017). Social studies teachers come to the home classroom to teach their coursework.
Setswana

Setswana is the course to learn the structure, pronunciation, and written communications in the language (GENFN, February 7, 2017). Although the research site was an English medium school and the official language of Botswana is English, the national language of Botswana is Setswana (Government of Botswana, 2011b). Setswana is taken all three years for junior secondary school (GENFN, February 7, 2017; “Botswana Examinations Council,” 2017). Setswana teachers move from classroom to classroom to teach the students.

Agriculture

Agriculture class, like all classes, is taken all three years of junior secondary school (GENFN, February 7, 2017; “Botswana Examinations Council,” 2017). Agriculture is taken in a classroom for the first two years of junior secondary school. The Agriculture teacher has a classroom. Students must move to the Agriculture classroom for the class, which is located on the second floor of one of the buildings. In an observation in the Agriculture class, the researcher noted the poor infrastructure. The whiteboard was falling from the wall, so a student got up and propped a push broom and moved a desk to support the whiteboard from falling. In that same class period, the researcher noticed a rustling from above in the ceiling tiles. After a minute, a feather floated down on the research assistant as he was taking notes. A soft cooing was heard from above (O9, January 25, 2017).

The course content in agriculture consists of food production, importing and exporting food, postsecondary opportunities in agriculture, and methods of agriculture. According to the Agriculture teacher in the Form 3, the curriculum has changed to include agriculture lab, in addition to classroom lessons. Students meet outside at the “plots” on pre-assigned days.
Students are given a plot of land that measures 4x4 meters (see Figure 6). The students have been taught how to prepare the soil. Then, they are given seeds and tools to prepare and plant. During the observation of the agriculture class, the teacher demonstrated the technique for preparing the soil. The students then prepared their plots while the teacher walked up and down the rows. The students were told, even if they did not have Agriculture that day, they still needed to water their crops. Students were expected to water even on breaks and weekends. Their crop production was 25% of their final examination grade (O4, January 18, 2017; P1, January 19, 2017; P2, January 19, 2017; P3, January 19, 2017; P4, January 19, 2017; P5, January 19, 2017; P6, January 19, 2017; O9, January 25, 2017).

Figure 6. Students wearing their house shirts working on their plots in Agriculture
Moral Education

Moral education is required at the school and students take the class for three years. The researcher learned through examination of the Moral Education textbook, an observation during a Moral Education Exam, and discussions with the Moral Education teacher, Moral education teaches values important in Tswana culture. The course includes teen-related topics such as drug and alcohol use, teen pregnancy, HIV/AIDS, and sexual education (GENFN, February 7, 2017). The Moral Education teacher moves to the home classrooms to teach her class.

Religious Education

All elective classroom teachers have classrooms because a student only picks two elective courses, so the class leaves their assigned classroom for electives. The objective of Religious Education is to teach students about all religions, not just one. Students are enrolled in this course all three years of junior secondary school (GENFN, February 7, 2017; “Botswana Examinations Council,” 2017). During an observation in Religious Education, groups of students presented on the Baha’i faith and Islam (O5, January 20, 2017).

Physical Education

Physical Education is an elective course. At the research site, Physical Education meets both in the classroom and outdoors. Students take Physical Education for all three years of junior secondary school (GENFN, February 7, 2017; “Botswana Examinations Council,” 2017). The classroom topics are health-related, and outside, students are involved in games and sports (GENFN, February 7, 2017).
Design and Technology

Design and Technology is an elective class focused on trade types of skills. Design and Technology is taken all three years for junior secondary school (GENFN, February 7, 2017; “Botswana Examinations Council,” 2017). This class meets in a lab setting. Many of the students with LD chose this class as an elective. The room consists of a classroom and an adjoining work area with tools and equipment. During an observation, Design and Technology students were creating a picture frame. They were asked to draw several sets of plans with accurate measurements for homework. The teacher asked the students to share their plans with the person sitting next to them. The person sitting next to them was instructed to offer suggestions. During this partner discussion, the teacher circulated to review the students’ homework and provide guidance. The students were then instructed to choose the materials they would need to create their frames for the next class meeting. The teacher told students they could use the Internet at home or in the computer lab to find designs if they wanted. The classroom/lab seemed to have plenty of material scraps and tools to use (IFC3, November, 28, 2017).

Office Procedures

Office Procedures is an elective held in the computer lab in the school. The computer lab has about 40 new computers, an LCD projector, and several printers. The computer lab is one of the only classrooms that has air conditioning because the intense heat in the summer could affect the computers’ longevity. The computer lab is clean, modern, and well kept. Students use the computer lab for Office Procedures, but teachers do not schedule the computer lab for projects in their classes. The content of Office Procedures is how to use the computer and the programs on
French

French is the only foreign language elective class offered at the research site. Students enrolled in French take the class for all three years of junior secondary school (GENFN, February 7, 2017; “Botswana Examinations Council,” 2017). The French classroom in Figure 7 was unique because it met in an outside classroom.
Art

The researcher learned through informal discussions with the Art teacher that students are involved in sculpting, sketching, and painting. If the student elects to take Art, the course is taken all three years for junior secondary school (GENFN, February 7, 2017; “Botswana Examinations Council,” 2017). The art teacher has her own classroom, and students travel to her classroom (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

Home Economics

Home Economics was one of the elective course options, and as such, was taken all three years of junior secondary school (GENFN, February 7, 2017; “Botswana Examinations Council,” 2017). The content of Home Economics consisted of cooking, sewing, planning healthy meals, and creating household budgets. The Home Economics course met in the Home Economics Lab. The Home Economics Lab consisted of six kitchen stations. The kitchen stations had a stove, oven, microwave, refrigerator, and a few sewing machines in the classroom. Students were expected to create sewing projects using the skills they had learned in class as part of their exam requirements (IFC2, November 2016).

Guidance and Counseling

Guidance and Counseling is the only course that does not have a national examination. Students do not elect to take Guidance and Counseling. The GCT met with each class periodically to discuss social and academic issues. The course has a broad scope in the curriculum. The GCT educates students on applying for secondary school, secondary school requirements, post secondary school options, government payment for post secondary school, and exam scores needed to attend each option. The course also included content on safe sex,
bullying, drug and alcohol use, and medical care offered by the government (GCTI, December 6, 2016).

Sex Education

HIV/AIDS has affected almost all facets of society in Botswana. At the research location, sex education to prevent HIV/AIDS was a common thread in the structure of the school, coursework, and daily discussion in classes. Sex education is not a class within the school or a one-time discussion from the faculty to students, but infused into many courses. The researcher found sex education as a part of several course curricula including Moral Education, Guidance and Counseling, and Science. In addition to students’ exposure to sex education in classes, signs and posters were found throughout campus and assemblies provided by the Ministry of Education to educate students on HIV/AIDS prevention and procedures for free testing (Doc2, November 22, 2016). Figure 8 provides an agenda and activities completed at the school site during the World Aids Day assembly.
Figure 8. An agenda from the World AIDS Day Assembly

School Schedule

The master schedule of the school is over a six-day span. Each class period is a forty-minute block. Some classes are in double blocks while others are in single blocks. Each class (e.g. 1A, 1B, etc.) in the school has a different schedule. Figure 9 is one student’s schedule over the six-day period. The entire class of students assigned to a form has the same schedule, with the exception of elective classes, across all three years of junior secondary school (GENFN, February 7, 2017; see Figure 9).

The day ends for all students with a course called Prep, which stands for preparation. A Prep class is a time in the day for all students to work on homework or to get teacher assistance. In conversations with teachers, the researcher was told students used to say they could not complete homework assignments because they did not have electricity at home or they had other
responsibilities. The Prep course at the end of the day was developed so students had the time for homework built into their day (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

In the schedule found in Figure 9, note that a tea and lunch break are a consistent part of the students’ school day. Lunch and tea are provided free of charge to all students through government funding. Tea break is bread with a spread such as peanut butter or preserves and a drink. A hot meal is given every day for lunch (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Day 3</th>
<th>Day 4</th>
<th>Day 5</th>
<th>Day 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setswana</td>
<td>P.E.</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Procedures</td>
<td>Office Procedures</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Procedures (Double period)</td>
<td>Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>Moral Education</td>
<td>Setswana</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>English (Double period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Break</td>
<td>Tea Break</td>
<td>Tea Break</td>
<td>Tea Break</td>
<td>Tea Break</td>
<td>Tea Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>P.E.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Setswana</td>
<td>P.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (Double period)</td>
<td>Social Studies (Double period)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English (Double period)</td>
<td>Setswana (Double period)</td>
<td>P.E. (Double Period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Moral Education</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Office Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Sample Student Schedule

**Materials**

The government provides books for each course and typically enough were available for each student in a class. However, the researcher found that in some classes there were not
enough books for each student. The student was responsible for the book during the school year and was to return it at the beginning of the next school year. Books tended to be in disrepair because they were paperback and had been used by many students. Many times, the teachers would ask a student to bring a stack of books from the front office to the classroom. The students would then have to share books while in class (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

Besides having books assigned, students also have a chair assigned each school year. Each chair has a number spray painted on the back to assign them to students (P12, January 19, 2017). Figure 10 provides an image of numbers spray painted on chairs from the research site. The students can move their chairs from the classroom to outside assemblies and to lunch, if they choose. The student is responsible for bringing the chair back to his/her classroom each day.

Students are responsible for having two notebooks for each course. One notebook is for note-taking and the other is for homework (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

Students at the research site are exposed to technology if they are in Office Procedures. The school has a clean, modern computer lab to be used by the Office Procedures class. Several other elective classes have three or four computers for students to use, though none of the home base classes have computers. The school does not have Wi-Fi on campus.
A student who is struggling at any school in Botswana has the opportunity to be evaluated if teachers suspect a disability. The process for evaluation is centralized in the country. The evaluation process begins with a faculty member at the primary or junior secondary school identifying a student as having a learning problem and arranging for the student to be assessed for a disability at the Botswana Central Resource Centre (CRC). At the school observed, the GCT has taken the lead in both identifying a student who might need testing and providing accommodations for students. The GCT explained to the researcher that one of the resources available is the CRC. She explained the CRC is made up of educational psychologists who conduct assessments for students whom educational professionals suspect
may have a disability. The CRC is located in Gaborone in the south of the country by the border of South Africa. The educational psychologists at the CRC are expected to conduct assessments for the entire country and to travel to all locations if they are needed (GCTI; December 7, 2016). The country of Botswana has modern motorways for the CRC employees to drive, but it can be a long trip depending on the location. For example, to drive to Kasane, in the north of the country, on the border of Zambia, from Gaborone, it would take approximately eleven hours (“Google Maps,” 2017).

The pamphlet, *Division of Special Education, Central Resource Centre*, described the services provided (Doc5, November, 18, 2017). Intervention services provided by the CRC include screening and assessment. The CRC provides therapist services for physiotherapy, speech-language, occupational therapy, and low vision. Psychologist services listed are educational psychology, psychometrics, and remedial therapy. Besides these services, the CRC also provides Braille transcription and audio books and is responsible for providing workshops for parents and teachers (Doc5, November, 18, 2017). The CRC educates the public through printed material like the *Directory of Specific Conditions and Disabilities* (Doc6, November, 18, 2017).

The GCT explained the exam process for students with LD. She shared all students with disabilities, diagnosed by the CRC, were given accommodations on their exams. The educational psychologists at the CRC write a report for each student documenting test scores, current levels, and recommendations. All students with a disability are given a reader, extended time, a scribe, and a separate classroom in which to take exams. All traditional students in the school receive two hours per exam paper. Students with disabilities have an additional 30 minutes or a total of 2 hours and 30 minutes. The separate classrooms where students take their
exams are located throughout the school, as no central room for direct support by one teacher is provided in the school. All teachers are expected to provide support to students with LD. Any time a teacher is not invigilating larger classes, he or she is expected to act as a reader or a scribe for a student with LD (GENFN, February 7, 2017). Beyond this type of support, no other direct support, after identification by the CRC staff member, is provided consistently to students with LD.

Research Subquestion 1: Routines and Classroom Life

To answer the central research question, “What are the observed supports, practices, and perceptions of the inclusive culture in a junior secondary school setting in Gaborone, Botswana to support students with LD?” subquestions were created. Each subquestion was used to explore the inclusive practices used to support students with LD in a junior secondary school in Gaborone, Botswana. The first research subquestion is, “What are the daily routines, academic activities/accommodations, and classroom life for students with LD within the school’s culture?” Data were taken through formal and informal interviews with students and adults, class observations, field notes, documents, and pictures. Major themes that appeared in the analysis of the first research question fell under daily routines, academic activities/accommodations, and classroom life.

Daily Routines

The daily routines of students with LD were coded using the subthemes of Class Interaction and Class Participation. The overall nature of the routines of students with LD did not differ from that of their peers as described in a summary of the school day.
Class Interaction

Students with LD were included equally in all classes at the research site. The theme of class interaction was divided into several subthemes to better explain the organic environment in which students with LD live within their school’s culture. Interviews and observation data were used for this part of the analysis. At least one student with LD was observed in each class.

Class Participation

As one teacher said during a class observation, “There is no free ride. You have to pay. Payment is participating.” All students are expected to participate in discussions, presentations, group work, and in answering questions in class (O1, January 16, 2017). Students often will raise their hands to answer questions, though at other times, teachers choose to call on students randomly. The SET explained, “Those with disabilities normally they are reluctant to answer questions in class.” (SETI, January 25, 2017). The ST confirmed, “Usually they don't like answering, because when they answer they will think when it's wrong they will laugh at me. Some of them, they try.” (STI, January 18, 2017). When the researcher asked more about class participation for students with LD, the ST expanded,

…it's like they are lazy to think. They don't ...they don't want to be forced to do something. They want to do something where they can be applauded for doing it, but they don't want to do something that you might say, ‘No, it's not correct.’ They feel very stressed...Always, you have to make sure that you try to make something that will help them boost their morale. They can't just ask questions in class. They can't just answer questions in class. Thirdly, for them to maybe to be part of a discussion or something.
like when we carry out experiments, it means I have to give them a certain part of the experiment to do…That is how they usually get involved. They can't just do something without the guidance of the teacher. They can't ask. They can't answer. You always have to push them. (STI, January 18, 2017)

Academic Activities/ Accommodations

Academic Activities and Accommodations for students with LD were coded using the subthemes of Exams, Infrastructure, Homework and Classwork, and Grades. Most academic activities were the same for students with LD as their general education peers. On the surface, it appeared no accommodations were given to students with LD, yet when the researcher began interviewing, the researcher found some teachers giving accommodations to students with LD.

Exams

During the time the researcher was immersed in the culture, the students at the junior secondary school were taking their end-of-year examinations. The end-of-year exam process lasts two weeks. All nine subjects have exams written by the Botswana Examination Counsel. Each exam consists of two papers, except Setswana, which has three papers, and English, which has four papers. Papers are two separate tests. For example, Paper 1 might be a multiple-choice exam, and Paper 2 might be an essay or short answer exam (IFE1, November 18, 2016, IFE2, November 11, 2016, IFE3, November 21, 2016, IFE4, November 21, 2016, IFE5, November 23, 2017, IFE6, November 23, 2017).

The researcher was able to observe six students with LD during exam time. When observing exam invigilation for students with LD, the researcher found a variety of different
student needs and invigilator practices. In one observation, the invigilator read the question to the student, but the student did not reply. While observing a non-participant student with LD, the student wrote his answer on his exam paper and handed it to the invigilator. The invigilator rewrote the answer neatly on another exam paper. After the exam was complete, the invigilator explained the student had difficulty speaking. In another exam observation, S4 preferred to read the test by herself, and she wrote her own answers. Then, she had the scribe rewrite her answers neatly. An emphasis on neatness in classes and on exams is a culture norm (IFE1, November 18, 2016, IFE2, November 11, 2016, IFE3, November 21, 2016, IFE4, November 21, 2016, IFE5, November 23, 2017, IFE6, November 23, 2017).

Most exams took place in a classroom with the windows and doors opened, but one exam, for a non-participant student with LD, took place in a trailer that serves as the Guidance and Counseling office and resource room. The heat in the room was stifling. November is summer in Botswana. The trailer was not insulated, so the temperature inside the trailer was approximately 95° F (35°C; IFE2, November 18, 2017).

When exams are graded; all students’ exam grades, including students with LD, are posted on a board in the middle of the school beside their names. Students are expected to come to school and look for their exam grades (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

Infrastructure

One separate area at the school is designated for students with LD to receive support. The GCT explained that a trailer was provided after an in-service given by a professor of special education from the University of Botswana (UB) about a year ago. Half of the trailer served as a resource room for students with LD, and the other half was the Guidance and Counseling Office.
The GCT explained the speaker from UB recommended the resource room, so the LD teacher could work with students alone (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

The SET, the school’s LD teacher, stated, “I think the ministry should also think of building resource rooms in schools, so that students could be assisted in conducive areas.” (SETI, January 25, 2017). Since the researcher has left Botswana, a private donor has given money for a resource room to be built.

**Homework and Classwork**

Homework is assigned regularly for all students including those with LD. The students are responsible for returning their completed homework the next class period unless the teacher gives another due date. Many students with LD did not complete their homework assignments. A ST recalled problems in his classes with students with LD not turning in their homework, not remembering they were given homework, or forgetting the homework at home if they did complete it. He said in frustration, “Then the next day, not after two days, the next day, they will have forgotten” (p. 9).

He further commented by providing the example: “[If you ask students with LD to complete a homework assignment, and say,] do questions A, B, C, D. The following morning maybe … they will have forgotten that you gave them the homework (p. 9). The ST believed students with LD might be better prepared for class and complete more assignments with closer monitoring from home. He stated that some of the students with LD may do homework, but “Then maybe tomorrow you don't have a lesson [a class] with them. The next lesson they're supposed to bring it. They would have forgotten the exercise book at home” (p. 9).

The ST concluded by discussing students with LD’s completion of classwork
Even in class, sometimes some of them, when you give them work, because they are slow at doing things, they can't. If you say we are going to do this [assignment] for 20 minutes, they can't complete the work. If you give them the work and then you start moving around marking, you will realize that some of them, have not yet started writing…They will write the questions, and then leave them blank. (STI, January 18, 2017, p. 9)

The MT felt similarly to the ST. The MT commented that students with LD in his math class were not completing classwork either.

I don't think sometimes it is deliberate. Like I stated earlier, the problem of understanding instruction makes them to lose interest or feel as if this is difficult for me, so I cannot do it. Sometimes even if they try to do the assignment they are given, especially mathematics, they will just write the question and leave the space. That is how they attempt to do their assignments. (MTI, December 7, 2016, p. 7)

Classroom Life

The classroom life of students with LD was coded using the subthemes of Bullying, Note-Taking, and Materials and Organization. Students with LD struggled in their classroom life with bullying and with being disciplined due to lack of organization.

Bullying

The researcher observed no bullying in any observations. Moreover, many teachers and administrators did not know about bullying of students with LD. Some adults did discuss this
issue in their interviews. When the researcher asked the ST if students with LD had friends, he replied,

Yes, they do [have friends]. They do, the other problem that I think that they face is that their classmates, some of them, will ridicule them, some of them will accept them as they are… It usually happens in class when you ask a student with a learning disability to answer a question. They [students in the class] will boo to that child. Then the child will think because answering is like now is a problem to them because they feel belittled. Then usually they [students with LD] don't like answering because when they answer, they will think because when it's wrong they will laugh at me. (STI, January 18, 2017, p. 10)

Some students with LD were upset by the class ridicule, and they did not want to be associated with the special education program, as the GCT teacher stated,

I think there are a few cases of bullying, which has been reported by these kids. I think the whole problem is stigmatizing them. The problem, itself, is stigmatizing them. To the extent that I overheard [student’s name] sitting in those tables. I overheard him say, ‘I don't know why I am in this program. I don't like it, because I'm capable.’ That's what he said. (GCTI, December 6, 2016, p. 16)

**Discipline**

From the perspective of the researcher, students at the research school had few discipline problems. When the researcher observed classes, it was often the research assistant who pointed out student discipline problems to the researcher. Typical disciplinary problems in classes might be talking to another student when the teacher was talking, not wearing a tie to school, or
sleeping in class. The most frequently observed discipline problem was talking in class (O1, January 16, 2017; O2, January 18, 2017; O3, January 18, 2017; O4, January 18, 2017; O5, January 5, 2017; O6, January 20, 2017; O7, January 23, 2017; O8, January 23, 2017; O9, January 23, 2017, O10, January 25, 2017). Student participants discussed being disciplined for not turning in homework or for forgetting materials (S2I, January 18, 2017; S4I, January 20, 2017; S1I, January 23, 2017; S3I, January 25, 2017). An unnamed, reliable Motswana source explained it is a part of the culture of Botswana for teachers to discipline students with a “beating.” The “beating” consists of the use of a stick to hit the students’ hand or buttock.

During classroom observations, the researcher never observed a “beating”, but during one observation, a boy walked in late to class. As the boy walked down the row to sit down, another boy grabbed his buttock. Then, they both laughed. The research assistant, who accompanied the researcher to the research site daily, translated the event. The teacher switched to Setswana and reportedly said, “If the visitors were not here, I would beat you.” Then, the teacher continued to talk about exam results needed to get into secondary school in English (O8, January 23, 2017).

**Material and Organization**

Students with LD often were disciplined for not bringing materials to class. Typically, students with LD tended to have difficulty mastering organizational skills. Lacking organization can manifest in students forgetting their homework, books, and materials at home (Bryan & Burstein, 2004; Bryan, Burstein, & Bryan, 2001). The student participants in this study also had difficulty organizing their materials. The researcher noted in class observations each time a student with LD was not prepared for class (O1, January 16, 2017; O2, January 18, 2017; O3, January 18, 2017; O4, January 18, 2017; O5, January 5, 2017; O6, January 20, 2017; O7,
Students with LD often would forget books, homework, notebooks, or a pencil. The general education teacher, SET, asserted, “They don't have much confidence. Some of them, they don't come to class prepared. They don't bring all the necessary material.” (SETI, January 25, 2017). Similarly, ST, another general education teacher stated, “They need to be closer to someone who will always say, ‘Do this. It's day three. You have to take A, B, C, D.’ They need guidance from home, and so that they can be able to do their work at home.” (STI, January 18, 2017).

In class and school observations, the researcher did not see any materials being used just for students with LD. During the interview with SET, the researcher asked, “Do you have any resources, perhaps from the government or the region, that you have been given to support students with learning disabilities?” SET replied, “No.” The researcher sought to clarify, “Nothing?” SET replied again, “I don't know of any. Nothing” (SETI, January 25, 2017).

Research Subquestion 2: Identification in the Culture

To answer research subquestion number two, “How do students with LD in Gaborone, Botswana view themselves in the culture of an inclusive setting?” Data were gathered to answer this question in the form of interviews with students and adults, formal and informal class observations, field notes, documents, and pictures. Major themes that emerged in the analysis of data for research subquestion two were: bullying, note-taking, grades, discipline, and attendance.

This research question was written to seek the opinions and views of students with LD. All sources of data were used in this analysis, but the main source of data to answer this question was the interview data from students with LD.
Bullying

All of the student participants interviewed spoke about the issue of bullying. Student 3 was the most affected by the problem. The researcher asked S3 about his least favorite part of school.

My least favorite part is some people who bullying others and telling harsh words to them. The bullying and saying harsh words, I hear around the school. That is the most common thing that happens around school. (S3I, January 25, 2017, p. 18)

Later, the researcher asked S3 if he felt like an important part of his class. Student 3 leaned forward and placed his elbow on the desk in front of him and his hand to his forehead. He looked down at his feet.

S3: No.

Researcher: Why do you say that?

S3: Because sometimes I just feel like I’m getting ignored in my class, people forget about me.

Researcher: You get ignored?

S3: Yes...because they don't treat me okay.

Researcher: What does that mean, they don't treat you okay?

S3: Every day, I come home from school I have a broken heart. A broken heart. Yeah, yeah they hurt my feelings.

Researcher: How do they hurt your feelings?

S3: [He looks away from the interviewer when speaking.] Say hateful things to me.

Researcher: In your class?

S3: A few in my class but mainly outside of class.
Researcher: What kind of things do they say?

S3: I hear like some say I'm crazy.

Researcher: Crazy?

S3: I'm not a normal person.

Researcher: What else do they say?

S3: Go stay at the mental place.

(S3I, January 25, 2017, p. 13-14)

Student 2 also discussed the issue of bullying. He stressed, “Bullied, yes I am, but called names, no.” The researcher asked, “What does it mean to be bullied here?” Student 2 elaborated, “To be bullied is when a particular person comes for you, and he pushes you around. He can either also call his friends so they can push you, beat you even, and just to disturb you, or offend you.” (S2I, January 18, 2017, p. 10).

When S4 was asked if she had ever been bullied, she became reluctant and reserved. Her body language changed. With her hands folded in her lap, she looked down at her knees. She replied, quietly, “Yes.” The researcher asked probing questions to prompt elaboration, but S4 said, “I don't think I want to talk about them.” The researcher shifted focus to another topic of discussion (S4I, January 20, 2017, p. 11).

Student 1 was very eager to discuss the specific aspects of the special education program he felt caused him to be called names. “Yeah. Writing in different classrooms during exams is really depressing…Most of the students know. They tease a lot of people in this program.” The researcher asked for S1 to elaborate. He explained students say things like, ‘This nigga is a fool. He's in the special education program.’ or ‘He's a fool. He'll never pass. He needs extra time to
think.” He goes on to explain, “It’s not being bullied. They just tease you.” (S1I, January 23, 2017, p. 13).

**Note-Taking**

Notes are ingrained in the school culture. In every formal and informal class observation, the researcher viewed students taking notes. In addition, all four student participants discussed note-taking as a problem in their interviews (S2I, January 18, 2017; S4I, January 20, 2017; S1I, January 23, 2017; S3I, January 25, 2017). Students were expected to take notes in every class. Class notes were as short as a page or several pages, depending on the student’s handwriting. School faculty members and the research assistant explained notes are a necessity because of the high cost of printer paper and ink (GENFN, February 7, 2017). Although students do have textbooks for some classes, they do not have textbooks for all of their classes, and they must copy information from the book to take home and study. During an observation in a science class, the researcher noted,

> At the beginning of the class, the teacher has the notes already on the board, including drawing of electrical circuits. Students copy a portion of the notes, and then the teacher talks a bit. Students draw and label diagrams, and then the teacher talks a bit. (O6, January 20, 2017)

According to interviews with all four students with LD and interviews with ST (December 18, 2016) and MT (December 7, 2016), students have difficulty with note-taking. When S4 was asked about what she hated about school the most, she joked, the “pile of notes” (S4I, January 20, 2017, p. 2). However, S3 discussed notes in a more serious manner, “Mostly I get problems in writing notes” (S3I, January 25, 2017, p. 11). In a class observation, the teacher dismissed the
class. The entire class left the room. Only S3 was left sitting in front of the board, in an empty classroom, copying notes (O2, January 18, 2017).

Grades

Student participants were asked about their grades. Student 4 made average to above average marks. She quietly shared, “Well, sometimes I get B’s. I get C’s, sometimes D’s.” (S4I, January 20, 2017, p.5). In contrast, S2 talked about his high grades first. He boasted he had a 90 in Moral Education and a 95 in English in Form 2. However, he said his lowest grade was a zero in math. When asked why he got that grade, he confided, “I struggle math, mostly first, and because math, it's not really my strong suit, math” (S2I, January 18, 2017, p. 6). Student 1 began talking proudly about getting B’s in primary school, but then said he was now an average student. As he expanded, he said he was below average in math and science (S1I, January 23, 2017). S3 described his poor grades similarly. He pointed out he has a D now, but in Form 1 he had an overall grade of a U. He tried to explain why he believed students with LD make poor grades: “People with disabilities. They don't have the courage to pass. Like how I felt when I was getting U's” (S3I, January 25, 2017).

Discipline

Although the researcher did not see any “beatings,” a type of accepted discipline, student participants discussed it. The researcher asked S2 to define a “beating.” He explained, “You get beaten. There's a stick they use. The stick, it's ... they wrap it in soft tape, and then they beat you on the back, on the butt, on the hand.” The researcher furthered the conversation by asking what infraction might get them in enough trouble to be “beaten” (S2I, January 18, 2017, p. 4). He
replied, “Not bringing homework assignments, not writing notes, making noise in the class, disobeying the teacher, and disrespecting teachers.” [The teacher can] “beat the class for not completing homework, making noise in class, or when the whole class gets in trouble.” Student 2 grinned when he talked about not doing homework (S2I, January 18, 2017, p. 4). Similarly, S4 confirmed the types of disciplinary problems that lead to punishment. “Well, in most cases, for notes. We get whipped for not writing the notes. Strokes” (S4I, January 20, 2017, p. 3).

**Attendance**

Truancy is rarely a problem at the research site. During student interviews, students discussed many problems they experienced at school such as bullying, poor grades, note-taking, or exam failure. However, they never mentioned not wanting to go to school or missing school for any reason. After S3 openly discussed the perils of bullying, the researcher asked if the student liked school. S3 said, “Yeah, I love it [school]… I just decide to ignore them, but it's a challenge for me trying to ignore them” (S3I, January 25, 2017, p. 15).

When the researcher asked if the students are ever absent from school, S2 replied, “I miss school rarely, very, very rarely, only if I have to go do something, that's all. That's the only time I can miss school” (S2I, January 18, 2017, p. 10). “I'm never absent from school,” boasted S3 (January 25, 2017, p. 16). Student 4 asserted, “I never miss school. I'm always here” (January 20, 2017, p. 12). While S1 confirmed, “I don't think I have a reason to miss school… I've never missed school” (January 23, 2017, p. 10).
Research Subquestion 3: Perspective of Teachers and Administrators

To answer research question number three, “How do teachers and administrators view the inclusive education program?” data were taken through interviews with students and adults, formal and informal class observations, field notes, documents, and pictures. Major themes that appeared aligned with this research question were school culture for inclusion, policy dissemination, policy implementation, and teacher education and professional development.

School Culture for Inclusion

The teachers and administrators were both aware and accepting of the country’s policy on inclusive education. The Inclusive Education Policy was passed into law in 2014 (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014). The policy was printed and posted on the school’s notice board in the front office (GENFN, February 7, 2017). In addition, the School Intervention Team (SIT) Policy, written by faculty from the school, hung beside it (GENFN, February 7, 2017). The Revised National Policy of Education (1999) recommended schools have a SIT team in place. The school’s policy defined the SIT team as the DSH, a HOD, the GCT, Special and General education teachers, and parents of student with disabilities. The policy outlined the objectives of the SIT team to remediate students with special needs, refer students for assessment, conduct in-services, provide guidance and counseling for students with disabilities, and to monitor the progress of students with disabilities (Doc1, November 18, 2016). During the observation period at the school, to the researcher’s knowledge, the SIT team did not meet.

As previously stated, the GCT heads the special education program at the research site. Her enthusiasm for the special education program and the students in the program is apparent. She attributes her passion to a former student with Cerebral Palsy, who is now a student at the
University of Botswana. She believes he is the reason special education became so important to her.

When I came here, I met one boy who was a special education student. He came with his evaluation from primary school. This boy gave me a challenge, and I decided I need to learn about this problem because this boy was so assertive. He would come in the office and say, ‘I want to have a team of people who can assist me.’ Then I would say, ‘There's nobody who can just volunteer to assist you as a student.’…I was under tremendous pressure. Then, I realized; there's a need. There's a need to advocate for these kids. Then I started learning about special education. (GCTI, December 6, 2016, p. 8)

The GCT recalled the difficulty of starting the special education program at the research site.

When we started, because I started this program last year, when we started it was harder. Teachers were reluctant to assist. They were always saying, ‘These are your students. Special education are your students.’ They were reluctant to help them. They were always saying that I'm not trained in assisting these kids, and it was quite a challenge. But, through awareness, they began to appreciate the program. Particularly, that workshop that we did with the professor [from University of Botswana]. That is when they [the faculty] realized this thing [special education] is quite helpful, and they also need to learn more about it. (GCTI, December 6, 2016, p. 7)

The SH had only been at the school for a little over a year. She was not there when the program began, but when asked how she created a culture of acceptance for the inclusion of students with LD, she only said she tried to motivate her teachers, but she did not elaborate (SHI, December 7, 2017).
Teachers and administrators did not always feel inclusion was the right thing for their school. Many teachers and administrators felt they were ill prepared to teach students with LD. General education teachers and some administrators felt it was the general education students who suffered because the teacher needed to slow down the class pace for the students with LD. The SH said it is not really inclusion but a mixed ability class and the students without disabilities are being pulled down. She continued, “Sometimes they [general education students] become discouraged, or not interested in the learning because you are not going at their pace” (SHI, 7, 2016, p. 8). But not all teachers felt inclusion was inhibiting general education students. The GCT believed, “All of the students are clever, including the special education students” (GCT, December 6, 2017, p. 6).

Due to the feelings of some faculty members, the researcher wanted to find out if they believed inclusion benefited students with LD and if they believed inclusion was benefitting students at the research site. The DSH, who had supported special education and inclusion of students with LD, said she believed inclusion was not working because there was not enough infrastructure and manpower to run the program correctly (DSHI, December 6, 2016). The SH stated, “Inclusion is not benefitting students with LD because there is no inclusion. It is a mixed ability class and students with LD fail. It is also hurting students without disabilities” (SHI, December 7, 2017, p. 8). In contrast, the HOD proclaimed, “Yeah. I think it [inclusion] has benefited them [students with LD]. It has boosted their self-esteem, and they really feel that the school is doing something for them” (HODI, December 7, 2017, p. 9). She continued by saying, “I'm noticing that really they're very confident. Now they come up and really want to go out and talk to you whenever they feel like it. They feel really that they are really been taken care of, and…their results on exams is improving” (HODI, December 7, 2017, p. 9).
Policy Dissemination

Special education was introduced to Botswana in the Revised National Policy on Education (Ministry of Education Botswana, 1994), and recently inclusion has been introduced through the Inclusive Education Policy (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014). The researcher found the distribution of information regarding new government policies as a reoccurring theme in interviews with administrators. It seemed the administrators were aware of government policies regarding special education, but they felt they did not know enough. This lack of knowledge was the case for DSH, “During our training [through the Ministry of Education], they just inform us of these policies that you have to get yourself acclimatized with. It’s upon you…you can buy your own and read for yourself” (DSHI, December 6, 2016, p. 5). The DSH believed it was the responsibility of the person in management to become educated on the policy. She recalled a time when she began in school management. Her former school head was very active in learning more about government policy and disseminating policy information to the faculty.

When I started getting into management, I found in our school that the school head had it when I started being a senior teacher. He was very active, and so I had a lot of insight into these government policies. It depends on who is there that you meet, but otherwise when you get transferred to another school, you find government policies, the school head there is silent. It depends who is really in place. (DSHI, December 6, 2016, p. 5)
Policy Implementation

Since administrative knowledge of the *Inclusive Education Policy* (2014) was limited, the researcher wondered how the school implemented the policy. The DSH discussed implementation of inclusion at the research site, and she shared she is learning about students with LD along the way.

It's very interesting, because as much as I'm learning, I'm also recognizing that there have been a lot of gaps that we have created not catering for these students….We are trying to involve every teacher into this exercise [inclusion]. We are just starting, but at least with the tests, when we do this [provide accommodations], we make sure that they are catered for. The SIT [School Intervention Teams] teams for these students, we decided as a school, it should not be just a particular teacher or the guidance committee only. We are handling them on a day-to-day basis, so bit by bit; we should be trying to include them. Not only to help them during tests. That's what we are advocating for from teachers.

(DSHI, December 6, 2016, p. 7)

The DSH is honest and forthright throughout her discussion. The researcher recalled her positive attitude towards inclusive education and special education.

The researcher found the adult participants consistently discussed several major obstacles to implementation of the Inclusive Education Act. Administrators and the special education teacher were forthright about the Ministry of Education not providing appropriations for special education teachers to be hired at schools. Teachers and administrators also protested the methods in which students were assessed to qualify for special education (DSHI, December 6, 2016).
Allocations

A major problem affecting the successful implementation of the Inclusive Education Act (2014) at the research site was the allocation of teachers. The Ministry of Education allowed each school to hire teachers based on student population. All nine subject area classes must have teachers, but special education is not a subject. Therefore, it does not get an allocation. As a result of special education not receiving an allocation, the SET at the research site is a full-time Moral Education teacher. Many faculty members at the research site were frustrated with having a trained special educator on staff who is not able to work with students with LD because of the Ministry of Education’s allocation process. The SH explained, “We are informed on what to teach in our school…we are informed to include it in all the subjects. We have special education teachers, but they are not posted here to teach the special education” (SHI, December 7, 2016).

The SH also addressed the issue of special education teacher allocations.

Yes, I see a lot of problems because the government itself, though it’s calling for inclusion of these students in the learning, day to day learning, there is no manpower that are trained to assist. Even when there is manpower, like we have a special education teacher here in [research site], they are teaching other subjects. Now I feel until the government releases these teachers who are trained in special education to assist these students then we are going to have a problem. (SHI, December 7, 2016)

The researcher continued this line of questioning by asking the DSH how the special education program runs without a full-time special education teacher (DSHI, December 6, 2016). She explained students with LD were served in school through teachers volunteering to help them. She explained that many schools have a special education teacher on staff. However,
these teachers designated as special education teachers are not allocated to teach special education. She said, it is possible to request a full-time special education teacher through the Ministry of Education, if you can prove a need (DSHI, December 6, 2016).

After learning schools could receive an allocation for a special education teacher, the researcher wanted to learn more about requests to the Ministry of Education. The SH interviewed explained that she has told the Ministry of Education her desire to make the special education teacher a full-time position (SHI, December 7, 2016). She explained she had petitioned the Ministry of Education for a full-time, special education teacher position because she felt the special education teacher was overloaded (SHI, December 7, 2016). The DSH interviewed believed her school was fortunate, because they had a special education teacher, but they wished to have her work full time with students with LD. “Yes, we wanted this exercise [inclusion] to be implemented, but we are lacking. One of the things that I think they can do right now is release these teachers who are trained in special needs” (DSHI, December 6, 2016, p. 11). Likewise the SH confirmed,

These people are trained for special education, and they are sent to schools. They are sent to schools, but they are not sent to schools to implement or to do the thing [special education], they are sent to school to teach different subjects. (SHI, December 7, 2016, p. 9)

Due to the persistence of the SH and the DSH, the school received an allocation at the end of the data collection period. The SET was given a full-time position to support students with special education needs, and the school was given an allocation to hire a new Moral Education teacher.
The SET working in the school has a diploma (3 years) in Moral Education and a Bachelor’s Degree in Special Education with a focus on LD. She teaches Moral Education full-time at the research site. She is to work with students with LD on the side. As a result of this, she is unable to be a special education teacher. She informed the researcher she is to write all of the IEPs for the students with LD and conduct the meetings but has not had time to write even one. The researcher asked her what she wanted to make the special education program better for students with LD. She affirmed,

Make me a full-time special education teacher, so that I may be able to assist the students with the knowledge that I've acquired from the university. Because I don't find any reason really for me to go to the university to be educated on special education, and then when I get here, I do something different. I don't find any point on that. If I'm made to choose special education full-time, I will have time to assist the students, I will be able to assess them, prepare them well and implement the recommendation from the CRC, meet with other stakeholders who assisted the students. (SETI, January 25, 2017, p. 11)

Evaluation Process

Since the special education teacher for students with LD works full-time as a Moral Education teacher, the GCT took it upon herself to run the special education program at the research site. One of the problems identified by the GCT and the other adult stakeholders is the excessive time it can take for a student with LD to be diagnosed. The SH remarked, “Not being assessed is a problem because it takes time for the student to be assessed” (SHI, December 7, 2016, p. 7). Similarly, the SET recalled, “It takes a while, because they [Central Resource
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Centre (CRC) caters for a lot of schools. I think it's because of lack of manpower” (SETI, January 25, 2017, p. 5).

Most students with LD are diagnosed between ages 14 to 16. Some are diagnosed in primary school, but it is more common for students to be diagnosed in junior secondary, SETI explained (SETI, January 25, 2017). The researcher learned no procedure exists for the transferring of records for students who were evaluated and diagnosed in primary school. Sometimes parents or students will bring the evaluation reports to the junior secondary school, but primary schools do not transfer the documents to the junior secondary school. Since students can choose the schools they wish to attend, the primary schools often do not know where students will attend for junior secondary school. This lack of structure in the school selection process can lead to the junior secondary schools needing to take students to the CRC for evaluation, even though they may have already been diagnosed (SETI, January 25, 2017).

According to GCT, SH, and DSH, special education is not a part of the GCT’s job description, but she has become quite passionate about students with LD. The GCT does not have special education training, but she is learning on her own about students with disabilities’ needs and the resources available to them in Gaborone (GCTI, December 6, 2016). The DSH, HOD, and SH acknowledged it is because of the efforts of the GCT that so many students at the school have been assessed and are receiving services (DSHI, December 6, 2016; HODI, December 7, 2016; SHI, December 7, 2016). HOD offered,

When I came here, I found that the senior teacher Guidance and Counseling is trying her best in making sure that the students are being assessed, so she's been taking them to the CRC, Central Resource Centre. So, a good number of students I found had been already
assessed. I was so impressed when I got here to find that really the recommendations are being implemented. (HODI, December 7, 2016, p. 6)

For students to get tested at the research site, the GCT took the students in her car to the CRC in the south of the city. She arranged for the student’s parent or guardian to be present to meet with the educational psychologists, so they could report background information. Then, she followed up with the CRC, so she could get reports of their assessments. Once the reports were obtained, she began to give the students with LD the accommodations the CRC recommended on their national exams. The GCT described her efforts and challenges in regards to the evaluation process.

I wrote a letter in 2014, referring some students there [CRC]. They took almost a whole year to respond. A whole year to respond! Last year, I made some phone ups. I even drove from here to CRC to say, ‘When are you going to assess my students? I've referred this number of students to your institution, and you guys are taking too long.’ …Then they (CRC) will say… ‘It's just three psychologists for the whole country. We are not many, we are thin on the ground, and we are really having challenges to cover the whole country.’ (GCTI, December 7, 2016)

She discussed the changes at the CRC.

I understand, now, there are quite a number of them [educational psychologists]. I saw some new ones, last time when I brought kids for assessment, around June this year.

There were quite a number of … About six psychologists, but they cover the whole country. They cover the whole country. You can imagine, there are so many schools, so many. More than two hundred schools, junior secondary schools. They cover all schools, from primary level up to senior secondary. So, they're overwhelmed. You need
to push them, for my students to be assessed. The first ones were assessed last year in November, the first group. The second group was assessed this year, June. (GCTI, December 7, 2016)

The researcher asked the GCT how she disseminated the information gained from evaluations to the faculty at the school. She recalled,

I've shared those things with them [the school faculty]. These are the reports coming from CRC, and these are the expectations. I even compiled a report; I have it here… These are the needs of the children, the specific needs…Instead of sharing the whole report, I picked those recommendations to say, ‘These are the recommendations which have been proposed by CRC.’ As a school, we need to make sure that we implement some of these recommendations that we can be able to implement. (GCTI, December 7, 2016, p. 10)

Teacher Education and Professional Development

Since special education was written into law in 1994 and inclusion has only been written into policy since 2014, many teachers who have been teaching for 5-10 years, depending on the location of their teacher education program, did not receive coursework on special education. However, teachers who are newer to the field report they have had coursework in special education. All teacher education programs in Botswana have now implemented special education courses for all teachers of all subjects (Ministry of Education Botswana, 1994), but veteran teachers have had little to no coursework in special education. Thus, a need exists for professional development in the schools.
All teachers mentioned a lack of PD for special education and meeting students’ needs. Since many teachers and administrators have not been prepared in special education, the researcher asked if the Ministry provided in-services in special education. Administrators said they received in-service PD through the Ministry on many topics (DSHI, December 6, 2016; HODI, December 7, 2016; SHI, December 7, 2016). Teachers have received a few in-service trainings at the school, but the faculty members arranged them, not the Ministry. The MT suggested PD would help the faculty to be more prepared to work with students with LD. He stated, “Definitely, I believe it [special education] could be a good program. Maybe because most of the personnel here, we’re not trained to deal with such situations” (MTI, December 7, 2016). The GCT tried to provide PD to the teachers at the research school, even though she is not prepared in special education (GCTI, December 6, 2017). The GCT recalled,

I do read some research on special education students. I’ve already read some of the articles that I have read to staff on special education, on issues of inclusive education, and scribing, and reading. I downloaded those from the Internet because I felt they could be useful to teachers because they’re [the faculty] not aware of these things…They don’t know how they [special education students] really should behave, so I had to go onto the Internet to look for those things. After reading those articles, I realized what I need to share with the rest of staff. (GCTI, December 6, 2017, pp. 4-5)

The SET is formally prepared as a special educator to support students with LD. She has knowledge of accommodations and teaching strategies she learned in her program at the University of Botswana. The researcher asked her if she had conducted any PD for the faculty, but she stated she had not (SETI, January 25, 2017).
Research Subquestion 4: Accommodations, Adaptations, or Instructional Strategies

To answer research subquestion number four, “What accommodations, adaptations, or instructional strategies do teachers use to support students with LD?” data were taken through interviews with students and adults, formal and informal class observations, field notes, documents, and pictures. The only theme that emerged during analysis of this research question was the theme of accommodations. This theme is provided in relation to those identified to help frame the observation of practice prior to the study and outlined in chapter two.

Accommodations

The observation protocol developed by the researcher was based upon work by Mukhopadhyay (2009) who developed a non-participant, observation protocol for inclusive, primary classrooms in Botswana. This framework served as the basis for the observation protocol created and used in this study (see Appendix E). The accommodations, adaptations, and instructional strategies used on the observation protocol were further defined in chapter three, and research supporting these categories as a way to support students with LD was provided (see Table 3). The accommodations, adaptations, or instructional strategies listed for use on the observation protocol were selected by the researcher because Mukhopadhyay (2009) validated his observation protocol in Botswana, which included accommodations, adaptations, or instructional strategies appropriate for this culture.

In the current observations in the junior secondary school, the accommodations provided to students with LD were not standardized throughout the school. Some teachers accommodated students with LD, and some did not. The researcher observed ten classes throughout the school, ranging from a traditional classroom setting to a lab setting. Some classes met in a classroom
and some met outside. The only characteristic the researcher required when selecting a class for observation was there needed to be at least one student diagnosed with LD by the CRC present in the class. This criterion allowed the researcher to gain perspective on the types of accommodations, adaptations, or instructional strategies commonly being provided for students with LD. Despite the requirement of the presence of a student with LD, the researcher only observed about half of the accommodations, adaptations, or instructional strategies listed on the observation protocol (Mukhopadhyay, 2009) being used. No teaching strategies or mnemonic devices, co-teaching, differentiated instruction, alternative or adapted assignments, or guided notes were being used. The researcher did observe teachers using versions of peer tutoring, repeat/rephrase, small group instruction, reduced assignments, extended time on assignments, and students provided assistance with note-taking. Since many of the accommodations, adaptations, or instructional strategies listed on the observation protocol were not used, the researcher provided a description of the methods for students with LD that were being used in classes (O1, January 16, 2017; O2, January 18, 2017; O3, January 18, 2017; O4, January 18, 2017; O5, January 5, 2017; O6, January 20, 2017; O7, January 23, 2017; O8, January 23, 2017; O9, January 23, 2017, O10, January 25, 2017).

Peer Tutoring

Peer tutoring was informally used for students with LD. Many classes had tables instead of desks, so students had to sit two or three to a table. Sometimes the teacher would require students to sit together to share books. For that reason, it often looked like students were working together, yet it may have been out of necessity. Several teachers told the researcher they assigned a peer to help the student with LD in class (GENFN, 2017). Likewise, several
students told the researcher, “They had a friend who helped them in class” (S2I, January 18, 2017; S3I, January 25, 2017).

On one occasion, during lunch, the researcher walked into the trailer being used for the dual purpose of serving as the Guidance and Counseling office and the resource room to find a student with LD and a general education peer working at a desk. The student with LD explained he did not understand a concept being taught in math, so he asked an older friend for help. His friend gave up her lunch hour to work with him individually. It appeared he had arranged his own peer tutoring. He told me later he had asked her before for help (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

The SET was the only teacher who used peer tutoring regularly. In her interview, the SET discussed using the strategies she learned in her special education teacher preparation program in her Moral Education class. When she was asked about the accommodations she used, she contributed, “At times I employ methods such as peer teaching. I’ll find a student who shows the signs of understanding to assist the other one with studying and get them to be working” (SETI, January 25, 2017, p. 8).

**Repeat/Rephrase**

In observations, the researcher would commonly see teachers repeating or rephrasing assignment instructions for students with LD. The Agriculture teacher stood out as using repeat/rephrase consistently and specifically to meet the needs of a student with LD in her class. During an observation in the Agriculture class, the teacher assigned classwork. After she explained the assignment, she walked to the student with LD sitting in the front row to converse with him privately about the assignment. She circulated in the class to observe students’ work,
but when she came to the student with LD, she noticed he was struggling. She worked the first couple of questions with the student and explained the answers in Setswana and English (O9, January 25, 2017).

**Small Group**

Small groups were used in two of the classes observed. The Agriculture teacher assigned a small group quiz (O9, January 25, 2017). The Religious Education teacher used small group presentations in class (O5, January 20, 2017). It was common to see small groups of students being asked to summarize a reading assignment or a review of the last class (GENFN, February 7, 2017).

**Reduced Assignment Length**

The researcher did not see teachers using reduced assignment except for the SET. The SET would most likely be the person expected to make accommodations, and she did talk about the accommodations she used in her Moral Education class.

Sometimes during the lesson when I give other students class exercise, I will say for instance, with the rest I'm giving them five questions to answer, but with these ones having disabilities, I will sometimes give them two questions or one question because they struggle to grasp it. (SETI, January 25, 2017, p. 8)

**Notes**

Note-taking is a necessary skill in schools in Botswana, but students with LD point out that note-taking is one of the most difficult tasks they must complete each day (S2I, January 18,
Because of the cost of printing, teachers cannot make a copy of another student’s notes (GENFN, February 7, 2017). The ST reported the problem from his perspective:

They usually have a problem…copying words from the board or the textbook, just to write them properly is just a problem. They can't copy the text from the book into their own books or exercise books. (STI, January 18, 2017, p. 8)

Due to the lack of technology in classrooms, teachers rarely typed class notes, used PowerPoint, or posted notes on class websites, nor could teachers easily email a copy of class notes to a student. Teachers wrote notes on the chalkboard or whiteboard. Students were required to copy the notes. For this reason, teachers rarely provided note-taking accommodations, though there were exceptions. The researcher observed a science class and noticed S2 was not taking notes while the rest of the class was writing. After class, S2 approached the researcher to explain that the teacher privately asked him to bring a memory stick to school. The science teacher puts all of the class notes on the memory stick for S2. He said the boy only copies a portion of the notes in class. Later, in the interview with S2, the researcher asked about note-taking. Student 2 confirmed, “Well you can either choose from a memory stick or bring in a CD…So far, I have science notes are printed, social studies notes that are printed, yeah so far” (S2I, January 18, 2017, p. 7).

Similarly, S3 received accommodations for note-taking from some teachers. “My OP [Office Procedures] teacher prints notes for me,” remarked S3, and he also said his English and Social Studies teachers give him extra time to write his notes (S3I, January 25, 2017, p. 9).

Student 4 mentioned the Moral Education teacher provided her with notes (S4I, January 20, 2017).
Other Strategies

Teachers used other accommodations, adaptations, and instructional strategies. These strategies included wait time, shortened assignments for students with LD, students with LD being seated in the front row, and audiovisual supports.

The Agriculture teacher used appropriate wait time when asking questions in class. She asked a question of a student diagnosed with a Language Impairment and LD during an observation of her class then explained she was going to come back to him for the answer. When she came back to him, she prompted him with a clue, and he successfully answered the question. She explained after class she knew it took him a long time to process information, so she often asked him a question and came back for the answer. She stated this strategy has allowed him to gain the confidence he needed to raise his hand in class and participate (O9, January 25, 2017).

No teacher was observed changing or shortening an assignment except the SET, who stated, “I will try to somehow modify questions for them [students with LD]. If others are, for instance, to analyze a particular thing, I will leave them to list or to briefly explain, instead of discussing, analyzing issues” (SETI, January 25, 2017, p. 9).

The GCT was the only teacher who talked about the use of the audiovisual supports she used in her Guidance and Counseling class. She elaborated, “I make use of audio visual to ensure that ... If they [students with LD] cannot hear it from verbal communication… Sometimes I make use of my phone. Sometimes, when I'm providing motivation, I just make use of my phone. I make some recordings, and then I make them listen” (GCTI, December 6, 2016, p. 11). Also, she explained she used nontraditional methods of student response for her assignments.
“Sometimes they [students with LD] can be able to see or draw, and then listen” (GCTI, December 6, 2016, p. 11).

Although the researcher could identify accommodations, adaptations, or instructional strategies being used in classes at the research site, some teachers admitted to not using accommodations for students with LD. When asked if he did anything specific for his students with LD that would be considered an accommodation, MT commented, “Definitely I would say no. The treatment is just the same as others” (MT, December 7, 2016, p. 6). Of the four students interviewed, S1 was the only student who said he did not receive any accommodations (S1, January 23, 2017).

Exam Accommodations

Whereas few accommodations were given consistently in classes, several accommodations were given during examinations. Almost all students diagnosed with LD by the CRC had the same examination accommodations. The CRC made recommendations for student learning based off the assessment results and provided a report to the school. Students with LD received extended time, a private testing area, a scribe, and a reader. All students were given two hours for their examinations. Students with LD received an additional thirty minutes (Botswana Examinations Council, 2017a). Students with LD took their exams in a classroom away from their peers with only a reader and a scribe present. All students were provided with a reader and a scribe. The researcher observed exam invigilation for students with LD. Students often requested to read their own exams or write their own answers (GENFN, February 7, 2017).
**Trustworthiness**

All data gathered were triangulated to ensure trustworthiness. Multiple sources of data were used for each emergent theme including interviews, observations, and document analyses. After the transcription of the interview data, all of the participants were contacted to verify the accuracy of the transcripts and to make changes.

In addition, the University of Botswana, Office of Research and Development required, as a part of IRB process, the use of a local research assistant. The assistant needed to be fluent in Setswana, have attended school in Botswana, and have knowledge of Gaborone. The University of Botswana required the research assistant to attend every school visit with the researcher. The research assistant was used to clarify cultural questions and translate to Setswana when needed.

To ensure accuracy in the daily recordings of events, notes were taken and reviewed or enriched by the research assistant. Ayala and Elder (2011) recommend the use of a note-taker to capture nonverbal behavior. During interviews and school observations, the research assistant took notes on content, infrastructure, materials, and body language along with the descriptions being recorded by the researcher.

**Member Checking**

Member checking was conducted through the use of the research assistant. The transcripts were sent by email to the research assistant in Botswana who printed the transcripts and brought them to the research site for all participants to read and make corrections if needed. The research assistant then took a digital picture of the corrections and participants’ signatures on the transcripts and emailed them to the researcher. All participants were contacted and reviewed the transcripts of their interviews.
Inter-Coder Agreement

A research assistant provided inter-coder agreement using Nvivo (Nvivo for Mac, 2010). The research assistant was a doctoral student in the special education program but was not associated with the study. The research assistant coded 30% of the data and varied the type of data coded to include interviews, observation notes, field notes, documents, and pictures. Table 14 states the inter-coder agreement by themes and subthemes.

Miles and Huberman (1994) recommend an inter-coder agreement score of 80% or higher. Cohen’s kappa is used to compare two raters (McHugh, 2012). The typical scale used to measure kappa is 0 indicates no agreement, 0–0.20 as slight agreement, 0.21–0.40 as fair agreement, 0.41–0.60 as moderate agreement, 0.61–0.80 as substantial agreement, and 0.81–1 as almost perfect agreement (Landis & Koch, 1977). Table 14 shows agreement was above 80% for all data coded, with the range of inter-coder agreement being from 83.13% to as high as 99.94%, hence the level of agreement was above the recommended guidelines for qualitative data analyses of 80%.
Table 14

Intercoder agreement by theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Subquestion</th>
<th>Kappa</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Disagreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>83.73</td>
<td>16.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSQ1- Cultural</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>84.49</td>
<td>15.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>95.06</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>99.12</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>99.30</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>16.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSQ2- Policy and</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>84.22</td>
<td>15.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>98.92</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Interaction</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>99.67</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions about School</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>99.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>99.70</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material and</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>99.76</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSQ2- Cultural</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>90.86</td>
<td>9.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>99.38</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>99.94</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>87.31</td>
<td>12.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSQ3- Policy and</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>88.11</td>
<td>11.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Dissemination</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>99.67</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Implementation</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>99.08</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education and</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>99.24</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Culture for</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>98.30</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>95.10</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSQ4- Policy and</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>94.66</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>97.48</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Botswana will achieve an inclusive education system in which provides children, young people and adults with access to relevant, high quality education which enables them to learn, whatever their gender, age, life circumstances, health, disability, stage of development, capacity to learn or socio-economic circumstances. (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014, p. 1)

This vision of an inclusive education in Botswana is the framework for this study with a specific lens to examine, reflect upon, and attempt to understand the current status in one school for secondary students with learning disabilities (LD) in Gaborone, Botswana. The researcher used an ethnographic research design to answer the proposed research questions. The study was conducted with direct support from faculty in Botswana, and the researcher immersed herself in the culture of this junior secondary school for a four-month period. Data were collected through interviews, document analyses, and observations. Participants were interviewed and all data were member-checked by general education teachers, a special education teacher, school administrators, and the students with LD at the school site. Gathered ethnographic data were analyzed and triangulated using Nvivo software (Nvivo for Mac, 2010).

The researcher begins this chapter with a summary of themes and findings from the ethnographic study. Next, a discussion is provided of the findings aligned with each research question, and the overall relationship of the findings with the current literature on education in Botswana, the state of inclusive practices, and what is considered evidence-based practices for students with LD. The researcher provides recommendations to consider for secondary students with LD in Botswana and in general practices that might be further enhanced or refined. The
chapter concludes with limitations and potential contributions to the field from this ethnographic study. These recommendations are framed from the lens of the researcher who was a general and special education teacher, has taught in 6 countries, worked collaboratively with faculty in Botswana related to this study and has a unique lens in providing these considerations as a person who also has a diagnosis of a LD.

The researcher defined an emerging special education program as a country with policy, implementation, and research. Botswana’s middle-income status and dedication to social programs caused Botswana’s special education program emerge and met the criteria established by the researcher for an international investigation of practices for students who are LD. This study occurred at a time when Botswana’s growth aligned with the creation of an inclusive educational system. Data was analyzed through the researcher’s unique lens, with continuous reflection and validation by two professors in Botswana, and a research assistant who was a product of the educational system. The themes that emerged and the discussion presented are that of this researcher, but were validated by review from Batswana and experts in the educational system.

Botswana was selected, as this country dedicates more of their GNP than most other countries in the world to education (Statistics Botswana, 2014; The World Bank, 2016). Their policies on education are aligned with UN policies (Ministry of Education Botswana, 1994; Ministry of Education Botswana, 1977, 2014, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1990, 1994), and these policies are being implemented. The implementation of their inclusive policy emerged in the last decade, and just as any new initiative, struggles and strengths were identified. The researcher was given a unique opportunity in this study to examine the implementation of special education policy firsthand at
the research site. The researcher found that novice, general education teachers had a basic understanding of special education because they had taken coursework in their teacher preparation programs. The SET understood and implemented research-based techniques in her classes, but during the time of this study, her bandwidth was limited in the time for her direct support to students, as her primary teaching responsibility was not students with disabilities. The administrators observed worked to include all students. Throughout the observations, all students were in classes together, and the school was an inclusive environment.

Beyond the implementation of policy, the entire school staff, from administration, to teachers, to peers, appeared to have a sheer desire to help all students to succeed. Many teachers and administrators at the research site were concerned about their students with disabilities in their classes. They asked for help and wanted to learn more about teaching students with disabilities. The GCT went beyond her defined role and stepped up to support the students with LD when the person assigned had no choice but to serve the students in her Moral Education class. The GCT was touched in the past by a student with CP and made it her mission to support students with disabilities in her more flexible role. She did her job selflessly and learned as much as she could on her own about special education. She served as a bridge, until at the end of the study when the SET was given time in her role to directly support students, to give students with disabilities at the research site what they needed to be successful. Because the GCT had flexible time in her schedule and the desire to help students with LD, she went beyond her role by driving students in her car to the CRC to be evaluated. She chose to open her doors to students with special needs at the school, even though special education was not part of her designated job.
Synthesis of the Research

Using this overall context of the educational system in Botswana to serve students with LD in inclusive settings, the researcher returns to the initial framework presented by Winzer and Mazurek (2012). Using this framework, the researcher provides a synthesis and analyses of the findings aligned with each research question and subquestion, blended with the current literature available on special education in Botswana and the findings from this ethnographic study.

The primary question answered by this researcher was: What are the observed supports, practices, and perceptions of the inclusive culture in a junior secondary school setting in Gaborone, Botswana to support students with LD? This primary question was further broken down into four subquestions.

1. What were the daily routines, academic activities/accommodations, and classroom life for students with LD within the school’s culture?
2. How did students with the identification of LD in Gaborone, Botswana view themselves in the culture of an inclusive setting?
3. How did teachers and administrators view the inclusive education program?
4. What accommodations, adaptations, or instructional strategies did teachers use to support students with LD?

The theoretical framework, The Model of Inclusive Schooling, created by Winzer and Mazurek (2012), consists of four themes: school transformation, dimensions of time, cultural parameters, and policy and outcomes, which all circle the theme of social justice. These four themes provide the framework for the discussion of the findings.
School Transformations

Winzer and Mazurek (2012) identified the theme school transformation as consisting of influences in globalization, legislation, and economic conditions. Many countries developed a special education policy after the UN drafted the Salamanca Statement. Yet in many nations, services for students with disabilities still do not exist in schools, even though they have a policy in place (Winzer & Mazurek, 2012).

Data under research subquestion three, how do teachers and administrators view the inclusive education program?, aligned with school transformation. Major themes that emerged from the various forms of data analyzed for this research question were of school culture for inclusion, policy dissemination, policy implementation teacher education, and professional development. These themes expand the literature on education in Botswana for students with LD by helping the field understand the voice of administrators in relation to this population in this one, junior secondary school setting. The concerns shared by administrators reflect common concerns found internationally, related to how to most effectively serve and support students with LD in secondary settings (Florian, Black-Hawkins, & Rouse, 2017).

School Culture for Inclusion and Policy Dissemination and Implementation

These two themes are discussed simultaneously. Administrators reflected that current practices and emerging infrastructure are needed to support students with LD in inclusive settings. Special education is new to Botswana through the Revised National Policy on Education in 1994 (Ministry of Education Botswana, 1994). The concept of inclusion is even newer, being introduced to the country in 2014 through the Inclusive Education Policy (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014).
The research site had the *Inclusive Education Policy* prominently posted in the teacher room, located in the front office, and hanging next to it was the School Intervention Team (SIT) Policy. The *Inclusive Education Policy* is the national policy, while the SIT was written by the faculty at the school site (GENFN, February 7, 2017). The SIT policy was more reflective of what teachers knew, though few faculty members knew, shared they knew, or understood the policies for special education. Lack of a clear understanding of special education and the even newer policy of inclusion is consistent with findings from Boitumelo, Mangope, and Mukhopadhyay (2015) and Mukhopadhyay (2013). In both studies, the researchers found a need for teachers in Botswana to receive more PD around special education and inclusive education. This research provided the foundation for this current study and supported this researcher’s findings, yet expanded the discussion specifically to students with LD.

**Evaluation Process**

This emerging culture of inclusivity, by providing general education and special education services, was evident in the current evaluation process. Many educators interviewed felt the evaluation process took too long to complete (GCTI, December 6, 2016; DSHI, December 6, 2016; HODI, December 7, 2016; SHI, December 7, 2016; SETI, January 25, 2017), and once completed, the recommendations were more consistent and generic across students with LD than differentiated or unique to each student (GENFN, February 7, 2017). The importance of this process occurring quickly is critical, as without the evaluations provided by the CRC, the school is not able to provide support for students with LD (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaksetse, 2017). Once identified, the school then is to provide the supports listed. These supports were provided during the examination period, but more sporadically during daily
classroom instructions and routines. Further research is needed related to the process of evaluation, individualization, and implementation of strategies for students with LD in inclusive, junior secondary settings in Botswana and should be expanded to determine if the findings in this study are unique to this specific, junior secondary school.

Cultural Parameters

The theme cultural parameters includes religion, education systems, and traditional values (Winzer & Mazurek, 2012). If inclusive education is embraced in the school’s culture, students with LD may be more accepted by peers, teachers, and school staff.

Question two, how do students with the identification of LD in Gaborone, Botswana view themselves in the culture of an inclusive setting?, was answered in an effort to examine the school life of students with LD. The research found these data to be alignment with cultural parameters (Winzer & Mazurek, 2012).

Data aligned with this research question emerged from interviews and discussions with students and adults, classroom observations, field notes, document analyses, and images captured. Major themes that emerged in the analysis of this research question were aspects of bullying, note-taking, grades, discipline, and attendance. These themes expand the literature on education in Botswana for students with LD by illuminating the classroom experience for students with LD. Many themes emerged for all students in the school, not just those with LD.
Bullying

Historically, people with disabilities in Botswana were not included in much of society (Livingston, 2005). When students with disabilities began to go to school, teachers would sometimes physically or verbally abuse students with disabilities (Dart, 2006; Shumba & Abosi, 2011). As the culture of inclusion has evolved, there are fewer reports of abuses of students with disabilities by faculty, but in this study, bullying was a major theme prevalent in interviews with students with LD. The concept of bullying for the students with LD encompassed discussions in interviews with students. In fairness to this question, the researcher only interviewed students with LD formally, so the issue of bullying may or may not be unique to this population of students or specific to this school site, but from this study, it can be reported as a theme discussed by the students with LD.

Literature on bullying in Botswana is limited. In a study by Tjavanga and Jotia (2012), the researchers found no interventions in place in Botswana’s schools addressing the issue of bullying. Mangope, Dinama, and Kefhilwe (2012) explained bullying is prevalent in the junior secondary schools in Botswana. The researchers elaborated that traditionally, bullying was not seen as a problem and considered a “rite of passage” and as such, often goes unpunished in schools (Mangope et al., 2012). The researcher did not find any literature about bullying in Botswana specific to students with LD. However, Mosenki (2006) studied bullying in Gaborone’s junior secondary schools and found a significant relationship between low academic achievement and being bullied.

Interestingly, adults who were interviewed knew little about the bullying of students with LD, which is supported by the findings of Tjavanga and Jotia (2012) that stated most bullying
occurred outside of school. This behavior occurring outside of school may be because students, those with and without disabilities, are expected to behave in an appropriate manner inside of school, or they are punished. In front of adults, including the researcher, signs of bullying were not observed, yet were consistently noted in the interviews of students with LD.

**Note-Taking**

All students were expected to take notes in all of their classes, so they had material to study at home (GENFN, February 7, 2017). Printing is very costly in Botswana, so worksheets and printed notes are uncommon (GENFN, February 7, 2017). During observations, the researcher saw students taking notes throughout their classes (O2, January 18, 2017; O6, January 20, 2017). During interviews, all four students with LD discussed their problems with note-taking (S2I, January 18, 2017; S4I, January 20, 2017; S1I, January 23, 2017; S3I, January 25, 2017). This struggle with the writing process is common for students with LD (Boyle, 2010, 2012; Suritsky, 1992), but the specific nature of the issues with note-taking experienced by students with LD was not clear from the CRC report. The CRC did not provide any specific note-taking accommodations for students with LD. The literature focuses on teaching note-taking skills and providing notes to students with LD is an evidence-based practice, but these types of strategies or processes were not observed at this time in this secondary setting (Bulgren et al., 1988; Deshler et al., 2008; Schumaker & Deshler, 1988; Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1990). Further alignment and discussion about bullying and note-taking, as well as general accommodations being provided for students with LD, is an area in need of further research within this school site from this current study.
Dimensions of Time

Winzer and Mazurek (2012) first described the dimensions of time section of the framework as important in evaluating an inclusive system. The authors postulated the evaluation of an inclusive system requires longitudinal data, and evaluation occurs in slow increments. Reform, such as Botswana’s inclusive movement, occurs in three phases: slow growth, explosive growth, and burnout (Steiner-Khamsi, 2010). With all reform, including inclusion, it is the people who will view the new policy through the lens of their culture; therefore, it is through the people’s acceptance of the reform that change occurs. Policy is a catalyst for change, but the success or failure of that policy depends on the people of the culture (Winzer & Mazurek, 2009).

Research subquestion four, what accommodations, adaptations, or instructional strategies do teachers use to support students with LD?, aligned with Winzer and Mazurek’s (2012) themes dimension of time, policy and outcome, and school transformation. The researcher chose to report data which fell under research subquestion four under the theme, dimensions of time, because the accommodations teachers chose to use in their classes demonstrated the forward movement in and progressive thinking about the ongoing movement to include students with LD at their school.

The analysis of this research question provided only one additional theme not already identified or discussed. The theme that emerged was the use of accommodations for students with LD. Although accommodations were observed in some cases, limited differentiation of instruction occurred only in isolated incidents, in a specific teacher’s classroom, or during a specific lesson. A brief summary of themes beyond what was discussed from talking with students with LD in their interviews is provided.
**Accommodations**

The data analyzed from this study aligns with a quote provided by Mangope, Bawa Kuyini, and Major (2012) describing education in Botswana, related to practices for students with disabilities: “…a gulf between individual teacher practice and broader school level measures designed to accommodate special needs. In other words, many teachers are left on their own in the absence of uniform school measures for special students.” Similarly, at the research site, the researcher found some teachers used accommodations for students with LD, doing so at their discretion since no IEPs were written for the research site. This was due to the SET’s job being to provide instruction in Moral Education to all students in her house daily, leaving her limited to no time to support students with LD. Due to a lack of a dedicated budget line for a fulltime SET in the school, no standardized accommodations for students with LD were provided, yet the literature recommends an IEP for each student with LD (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017; Mangope et al., 2012). Evaluation reports were written for students with LD by the CRC with accommodations provided by the educational psychologists. However, teachers were not privy to the information provided on the reports. The psychologists from the CRC recommended in the reports that the information provided should be used to write an IEP for the students with LD, yet no IEPs were written for the students with LD at the school. However, at the end of the study, this practice was changing in front of the researcher’s eyes as the school allotted a full-time special education teacher to provide direct support to students and to teachers starting to provide accommodations for students with LD.

However, even with no IEPs at the research site or professional development on providing accommodations to students with LD, teachers at the research site still used some
accommodations. These accommodations were limited and used at the teacher’s discretion. Students with LD may have been more successful in classes using strategies like peer tutoring (Anderson et al., 2004; Delquadri et al., 1983) or guided notes (Anderson et al., 2004; Horton & Hall, 1998), yet this recommendation, due to other factors, may or may not have been successful. A future issue to address at this school and perhaps in Botswana in general is a standardized process and toolkit to support students with LD in secondary settings.

Policy and Outcomes

The final theme of Winzer and Mazurek’s framework (2012) is policy and outcomes. This theme refers to leadership, teacher preparation, or early intervention. Through the examination of interviews and observations, the researcher ascertained the stakeholders’ perspectives on the implementation of inclusive practices for students with LD.

Much of the data aligned with research question one fell under the category of policy and outcome. The data obtained came from interviews and discussions with students and adults, classroom observations, field notes, document analyses, and images captured. Major themes that emerged in the analysis for this research question were daily routines, academic activities/accommodations, and classroom life. These themes expand the literature on education in Botswana for students with LD by illuminating the classroom experience for students with LD. Many of the themes reflect that the same educational experiences occurred at this school site for all students with limited differences observed for students with LD. These small differences are highlighted and recommendations related to expanding supports for this population of students with LD in Botswana is provided for consideration to potentially further improve inclusive practices for students with LD.
Daily Routines

Class Interaction

All students, including those with LD, are expected to interact in classes with the teacher and other students by answering open or closed-ended questions. Teachers often asked questions requiring a choral response, which gave students with LD limited time to process an answer, but this technique did provide a chance to blend in with the voices of their peers.

All students were expected to participate in small groups on assignments and projects, but often students with LD were hesitant to answer questions in class. This hesitation may have been due to their disabilities, or it may have been a reflection of how these students were treated by their peers who, according to their interviews, bullied them or teased them about their disabilities (GENFN, February 7, 2017). The reason behind their hesitation is not clear, but is an area to consider further in future research.

The daily routine for all students included completion of homework, classwork, and notes, and, more often than not, students with LD were not able to meet the demands of several of these requirements. This finding is aligned with research noting students with LD often have difficulty completing homework (Bryan & Burstein, 2004; Bryan et al., 2001). Yet, how these findings about homework align with what occurred for students with LD in Botswana is not currently documented in the literature. This finding could be unique to this site, but was a theme that emerged. The reason why students with LD may or may not be able to complete daily classroom routines was not clearly determined due to limited information on the specific aspects of a student’s needs in the diagnosis, but overall the daily interactions of this population of students was more alike than different from their peers.
Students with LD observed were fully integrated with their peers, but often met academic tasks with less success than their peers. The researcher noted in classroom observations a lack of accommodations being used to support students with LD. However, in interviews with student participants, it was revealed that some teachers were privately providing accommodations in classes. In observations, students with LD often did not write down assignments, or they only wrote down part of the assignment due to being distracted or slow at note-taking. In student interviews, student participants told the researcher they often did not know how to complete the assignment given for homework, so they would not complete the work. Moreover, even if the student did finish the homework assignment, they often forgot to bring the assignment back to school on the day of the class (S2I, January 18, 2017; S4I, January 20, 2017; S1I, January 23, 2017; S3I, January 25, 2017). These findings align with the current literature on the performance of students with LD in general (Bryan & Burstein, 2004; Bryan et al., 2001; Bryan & Sullivan-Burstein, 1998), but this literature is not reflective of the culture of Botswana and further observations could occur to determine if this finding is specific to this school or was unique to this researcher’s experience during the time she was at this school site.

**Academic Activities/ Accommodations**

**Homework, Classwork, and Grades**

Students with LD are known to traditionally have academic difficulty in school (Abosi, 2007), hence the need for a diagnosis and specific, targeted interventions. More specifically, students with LD tend to have difficulty completing homework and classwork (Bryan & Burstein, 2004; Bryan et al., 2001). This overall difficulty of students with LD was consistent with what students with LD at the research site discussed. They specifically talked about how
difficult it was for them to complete both homework and classwork. This difficulty was not clearly remediated with strategies of direct interventions during the time the researcher observed at the research site.

Exams

The researcher was able to observe exam invigilation for students with LD at the research site. The CRC, the body that identifies students with LD in Botswana, recommends accommodations and strategies to support students with LD in their exams and schoolwork. During exam invigilation, students with LD consistently were observed being given the exam accommodations suggested upon diagnosis by the CRC. As a result, the research site had one of the highest junior secondary student test scores in the country (Botswana Examinations Council, 2017b). Despite this success, the researcher found it interesting that all of the students with LD were given the exact same exam accommodations, though many of the students with LD did not seem to need some of the accommodations they were given. A potential concern is the danger that the use of unnecessary accommodations could create a climate of learned helplessness for this population of students. A consideration in future research would be to empower students to do more on their own first by considering if a student can perform a task without accommodations or adaptations to prevent this potential issue (Arnold, 1997; Canino, 1981; Thomas, 1979).

Infrastructure and Materials

The researcher viewed this culture through a unique lens. As a citizen and resident of the United States, the researcher understood the perspectives and feelings of many readers from
developed countries who might feel this school is lacking in materials and resources. However, the researcher also has taught in several locations internationally and viewed this location from a very different lens than someone who may have only been educated or taught in the developed world.

The public school that served as a research site was resource-rich compared to some other schools in the area or in other developing countries. The school has a computer lab, with approximately 40 computers, an LCD projector, and a printer, all in good condition and working order. The library has high-interest, age appropriate books and reference books. Most importantly, for the purpose of this research, this school has the beginnings of a special education program (GENFN, February 7, 2017), and in just four months of being at the school site, the level of support was set to further increase as a continued trajectory to support students with LD in junior, secondary schools in Botswana.

The resource richness of this site was reflected in field notes, but the need for more materials and infrastructure specifically to support students with LD is an area of further consideration. No programs or learning strategies specifically for students with LD also were noted. No specific materials, curricula, or evidence-based practices were used for students with LD on a regular basis. This type of program is emerging and until recently, the school did not have a specific location to serve students with LD, and the special education teacher hired was not provided time to directly work with the students. These findings are consistent with the research of Mukhopadhyay, Nenty, and Abosi (2012) who discussed a lack of facilities and resources for inclusive schools. Yet, the researcher saw clear signs of forward and positive movement in making changes to create a more consistent and sustained structure, from diagnosis to graduation, for students with LD.
Classroom Life

Discipline

The culture of Botswana is focused on human rights and respect of others (Presidential Task Group, 2017). The culture of the school visited by the researcher was one of overall respect for the teachers and administrators. Many students stated they were reluctant to ask for help. Students are expected to be respectful of adults at all times in their culture. The researcher wondered if students interpreted this level of respect as making them unable to ask for help or state their needs.

Material and Organization

Students with LD often have problems with organization (Bryan & Burstein, 2004; Bryan et al., 2001). As a result of poor organizational skills, students with LD tend to forget homework assignments, books, and materials at home. The combination of the six-day schedule and the poor organizational skills puts students with LD at a unique disadvantage due to what the researcher found to be a difficult schedule to follow at times. During student interviews, students with LD stated they would forget their materials or homework and the changing schedules were noted as playing into this issue. In observations, the researcher watched students with LD digging through their backpacks to find materials or homework assignments rarely with a successful outcome (GENFN, February 7, 2017). An interesting future area of exploration would be to study the impact of structures and processes in the educational system on the performance of students with LD.
Recommendations

The national principles of Botswana are democracy, development, self-reliance, unity, and bothos, a tenet of African culture meaning well-rounded character. All of these principles uphold the philosophy of Kagisano, or social harmony, which is the underlying goal of all policy written in Botswana (Presidential Task Group, 2016). The government of Botswana upheld these values though their commitments made to all Batswana, including those with disabilities, by writing policies such as the Revised National Policy on Education (Ministry of Education Botswana, 1994) and the Inclusive Education Policy (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014) to educate all students. To continue to uphold these important values of Tswana culture and further develop the education for students with LD, the researcher provides the following considerations for future research and development for secondary students with LD. These recommendations are offered through the narrow view of one school site and one researcher’s observations. The lens of the researcher is unique as a person with a LD, but narrow in that she is not a native of Botswana and humbly provides these reflections as an outcome of the hospitality and philosophy of Kagisano she so appreciatively encountered during her four months of research in the region and school setting.

Government Structure for Special Education

Steiner-Khamsi (2010) explained educational reform, like inclusion, grows in three phases: slow growth, explosive growth, and burnout. While Botswana’s special education program has evolved since its implementation in 1994, it has not fully evolved, suggesting the program may be in the slow growth stage. This section addresses areas of consideration to help
move growth forward and to provide recommendations for both the school and Ministry of Education to consider in the areas of policy, PD, and direct support for students with LD.

Policy Recommendations

A need exists for a clear and consistent definition and understanding of what is determined LD in Botswana. This statement is one that could be made in any country as this area of disability is often considered too broad or vague and has a range of meaning by person and by type of learning disability they exhibit (math, reading, writing). In Botswana, the vagueness of LD is further exacerbated by the lack of a clear definition of disability in general. Currently, the Botswana Ministry of Education appears to have several definitions of the word “disability.” For example, the Inclusive Education Policy states, a student may receive special education services if the following is true:

Children, young people, and adults are defined as having special educational needs if they need services, which are over and above what is generally provided as standard in the education system. Most learners have special educational needs because they are members of disadvantaged and vulnerable groups in society. Special educational needs may result from, for example:

- being from a very poor or deprived background or vulnerable or marginalised social group;
- living in isolated circumstances;
- not being fluent in the language of instruction in school;
- having a developmental delay;
- having a disability;
having emotional and behavioural difficulties; or from living a life that has been disrupted by distressing or tragic circumstances

(Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014, p. 3)

However, the Population and Housing Census (Statistics Botswana, 2014) defines people with disabilities thusly:

Long term impairment, be it physical, mental intellectual, or sensory, whether congenital or acquired which, when combined with environmental and societal barriers limits the person’s ability to function in society on an equal basis with others who have no impairment. The limitations include inability to carry out activities of daily living independently. (p. 204)

Impairment is defined as this: Any loss or abnormality of psychological, physiological, or anatomical structure or function (Oliver & Barnes, 1998, p. 15).

In addition, the CRC printed a booklet, *Directory of Specific Conditions and Disabilities*, to provide education to schools and the public about disabilities. The aim of the booklet was to “give an overview description of the condition that may be seen in children in schools and some features that may be exhibited” (Doc6, November, 18, 2017, p. 1). The following conditions are described as a disability: Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, Autism, Cerebral Palsy, Down Syndrome, Dyslexia, Epilepsy, Hydrocephalus, Mental Retardation, Microcephaly, Osteogenesis Imperfecta, and Spina Bifida (Doc6, November, 18, 2017, p. 2-16). Information was provided on assessment, phonic awareness, and learning styles (Doc6, November, 18, 2017, pp. 17-27). However, the term LD is currently absent from the document (Doc6, November, 18, 2017).
One of the first tasks of the researcher upon arriving in the country was to ensure she entered the dissertation study with a clear definition of LD. Upon initial and ongoing investigation, she learned from lead researchers, administrators, and teachers alike that the term LD is embraced as a disability, but no formal definition currently exists. Most shared with the researcher that either the US or other countries’ definitions are used to provide a loose understanding and use of the term. No formal definition of LD in Botswana was found in the Revised National Policy on Education (Ministry of Education Botswana, 1994) or in the Inclusive Education Policy (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014).

In an informal conversation with a professor of special education at the University of Botswana, the researcher was told the country draws definitions of disabilities from various Western nations, but Botswana has no formal, consistent, or standardized definition for use in the country of Botswana. With no standardized definition of disability and no definition of LD provided by the government, the CRC may not be using an appropriate criterion to diagnose a student with a disability, or various assessors may be looking at each student through a different lens. This need for clarity at a national level has implications at the school, classroom, and individual student level for both understanding and providing direct support to students with LD. Having a clear, written, and practice-based definition could help improve understanding and practice of students with LD.

Professional Development

Botswana should be commended for their implementation of special education as a major course of study at the universities and teacher’s colleges. Furthermore, Botswana has required all teacher preparation programs include special education coursework (Abosi & Otukile-
Mongwaketse, 2017). However, many of the veteran teachers have not had formal coursework in teaching students with disabilities.

In Botswana’s *Inclusive Education Policy*, Policy Goal 2 states, “Teachers will have the skills and resources to enable children of different abilities to learn effectively” (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014). Furthermore, Commitment Statement 5 continues, “Action will be taken to ensure that teachers will be more effective in enabling children to learn” (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014). And Commitment Statement 6 added the following: “Action will be taken to improve schools’ access to a wide range of good quality teaching and learning resources appropriate to the number of children being taught and to the specific needs of children with disabilities” (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014, p. 10).

In addition to the Commitment Statements from the *Inclusive Education Policy* (2014), the *Revised National Policy on Education* (Ministry of Education Botswana, 1994, para.9.6.21) states the CRC is responsible for professional development of teachers, and the Faculty of Education at the College of Education at the University of Botswana should develop preservice teacher programs that incorporate special education. The policy recommends all teachers who did not receive coursework in special education would receive professional development to supplement their learning (Ministry of Education Botswana, 1994, para. 9.6.31).

Even though the *Revised National Education Policy* recommended PD for teachers in 1994, teachers at the research site have had few inservices on the topic of special education. The faculty of the University of Botswana provided two inservices; however, teachers stated the two inservices were not enough. Researchers echo these findings in studies completed with primary school teachers in inclusive settings (Mukhopadhyay, 2013; Mukhopadhyay et al., 2012).
In discussions with the more experienced faculty members, the researcher learned that many of the seasoned general education teachers have not received any coursework in special education while they were in teacher preparation colleges or universities, while newer faculty members did receive some coursework in the area of special education. Thus, it is important for PD to be given to faculty members so better support can be given to students with LD.

Acceptance for Students with LD

Educating faculty members could help teachers realize students with LD are very capable of learning but only need academic supports in targeted areas to be successful. With this new broadened educational focus of inclusive education, the faculty with further education could begin to create a culture of harmony for all students, including those with LD. Educating the faculty members at school sites, such as the one studied by the researcher, could better equip teachers and administrators to approach the problem of bullying students with LD within schools. Botswana’s *Inclusive Education Policy*, policy goal 4 states the following: “Schools will be supportive and humane establishments, which embrace and support all their learners and value their achievements so that children will attend school regularly, behave well, and work hard at their studies” (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014, p. 1).

Moreover, commitment statement 9 continues, “Actions will be taken to ensure that schools are supportive and humane establishments which embrace and support all their learners and value their achievements” (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014, p. 2). And 9c of this statement tackles the issue of bullying by noting, “Schools will develop anti-bullying policies and practices to ensure that children with special educational needs are safe and happy in the school environment” (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014, p. 12).
It is the belief of this researcher that the government of Botswana has begun implementation of “supportive and humane establishments which embrace and support all their learners and value their achievements” (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014, p. 2), yet this approach may need to further consider how students with LD feel in their inclusive environment and include consideration of addressing the potential theme of bullying that emerged during this study. Steps may need to be taken to support initiatives that address overall acceptance of all students, including addressing the potential issue of bullying, and to ensure students are taught independent learning strategies while receiving direct and targeted support related to their disabilities.

This type of cultural and inclusive programming could parallel the countrywide model already created for talking about the cultural issue of HIV/AIDS throughout the country. The HIV/AIDS program is an example of a successful program implemented to combat discrimination against those affected by HIV/AIDS. Moreover, the research location has done a commendable job enforcing commitment statement 8.f: “The role of schools in reducing the spread of HIV and AIDS will be increased with existing HIV and AIDS awareness and prevention campaigns strengthened, and awareness materials made accessible to all learners, including those with disabilities” (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014, p. 12). The school has a barrage of literature, signage throughout the campus, teaching and re-teaching in many courses at all levels, and assemblies dedicated to healthy living. Part of this campaign is used to stop the discrimination against those with HIV/AIDS and those whose families have been affected by HIV/AIDS. With the success of this program, a similar program could be used to tackle the potential bullying problem or further education about the positive differences presented in inclusive school settings for students with disabilities.
The GCT suggested a program to sensitize the general education students about disabilities (GCTI, December 7, 2016). If a program focused on learning differences went into effect in primary school, and continued into junior secondary school, students with LD may be more accepted for their unique differences.

In addition to an anti-bullying campaign, the researcher found limited research in Botswana in the area of bullying and no research on bullying for students with LD. Research conducted in this area could benefit all students with further investigation aligned with the policies on inclusive education to determine the impact of such programs on all students, including students with disabilities.

Program for Students with LD

Policy drives program development and while special education programs continue to grow and progress in Botswana; special education is not fully developed. To further develop special education in Botswana, each school might benefit from being given an allocation for a special education teacher. Students with LD also may benefit from changes being made to the Central Resource Centre based upon the establishment of a specific definition of LD, and teachers could be assisted in providing the appropriate and standardized adaptations and accommodations for students with LD with IEPs.

Allocations

The heart and soul of any special education program is the teachers. Special education teachers are professionals, who not only provide support for students with LD, but also can educate other faculty members through professional development on teaching students with LD.
They can ensure the correct adaptations and accommodations are provided to students with LD, as these are the people who are working directly with the students everyday. It is through their knowledge of strategies and evidence-based practices that students with LD learn and thrive. Currently, the Ministry of Education allows each school allocations for subject area teachers, but not for a special education teacher because special education is not a course, and allocations are aligned with specific courses. The researcher learned a system is in place for petitioning the Ministry of Education for a special education teacher, which is what happened at the research site, but this practice is not a common or adopted practice. Students with LD are dependent upon the school to petition for a special education teacher to support their learning needs and to meet the goals outlined in the *Inclusive Education Policy* (2014).

During the last few weeks of the study, the special education teacher was given a fulltime special education teaching position. An allocation was opened to hire a new Moral Education teacher (GENFN, February 7, 2017). Although the research site has been fortunate enough to be given the funding for a full-time special education teacher, the researcher learned through conversations with teachers and administrators that many schools in the area and throughout the nation are not as lucky. In fact, when the researcher entered the school in October 2016, the SET had a full-time course load teaching Moral Education. It was this teacher’s job to do what was possible for students with disabilities when time permitted, but with a full teaching load, it was virtually impossible to provide services for students with special needs, write IEPs, provide accommodations for students, and enforce the law. Without a trained teacher to provide services for students with disabilities, policies created by the Ministry of Education may never be fully implemented and an Individualised Education Programme and a School Intervention Team (SIT) cannot be created. In addition, a special education teacher could be used to provide professional
development for the faculty. Individualised Education Programmes might be written and implemented. Students with LD could be accommodated in classes and on exams, and with a special education teacher on staff at all schools, who is qualified to diagnosis students with a disability, students could spend less time waiting to be taken to the CRC for evaluation.

Central Resource Centre

The Central Resource Centre (CRC) is an agency staffed with educational psychologists, located in Tlokweng, in the south of the country, next to the South African border. The educational psychologists are expected to fan out over the country assessing students suspected of having a variety of disabilities. According to GCT, only six educational psychologists are allotted for the whole country. Thus, it is not surprising it can take up to a year for a student to be assessed (GCTI, December 7, 2016).

Upon the researcher’s arrival in the country, the researcher asked faculty at the research site about definitions used by the CRC for diagnosis of students with LD. The researcher was given a pamphlet titled the Division of Special Education, Central Resource Centre (Doc5, November 18, 2017) and a booklet titled Directory of Specific Conditions and Disabilities (Doc6, November 18, 2017).

The pamphlet Division of Special Education, Central Resource Centre listed the services provided by the CRC and general information such as hours of operation. Assessments are only conducted on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Mondays and Fridays are used for Stimulation and Therapy, and Wednesday is a follow up day (Doc5, November 18, 2017). With the log of students needing assessment from schools throughout the nation and the length of time it takes for a student to be assessed, extending assessment hours, hiring more educational psychologists,
and providing a location in the north of the country could help to ease some of the problems reported by participants at the research school.

The Central Resource Centre and Transitions

   To alleviate some of the testing burden of the CRC, the researcher recommends the development of a process for the transition of paperwork when students leave schools and move to the next school. When interviewing the SET, the researcher learned Botswana has no procedure for transferring records for students who were evaluated and diagnosed in primary school. Parents or students have to bring the evaluation reports to the junior secondary school, because primary schools do not transfer the documents to the junior secondary school. Since students can choose the schools they wish to attend, the primary schools often do not know where students will attend junior secondary school. When students arrive at the next school with no evaluation from the CRC, the junior secondary school may need to take students to the CRC for evaluation, even though they may have already been diagnosed (SETI, January 25, 2017). Since the CRC is already overwhelmed with students needing assessment, a system should be put into place to pass the records from primary to junior secondary school, and again from junior secondary school to secondary school, to reduce students being reassessed by the CRC. Students should also be made aware of their assessment and be prepared to share their needs and documentation as another way to address this issue.

The Central Resource Centre and Professional Development

   According to the pamphlet from the Division of Special Education, Central Resource Centre, Section 5.0 Information and Education, one of the duties of the CRC is to conduct workshops: “Workshops for teachers and parents are held throughout the year both at the CRC,
and Education Centres and Schools” (Doc5, November 18, 2017, para. 5). Teachers at the research site shared they did not have PD on special education. The GCT stated there have only been two in-services on special education (December 6, 2016). Researchers agree that more professional development on special education is needed (Mukhopadhyay, 2013; Mukhopadhyay et al., 2012).

When the researcher asked the SET, a trained special educator, if she had been asked to conduct any PD for the school, she stated she had not (SETI, January 25, 2017). Since the CRC is not providing PD for schools, the special education teacher could provide professional development for the school faculty. Billingsley (2007) discussed special education teachers becoming teacher-leaders. Through leading PD at the school, the special education teacher would be taking on a leadership role. Their experience and preparation from the University of Botswana could be used to teach other faculty members about appropriate accommodations for use in classes for students with LD. With more PD for teachers at the research site, the school culture for inclusion could further advance the success of this population and could continue to evolve, aligned with the mission of the countries’ inclusive education policies.

**Individualised Education Programme (IEP) and Standardized Accommodations**

After a student is assessed and diagnosed with a disability by the CRC, a report is sent to the student’s school, and an Individualised Education Programme (IEP) can be written. Much like other nations, students with disabilities in Botswana need an IEP to receive special education services (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017; Mangope, Bawa Kuyini, & Major, 2012). Preservice, special education teachers learn to write an IEP in their teacher education programs (SETI, January 25, 2017). Yet, in a study conducted by Mangope, Bawa Kuyini, and Major
(2012), of the teachers polled, only 54.1% of special education teachers had IEPs written for their students with disabilities. At the research site, no IEPs were written. Therefore, teachers were unaware of the accommodations a student needed to be successful, and students with LD were provided with accommodations during exams and in some classes, but not with consistency. The researcher recommends the writing, implementation, and consistent use of an IEP to standardize accommodations for each student with LD. These accommodations also could be shared with the students to help with their understanding of their abilities and disabilities, so that they too can share with teachers, during transition, their needs as outlined on their IEPs. All of the students’ teachers also could be informed of the accommodations on the IEP and taught to use these accommodations in classes through PD.

Improved Student Self-Awareness

Students with LD could benefit from learning self-advocacy skills. When a student receives the diagnoses of LD and their IEP is written, the student could be taught about their disability, accommodations that may assist them in classes, and how to respectfully ask a teacher for support. When the student with LD learns about their disability and the supports they will receive, they may feel a sense of relief and less frustration. By applying accommodations such as extended time and reduced classwork and homework, the students’ assignment completion rate could improve. Yet, the best accommodations and tools to use for students with LD in Botswana are still unknown. Also unknown is how to incorporate the culture of respect for adults while still allowing students with LD to self-advocate by asking teachers for help and accommodations.
Many countries use evidence-based practices to support students with LD, but how and if these same practices and ideas are appropriate for Botswana is yet to be answered. Use of these tools or other tools aligned with the culture and practices of Botswana may help students begin to feel successful at school, potentially resulting in better self-confidence and improved self-image.

An Accommodation Toolkit for Botswana

Each student with LD has different needs, and when the educational psychologists at the CRC assesses them, the evaluation team should provide the school with recommended accommodations based on the student’s test scores. The special education teacher then could take the information from the CRC’s report to create an IEP and tailor instruction to include the accommodations recommended by the CRC, and the general and special education teachers could use these accommodations. An individualized toolkit may be provided for each student, which includes research-based practices. The writers of the *Salamanca Statement* encouraged research-based practices to be used globally in classrooms for students with disabilities (UNESCO, 1994).

The Botswana Ministry of Education might want to consider creating an accommodations toolkit for students with LD. This set of tools could be used to inform all professionals of the definitions and criteria for LD for students in Botswana. It could be built upon practices from other countries and adapted to the accepted cultural and academic practices in Botswana. Further research may be conducted to determine how effective these research-based accommodation choices are for students with LD in Botswana.

The UN, Pathfinders of Australia, and the Ghana Educational Service have comprised such a toolkit. The toolkit for educators in Ghana is called *Disability Rights Awareness and*
Inclusive Education: Building Capacity of Parents and Teachers a Manual for Inservice Training and Community Education (Kuyini et al., 2015). In this manual, the authors provide definitions of various disabilities, information on assessment and screening, information on the Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and laws specific to Ghana. The authors created modules specific to the schools’ and staff members’ roles in an inclusive setting, including case studies for learning to work with students with different disabilities such as using accommodations to fit a variety of different learning needs (Kuyini et al., 2015).

The manual created for Ghana by Kuyini et al. (2015) is a good example of a toolkit that could be created for Botswana. Research-based accommodations and strategies for students with LD could be included, but they also need to be appropriate for the school and countries’ cultures. In the schools of Botswana, general education teachers typically have classes of 40 students, so accommodations need to align with the complications that might occur with such large numbers of students in a classroom setting. This toolkit also has to align with the resources available in the school setting as well as the strong respectful culture created between students and teachers. For example, currently technology is not always readily available, and printing is expensive, so a student advocating for tools that are not available or in a way that does not align with the culture norms need to be considered in the recommended accommodations.

The accommodations recommended by the researcher are supported by research, used throughout the world, and may be suitable for consideration for use in schools in Botswana. Table 15 provides a list of research-based accommodations and strategies for students with LD to consider as a beginning resource toolbox.
Table 15

Accommodations for students with LD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles for a Student with LD</th>
<th>Possible Accommodation</th>
<th>Research Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homework completion</td>
<td>Reduce or individualize homework while keeping the same content</td>
<td>Horton &amp; Hall, 1998; LDAA, 2013; Maccini &amp; Gagnon, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework completion</td>
<td>Homework Planners</td>
<td>Bryan &amp; Sullivan-Burstein, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classwork completion</td>
<td>Reduce or individualize classwork while keeping the same content</td>
<td>Horton &amp; Hall, 1998; LDAA, 2013; Maccini &amp; Gagnon, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note-taking</td>
<td>Guided Notes</td>
<td>Lazarus, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor memory</td>
<td>Mnemonic Devices</td>
<td>Bulgren et al., 1988; Deshler et al., 2008; Schumaker &amp; Deshler, 1988; Scruggs &amp; Mastropieri, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-level instruction</td>
<td>Differentiated Instruction</td>
<td>Tomlinson, 2001; Tomlinson et al., 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exam Accommodations

An accommodations toolbox, if created, could be used to support the individual needs of students with LDs, but it should not be used as a one-size-fits all model. Not all students with LD require the same accommodations. The students with LD at the research site were given the same exam accommodations regardless of disability. However, many students did not need all of the exam accommodations they were being given. The need for individualization of these accommodations would be a logical, next step for the education of students with LD.

Individualization is important as is over-prescription of accommodations that can lead to students with LD, who are capable of completing the task without assistance, developing learned
helplessness. When a person experiences repeated failures or constant support, they feel they do not have control over their situations and are doomed to fail. Students with LD can experience repeated academic failure, which has been linked to learned helplessness (Canino, 1981; Thomas, 1979). There is a danger that the students with LD at the research site who have identical exam accommodations, many of which were observed to potentially be unnecessary, could create a reliance on an accommodation rather than the student having the confidence to complete the task independently. The need for independence and confidence are important skills for students with LD, as they move into careers, or as they choose college options. Further clarifying and differentiating practices for students with LD is an area of consideration for Botswana’s educational system.

**College Options**

Improving self-sufficiency and ensuring students who are LD are aware of their rights could further support students in Botswana as they transition to an already inclusive culture of the university or other post-secondary opportunities. The University of Botswana provides supports for students with many disabilities, including LD (University of Botswana, 2017), yet ensuring this population is ready to self-advocate, aligned with the norm of the culture for what they need, is a potential next step.

The Guidance and Counseling class curriculum offers information about post-secondary opportunities in junior secondary school. The GCT could include information about disability supports in post-secondary schools as these were found at the University of Botswana. Currently, students with disabilities may not see post-secondary school as an option due to the fact that information regarding the Disability Support Service Unit may not be publicized. Even
with information on options, students will need the ability to advocate for their needs to ensure success.

These recommendations and reflection are presented respectfully and with caution due to the limited time and experience of the researcher being in Botswana. The researcher acknowledges that, despite being a person with LD, the culture and personal experience of the researcher is definitely different, having received services in the U.S. The researcher also acknowledges that each person with LD is unique as are any individuals. Yet, the recommendations the researcher provides, through her lens, for the Ministry of Education, are to create a definition of LD for Botswana and to build an Accommodations Toolkit for use with education professionals in Botswana.

**Limitations**

All research has limitations, but international research conducted by those outside of the country comes with potential naivety and cultural bias. This “visitor” status combined with the inherent limitation of ethnography research is an important variable to consider in the presentation of these findings. Ethnography innately embraces a cultural grounding for the research in that the focus is on a culture-sharing group and identifies significant patterns, such as ideas, beliefs, rituals, and customary behaviors (Creswell, 2007) found in the culture being studied. The ethnographer in this study used observations, interviews, and document analyses from one junior secondary school in Gaborone, Botswana (Brantlinger et al., 2005; Creswell, 2007; Fetterman, 2010). The results garnered from this research cannot be generalized to other culture-sharing groups and are presented through the lens of this researcher, in this site, during the four-month visit.
“Prolonged engagement” and “persistent observation” in the culture is necessary (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The researcher was immersed in the culture for four months. However, the IRB from the University of Botswana took over a month to obtain, so the actual time gathering data was three months. While living in Gaborone, Botswana, the researcher learned the day-to-day routines of people in the culture and the items and traditions. While learning about the culture outside of the research site, the researcher also was immersed in the culture of the school. The researcher was able to collect data throughout the time at the research site, but a more prolonged time period would have allowed for an even richer description and understanding of the culture of students with LD in an inclusive, junior secondary school in Gaborone, Botswana.

A major limitation of this study was the researcher could not find a definition, guideline, or criteria provided by the government of Botswana to define LD within their educational system. For the purpose of this study, the definition of LD came from the US Department of Education. This definition was the one suggested by the researchers in Botswana as the most commonly used definition at the time of this study.

The researcher had very few obstacles at the research site. Student participants were never absent. Teacher participants were rarely absent, with the exception of one of the adult participants who was absent for several weeks. The school and the university closed one day due to weather. Parent involvement in this study was minimal, as was their overall participation in the design of the study.

The gatekeepers at the school allowed the researcher to observe any classroom at any time, which meant the classroom observations were not prearranged. Therefore, what was observed was authentic as teachers did not change or alter their lessons in advance of
observations. However, the teachers could change their teaching methods while the researcher and the research assistant were present in the room.

A limitation of ethnography is researcher bias. The researcher is a citizen of the US and is a person with a LD. However, the researcher also has had extensive experience living and working abroad. It is through these lenses the data were analyzed, but again the caution is that the findings presented are from one researcher’s viewpoint.

Some day-to-day problems also can be viewed as a limitation. The researcher experienced power outages and Internet outages, which slowed work at times. A day of data collection was missed because the researcher needed to apply for an extension of immigration.

Implications for the Field and Future Research

The data analyzed in this study revealed the research site’s struggle to implement policies on inclusive education. However, these themes could have implications, which reach further than just the school the research was conducted. The results could reflect the feelings of other schools, faculty members, and students with LD.

Policy

The government of Botswana has strong policy in place to support students with disabilities in Botswana. Currently, the policies of Botswana educational leaders and practitioners alike agree that they use several global definitions for the word disability. The Convention on the Rights of the Persons with Disabilities explained “persons with disabilities include those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual, or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an
equal basis with others” (UNGA, 2006, p. 1). Rather than using other definitions, a country might use the definition written by the UN for consistency, not only in Botswana, but the world.

The researcher did not find a definition for LD in any UN documents, so for this research study, the definition from the United States was used (U.S. Department of Education, 2004, para. 10). The term LD was searched as Learning Disabilities, Learning Difficulties, and Learning Disorders. One possible reason for not finding a definition was explained by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in the book, Students with Disabilities, Learning Difficulties and Disadvantages. “The term special needs education means different things in different countries” (OECD, 2007, p. 18). Furthermore, the authors state they felt a disability category might not describe the whole child:

Disability categories are viewed as having only partial implications for educational provision or for the development of teaching programmes, which inevitably have to take the whole child into account. In this way, therefore, categories based on medical descriptions are at best of only limited value to education policy-makers. (OECD, 2007, p. 18)

A definition cannot represent the whole child’s needs, but in a dawning special education program like that of Botswana, the government might consider establishing a framework to be used by the educational psychologists at the CRC to ensure consistency in how students are being identified with a disability, specifically those who are labeled LD. The Ministry of Education could write a formal definition to suit the culture and needs of students with LD in Botswana. By creating a standardized definition for disabilities and LD, a framework for diagnosis could be created, followed by appropriate accommodations for students.
Teacher Preparation

Through the implementation of special education policies in Botswana, all teachers are required to complete coursework on teaching students with disabilities (Abosi & Otukile-Mongwaketse, 2017). Novice teachers at the research site stated they had taken coursework on special education in their teacher preparation programs. However, veteran teachers did not have any coursework, and at the site studied, limited to no PD had been provided. While immersed at the research site, the researcher found caring teachers and administrators eager to learn more about working with students with LD. Professional development could help further support these devoted teachers to learn additional accommodations to use in their school and classrooms to better serve students with LD.

Conclusions

When answering the question, “What are the observed supports, practices, and perceptions of the inclusive culture in a junior secondary school setting in Gaborone, Botswana to support students with LD? the researcher found class accommodations were in place at the research site, though they were inconsistent and only some general educators used these accommodations for students with LD. The researcher found themes of students with LD being bullied and struggling with note-taking, homework, and classwork completion. Themes that emerged from teachers and administrators were a lack of PD on understanding and meeting the needs of students with LD, delayed assessments for students suspected to have LD, and a lack of special education teacher allocations to support students with LD. The researcher also discovered teachers like the GCT, who was so moved by a former student with a disability that she created and ran the special education program in addition to her other job responsibilities.
Additionally, the deputy school head believed in inclusive education, but felt the schools were not receiving the support they needed to be successful.

When embarking on this adventure, the researcher searched for a nation with an emerging special education program, which included policy, implementation, and research from a university. What the researcher found was Botswana. Botswana is a deeply patriotic nation and the Tswana people are proud of their heritage, and the obstacles they have overcome to become an upper-middle class nation. This pride is shown through the social programs the government has created to support all Batswana, including those with LD. Kagisano is alive in the people and policies of Botswana.

In 1994, the government of Botswana committed to educating students with LD (Ministry of Education Botswana, 1994). This commitment was observed in the research site in Gaborone. Although this research study was only completed in one school, after immersion at the school, the researcher firmly believes this research site has completed an extraordinary amount of work to initiate best practices for the inclusion of students with LD. As is true for all schools in all countries, further work is still needed to ensure the best outcome for each student.

To achieve the goal of meeting individualized needs, the government of Botswana might consider creating policies, PD for teachers, and direct support around and for students with LD. The Ministry of Education could consider funding special education teacher allocations in all schools and creating a standardized definition of LD to assist the CRC in evaluations. Finally, an Accommodations Toolkit might be created to support students with LD and to aid educational professionals on how to best support students with LD. As new practices and procedures are put into place, further research on students with LD in junior secondary schools could contribute to the ongoing development and success of this population in a country that embraces both the rich
traditions of their culture while focusing on the individual needs of students with LD in inclusive settings.
APPENDIX A
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR STUDENTS
Semi-Structured Protocol for Junior Secondary Students with Learning Disabilities

**Introduction:** I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Central Florida in the United States. I am researching junior secondary students with LD in inclusive classes in Gaborone, Botswana. With the assistance of researchers at the University of Botswana, I was able to locate your school and classroom as a potential research site. Your experiences in your classes will help me to learn more about the educational experiences for students with LD in Gaborone.

There are no right or wrong answers in this interview. You may freely express your opinion. This interview will be confidential, and your name will not be associated with this interview. The answers you provide will be analyzed and used for future publications.

To ensure I remember all of the information you share today, I will be recording this interview. I will transcribe the interview, and I will share the transcription with you to make sure I have accurately portrayed your feelings. Please know you may stop this interview at any time. Thank you.

**Demographic Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Adapted from/Developed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How old are you?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What grade/level are you in?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inclusive Education Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Alignment to the Policy Goals</th>
<th>Adapted from/Developed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you enjoy school?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>“NLTS-2,” 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your favorite part of school?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your least favorite part of school?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe your grades in school.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When were you diagnosed with a learning disability?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does it mean to have a learning disability?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do your teachers provide you with accommodations or extra help (changes in your assignments for class) in your classes? If so, what are these accommodations?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 2</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell me about a time you asked a teacher for accommodations or extra help? Do you ask often?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 2</td>
<td>Prater, Redman, Anderson, &amp; Gibb, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you get along with your teachers?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>“NLTS-2,” 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell me about your friends at school.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>“NLTS-2,” 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you see any friends from school outside of the school day? What are typical activities you do with your friends?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>“NLTS-2,” 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel like you are an important part of your class? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 4</td>
<td>“NLTS-2,” 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you ever bullied, picked on, or called names at school?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>“NLTS-2,” 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you miss school? What is the typical reason for missing school?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 4</td>
<td>“NLTS-2,” 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What career do you want when you leave school? Will this require more education? If so, where will you go to obtain this education?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 1</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you so much for your time and the valuable information you have provided.
APPENDIX B
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR ADMINISTRATORS
Semi-Structured Protocol for Administrators

**Introduction:** I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Central Florida in the United States. I am researching junior secondary students with LD in inclusive classes in Gaborone, Botswana. With the assistance of researchers at the University of Botswana, I was able to locate your school and classroom as a potential research site. Your expertise as a school administrator will help me to learn more about the educational experiences for students with LD in Gaborone.

There are no right or wrong answers in this interview. You may freely express your opinion. This interview will be confidential, and your name will not be associated with this interview. The answers you provide will be analyzed and used for future publications.

To ensure I remember all of the information you share today, I will be recording this interview. I will transcribe the interview, and I will share the transcription with you to make sure I have accurately portrayed your feelings. Please know you may stop this interview at any time. Thank you.

**Interview Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demographic Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Adapted from/ Developed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Did you teach before becoming an administrator? If so, what subjects? Grade levels? How long?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How long have you been an administrator at this school?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How long have you been an administrator overall?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Where did you receive your education?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What type of degree did you receive and in what subject area?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Were you enrolled in a special education course during your education?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Did any of your university courses, besides the special education course, discuss special education?  

**Inclusive Education Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Alignment to the Policies Goals (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014)</th>
<th>Adapted from/Developed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementing Policy/ Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How are educational policies disseminated to schools from the government?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What policies have you had to implement regarding inclusion?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>Timor &amp; Burton, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How have you created a school-wide culture of acceptance for inclusion?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>Dieker, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How has inclusion been received by the staff and faculty?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Timor &amp; Burton, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How has inclusion been received by the parents?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Describe problems, if any, you have had with the implementation of inclusion.</td>
<td>Policy Goal 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>Salisbury, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What resources have you been provided to implement inclusive education in your school?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 2</td>
<td>Rodriguez, 2013; Salisbury, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In your opinion, has inclusion benefited the students with LD at you school? Explain your answer.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In your opinion, has inclusion benefited students without disabilities at your school? Explain your answer.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you so much for your time and the valuable information you have provided.
APPENDIX C
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR TEACHERS
Semi-Structured Protocol for Teachers

**Introduction:** I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Central Florida in the United States. I am researching junior secondary students with LD in inclusive classes in Gaborone, Botswana. With the assistance of researchers at the University of Botswana, I was able to locate your school and classroom as a potential research site. Your expertise as an educator will help me to learn more about the educational experiences for students with LD in Gaborone.

There are no right or wrong answers in this interview. You may freely express your opinion. This interview will be confidential, and your name will not be associated with this interview. The answers you provide will be analyzed and used for future publications.

To ensure I remember all of the information you share today, I will be recording this interview. I will transcribe the interview, and I will share the transcription with you to make sure I have accurately portrayed your feelings. Please know you may stop this interview at any time. Thank you.

**Interview Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Demographic Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Adapted from/ Developed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What subjects do you teach?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How long have you been teaching at this school?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How long have you been teaching overall?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Where did you receive your teacher training?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What type of degree did you receive?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Were you enrolled in a special education course during your teacher training?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Did any of your university courses, besides the special education course, discuss special education?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Have you taken any professional development courses on special education?</td>
<td>Round, Subban, &amp; Sharma, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Inclusive Education Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Alignment to the Policies Goals (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014)</th>
<th>Adapted from/ Developed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you have students with LD in your class? If so, how many?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class/ School Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do you ensure students with LD are included in classroom activities?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 2, 4</td>
<td>Mukhopadhay, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Describe policies at your school, which support students with LD.</td>
<td>Policy Goal 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>Dieker, 2013; Mukhopadhay, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Describe the accommodations you use in your class for students with LD.</td>
<td>Policy Goal 2</td>
<td>Mukhopadhay, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Describe the academic differences you notice for students with LD in your class.</td>
<td>Policy Goal 4</td>
<td>Mukhopadhay, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Describe the behavioral differences, if any, you notice for students with LD in your class.</td>
<td>Policy Goal 4</td>
<td>Lorger, Schmidt, &amp; Vukman, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are your students with LD socially accepted by their peers? Please provide examples.</td>
<td>Policy Goal 4</td>
<td>Lorger et al., 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you so much for your time and the valuable information you have provided.
APPENDIX D
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER
Semi-Structured Protocol for Special Education Teachers

**Introduction:** I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Central Florida in the United States. I am researching junior students with LD in inclusive classes in Gaborone, Botswana. With the assistance of researchers at the University of Botswana, I was able to locate your school and classroom as a potential research site. Your expertise as an educator will help me to learn more about the educational experiences for students with LD in Gaborone.

There are no right or wrong answers in this interview. You may freely express your opinion. This interview will be confidential, and your name will not be associated with this interview. The answers you provide will be analyzed and used for future publications.

To ensure I remember all of the information you share today, I will be recording this interview. I will transcribe the interview, and I will share the transcription with you to make sure I have accurately portrayed your feelings. Please know you may stop this interview at anytime. Thank you.

**Interview Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Demographic Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Adapted from/ Developed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Besides your job as a special education teacher, what other roles do you have at the school?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How long have you been teaching at this school?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How long have you been teaching overall?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Where did you receive your teacher training?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What type of degree did you receive?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Were you enrolled in a special education course during your teacher training?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Did any of your university courses, besides the special education course, discuss special education?</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Have you taught any professional development courses on special education?</td>
<td>Round et al., 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Inclusive Education Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Alignment to the Policies Goals (Ministry of Education Botswana, 2014)</th>
<th>Adapted from/ Developed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How are students evaluated for a disability in Botswana?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 5</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When are students typically evaluated?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 5</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are students ever evaluated at the junior secondary level? If so, how often does it happen?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 5</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IEP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How often do you write the IEP?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 2</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Who participates in the IEP meetings? What is the role of each participant in the meeting?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 2</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are parents involved in the IEP process?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you collaborate with regular education teachers? If so, how?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 2, 4</td>
<td>Dieker, 2013; Mukhopadhyay, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you provide instruction or support for students with LD? If so, how?</td>
<td>Policy Goal 2, 4</td>
<td>Mukhopadhyay, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. What resources do you use to support students with LD? | Policy Goal 2 | Rodriguez, 2013; Round et al., 2016
--- | --- | ---
10. Do you feel teachers are prepared to teach students with LD? | Policy Goal 2 | Mukhopadhyay, 2009

**Students with LD**

6. Describe the academic differences you notice for students with LD. | Policy Goal 4 | Mukhopadhyay, 2009
--- | --- | ---
6. Describe the behavioral differences, if any, you notice for students with LD. | Policy Goal 4 | Researcher
7. Are your students with LD socially accepted by their peers? Please provide examples. | Policy Goal 4 | Researcher

Thank you so much for your time and the valuable information you have provided.
# Classroom Observation Protocol

## Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students in Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students with LD in class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Beginning Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Ending Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Classroom Observation: Teacher in School Culture (UNESCO, 2017, para.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodations, Adaptation, or Instructional Strategy (Mukhopadhyay, 2009)</th>
<th>Observation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Tutoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat/ rephrase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching strategies (mnemonic devices)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided notes given</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced assignment length</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended time for assignments and/or tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other accommodations used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Classroom observation: Students with LD in School Culture** (UNESCO, 2017, para. 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation (Mukhopadhyay, 2009)</th>
<th>Observation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are engaged (head up, working on the assigned task, not using electronics, not talking to others, except when told to do so).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students participate in discussions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are prepared for class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior (Mukhopadhyay, 2009)</th>
<th>Observation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students seem to get along with the teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students seem to get along with their peers.

Disciplinary problems exhibited.

**Social**  
(Mukhopadhyay, 2009)  
Observation Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students seem to have friends in class.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher treats students like an equal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their peers treat students like an equal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are not observed being bullied.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR STUDENTS TRANSLATED TO SETSWANA
**Potsolotso ya baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go tlhaloganya se se rutwang**

**Matseno:** Ke moithuti go tswa Unibesithi ya Central Florida kwa Amerika. Ke dira patlisiso e e itebagantseng le go sekaseka mekgwa ya go ruta e e dirisiwang go akaretsa baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go thoka go tlhaloganya se se rutwang mo dikoleng tse dikgo lwane mo Gaborone, Botswana. Ka thuso ya batlhatlheledi ba ba dirang dipatlisiso mo Unibesithi ya Botswana, ke ne ka kgona go utlwalela ka sekole sa lona gore se na le bokgoni jwa gore ke dire patlisiso yame mo go sone. Maimemgelo le kitso ya gago ya borutabana e tla nthusa gore ke ithute go le gontsi ka baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go tlhaloganya se se rutwang.

Mo potsolotsong e, ga go na karabo e go tweng ke yone ya nnete kana e sa amogelesegeng. O gololesegile go ntsa maikutlo a gago fa o araba dipotso. Potsolotso e e bolokesegile, ga go na fa leina la gago le tlaa umakiwang. Dikarabo tse o tla di fang di tlaa seksekwa mme di dirisiwe go kwala dipego tse di tlaa gatisiwang mo isagong.

Go tlhomamisa gore ke gakologelwa sengwe le sengwe se o se mpoleletseng, ke tlaa gatisa potsolots e. E tlaa re morago ga potsolotso ke bo key a go kwala puisano ya rona ke boa ke e abelana le wena, o reetse go tlhomamisa gore ke kwadile sone se o se buileng. Ka tsweetswee, gakologelwa gore o ka emisa potsolots e nako nngwe le nngwe. Ke a leboga.

**Dipotso ka ga moithuti**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dipotso</th>
<th>Di tserwe mo go/ Di itiretswe ke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. O mo mopatong wa bokae?</td>
<td>Motlhohlotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dipotso ka ga go ruta mo go akaretsang baithuti botlhe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dipotso</th>
<th>Tsamaelano le molao wa Thuto le maitlamo (Lephata le Thuto le Tlhabololo dikitso, 2014)</th>
<th>Di tserwe mo go/ Di itiretswe ke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ka sekole</td>
<td>N/A “NLTS-2,” 2003 Motlhotlhomisi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A o rata sekole?</td>
<td>N/A Motlhotlhomisi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke eng se o se ratang thatathata ka ga sekole?</td>
<td>N/A Motlhotlhomisi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke eng se o sa se rateng ka ga sekole?</td>
<td>N/A Motlhotlhomisi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlhalosa ka matshwao a o tshwarang.</td>
<td>N/A Motlhotlhomisi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go nna le bogole mo dithutong</td>
<td>N/A Motlhotlhomisi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go lemogilwe leng gore o na le mathata a go thaloganya se se rutiwang?</td>
<td>N/A Motlhotlhomisi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go ntse jang go nna le bothata jwa go thaloganya se se rutiwang?</td>
<td>N/A Motlhotlhomisi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A barutabana ba gago ba a tle ba iphe nako ya go go thusa o le nosi (jaaka go fiwa tiro ya kwa gae e e sa tshwaneng le ya baithuti ba bangwe) mo tleseng? Fa go le jalo, ba go thus aka mekgwa efe?</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 2 Motlhotlhomisi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpolelela fa o kile wa kopa thuso mo morutababeng? A o a tle o kope gore a go thuse?</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 2 Prater, Redman, Anderson, &amp; Gibb, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A o dirisanya sentle le barutabana ba gago?</td>
<td>N/A “NLTS-2,” 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirisano le ba bangwe</td>
<td>N/A “NLTS-2,” 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpolelela ka ditsala tsa gago mo sekoleng.</td>
<td>N/A “NLTS-2,” 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A o a tle o bonane le ditsala tsa gago tse di mo sekoleng ka kwa ntle ga sekole? Ke dife dilo tse lo tlwaetseng go di dira le ditsala tsa gago fa lo le mmogo?</td>
<td>N/A “NLTS-2,” 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A o ikutlwa o le mongwe yo o botlhokwa mo tleseng ya gago? Ke eng o akanya jalo?</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 4 “NLTS-2,” 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A go na le ba ba go tshwenyang, ba go rumola, ba go bitsa maina a o sa a rateng mo sekoleng??</td>
<td>N/A “NLTS-2,” 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O lofela sekole go le kae?  Ke afe mabaka a a dirang gore o se ka wa kgona go tla sekoleng?</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 4</td>
<td>“NLTS-2,” 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O batla go nna eng kana go bereka tiro efe fa o fetsa sekole?  A se o se batlang se tlaa thhoka gore o nne le thutego e e kwa godimo?  Fa go le jalo, o tlaa tswelela o ya go dira dithuto tseo?</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 1</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ke lebogela thata nako e o e mphileng, le dikarabo tse di bothokwa tse o di mphileng.**
APPENDIX G
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR ADMINISTRATORS TRANSLATED TO SETSWANA
**Potsolotso ya Baeteledipele ba sekole**

**Matseno:** Ke moithuti go tswa Unibesithi ya Central Florida kwa Amerika. Ke dira patlisiso e e itebagantseng le go sekaseka mekgwa ya go ruta e e dirisiwang go akaretsa baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go thoka go tlhaloganya se se rutiwang mo dikoleng tse dikolwane mo Gaborone, Botswana. Ka thuso ya batlhatlheledi ba ba dirang dipatlisiso mo Unibesithi ya Botswana, ke ne ka kgona go utlwalela ka sekole sa lona gore se na le bokgoni jwa gore ke dire patlisiso yame mo go sone. Maitemogelo le kitso ya gago ya borutabana e tla nthusa gore ke ithute go le gontsi ka baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go tlhaloganya se se rutwang.

Mo potsolotsong e, ga go na karabo e go tweng ke yone ya nnete kana e sa amogelesegeng. O gololosegile go ntsha maikutlo a gago fa o araba dipotso. Potsolotso e e bolokesegile, ga go na fa leina la gago le tlaa umakiwang teng. Dikarabo tse o tla di fang di tlaa seksekwa mme di dirisiwe go kwala dipego tse di tlaa gatisiwang mo isagong.

Go tlhomamisa gore ke gakologelwa sengwe le sengwe se o se mpoleletseng, ke tlaa gatisa potsolotso e. E tlaa re morago ga potsolotso e e kwale puisano ya rona ke boa ke e abelana le wena, o e bale go tlhomamisa gore ke kwadile sone se o se buileng. Ka tsweetswe, gakologelwa gore o ka emisa potsolotso e nako nngwe le nngwe. Ke a leboga.

**Dintla tsa Potsolotso**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sekole:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nomore ya motsaya karolo:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomore ya potsolotso:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kgwedi:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nako ya go simolola:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nako ya go fetsa:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dintla ka ga Moeteledipele

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dipotso</th>
<th>Di tserwe mo go/ Di ithametswe ke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A o ne wa ruta pele ga o nna moeteledipele? Fa go le jalo, o rutile dithuto dife? Mephato efe? Lobaka lo lo kae?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. O ntse moetelediple wa sekole se lobala lo lo kae?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ka kakaretso o na le lobaka lo lo kae o le moeteledipele?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. O ithutetse kae tiro ya gago?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Thutego ya gapp ya degree e itebagantse le dithuto dife?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A o ne wa dira dithuto tsá ba-na-le-bogole ka nako ya fa o ithutela tiro ya gago?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A go na le dithuto dingwe tse o neng wa di tsaya kwa unibesithi tse di neng di bua ka go ruta bana ba ba nang le bogole ntleny ga thuto e e itebagantseng le ba-na-le-bogole?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dipotso ka ga thuto e e akaretsang baithuti botlhe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dipotso</th>
<th>Tsamaelano le molao wa Thuto le maitlamo (Lephata la Thuto le Tlhabololo dikitso, 2014)</th>
<th>Adapted from/ Developed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Melao e go tsamaisiwang thuto ka yone e goroga jang kwa dikoleng go tswa mo ga goromente?</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>Timor &amp; Burton, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ke efe melao e o neng wa tshwanelwa ke go e diragatsa mabapi le thuto e e akaretsang baithuti botlhe?</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>Dieker, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A o tlhamile tsamaiso ya gore sekole sa gago sotho se thhaloganye se bo se amogele molao wa thuto e e akaretsang baithuti botlhe?</td>
<td>Molao wa thuto, Maitlamo 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>Dieker, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Thuto e e akaretsang baithuti botlhe e amogetswe jang ke barutabana le badiri ba bangwe mo sekoleng sa gago?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Timor &amp; Burton, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Thuto e e akaretsang baithuti botlhe e amogetswe jang ke batsadi?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tlhalosa mathata, fa a le teng a o nnileng le one ka thuto e e akaretsang baithuti botlhe mo sekoleng sag ago.</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>Salisbury, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. O dirisa didirisiwa dife mo sekoleng sag ago go diragatsa thuto e e akaretsang botlhe?</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 2</td>
<td>Rodriguez, 2013; Salisbury, 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moithuti**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Go ya ka maikutlo a gago, a thuto e e akaretsang baithuti botlhe e solegetse molemo baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go thaloganya se se rutiwang?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Go ya ka maikutlo a gago, a thuto e e akaretsang baithuti botlhe e solegetse molemo baithuti ba ba se nang bogole jwa go thaloganya se se rutiwang? Tlhalosa karabo ya gago.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ke lebogela thata nako e o e mphileng, le dikarabo tse di bothokwa tse o di mphilen
APPENDIX H
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR TEACHERS IN TRANSLATED TO SETSWANA
Potsolotso ya Barutabana

Matseno: Ke moithuti go tswa Unibesithi ya Central Florida kwa Amerika. Ke dira patlisiso e e itebagantseng le go sekaseka mekgwa ya go ruta e e dirisiwang go akaretsa baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go thoka go thaloganya se se rutwang mo dikoleng tse dikgolwane mo Gaborone, Botswana. Ka thuso ya batlhatlheledi ba ba dirang dipatlisiso mo Unibesithi ya Botswana, ke ne ka kgona go utlwalela ka sekole sa lona gore se na le bokgoni jwa gore ke dire patlisiso yame mo go sone. Maitemogelo le kitso ya gago ya borutabana e tla nthusa gore ke ithute go le gontsi ka baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go thaloganya se se rutwang.

Mo potsolotsong e, ga go na karabo e go tweng ke yone ya nnete kana e e sa amogelesegeng. O gololesegile go ntsha maikutlo a gago fa o araba dipotso. Potsolotso e e bolokesegile, ga go na fa leina la gago le tlaa umakiwang. Dikarabo tse o tla di fang di tlaa seksekwa mme di dirisiwe go kwala dipego tse di tlaa gatisiwang mo isagong.

Go tlhomamisa gore ke gakologelwa sengwe le sengwe se o se mpoleletseng, ke tlaa gatisa potsolotso e. E tlaa re morago ga potsolotso ke bo key a go kwala puisano ya rona ke boa ke e abelana le wena, o reetse go tlhomamisa gore ke kwadile sone se o se buileng. Ka tsweetswee, gakologelwa gore o ka emisa potsolotso e nako nngwe le nngwe. Ke a leboga.

Dipotso tsa Potsolotso

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sekole:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nomore ya motsaya karolo:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomore ya potsolotso:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kgwedi:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nako ya go simolola:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nako ya go fetsa:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dipotso ka ga morutabana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dipotso</th>
<th>Di tserwe mo go/ Di itiretswe ke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. O ruta dithuto dife?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. O na le lobaka lo lo kae o ruta mo sekoleng se?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. O na le dingwaga tse kae o ruta?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. O ithutetse kae borutabana?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. O dirile dithuto dife tsa degree?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ka nako ya fa o ithutela borutabana, a o ne wa dira dithuto dingwe tse di itebagantseng le go ruta baithuti ba ba nang le bogole?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A go na le dithuto dingwe tse o di dirileng kwa unibesithi tse di neng di bua ka baithuti b aba nang le bogole ntleng ga dithuto tsa ba lephata la bana ba ba nang le bogole?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dipotso ka ga go ruta mo go akaretsang baithuti botlhe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dipotso</th>
<th>Tsamaelano le molao wa Thuto le maitlamo (Lehapa la Thuto le Tlhabololo dikitso, 2014)</th>
<th>Di tserwe mo go/ Di itiretswe ke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A o na le baithuti ba ba nang le bothata jwa go thhaloganya se se rutwang? Fa go le jalo, ba kae ka palo</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sebopego sa tlelase kana sa sekole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sebopego sa tlelase kana sa sekole</th>
<th>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 2, 4</th>
<th>Di tserwe mo go/ Di itiretswe ke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. O thhomamisa jang gore o akaretsa baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go thhaloganya se se rutiwang mo go tse o di dirisang baithuti ba bangwe mo tleseng ya gago?</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>Mukhopadhyay, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Thhalosa melao ya sekole sa lona e e rotloetsang gore baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go thhaloganya se se rutiwang ba a thusiwa</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>Dieker, 2013; Mukhopadhyay, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Thhalosa tse o di dirang mo tleseng ya gago go thusa baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go thhaloganya se se rutiwang.</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 2</td>
<td>Mukhopadhyay, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Moithuti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moithuti</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tlhalosa pharologanyo e o e lemogang ka baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go tlhaloganya se se rutiwang mo tlesaseng ya gago.</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fa go le teng, tlhalosa pharologanyo mo boitshwarong jwa baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go tlhaloganya se se ruti wang mo tlesaseng ya gago. Describe the behavioral differences, if any, you notice for students with LD in your class.</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go tlhaloganya se se rutiwang ba amogelwa ke baithuti ba bangwe? Ka tsweetswee fa dikai.</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ke lebogela thata nako e o e mphileng, le dikarabo tse di botlholwa tse o di mphileng.
APPENDIX I
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER TRANSLATED TO SETSWANA
**Potsolotso ya Barutabana ba ba rutetsweng thuto ya baithuti ba ba nang le bogole**

**Matseno:** Ke moithuti go tswa Unibesithi ya Central Florida kwa Amerika. Ke dira patlisiso e e itebagantseng le go sekaseka mekgwa ya go ruta e e dirisiwang go akaretsa baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go tlhoka go tlhaloganya se se rutwang mo dikoleng tse dikgolwane mo Gaborone, Botswana. Ka thuso ya bathatlheledi ba ba dirang dipatlisiso mo Unibesithi ya Botswana, ke ne ka kgona go utlwalela ka sekole sa lona gore se na le bokgoni jwa gore ke dire patlisiso yame mo go sone. Maitemogelo le kitso ya gago ya borutabana e tla nthusa gore ke ithute go le gontsi ka baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go tlhaloganya se se rutwang.

Mo potsolotsong e, ga go na karabo e go tweng ke yone ya nnete kana e e sa amogelesegeng. O gololesegile go ntsa maikutlo a gago fa o araba dipotso. Potsolotso e e bolokesegile, ga go na fa leina la gago le tlaa umakiwang. Dikarabo tse o tla di fang di tlaa seksekwa mme di dirisiwe go kwala dipego tse di tlaa gatisiwang mo isagong.

Go tlhomamisa gore ke gakologelwa sengwe le sengwe se o se mpoleletseng, ke tlaa gatisa potsolotso e. E tlaa re morago ga potsolotso ke bo key a go kwala puisano ya rona ke boa ke e abelana le wena, o reetse go tlhomamisa gore ke kwadile sone se o se buileng. Ka tsweetswee, gakologelwa gore o ka emisa potsolotso e nako nngwe le nngwe. Ke a leboga.

**Dintla tsa Potsolotso**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sekole:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nomore ya motsaya karolo:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomore ya potsolotso:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kgwedi:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nako ya go simolola:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nako ya go fetsa:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Dipotso ka ga Morutabana**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dipotso</th>
<th>Di tserwe mo go/ Di ithametswe ke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ntle le tiro ya gago ya go nna morutabana wa thuto ya ba-na-le-bogole, o dira ditiro dife gape mo sekoleng?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. O na le lobaka lo lo kae o ruta mo sekoleng se?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. O na le dingwaga tse kae o ruta?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. O ithutetse kae borutabana?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. O dirile dithuto dife tsa degree?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ka nako ya fa o ithutela borutabana, a o ne wa dira dithuto dingwe tse di itebagantseng le go ruta baithuti ba ba nang le bogole??</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A go na le dithuto dingwe tse o di dirileng kwa unibesithi tse di neng di bua ka baithuti b abe nang le bogole ntleng ga dithuto tsa ba lephata la bana ba ba nang le bogole?</td>
<td>Motlhotlhomisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A o dirile dithuto dingwe tsa itlaleletso ka ga ban abe ba nang le bogole?</td>
<td>Round et al., 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dipotso ka ga go ruta mo go akaretsang baithuti botlhe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dipotso</th>
<th>Tsamaelano le molao wa Thuto le maitlamo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>(Lephata la Thuto le Tlhabololo dikitso, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di tserwe mo go/ Di ithametswe ke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Go dirwa ditlhatlhobo dife mo Botswana mo baithuting ba ba nang le bogole go lemoga bokoa jwa bone?</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Baithuti ba go nna jalo ba tihatlhobiwa leng?</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A baithuti ba a tle ba tihatlhobiwe fa ba le mo dikoleng tse di kgolwane? Fa go le jalo, ba tihatlhobiwa ga ka?</td>
<td>Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IEP**

4. How often do you write the IEP?                                      | Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 2 | Motlhotlhomisi |
5. Who participates in the IEP meetings? What is the role of each participant in the meeting?  
| Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 2 | Mothotlhomisi |

6. Are parents involved in the IEP process?  
| N/A | Mothotlhomisi |

**Thuto ya baithuti ba ba senang bogole bope**

| 7. A o dirisanya le barutabana ba bangwe ba ba sa rutelwang thuto ya ba-na-le-bogole? Fa go le jalo, o dirisanya nabo jang? | Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 2, 4 | Dieker, 2013; Mukhopadhyay, 2009 |
| 8. A go na le ditsela tse o thusang baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go thhoka go thhaloganya se se rutiwang? Fa go ntse jalo, o ba thusa jang? | Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 2, 4 | Mukhopadhyay, 2009 |
| 9. O dirisa didirisiwa dife tsa thuto go ruta baithuti b aba nang le bothata jwa go thhaloganya se se rutiwang? | Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 2, 4 | Rodriguez, 2013; Round et al., 2016 |
| 10. A o akanya gore barutabana ba ikemiseditse go ruta baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go thhaloganya se se rutiwang? | Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 2 | Mukhopadhyay, 2009 |

**Baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go thhaloganya se se rutiwang**

| 6. Tlhalosa pharologanyo e o e lemogang mo dithutong mabapi le baithuti ba ba nang le bogole go thhoka go thhaloganya se se rutiwang. | Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 4 | Mukhopadhyay, 2009 |
| 6. Tlhalosa pharologanyo e o e lemogang mo botshwarong jwa baithuti ba ba nang le bogole go thhoka go thhaloganya se se rutiwang. | Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 4 | Mothotlhomisi |
| 7. A baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go thhoka go thhaloganya se se rutiwang ba amogelwa ke baithuti ba bangwe? | Molao wa Thuto, Maitlamo 4 | Mothotlhomisi |

Ke lebogela thata nako e o e mphileng, le dikarabo tse di botlhokwa tse o di mphileng.
APPENDIX J
OBSERVATION PROTOCOL TRANSLANTED TO SETSWANA
**Kaedi ya tse di tlaa lebelelwang mo Tleseng**

**Dintlha ka ga Morutabana**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leina la Sekole</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thuto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mophato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo ya baithuti mo tlelaseng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Palo ya baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go thoka go thaloganya se se rutiwang**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kgwedi</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nako ya go simolola go lebelela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nako ya go fetsa go lebelela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tse di lebelelwang mo tlelaseng: Morutabana go ya ka tsamaiso ya sekole** (UNESCO, 2017, para. 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Go akaretsa baithuti bothe, go dira gore baithuti ba thaloganye, kgotsa mekgwa ya go ruta (Mukhopadhyay, 2009)</th>
<th>Dintlha tse di lemogilweng</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baithuti ba rutana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go boelela dintlha/ Go dirisa mafoko a mangwe go thalosa ntlha e le nngwe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mekgwa ya go ruta e e dirisiwang (ditsompelo tse di dirisiwang gore baithuti ba thaloganye)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barutabana ba thusana go ruta kana ba tshwaraganela thuto mo tlelaseng e le nngwe fela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiro ka ditlhotshwana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go tlhalosetsa baithuti ditaelo tsa se ba tshwanetseng go se dira</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go fa tiro e nngwe ntleng ga e e neng e rulaganyeditswe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go fa dintlha tse di kaelang moithuthi gore a dire eng, jang.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go fokotsa selekanyo sa tiro e e neng e filwe baithuti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go okeletsa baithuti nako ya go dira tiro kana ya go kwala teko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tse dingwe tse di dirilweng go thusa baithuti go thalaganya se se rutwang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tse di lebelelwang mo tlelaseng: Baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go thalaganya se se rutiwang go ya ka tsamaiso ya sekole** (UNESCO, 2017, para. 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Go tsaya karolo mo thutong (Mukhopadhyay, 2009)</th>
<th>Dintlha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baithuti ba a bereka (ba thinkgetse ba dira tse ba di laetsweng, ga ba dirise sepe sa maranyane, ga ba buisane, fa e se ba kopilwe go dira jalo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baithuti ba tsaya karolo mo dipuisanong tsa tlelase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Boitshwaro**  
(Mukhopadhyay, 2009) | **Dintlha tse di lebelelelwang** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go lebega baithuti ba dirisanya sentle le morutabana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go lebega baithuti ba dirisanya sentle ka bobone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go a bonala fa go na le mathata a go kgalemela baithuti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Botsalano**  
(Mukhopadhyay, 2009) | **Dintlha tse di lebelelelwang** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go lebega fa baithuti ba na le botsalano motlaseng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morutabana o tsaya baithuti e le bakaulengwe ba gagwe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baithuti ba dirisanya jaaka bakaulengwe, ba tsaana sentle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga go bonale fa go na le baithuti ba ba kgokgontshang ba bangwe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IRB APPROVAL FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
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From: UCF Institutional Review Board #1
FWA00000351, IRB00000138

To: Samantha L. Mrstik

Date: October 11, 2016

Dear Researcher:

On 10/11/2016 the IRB approved the following human participant research until 10/10/2017 inclusive:
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Expedited Review

Project Title: An Examination of Inclusive Practices for Secondary Students with Learning Disabilities in Gaborone, Botswana

Investigator: Samantha L. Mrstik
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Use of the approved, stamped consent document(s) is required. The new form supersedes all previous versions, which are now invalid for further use. Only approved investigators (or other approved key study personnel) may solicit consent for research participation. Participants or their representatives must receive a copy of the consent form(s).
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I am writing this letter in support of an application for a research permit by Samantha L. Mrstik, a PhD student affiliated to Department of Special Education at the University Of Botswana. The title of the proposed study is “An Examination of Inclusive Practices for Secondary Students with Learning Disabilities in Gaborone, Botswana”. The overall objective of the study is to explore the daily routines, the perceptions of others, and the perceptions of junior secondary students with LD in inclusive settings, specifically in Gaborone, Botswana. It is hoped that the findings of the study may contribute to the existing special education research in Botswana by providing data on the perceptions and daily experiences of junior secondary students with LD in an inclusive setting, a topic currently unexplored.
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APPENDIX M
ADULT CONSENT
An Examination of Inclusive Practices for Secondary Students with Learning Disabilities in Gaborone, Botswana

Informed Consent - Adult

Principal Investigator: Samantha Mrstik, M.Ed.
Faculty Advisor: Lisa Dieker, Ph. D.

Investigational Site: Select Junior Secondary and Secondary Schools in Gaborone, Botswana

Introduction: Researchers at the University of Central Florida (UCF) study many topics. To do this, we need the help of people who agree to take part in a research study. You are being invited to take part in a research study, which will include teachers and administrators in junior secondary and secondary schools in Gaborone, Botswana. This study will include 1-2 administrators and 4-6 teachers. You have been asked to take part in this research study because you are a teacher or school administrator in an inclusive secondary school in Gaborone, Botswana. You must be 18 years of age or older to be included in the research study.

The person doing this research is Samantha Mrstik, M.Ed. of the University of Central Florida, College of Education and Human Performance, Department of Child, Family, and Community Sciences. Because the researcher is a doctoral candidate, Prof. Lisa Dieker, a UCF faculty advisor in the College of Education and Human Performance, Department of Child, Family, and Community Sciences, is guiding her research. This research is supported by Prof. Chigorom Abosi, Faculty of Education, Department of Special Education at the University of Botswana and Prof. Sourav Mukhopadhyay, Faculty of Education, Department of Special Education at the University of Botswana.

What you should know about a research study:

- Someone will explain this research study to you.
- A research study is something you volunteer for.
- Whether or not you take part is up to you.
- You should take part in this study only because you want to.
- You can choose not to take part in the research study.
- You can agree to take part now and later change your mind.
- Whatever you decide it will not be held against you.
- Feel free to ask all the questions you want before you decide.

Purpose of the research study: The purpose of this study is to explore the routines, accommodations, and instructional strategies used to support secondary students with learning disabilities (LD) in inclusive classes, and the perceptions of students with LD within the inclusive setting. This study will focus on students with LD at the secondary level in an attempt to add to the existing body of literature on special education in Botswana. This study will help the researcher, other teachers, schools, parents and students by providing information to better understand the instruction in an inclusive classroom in Botswana.

What you will be asked to do in the study: This study does not involve any intervention procedures. This research involves the researcher interviewing teachers and administrators in inclusive schools, observing classroom practices, and gathering student work. Information gathered by the researcher involves observations, interviews, and document analyses and thus will have very limited impact on the teacher and students. If you provide your consent, you may be asked to allow the researcher to:

1. Intermittently observe your class or school over a 4-month period (for an estimated total of 20-25 days).
2. Review student academic work products, assessments, individual education plans, and cumulative files.
3. Interview you regarding inclusive practices in the classroom and school. Participants do not have to answer every question, and you may choose to skip any question. This study has the potential to help educators and scholars understand the experiences of students with LD in the inclusive secondary classroom.

**Location:** All interviews and observations will take place at your school. You will not have to go anywhere beyond your normal daily school activities.

**Time required:** It is expected that this research study will be conducted for approximately 20-25 days, intermittently, over a 4-month period.

**Digital Recordings:** Digitally recorded interviews will be conducted during this study. If you do not wish to be digitally recorded during interviews, please inform the researcher. You will still be able to participate in the study. The digital recordings will be maintained on a password protected portable hard drive and kept in a locked, safe place when not in use. The recordings will be deleted at the conclusion of the study. There will be no video recording in this study.

**Risks:** There are no anticipated risks to participants taking part in this study. If any of the participants appear to be experiencing distress during any session, the researcher will end the interview.

**Benefits:** There are no benefits to being a part of this study.

**Compensation:** There is no compensation, or other payment to you for taking part in this study.

**Confidentiality:** Personal data collected in this study will be de-identified and coded to maintain confidentiality. We cannot promise complete secrecy.

**Study contact for questions** about the study or to report a problem, talk to: Samantha Mrstik, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Child, Family, and Community Sciences, College of Education and Human Performance, [contact information] or by email at [contact information] or Prof. Lisa Dieker, Faculty Supervisor, Department of Child, Family, and Community Sciences, College of Education and Human Performance, [contact information] or by email at [contact information].

**IRB contact about your rights in the study or to report a complaint:** Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (UCF IRB). This research has been reviewed and approved by the IRB. For information about the rights of people who take part in research, please contact: Institutional Review Board, University of Central Florida, Office of Research & Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246 USA or by telephone at +1 (407) 823-2901. You may also talk to them for any of the following:
- The research team is not answering your questions, concerns, or complaints.
- You cannot reach the research team.
- You want to talk to someone besides the research team.
- You want to get information or provide input about this research.

**Withdrawing from the study:** If you decide to leave the study, contact the investigator. If requested, the investigator can delete your data from the study. The person in charge of the research study can remove you from the research study without your approval. Possible reasons for removal include ethical or disciplinary procedures at the school or government level. The investigator can also end the research study early. We will tell you about any new information that may affect your health, welfare or choice to stay in the research.
APPENDIX N
PARENT CONSENT
An Examination of Inclusive Practices for Secondary Students with Learning Disabilities in Gaborone, Botswana

Informed Consent - Parent

Principal Investigator: Samantha Mrstik, M.Ed.
Faculty Advisor: Lisa Dieker, Ph. D.

Investigational Site: Select Junior Secondary and Secondary Schools in Gaborone, Botswana

Return of Consent Form: You are provided with two copies of this consent form. If you give consent for your child to participate in the research, please sign one copy and return it to the researcher or teacher and keep the other copy for your records.

Introduction: Researchers at the University of Central Florida (UCF) study many topics. To do this, we need the help of people who agree to take part in a research study. You are being invited to take part in a research study of inclusive practices for secondary students with learning disabilities in Gaborone, Botswana. Your child is being invited to take part in this research study, which will include 4-6 students, because he or she is a student who receives special education services in a Junior Secondary or Secondary School in Gaborone, Botswana.

The person doing this research is Samantha Mrstik, M.Ed. of the University of Central Florida, College of Education and Human Performance, Department of Child, Family, and Community Sciences. Because the researcher is a doctoral candidate, Prof. Lisa Dieker, a UCF faculty advisor in the College of Education and Human Performance, Department of Child, Family, and Community Sciences, is guiding her research. This research is supported by Prof. Chigorom Abosi, Faculty of Education, Department of Special Education at the University of Botswana and Prof. Sourav Mukhopadhyay, Faculty of Education, Department of Special Education at the University of Botswana.

What you should know about this research study:
- Someone will explain this research study to you.
- A research study is something you volunteer for.
- Whether or not you take part is up to you.
- You should allow your child to take part in this study only because you want to participate.
- You can choose not to take part in the research study.
- You can agree to take part now and later change your mind.
- Whatever you decide it will not be held against you.
- Feel free to ask all the questions you want before you decide.

Purpose of the research study: The purpose of this study is to explore the routines, accommodations, and instructional strategies used to support secondary students with learning disabilities (LD) in inclusive classes, and the perceptions of students with LD within the inclusive setting. This study will focus on students with LD at the secondary level in an attempt to add to the existing body of literature on special education in Botswana. This study will help the researcher, other teachers, schools, parents and students by providing information to better understand the instruction in an inclusive classroom in Botswana.

What you or your child will be asked to do in the study: This study does not involve any intervention procedures, but only involves the researcher, interviewing your child, observing classroom practices and gathering work your child produces in class. Information gathered by the researcher involves observations, interviews, and document analyses and thus will have very limited impact on your child. If you provide your consent, you may be asked to allow the researcher to:

4. Intermittently observe your child’s typical interactions in the targeted inclusive class and over a 4-month period (for an estimated total of 20-25 days).
5. Review your child’s academic work products, assessments, individual education plan, and cumulative file.

6. Interview your child regarding their experiences within the classroom and at school.

Your child does not have to answer every question and may choose to skip any question. This study has the potential to help educators and scholars understand the experiences of students with LD in the inclusive secondary classroom.

**Location:** All interviews and observations will take place at your child’s school. Your child will not have to go anywhere beyond where he or she conducts his or her normal daily school activities.

**Time required:** It is expected that this research study will be conducted for approximately 20-25 days, intermittently, over a 4-month period.

**Digital Recordings:** Digitally recorded interviews will be conducted during this study. If you would not like your child to be digitally recorded during interviews, please inform the researcher. You will still be able to participate in the study. The digital recordings will be maintained on a password protected portable hard drive and kept in a locked, safe place when not in use. The recordings will be deleted at the conclusion of the study. There will be no video recording in this study.

**Risk:** There are no anticipated risks to participants taking part in this study. If any of the participants appear to be experiencing distress during any session, the researcher will end the interview.

**Benefits or Compensation:** There are no direct benefits, compensation, or other payment to your child for taking part in this study.

**Confidentiality:** Personal data collected in this study will be de-identified and coded to maintain confidentiality. We cannot promise complete secrecy.

**Study contact for questions** about the study or to report a problem, talk to: Samantha Mrstik, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Child, Family, and Community Sciences, College of Education and Human Performance, or by email at or Prof. Lisa Dieker, Faculty Supervisor, Department of Child, Family, and Community Sciences, College of Education and Human Performance, or by email at .

**IRB contact about your rights in the study or to report a complaint:** Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (UCF IRB). This research has been reviewed and approved by the IRB. For information about the rights of people who take part in research, please contact: Institutional Review Board, University of Central Florida, Office of Research & Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246 USA or by telephone at +1 (407) 823-2901. You may also talk to them for any of the following:

- The research team is not answering your questions, concerns, or complaints.
- You cannot reach the research team.
- You want to talk to someone besides the research team.
- You want to get information or provide input about this research.

**Withdrawing from the study:** If you decide you want your child to leave the study or withdraw your child’s data, contact the investigator. If requested, the investigator can delete your child’s data from the study. The person in charge of the research study can remove your child from the research study without your approval. Possible reasons for removal include ethical or disciplinary procedures at the school or government level or withdrawing your child from the school. The sponsor can also end the research study early. We will tell you about any new information that may affect your health, welfare, or choice to stay in the research.

Your signature below indicates your permission for the child named below to take part in this research.

**DO NOT SIGN THIS FORM AFTER THE IRB EXPIRATION DATE BELOW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature of parent or guardian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Printed name of parent or guardian

☐ Parent
☐ Guardian (See note below)

**Note on permission by guardians:** An individual may provide permission for a child only if that individual can provide a written document indicating that he or she is legally authorized to consent to the child’s general medical care. Attach the documentation to the signed document.
APPENDIX O
PARENT CONSENT TRANSLATED TO SETSWANA
Tshekatsheko ya mekgwa ya go ruta e e akaretsang baithuti ba ba nang le bogole mo dikoleng tse dikgolwane mo Gaborone, Botswana

Fomo ya Tetla - Batsadi

Mothothlomisi mogolo: Samantha Mrstik, M.Ed.
Mothatlheledi wa gagwe: Lisa Dieker, Ph. D.

Mafelo a tlhotlhomiso: Go tlaa tlhophiwa mo dikoleng tse dikgolwane mo Gaborone, Botswana

Go busa Fomo ya tetla: O fiwa difomo tse tsa tetla di le pedi. Fa o lelelela ngwana wa gago go tsaya karolo mo patlisisong e, ka tsweetswee saena fomo e le nngwe o bo o e busetsa kwa mothothlhomising kgos a kwa morutabaneng, o bo o ipeela fomo e nngwe.

Matseno: Ba ba dirang ditlhotlhomiso kwa Unibesithi ya Central Florida (UCF) ba dira ditlhotlhomiso ka dithuto di le dintsi. Go diragatsa se, re tlhoka thuso ya batho ba le bantsi ba ba dumelang go tsaya karolo mo patlisisong e e dirwang.
O kopiwa go tsaya karolo mo patlisisong e e itebagantseng le go sekaseka mekgwa ya go ruta e e akaretsang baithuti ba ba nang le bogole mo dikoleng tse dikgolwane mo Gaborone, Botswana. Ngwana wa gago o lalediwa go tsaya karolo mo patlisisong e a na le baithuti ba bangwe ba le bane go ya kwa boratarong ka mabaka a gore ke moithutyo yo o nang le bogole, yo o thusiwang ka tsel e e haphegileng mo sekoleng se se golwane.

Motho yo o dirang patlisiso e ke Samantha Mrstik, yo o nang le dithutengo tsa M.Ed. go tswa Unibesithi ya Central Florida, College of Education and Human Performance, Department of Child, Family, and Community Sciences. Ka jaana mmatlisisi e le moithutyo wa lekwal o la bongaka, mogakolodi wa gagwe ke Prof. Lisa Dieker, yo le ene a tswang mo unibesithing ya gagwe, mo lephateng la gagwe. Ba bangwe ba ba gakololang moithutyo mo patlisisong e ke Prof. Chigorom Abosi, go tswa Unibesithi ya Botswana mo Lehateng la Thuto, Lekalana la dithuto tsa ba ba nang le bogole, gammogo le, Prof. Sourav Mukhopadhyay, yo le ene a tswang mo lephateng lone leo la Unibesithi ya Botswana.

Tse o tshwanetseng go di itse ka tlhotlhomiso e:
- Mongwe o tla go tla lo sepatlisiso e.
- Go tsaya karolo mo patlisisong ke sengwe se o se dirang ka go ithaopa.
- Go mo maruding a gago gore a o nna le seabe mo patlisisong e kgos a nnyaya.
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O letlelela ngwana wa gago go tsaya karolo mo patlisisong e ka go bo o batla a dira jalo.
Re go fa difomo tsa tetla gore o ipalele mabaka a tlhotlhomiso, diphatsa le mosola wa yone.
O na le tshwanelo ya go gana go tsaya karolo mo patlisisong e.
O ka dumela go tsaya karolo gone jaana mme fa o sa tlhole o batla go tswelela le yone, o ka fetola maikutlo a gago.
Kgato epe fela e o e tsayang ga e ka ke ya dirisiwa kgatlanong le wena.
O gololesege go botsa dipotso tsotlhe tse o batlang go di tlhaloganya yele o tsaya tshwetso.

Mabaka a Patlisiso: Maikaelelo a patlisiso e ke go sekaseka tse di tlwaelesegileng go dirwa mo matlwaneng a borutelo fa go na le baithuti ba ba nang le bogole, ka fa ba akarediwang ka teng mo dithutong, le mekgwa ya go ruta e e dirisiwang go ba akaretsa go lebilwe gore ke baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go tlhaloganga dithuto. Go tlaa sekasekwa le ka fa baithuti ba bangwe ba ba se nang bogole b aba tsayang ka teng, le go leka go tlhaloganya ka fa akanyang ka teng ka bone kana tse ba di dumelang ka bone. Patlisiso e e tlaa itebagan ya baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go tlhoka go tlhaloganya se se rutiwang mo sekoleng se se golwane ka maikaelelo a go oketsa kitso e e setseng e le teng ka bone mo Botswana.

Se se tla kopiwa mo go wena le ngwana wa gago mo patlisisong e: Patlisiso e ga e tle go ruta ngwana wa gago sepe fa e se fela gore moththlothomisi a botse ngwana wa gago dipotso, a lebelela tse di diragalang mo tlelaseng fa morutabana a tsweletse a ruta, le go lebelela tiro e ngwana wa gago a e dirang mo tlelaseng. Mooththlothomisi o ya go kgobokanya dintlha ka go lebelela, go botsolotsa, le go sekaseka didirisiwa tsa thuto. Ka go rialo, ga go tsela epe e ngwana wa gago a ka kgorolediwang ka yone mo thutong ya gagwe. Fa o ka letlelela gore ngwana wa gago a akarediwe mo patlisisong e, o ka kopiwa go lelelela moththlothomisi go dira tse latelang: 7. Go nna a lebelela ngwana wa gago mo tlelaseng a na le baithuti ba bangwe ba ba se nang bogole gore ba dirisanya jang selekanyo sa dibeke di ka tshwara bone (E ka nna malatsi a le masome a mabedi kana masome a mabedi le botlhano). 8. Go sekaseka tiro ya sekole ya ngwana wa gago, e ka nna diteko, dithathlobo, tiro ya malatsi otlhe, lenaneo le a le itiretseng la go ithuta, le faele ya gagwe e e tsentseng dilo tsotlhe. 9. Go botsolotsa ngwana wa gago ka se a se itemogetseng mo tlelaseng le mo sekoleng ka kakaretsa.

Ga go patikesege gore ngwana wa gago a arabe potso nngwe le nngwe; o ka tlola potso nngwe fa a sa kgone go e araba. Patlisiso e e na le bokgoni jwa go thusa ba mhama wa thuot go tlhaloganya tsamaiso ya thuot e e akaretsang baithuti botlhe mo ditelaseng boglo jang go lebilwe baithuti ba ba nang le bogole jwa go tlhaloganya se se rutiwang mo sekoleng.
**Lefelo:** Dipotsolotso tsothle le go lebelela baithuti go tlaa dirwa kwa sekoleng. Ngwana wa gago ga a tle go tswela goope kwa ntle, o tlaa bo a ntse le me sekoleng jaaka gale.

**Sebaka sa patlisiso:** Go solofelwa fa patlisise e e tsaya sebaka sa malatsi a le masome a mabedi go ya kwa go a masome a mabedi le bothano, kana selekanyo se se tshwarang dikgwedi tse nne.

**Go gatisa ka tsar aranyane:** Mantswe a ngwana wa gago a tla gatisiwa fa go ntse go buisanwa le ene. Fa o sa batle mantswe a ngwana wa gago a gatisiwe, ka tsweetswee, itsise motlhotlhomisi. Le fa go sa gatisiwe, o sants e a ka tsaya karolo. Dikgatiso di tla bewa di bolokeseqile, di lotleletswe kwa ope a ka se keng a di bone fa di se mo tirisong. Kwa bokhutlong jwa patlisiso, mantswe a tla sulthiwa. Ga go na ditshwantsho tse di tla tsewang mo patlisisosng e. Patlisiso e ke e sireletsegileng.

**Risk:** Ga go na se se tshosetsang botshelo mo patlisison e. Fa go na le batsaya-karolo bangwe ba ba supang fa ba na le matshwennyego mangwe, potsolotso e tsweletse, motlhotlhomisi o tla emisa go botsa dipotso.

**Dituelo:** Patlisiso e ga e na go duela ngwana wa gago sepe.

**Sephiri:** Kitso kana dintlha ka ga batsaya-karolo ga di di na go ntshediwa mo mpepeneng. Motlhomisi o tla somarela kitso eo ko a tsel a e thalogannwa ke ene fela.

**Study contact for questions:** Fa o na le dipotso kana o ngongorega ka sengwe mabapi le patlisiso, bua le: Samantha Mrstik, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Child, Family, and Community Sciences, College of Education and Human Performance, or by email at [XXXXXXXX] or by Prof. Lisa Dieker, Faculty Supervisor, Department of Child, Family, and Community Sciences, College of Education and Human Performance, [XXXXXXXX].

**Kwa o ka botsang teng kana wa ikuela fa go na le bongwe bothata ka patlisiso:** Dipatlisio kwa Unibesithi ya Central Florida e e itebagantseng le batho e dirwa go tlae ga lepathana la Institutional Review Board (UCF IRB). Patlisiso e e amogetswe ya ba ya dumalanwa ke IRB. Fa o batla go itse ka ga ba ba tshwanetseng go tsaya karolo mo patlisison e, o ka botsa ba: Institutional Review Board, University of Central Florida, Office of Research & Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246 USA kgotsa o leletse kwa +1 (407) 823-2901. O ka ba botsa le ka nngwe ya tse di latelang:

- Bathotlhomisi ga ba arabe dipotso kana matshwennyego a gago
- Ga o kgone go ikgolaganya le bathotlhomisi
- O batla go bua le mongwe o sele ntle le bathotlhomisi
- O batla go fa kitso nngwe kana go araba dipotso ka ga patlisiso

**Go tsma mo patlisison:** Fa o ka tsaya tshehetsa ya gore ngwana wa gago a emise go tsaya karolo mo patlisison e, o ka n ngwana o tlaa di karabo a di file di se ka tsa dirisiwa, buisana le motlhotlhomisi. Fa a kopilwe, motlhotlhomisi o ka sutha dikarabo tsu ngwana wa gago fa a bolokang dikarabo teng. Motlhomisi o ka nna a ntsha ngwana wa gago mo go tseeng karolo mo patlisison lo sa dumalana. Mabaka a go dira jaana a ka akaretsa melao mengwe ya sekole kana ya goromente, kgotsa fa ngwana wa gago a ka tlogela sekole patlisiso e ntse e tsweletse. Motlhotlhomisi le ene o ka nna a emisa patlisiso nako ya go se emisa ese e fitlhe.
Re tla go fa kitsiso ka ga sengwe le sengwe se se ka tlhagogang se ama botsogo, pabalesego kana boikgethelo bope fela jwa gore ngwana wa gago a se ka a tswelela le patlisiso.

Go saena fa tlase fa ke sesupo sa gore o letlelela ngwana wa gago go tsaya karolo mo patlisisong e..

**SE SAENE FA TLASE MORAGO GA LETSATSI LE LE KWADILWENG KE BA IRB FA TLASE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setlanyo sa motsaya-karolo</th>
<th>Kgwedi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setlanyo sa motsadi kana motlhokomedi wa ngwana</td>
<td>☐ Motsadi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Motlhokomedi (bala fa tlase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leina ka botlalo la motsadi kana motlhokomedi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ntla ya go elwa tlhoko ke batlhokomedi:** Motho o ka fa tetla gore ngwana a tseye karolo mo patlisisong fa fela a ka dira jalo ka mokwalo e bile a supile fa a le motlhokomedi wa ngwana yoo go ya ka molao, a na le tetla ya go tlamela botsogo jwa ngwana yoo. Go tlhokafala gore a tseny e bosupi jwa go nna jalo ga mmogo le fomo e e saennweng ya tetla.
APPENDIX P
PROFESSOR ABOSI GRADUATE FACULTY SCHOLAR FROM UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
Nomination and Appointment to Graduate Faculty and Graduate Faculty Scholars

The faculty who teach, advise and mentor graduate students are the heart of graduate education at UCF, and their efforts make the graduate experience what it is. We are indebted to their service on behalf of UCF's graduate students and graduate programs.

Prior to participating in graduate level instruction, an individual must be appointed either as a member of the UCF Graduate Faculty or as a graduate faculty scholar. UCF faculty who are tenured, tenure-earning, ranked Clinical or ranked Research professors, or ranked librarians are eligible to be appointed as members of the Graduate Faculty. Other UCF faculty (e.g. lecturers, instructors, research associates, adjuncts, etc.) and individuals not employed by UCF may participate as graduate faculty scholars. Teaching credentials must still be certified by the Office of Faculty Affairs if serving as an instructor of record.

Please see page 2 for a detailed description of the appointment roles, the process of the appointment, and submission of the nomination.

FACULTY INFORMATION (Please Type or Print)

Family or Last Name: Aboi
Personal ID (PID): __________
Employing Unit: University of Botswana
Nominating Graduate Program: Education PhD
First Name: Chigorom
Email: [Email]
Faculty Rank: Associate Professor

NOMINATION STATUS:

☐ Graduate Faculty
☐ Graduate Faculty Scholar
☐ Eligible to chair doctoral dissertation advisory committees
☐ Teaching only
☐ Has served on previous thesis/dissertation committees to completion
☐ Has served on previous thesis/dissertation committees to completion

Additional Information Regarding Nomination Status:

This nomination is supported by Dr. Lisa Dieker, Professor and Track Coordinator in the Education PhD, as well as by Dr. Karen Biraimah, Professor and Director of International & Special Programs within CEDHP.

ENDORSEMENTS OF NOMINATION: (Signatures Required)

Graduate Program Director: [Signature]
Email: [Email]
Date: 8/6/16
Department Chair or Director: [Signature]
Email: [Email]
Date: 8/1/2016
College Dean, if required: [Signature]
Email: [Email]
Date: 8/1/2016

APPOINTMENT BY THE COLLEGE OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

☐ Approved ☐ Denied

Signature of Dean of the Graduate College: [Signature]
Date: 8/18/16

UCF College of Graduate Studies - P.O. Box 160112, Orlando FL 32816-0112
September 10, 2016

Dear Dr. Abosi,

I am pleased to inform you that you have been appointed as a Graduate Faculty Scholar in the College of Graduate Studies at the University of Central Florida. With this appointment comes certain privileges and responsibilities in participating in graduate education at UCF and I strongly encourage you to review these at:
http://www.gradcatalog.ucf.edu/content/CollegeofGraduateStudies.aspx?id=5690#Graduate%20Faculty%20and%20Graduate%20Faculty%20Scholars
(Look under the “Graduate Faculty and Graduate Faculty Scholars” section).

In recognition of your expertise you were nominated by the Education program to participate in the educational activities of this program. I am always delighted when qualified individuals express their willingness to share their expertise with our students and I hope that you find your service as a Graduate Faculty Scholar to be a rewarding and fulfilling experience.

Sincerely,

John Veliopulos
Dr. John Veliopulos
Associate Dean and Director of Interdisciplinary Studies
College of Graduate Studies

Attachments:
Approved Nomination/Appointment form for your records (PDF)
APPENDIX Q
PROFESSOR MUKHOPADHYAY GRADUATE FACULTY SCHOLAR FROM THE
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
Nomination and Appointment to Graduate Faculty and Graduate Faculty Scholars

The faculty who teach, advise and mentor graduate students are the heart of graduate education at UCF, and their efforts make the graduate experience what it is. We are indebted to their service on behalf of UCF’s graduate students and graduate programs.

Prior to participating in graduate level instruction, an individual must be appointed either as a member of the UCF Graduate Faculty or as a graduate faculty scholar. UCF faculty who are tenured, tenure-earning, ranked Clinical or ranked Research professors, or ranked librarians are eligible to be appointed as members of the Graduate Faculty. Other UCF faculty (e.g. lecturers, instructors, research associates, adjuncts, etc.) and individuals not employed by UCF may participate as graduate faculty scholars. Teaching credentials must still be certified by the Office of Faculty Affairs if serving as an instructor of record.

Please see page 2 for a detailed description of the appointment roles, the process of the appointment, and submission of the nomination.

FACULTY INFORMATION (Please Type or Print)

Family or Last Name: Mukhopadhyay
First Name: Sourav
Personal ID (PID): ...
Email: ...
Employing Unit: University of Botswana
Facility Rank: Associate Professor
Nominating Graduate Program: Education PhD

NOMINATION STATUS:

☐ Graduate Faculty
☐ Eligible to chair doctoral dissertation advisory committees
☐ Has served on previous thesis/dissertation committees to completion
☐ Graduate Faculty Scholar
☐ Teaching only
☐ Has served on previous thesis/dissertation committees to completion

Additional Information Regarding Nomination Status:

This nomination is supported by Dr. Lisa Dieker, Professor and Track Coordinator in the Education PhD, as well as by Dr. Karen Biraimah, Professor and Director of International & Special Programs within CEDHP.

ENDORSEMENTS OF NOMINATION: (Signatures Required)

Graduate Program Director: [Signature]
Department Chair or Director: [Signature]
College Dean, if required: [Signature]

APPOINTMENT BY THE COLLEGE OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

Signature of Dean of the Graduate College: [Signature]

Date: 8/18/16

UCF College of Graduate Studies - P.O. Box 160112, Orlando FL 32816-0112
September 10, 2016

Dear Dr. Mukhopadhyay,

I am pleased to inform you that you have been appointed as a Graduate Faculty Scholar in the College of Graduate Studies at the University of Central Florida. With this appointment comes certain privileges and responsibilities in participating in graduate education at UCF and I strongly encourage you to review these at:
http://www.graduatecatalog.ucf.edu/content/CollegeofGraduateStudies.aspx?id=5690#Graduate%20Faculty%20and%20Graduate%20Faculty%20Scholars
(Look under the “Graduate Faculty and Graduate Faculty Scholars” section).

In recognition of your expertise you were nominated by the Education program to participate in the educational activities of this program. I am always delighted when qualified individuals express their willingness to share their expertise with our students and I hope that you find your service as a Graduate Faculty Scholar to be a rewarding and fulfilling experience.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. John Weishampel
Associate Dean and Director of Interdisciplinary Studies
College of Graduate Studies

Attachments:
Approved Nomination/Appointment form for your records (PDF)
### Raw Data Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCJSS Policy</td>
<td>Doc1</td>
<td>11/18/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World AIDs Day</td>
<td>Doc2</td>
<td>11/22/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCET</td>
<td>Doc3</td>
<td>11/21/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Doc4</td>
<td>11/21/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Doc5</td>
<td>11/18/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Scale</td>
<td>FN1</td>
<td>1/18/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Routines</td>
<td>FN2</td>
<td>1/18/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Routine</td>
<td>FN3</td>
<td>1/18/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Field Notes</td>
<td>GENFN</td>
<td>11/18/2016-2/7/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>O1</td>
<td>1/16/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>O2</td>
<td>1/18/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Procedures</td>
<td>O3</td>
<td>1/18/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (Lab)</td>
<td>O4</td>
<td>1/18/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Education</td>
<td>O5</td>
<td>1/20/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>O6</td>
<td>1/20/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>O7</td>
<td>1/23/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>O8</td>
<td>1/23/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (Classroom)</td>
<td>O9</td>
<td>1/25/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>O10</td>
<td>1/25/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Ob. Science</td>
<td>IFC1</td>
<td>11/25/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Ob. HE</td>
<td>IFC2</td>
<td>11/25/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Ob. DT</td>
<td>IFC3</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Ob. 1</td>
<td>IFE1</td>
<td>11/18/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Ob. 2</td>
<td>IFE2</td>
<td>11/18/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Ob. 3</td>
<td>IFE3</td>
<td>11/21/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Ob. 4</td>
<td>IFE4</td>
<td>11/21/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Ob. 5</td>
<td>IFE5</td>
<td>11/23/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Ob. 6</td>
<td>IFE6</td>
<td>11/23/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSH</td>
<td>DSHI</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>HODI</td>
<td>12/7/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>SHI</td>
<td>12/7/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET</td>
<td>SETI</td>
<td>1/25/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>STI</td>
<td>1/18/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCT</td>
<td>CGTI</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>MTI</td>
<td>12/7/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S1I</td>
<td>1/23/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S2I</td>
<td>1/18/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>S3I</td>
<td>1/25/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>S4I</td>
<td>1/20/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pictures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture 1</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>1/19/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture 2</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>1/19/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture 3</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1/19/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture 4</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>1/19/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture 5</td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>1/19/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture-Goats</td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>1/19/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Class</td>
<td>P7</td>
<td>1/19/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Class</td>
<td>P8</td>
<td>1/19/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly</td>
<td>P9</td>
<td>11/18/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Card</td>
<td>P10</td>
<td>1/19/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk 1</td>
<td>P11</td>
<td>1/19/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk 2</td>
<td>P12</td>
<td>1/19/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk 3</td>
<td>P13</td>
<td>1/19/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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