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ABSTRACT

Inclusive education has become a global trend in provision of services for pupils with disabilities. Kenya has contributed to the initiatives through provision of Free Primary Education (FPE) and formulation of Special Needs Policy towards promoting inclusive education. The policy was to ensure equitable access to quality education and training of learners with special needs. However, special needs education still faces many challenges and the implementation of the policy has not been very successful. The factors that hinder the provision of education for special needs learners include: insufficient data on children with special needs, stigmatization of persons with disabilities, lack of qualified professionals, ineffective assessment tools, inappropriate curriculum as well as instructional methodologies. This has led to misplacement of pupils with special needs in Special Units. This study focused on investigating the challenges facing implementation of inclusive education in public primary schools in Matete District, Lugari Sub County; Kenya. The objectives of the study were to establish the type of learner based factors influencing implementation of inclusive education, to assess the resources available, to explore the level of awareness among teachers and to assess level of training among teachers. The study employed the descriptive survey method and used qualitative methods to analyze the relationships between variables and further interpretation. The research instruments used included questionnaires, interview schedules and document analysis. The analysis of data was both qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative analysis considered conclusions from the respondents’ opinions while quantitative analysis involved use of frequency counts and distribution, tabulation, totals and calculation of percentages. Data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software whose output was presented in form of graphs, tables, percentages and charts. The learner based factors such as type of disability, motivation, benefits, performance, participation and self esteem had a great influence on implementation of inclusive education. Inadequate training, lack of teaching materials, inappropriate curriculum to a large extent decelerated implementation of inclusive education. The results highlighted the existence of poor learning environment as well as low level of awareness on the contents of Special needs policy among teachers as a hindrance to inclusive education. These results will assist the Ministry of Education to plan, organize and manage special educational provisions adequately. Recommendations of the report include: establishment of assessment resource centres to support in identification of type of disabilities, allocation of adequate funding and training of all the teachers. The report concludes that inclusive education is a basic human right and it requires involvement of all stakeholders including the government, teachers, parents, pupils and communities for it to become a reality.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study.

Inclusive education has emerged globally as one of the most the
dominant issues in the education of children with special needs. In the past
40 years the field of special needs education has moved from a segregation
paradigm through integration to a point where inclusion is central to
contemporary discourse. A succinct definition of inclusive education is
provided by Lipsky and Gartner (1996), who described it as students with
disabilities having full membership in age-appropriate classes in their
neighbourhood schools, with appropriate supplementary aids and support
services.

According to Antia et al. (2002), inclusion denotes a student with a
disability unconditionally belonging to and having full membership of a
regular classroom in a regular school and its community. The debate of
including them into society without being stigmatized has been discussed
internationally by the United Nation Commission on the Rights of
Children (UNCRC, 1989). All acknowledged education as a human right
and enacted some of the articles to include them in every social sector.
This study explores the challenges facing inclusive education in public
primary schools.

Inclusion in the context of education is the practice, in which
students with special educational needs spend most or all of their time
with non-disabled students. UNESCO, (2001) developed a language of
inclusion for the disabled into the system of education by stating the
following: ‘It starts from the belief that the right to education is a basic human right and the foundation for a more just society. Inclusive education takes the Education for All (EFA) agenda forward by ensuring all schools serve all children in their communities as part of an inclusive education system. It is concerned with all learners, with a focus on those who have traditionally been excluded from educational opportunities—such as learners with special needs and disabilities, children from ethnic and linguistic minorities’.

Inclusion is about the child’s right to participate and the schools’ duty to accept the child and to reject the use of special schools or classrooms to separate students with disabilities from students without disabilities. All students can learn and benefit from education and schools should adapt to the needs of students, rather than students adapting to the needs of the school. Individual differences between students are a source of richness and diversity, and not a problem. The diversity of needs and pace of development of students are addressed through a wide and flexible range of responses. It is a process of removing barriers and enabling all students, including previously excluded groups, to learn and participate effectively within general school systems (UNESCO, 2001).

Inclusive education is about the integration approach of the disabled learners in schools. It is under this inclusion model that learners with special needs spend most or all of their time with non-disabled learners. While inclusive education has its benefits, there are enormous challenges hindering its effective implementation especially in developing countries. Educational facilities in schools are inadequate especially in developing countries; and this is a threat to implementation of inclusive
education. These range from lack of adequate reading materials, to desks, classrooms among others. Inclusive education has led to an increased number of learners in the learning institutions. This leads to a decrement in the available resources in the schools.

According to a study conducted by Oakes and Saunders (2002), shortages of teaching and learning materials has a negative impact on the learners especially the disabled ones with less knowledge about a subject. This forces most of the parents to remove their children from the schools and take them to special schools. Lack of adequate resources to meet the educational needs of the disabled learners in the regular schools cause most of the parents to have doubt as to whether the needs of their children are adequately met in these schools. Thus, most parents prefer to take their children to the special schools as compared to the inclusive schools. This affects negatively the success of inclusive education.

Additionally, many schools in the developing countries are characterized by inadequacies in basic facilities such as properly ventilated classroom, furniture suitable for the disabled and non-disabled learners, kitchen, safe clean water, play ground, toilets and play material among others (IAEYC, 1991). This limits the enrollment of the disabled learners in the regular schools hence affecting the success of inclusive education.

Teacher’s training is equally important in the teaching and learning process. Most of the teachers do not have adequate training on handling both the disabled and non-disabled learners in one class. This affects the understanding of some of the learners of which it is reflected in their
performance. Continued poor performance among the disabled learners due to the poor teaching skills and abilities of the teachers triggers their poor enrollment in the regular schools. Angrist and Lavy (2001) observe that lack of adequate and proper training received by teachers lead to a reduction in their pupils' test scores. Thus, lack of adequate teacher training to handle both the disabled and non-disabled learners in the same class negatively affects the success of inclusive education.

There is no adequate support for inclusive education from the concerned stakeholders. In most of developing countries, most of the parents of the disabled learners are cautious about placing their children in an inclusion program because of fears that the children will be ridiculed by other children, or be unable to develop regular life skills in an academic classroom. This is mainly attributed to poor policy implementation. Many governments in the developing countries have not been able to effectively implement inclusive education policy framework. In some countries like Kenya, the education policy is an exclusively one-sided policy and fails to meet the needs of the challenged learners in inclusive education arrangement. One case in point is the endlessly controversial national exam, which fails to capture learners' diverse backgrounds and needs (Sugiharto, 2008).

In England, the Department for Education and Skills, (2004) made a clear commitment to inclusive education by embedding inclusive practice in every school and early years setting. It cited the 1997 Green Paper, as signaling the government’s commitment to the principle of inclusion and the need to rethink the role of special schools within that context. It also referred to the Special Education Needs (SEN) and
Disability Act (2001) as delivering “a stronger right to mainstream education, making it clear that where parents want a mainstream place for their child, everything possible should be done to provide it”. A further indication of England’s commitment to inclusive education is the government’s decision to place the Index for Inclusion (Booth and Ainscow, 2002) in every school.

Several Australian states have made a commitment to inclusive education. In Western Australia, for example, the aim of the Building Inclusive Schools (BIS) strategy since it commenced in 2002 has been to raise awareness across all levels of the education system of changing societal expectations in relation to the education of students with disabilities and the legal imperatives that now impact on schools. It is described as “a professional learning program that promotes and supports the cultural shift of inclusive educational practices in all public schools”.

Similarly, the Inclusive Education Statement (2005) in Queensland aimed to foster a learning community that questions disadvantage and challenges social injustice, maximize the educational and social outcomes of all students through the identification and reduction of barriers to learning, especially for those who are vulnerable to marginalization and exclusion and ensure all students understand and value diversity so that they have the knowledge and skills for positive participation in a just, equitable and democratic global society.

A reflection by Sailor (2009) suffices to sum up the present status of inclusive education: Without question, one of the thorniest policy questions to confront American education in the second half of the
twentieth century and continuing today is the issue of placement for students served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Federal policy consistently has used the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) language in statutory and regulatory policy to enhance the integration of students with disabilities and greater access to the curriculum of general education. In addition, families assisted by advocacy organizations have litigated successfully to achieve these ends for their children with disabilities. Some of these cases have produced favourable interpretations at the level of the Supreme Court.

In many African countries, the education of pupils with SEN began as 'Special Education'. 'Special Education' for pupils with blindness was followed by 'Special Education' for deaf pupils and in turn followed by 'Special Education' for pupils with physical disabilities soon afterwards. At the beginning, the education of pupils with SEN was especially a mission concern. Governmental commitment to the education of pupils with SEN only got into its stride after the seventies. However, some governments like the Nigerian (1960) and the Kenyan (1963) ones, started special education projects earlier on (Moremi, 1998; Munhunweyi, et al., 1997; Zindi, 1997).

In Kenya, the government declared Free Primary Education (FPE) for all Kenyans in 2003. This expansion has not been without major challenges, one of which is equity especially in relation to learners with special needs. The national education system has been characterized by lack of systems and facilities that respond to the challenges faced by learners with special needs. The United Nations Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities, rule 6, not only affirms the equal rights of
children, youth and adults with handicaps to education, but also states that education should be provided in integrated school settings and in the general school setting. (Special Needs Policy, 2008).

Inclusive education in most of the developing countries still remains in the realm of theory and far from practice; it is still grappling with problems of policy implementation, an environment that is not conducive for practice. The success of inclusive education is hindered by other factors like community’s attitude towards disability, lack of adequate involvement of all stakeholders among others. As such, more still needs to be done in order to ensure that the best is achieved from the objectives of inclusive education.

In view of the above, this situation calls for a re-appraisal of available approaches to expand SNE services so as to achieve an enrolment rate at par with that of other children. To attain this, Kenya needs to ensure the realization of inclusive education and simultaneously develop and implement guidelines that mainstream special needs education at all levels of the education system.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The debate about inclusive education has been lessened and the society is trying to assimilate into the system of involvement of the physically challenged pupils in the normal system of education. The society is also trying to fight stigmatization in order to create an opportunity for all in education. Despite all these efforts, there are still some challenges that affect inclusive education in our society from the international level to the local level. In Kenya, the Ministry of Education
approved the Special Needs Policy in 2009 to support equitable access to quality education and training of learners with special needs. However, special needs education still faces many challenges and the implementation of the policy has not been very successful.

Although no concrete data is available about children with special educational needs, it is suspected that some of these children generally stay at home without any intervention services. Others are in schools where they keep repeating classes/grades until their parents withdraw them. Still, others lose interest and drop out. Some special education classes have been criticized for a watered-down curriculum (Ellis, 2002). Inclusive education is a basic right for all children to be educated along with mainstream peers. To segregate children by any means is considered as a denial of their basic rights. Segregation has resulted in setting up plans that are central to special education and labeling children with SNE hence stigmatization. Avoiding to identify children with special needs may prevent them from getting the education they need (Norwich, 2010). As a consequence, 98 percent of children with special needs in developing countries do not have access to education (UNESCO, 1995).

Major issues in Kenya include the stigmatization of persons with disabilities, a lack of funding to equip teachers with the resources, materials and support required to meet learners’ needs, a lack of curriculum adaptations, inappropriate instructional methodology, unqualified personnel, inappropriate and biased assessment measures and the misdiagnosis of learning disabilities. This has led to the misplacement of pupils in Special Units. Children with special needs experience difficulties in learning and are often marginalized within or even excluded
from regular school systems. There is a shortage of specialized teachers and other support staff; children and youth with severe special needs continue to be excluded from school or receive less favourable treatment due to the inability of regular schools to meet their physical and educational needs.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the challenges facing implementation of inclusive education in public primary schools in Matete District, Lugari Sub County; Kenya and make recommendations necessary to enhance inclusive education.

1.4 Specific Objectives

1. To establish how learner-based factors influence implementation of inclusive education in public primary schools in Matete District.

2. To assess the resources available and their accessibility to children with special needs in public primary schools in Matete District.

3. To explore the level of awareness among teachers towards implementation of inclusive education in public primary schools in Matete District.

4. To assess the level of training among teachers implementing inclusive education in public primary schools in Matete District.

1.5. Research Questions

1. How do learner-based factors influence implementation of inclusive education?

2. What resources are available in facilitating children with special needs?

3. What is the understanding of inclusive education to implementers?
4. Have the implementers received appropriate training on special education?

1.6 Significance of the Study.

It is anticipated that the results of this research will assist the Ministry of Education to plan, organize and manage special educational provisions. The findings will also be used to enhance awareness creation about the Ministry’s policy on special education among stakeholders. The prevailing disabilities among children will be established in order to make appropriate referrals for further testing and proper treatment, appropriate placement in schools as well as giving teachers, parents and communities professional advice and guidance on matters relating to special education.

The results of this research will also facilitate the Ministry of Education to allocate adequate resources required to support special educational needs. The results of this study will form a basis on which future research could be built on and improve the delivery of their services on special needs education.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

The study involved small samples which affected the generalisability to other groups of children with similar needs in other locations. Moreover, it meant that there were few population-based perspectives on diversity and needs.

1.8 De-limitation of the study

The study was conducted in Matete District, Lugari Sub County and schools were sampled within the study area due to the high poverty
index and high population. The research only focused on 25 schools that were implementing inclusive education and left out 26 schools that did not have inclusive education.

1.9 Basic assumptions

The information provided by the respondents was a true reflection of the reality on the ground. The research was carried out on the premise that inclusive education was being implemented in sampled schools.

1.10 Definition of Significant terms

Inclusive Education: It refers to pupils with disabilities having full membership in age-appropriate classes in their neighbourhood schools, with appropriate supplementary aids and support services (Lipsky and Gartner, 1996). To Antia et al., (2002), inclusion denotes a student with a disability unconditionally belonging to and having full membership of a regular classroom in a regular school and its community.

Public primary schools: These are schools referred to as mainstream or commonplace schools admitting children who are not disabled to distinguish them from special schools. These schools are either government sponsored or donor funded and admit pupils between grade 1 and 8.

Special needs: the educational requirements of pupils or students suffering from any of a wide range of physical disabilities, medical conditions, intellectual difficulties, or emotional problems, including deafness, blindness, dyslexia, learning difficulties, and behavioural problems.
**Special needs education:** is the education of students with special needs in a way that addresses the students' individual differences and needs. Ideally, this process involves the individually planned and systematically monitored arrangement of teaching procedures, adapted equipment and materials, accessible settings, and other interventions designed to help learners with special needs achieve a higher level of personal self-sufficiency and success in school and community than would be available if the student were only given access to a typical classroom education.

**General classroom teacher:** provides knowledge and skills needed by everyone in a public primary school.

1.11 Organization of the Study

This research project report is organized in three chapters; chapter one focuses on background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations of the study, delimitations, assumptions, and definitions of significant terms. Chapter two focuses on literature review, which is discussed as follows; introduction, history of inclusive education, learner based challenges, training, resources and teachers perceptions, theoretical framework, conceptual framework, knowledge gap and summary of literature review. Chapter three describes the research methodology that was used in the study. It is divided into the following topics; introduction, research design, target population, sample and sampling procedure, research instruments, validity of research instruments, reliability of research instruments, pilot testing, data
collection procedure, data analysis ethical considerations and operationalization of variables. Chapter four focuses on data analysis, presentation and interpretation while Chapter five consists of a summary of research findings, discussions, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further research. The last section of this report includes the references and the appendices.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The review of literature is consistent with the research topic on challenges facing implementation of inclusive education in public primary schools. It is organized in sub-topics that reflect the objectives of the research project and begins with describing the concept of inclusion, influence of learner based factors, availability of resources, level of awareness and training of teachers. It also outlines the theoretical and conceptual frameworks and a summary of the literature review.

2.2 Concept of Inclusive Education

According to Lipsky (1996), inclusive education is interpreted as the philosophy and practice of educating students with disabilities in general education settings. It anchors on the notion that every child should be an equally valued member of the school culture. In other words, children with disabilities benefit from learning in a regular classroom, while their peers without disabilities gain from being exposed to children with diverse characteristics, talents and temperaments. According to Ajuwon (2008), supporters of inclusion use the term to refer to the commitment to educate each child to the maximum extent appropriate in the school and classroom he/she would otherwise attend.

It involves bringing the ancillary services to the child, and requires only that the child will benefit from being in the class (rather than having to keep up with the other students). This is a salient aspect of inclusion, and requires a commitment to move essential resources to the child with a
disability rather than placing the child in an isolated setting where services are located (Smith, 2007). For the child with a disability to benefit optimally from inclusion, it is imperative for general education teachers to be able to teach a wider array of children, including those with varying disabilities, and to collaborate and plan effectively with special educators. To Antia et al., (2002), inclusion denotes a student with a disability unconditionally belonging to and having full membership of a regular classroom in a regular school and its community.

While defining inclusive education, Simui, et al., (2009) noted that inclusive education is a “continuous process of increasing access, participation, and achievement for all learners in general education settings, with emphasis on those at risk of marginalization and exclusion”. Furthermore, these authors stated that inclusive education is not specific to children with disabilities but includes all groups of vulnerable children such as homeless children, children with HIV/AIDS and orphans. According to Simui et al., (2009), “every child matters equally and no child should be left behind, as proposed by the United Kingdom and United States education policies respectively”.

In his essay, Collins (2003) sees inclusion as an educational placement that places social skills over academic skills. He defines inclusion as “an educational philosophy that places a high value on the acquisition of social skills and holds that segregating students inhibits this acquisition. To eliminate any and all segregation, inclusion prescribes regular classroom placements for all students and correspondingly proscribes, or eliminates, all options for alternative placement.” This is also emphasized in UNESCO’s Salamanca Statement (1994) and by Slee
(2001), the latter considering that inclusive education is about the cultural politics of protecting the rights of citizenship for all students.

Writing from a British perspective, and as a person with a disability, Oliver (1996) argued that the education system has failed disabled students by not equipping them to exercise their rights and responsibilities as citizens, while the special education system has functioned to exclude them from both the education process and wider social life. He thus saw inclusion as a political as well as an educational process. The many issues affecting inclusion of special needs students have been debated over the last 25 years (Odom et al., 2011). The term “inclusion” replaced all previous terminologies of integrated special education and reverse mainstreaming, to mean more than just placing children with special needs in the regular educational classroom. It includes a sense of belonging, social relationships, and academic development (Odom et al., 2011).

Christensen (1996) argued that exclusion or segregation of students with special needs is a violation of their human rights and represents an unfair distribution of educational resources. Similarly, Lipsky and Gartner (1996) asserted that inclusive education is a fundamental right, derived from the principle of equity, which, if recognized, would contribute significantly to a democratic society.

In England, the Department for Education and Skills, (2004) made a clear commitment to inclusive education by embedding inclusive practice in every school and early years setting. It cited the 1997 Green Paper, as signaling the government’s commitment to the principle of
inclusion and the need to rethink the role of special schools within that context. It also referred to the Special Education Needs (SEN) and Disability Act (2001) as delivering “a stronger right to mainstream education, making it clear that where parents want a mainstream place for their child, everything possible should be done to provide it”. A further indication of England’s commitment to inclusive education is the government’s decision to place the Index for Inclusion (Booth and Ainscow, 2002) in every school.

In Australia, the inclusive education of individuals with special needs is supported by the Disability Discrimination Act (Australian Commonwealth Government, 1992), which sets out to prevent discrimination against a person on the grounds of disability alone. Similarly, the Inclusive Education Statement (2005) in Queensland aimed to foster a learning community that questions disadvantage and challenges social injustice, maximize the educational and social outcomes of all students through the identification and reduction of barriers to learning, especially for those who are vulnerable to marginalization and exclusion and ensure all students understand and value diversity so that they have the knowledge and skills for positive participation in a just, equitable and democratic global society (UNESCO, 1999).

The European Agency for Development in SNE has been developing “Indicators for Inclusive Education”, with the aim of developing a methodology that would lead to a set of indicators suitable for national level monitoring, that could also be applied at the European level. The indicators are expected to have a clear focus on the policy
conditions that may support or hinder the development of inclusive education within schools (UNESCO, 1999).

In the United States of America, the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) 2004 and the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), requires American school systems to examine how to best address the needs of students with disabilities based on academic achievement. This has “shifted the instructional focus with regard to students with disabilities from where they are educated to how they are educated” (McDuffie et al., 2009). It requires that students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum by being placed in the least restricted environment possible and therefore participate in the same assessments as students without disabilities unless the nature of their disability is determined to be too severe to do so.

Serious government involvement and commitment to the development of Special Education in Africa began in Nigeria, Kenya and Zimbabwe in 1960, 1963 and 1980 respectively (UNISE, 1993), when Universal Primary Education (UPE) was introduced in those countries. Even though UPE is a global educational pronouncement, it has nonetheless since then helped to direct an all inclusive education development. Several policy statements were enacted like the National Policy on Education (NPE) in Nigeria (1977), whereas Kenya started all-inclusive programmes, establishing education administration and inspectorate in 1977 and Zimbabwe’s serious concern began with the adoption of Universal Primary Education (1980).
All these states accepted the responsibility of training teachers in SNE though their policy statements in relation to SNE have been very hazy and often embedded in global policy pronouncements. Though Uganda has relaxed from the initial four children per family, UPE in Nigeria, Kenya, and Zimbabwe makes mandatory for all children of school going age to access educational services in the mainstream primary schools. The Nigeria Development Plan of 1974 among other pronouncements declared that the government would make adequate provisions for the education and care of the handicapped. In Zimbabwe, policies on SNE were addressed in the National Policy of 1982 and Parliamentary Act of 1992 with reference to disabled persons. These efforts were always supported by Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, Baptists, and Methodists Salvation Army who always initiated educational services as an espousal of Christian charity (UNISE 1993).

Uganda put emphasis on the promotion of education as a means of ensuring sustainable human resources and equalization of opportunities (USAID, 2003). The UNICEF (2004) statement of “Education is a right of children that must be respected; no child should be denied it and the opportunity to complete” and the Salamanca statement (1994) have attached value to education and explain the several personal commitments the government of Uganda expressed through the ratification of declarations geared at promoting education namely; the World Summit for Social Development held in Copenhagen March 1995, the World Conference on Education For All held in Jomtein Thailand1990, World Education Forum held in Dakar in April 2000 and the subsequent implementation of the Universal Primary Education in 1997.
In Zambia, the inclusion of students with disabilities is a fairly new concept. The Ministry of Education continues to review all legislation relating to persons with disabilities and endorses relevant international conventions in order to facilitate efficient and effective service delivery (Mungomba, 2008). Sharma et al., (2009) noted that historically, many educational systems adopt an integrated model as an initial approach to inclusive education. In this model, only selected students with disabilities are included in general education classrooms.

In Lesotho, conventionally, the provision of education and care for children with special educational needs has been primarily the responsibility of non-governmental organizations, churches and individuals—sometimes with financial support from private sources and donor agencies. A study conducted by Csapo (1987) revealed that approximately 400 children and youth receiving care in a dozen special schools were supported by donor agencies and that only 70 of these children were provided with special education. Most of these special schools were residential, providing long term-care. Csapo (1987) argued that these long-term care centres violates the caretaking tradition of the extended Basotho family system. She further showed that the long-term care is expensive, and disrupts family life. It also has the potential of causing emotional and psychological deprivation, resulting in alienation from the child's extended family and ultimately from society.

In Kenya, the government’s commitment to special needs education has been demonstrated through establishment of a special needs education section and the appointment of a SNE Inspector in 1975 and 1978 at Ministry of Education (MOE) headquarters. The government
further posted a SNE specialist at the Kenya Institute of Education (KIE) in 1977. Other developments include the preparation of teachers of learners with special needs and disabilities that have led to the establishment of Kenya Institute of Special Education (KISE) and departments of special needs education at Kenyatta and Maseno Universities.

According to the school mapping data set, there are 3,464 special needs institutions (38.2% ECDE, 3.4% NFE, 54.1% primary and 4.3% Secondary) in the country with 2,713 integrated institutions and 751 Special Schools. Eastern region records the highest number of SNE units at 734 while North Eastern has the lowest at 56. Among these, there are 10 public secondary schools for learners with Hearing Impairments, 3 for learners with Physical Handicaps and 4 for learners with Visual Impairments making a total of 17 secondary schools for learners with disabilities throughout Kenya. These figures show that access and participation of children with special needs is relatively low across the country. (Special needs policy, 2008).

The Leonard Cheshire Disability International (2002) implemented in Kenya an inclusive education intervention covering five primary schools and communities in Oriang in Rachuonyo District. The needs of these children were not met in an environment where, among other factors, teachers lacked the skills to support children with special needs. Peers were not prepared to work with children who looked different because of their special needs; lack of adaptive aids for children with special needs. Children with disabilities from Oriang community were not
accessing adequate educational interventions (Leornard Cheshire Disability, 2002).

2.3 Influence of Learner Based Factors on implementation of inclusive education

Gregory et al., (1998) concurs, that children who find themselves unacceptable to their peers or in unsatisfactory relationship with their teachers, life in school become a punishing experience. As without friends, many of the activities they undertake are meaningless. People without friends are an exceptionally vulnerable group, their health and welfare is constantly at risk. For example in India, the National Resource Centre for Inclusion (NRCI) successfully developed a model of desegregation which enables able-bodied children to study happily with the physically and mentally challenged. This prompted the Spastics Society Centers of India (SSI) to throw open especially their doors to able-bodied children as well.

Students with disabilities tend to disrupt the classroom with behaviour issues. Because they are not as cognitively developed as their peers, the teaching-learning process is not as effective as it could be. It is difficult to serve the needs of every student who is normally in the regular education class, and with the special needs students, the job becomes even more of a struggle for the teacher. Teachers have to treat special needs students differently based on their learning level standards. (Gregory et al., 1998)

Special needs students are deprived of a suitable education when they are taught at a mismatched level with students who are significantly
above their level. This can negatively affect a student’s sense of self-esteem and dignity. Even in physical education classes, students with physical disabilities are disadvantaged because the curriculum is not geared to include them (Combs et al., 2010). This can cause students with disabilities to face discrimination and bullying from their peers. In addition, they also experience low self-esteem, isolation, depression, and in some cases aggression (Khudorenko, 2011). These emotional breakdowns can lead to violence (Frances and Potter, 2010).

According to Jull (2008), ordinary learners and challenged learners have different modes of understanding thus making one ahead of the other. The challenged students are not fast learners thus they need more attention while handling them. Inaccessible environment, lack of support from teachers and school make most of the learners repeat or drop out of school thus not boosting their morale. Jull (2008) reiterates that inclusion of students with emotional and behavioral disorders in the inclusive classroom is a great challenge. The effectiveness of students with learning differences in the general education classroom requires that educators be trained in the instructional strategies to facilitate learning. Anti-social behaviors oftentimes exclude students from positive interactions with their peers. In addition, focus should be on educating the child in the least restrictive environment and in the best interest of the child.

2.4 Availability of Resources and their accessibility to children with special needs.

Financing and support of educational services for students with special needs is a primary concern for all countries, regardless of available resources. Yet a growing body of research asserts that inclusive education
is not only cost efficient, but also cost effective, and that equity is the way to excellence. The research seems to promise increased achievement and performance for all learners. Within education, countries are increasingly realizing the inefficiency of multiple systems of administration, organizational structures and services, and that special schools are a financially unrealistic option. For example, an Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 1994) report estimates that the average cost of putting students with special educational needs in segregated placements is seven to nine times higher than educating them in general classrooms.

Inadequate facilities and lack of relevant materials is one of the major obstacles to the implementation of inclusive education in developing countries (Charema and Peresuh, 1996). A study carried out by (Kristensen and Kristensen, 1997) in Uganda and another by Kisanji (1995) in Tanzania, both indicate that in most regular schools where children with disabilities were integrated, the required materials were not provided or were inadequate. Another study carried out in Zambia by Katwishi (1988) indicates that there were no specialist teachers in most mainstream schools to provide important advisory services that would assist regular teachers with managing learners with special needs who were being integrated.

Apart from teachers’ negative beliefs about inclusion and concern for their professional competency to practice inclusive education, resource issues also drew much concern for both teacher groups. Resource issues addressed physical aspects such as inaccessible classrooms to students in a wheel chair, overcrowded classrooms; materials such as Braille and large
prints: Further, teachers expressed concern about the lack of support from professionals with expertise such as peripatetic teachers or those with expertise in sign language and Braille as well as general special education experts: Teachers overwhelmingly believe that inclusive education is impossible without addressing their needs for specialist resources. Overall belief is that without sufficient resources and support inclusive education was not possible and doomed (Katwishi, 1988).

In order to provide a quality education for special needs students in the general education classroom, all of the necessary resources must be available for both the students and the teachers (Anderson et al., 2007). Resources are often extremely limited. There is a lack of teachers because there is a lack of funding, and these insufficient materials affect the success of the inclusion and those who are involved in the program. Resources such as adequate and trained teachers should be prioritized, and concept of inclusive education within the Kenyan education system be evaluated. The KIE had to first track the development and operationalization of a specialized curriculum to cover all subjects for children with disabilities. Monitoring implementation of this curriculum as well as teaching methods was to form a core component of the Ministry of Education’s Division of Quality Assurance and Standards.

2.5 Level of awareness among teachers implementing inclusive education.

These are perceptions towards inclusive education among teachers which has led to improvements in the material circumstances of children with special needs. Children with special needs are viewed as objects of charity or asylum and subjected to patronizing attitudes based on the non-
disabled person’s view of them as not fully human or as incapable of living ordinary lives. According to Salend and Duhaney (1999), in their review of studies (largely American), educators have varying attitudes towards inclusion, their responses being shaped by a range of variables such as their success in implementing inclusion, student characteristics, training and levels of support. Some studies reported positive outcomes for general teachers, including increased skills in meeting the needs of all their students and developing an increased confidence in their teaching ability.

Negative outcomes included the fear that the education of non-disabled children might suffer and the lack of funds to support instructional needs. For special educators, the benefits included an increased feeling of being an integral part of the school community and the opportunity to work with students without disabilities. It was believed that disabled people brought bad luck because they had been cursed or had had a spell placed upon them by witchcraft. Stereotypes are bundles of negative and untrue perceptions which often precondition how people treat and respond to disabled people (Salend and Duhaney, 1999).

Additionally, access to resources and specialist support affects teacher confidence and attitudes toward inclusive education (Bennett, 1997; Katzenmeyer, 1997). The teachers’ beliefs about inclusion suggest that they do not regard students with disabilities, particularly those with sensory impairments as belonging in regular classes and would rather prefer them being educated in existing special schools. Teachers also believed that including students with disabilities limits the amount of teaching work they could do thereby resulting in incompletion of the
syllabuses, teachers also believed that if students with disabilities were included in regular classes it would affect the academic performance of their peers without disabilities.

Teachers perceived that their professional knowledge and skills were inadequate to effectively teach students with disabilities in regular schools. Further, the teachers expressed fear and concern, that because they do not have the required knowledge and expertise to teach students with disabilities who are included in their regular classes; it is contributing to a reduction in the academic success of their schools. (Bennett, 1997; Katzenmeyer, 1997)

2.6 Training of teachers on inclusive education.

Many academics in the field of inclusive education point to teacher education and school leadership as essential for the implementation of inclusive education in the classroom (Ainscow, 2005; Sandhill and Singh, 2005; Booth et al., 2003; Ainscow, 1991), yet the standard of teacher training courses across India varies hugely, and they usually approach the inclusion of children with disabilities from a deficit perspective. According to Agbenyega (2006), many regular education teachers who feel unprepared and fearful to work with learners with disabilities in regular classes display frustration, anger and negative attitude toward inclusive education because they believe it could lead to lower academic standards (Gary, 1997; Tiegerman-Farber, 1998).

According to a study carried out by Mukhopadhyay (2005) in India, teachers do not feel equipped to teach children with disabilities and complain that they need more time to instruct these students. Many
government programmes have included a teacher training component in an attempt to instigate institutional change. However, a ‘special needs’ focus and a lack of training for management, combined with didactic training methodology do little to alter the classroom status quo, especially when responsibility is shifted onto a specialist resource teacher rather than methods altered to suit all students. However, a teacher can be fully qualified, but if the training is sub-standard it will still have a negative impact on teaching and learning quality in the classroom, whereas an under-qualified, poorly paid teacher with some imagination and innovative practices may have a positive effect.

Qualified teachers know that classroom needs must be approached “from a Curricular stand point”, in which difficulties are defined depending on each specific task and activity, and on classroom conditions. Most teachers are not qualified to handle the students with physical challenges. The underlying key to teacher success is preparation. Learning in the classroom with the least disruptions possible is essential. Wagner, et al. (2006) reported that general educators believe that they are not trained to effectively manage the challenging behaviors of EBD students, therefore making them apprehensive about having these students in their classes.

### 2.7 Theoretical Framework

Albert Bandura (1977) developed the social learning theory which states that learning, both cognitive and behavioral, takes place through the observation, modeling, and imitation of others. “The main characteristic of the social learning theory, are the centrality of observational learning, a causal model that involves an environment- person- behavior system,
cognitive contributions, and self-efficacy and agency” (Miller, 2011). This theory proposes that academic and behavior modeling takes place through verbal instruction, live modeling by a person, and symbolic modeling through four steps: attention, retention, reproduction, and motivation.

Inclusion classes capitalize on this theory because disabled peers can observe their nondisabled peers and their teachers and then imitate them both academically and behaviorally. Social learning theory combined with Freudian learning principles focus on teaching children important real-life social behaviors (Miller, 2011). As mentioned before, advocates for inclusion thought this course of action would help students with disabilities by emerging them into a learning community that mimics a mini society. Through this learning community students with disabilities are able to interact with their peers and develop friendships. When included in the regular classroom, special needs students have the opportunity to see their peers working habits, and they can model those habits and behaviors to reflect their own.

This insight ties into the Freudian theory of identification through observation of learned behavior from the peers around them. Bandura and Walter (1977), who were two other researchers who expanded on the exploration of Sigmund Freud’s identification concept of identification through modeling, realized that new behavior can be attained by observation; for example, when a student sees a peer being praised for their hard work, the student learns to try that behavior in hopes of pleasing the teacher and being praised also (Miller, 2011). This plays into the observational theory, where students with special needs can watch the correct behavior and model that desired performance.
2.8 Conceptual Framework

**Independent Variables**

**Learner Based Factors**
Performance, participation, motivation, benefits, retention, self esteem.

**Resources**
Learning materials, funding, Learning environment (facilities, buildings, classrooms), special needs teachers.

**Level of awareness**
Positive Perceptions, Social interaction

**Training**
Trained/specialised teachers, flexible curriculum, content of training.

**Intervening Variable**
Community Rehabilitation Centres

**Dependent Variable**
Status of implementation of Inclusive education in public primary schools.

**Moderating Variables**
Government Policies, NGOs implementing interventions on inclusive education

*Figure 1: Conceptual framework*
From the above conceptual framework (*figure 1*), several factors contribute to how inclusive education is implemented in public primary schools. The rate of implementation may be rated as either slow or fast. Challenges facing implementation of inclusive education were tackled from independent variables namely: learner based factors like performance, participation, motivation, benefits, retention and self esteem. Inadequate resources and training of teachers slows down implementation of inclusive education. Low levels of awareness on Special needs policy contributes to negative perceptions and poor social interaction.

2.9 Knowledge Gap

A study carried out by Grol (2000) in Botswana, Kenya, Nigeria and Zimbabwe, indicates that programs in the area of special educational needs are underrepresented and have poor, very little or non-existent documented literature. Economic and socio political factors affect equity and quality in both general and special education (UNESCO, 1993). A necessary precondition to appropriate policy formulation and program strategy is availability of data. It is evident that there are considerable data gaps in developing countries and this makes it difficult for planning, implementing and supporting inclusive education. Therefore it is imperative that research centers be established to generate data that will provide up to date statistics for informative planning and implementation of inclusive programs.

2.10 Summary

Children with disabilities, who are integrated in regular schools, would need additional provision and support in order to benefit socially, psychologically and educationally from any existing education system.
Most support systems offer a range of delivery services and placement alternatives for pupils with special educational needs. Approaches of the support offered differ from country to country depending on the administration, quality of personnel involved and the economic resources available. While there is consensus on the implementation of inclusion, it is perceived that developing countries have not yet reached the point where every school in all developing countries implements inclusive education.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This section explores the research methodology which was used in the study. This entailed the research design, target population, sample and sampling procedures, research instruments and data collection procedures. An explanation of how validity and reliability was achieved is included. Finally, pilot testing ethical considerations and operationalization of variables have been outlined.

3.2 Research design

Ogula (1995) defines a research design as a plan structure and strategy of investigation conceived so to obtain answers to research questions. The study employed the descriptive survey method. This method focused on systematic description or exposure of the salient aspects of a situation on the patterns that emerged. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) supports this view by asserting that this type of research attempts to describe such things as possible behaviour, attitudes and characteristics. The study used qualitative methods to analyze the relationships between variables and further interpreted the relationships. Descriptive survey was preferred because the research intended to avail useful information on the challenges facing implementation of inclusive education in Matete District, Lugari Sub County. The design availed the most desired and most valid information more easily.
3.3 Target population

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), the target population is the entire group a researcher is interested in or the group about which the researcher wishes in drawing conclusions. Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) further adds that a target population is any set of persons or objects that posses at least one common characteristic. The target population was 75 respondents from 25 public primary schools in Matete District, Kakamega County. The study targeted 3 respondents from each of the 25 sampled schools. These included: The head teacher, SNE teacher and a general classroom teacher who was to act as a control. The study area boarders Kakamega North District to the East, Lugari District to the North, Bungoma District to the west and Kakamega South to the south. It comprises two Locations namely Chevaywa and Luandeti which are entirely within Lugari Sub County.

3.4 Sampling procedure and Sample Size

A sample is a subset of the total population that is used to give the general views (Robert, 2003). A survey research is based on sampling which involves getting information from only some members of the population. Purposive sampling technique was used for this research given that not all the schools in the district were implementing inclusive education in identifying the schools.

Three respondents per the sampled schools were selected: Head teacher, Special Needs teacher and General classroom teacher. The Head teacher and SNE teacher were purposively sampled while a general classroom teacher was randomly selected. The target population of the study was 250 (25, head teachers, 25 special needs and 200 general
classroom teachers). The sample size of the general classroom teachers was calculated using the sample size table by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) (Refer to appendix d). The sample size for GC teachers was 132 at 95% confidence level with a margin error of 5.0%.

The formula used by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) for these calculations is shown below:

\[ n = \frac{X^2 \cdot N \cdot P \cdot (1-P)}{\left( ME^2 (N-1) \right) + (X^2 \cdot P \cdot (1-P))} \]

Where:
- \( n \) = sample size
- \( X^2 \) = Chi–square for the specified confidence level at 1 degree of freedom
- \( N \) = Population Size
- \( P \) = Population proportion
- \( ME \) = desired Margin of Error (expressed as a proportion)

### 3.5 Research instruments

Research instruments are the data collection tools that are used in a study. A questionnaire and an interview schedule were used in this study.

#### 3.5.1 Questionnaire

A questionnaire is a list of standard questions prepared to fit a certain inquiry (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999). A questionnaire was administered to general classroom teachers and special needs teachers as it was found to be the most ideal data collecting instrument for the relatively large sample (Tuckman, 1994).
3.5.2 Interview Schedule

According to Orodho (2004), an interview schedule is a set of questions that an interviewer asks when interviewing respondents. Interview provides reliable, valid and theoretical satisfactory results. Semi-structured interviews were conducted for the head teachers and the Education Officer in charge of Special Education as it afforded some flexibility to both the researcher and the interviewee (Rose and Cole, 2002; Freebody, 2003). The interview guide gave a degree of structure and organization to the process.

3.5.3 Pilot Testing

This is the smaller version of the larger study that is conducted to prepare for the study or field testing the survey to provide a rationale for the design (Orodho, 2003). The pilot testing involved pre-testing of the data collection instruments which determined their validity and reliability. The pilot testing was carried out in 8 schools that had not been sampled for the study based on the 50% rule as stated by Mugenda and Mugenda (1999). The schools were chosen through simple random sampling. The results of the pilot testing showed that some of the questions had been repeated while some were too long hence increasing the time taken by the respondents to answer the questions. This helped in the restructuring of questions to suit the objectives of the study.

3.5.4 Validity of Instruments

Validity is the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences which are based on the research results (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999). It is the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of data actually represents the phenomenon under investigation (Orodho, 2004). Validity
of research instruments was ensured through pilot testing to help refine the instruments and ensure the respondents understood the questions and answer them appropriately.

### 3.5.5 Reliability of Research Instruments

Reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999). Reliability of the study results was assured through methodological triangulation. According to Ogula (1998), methodological triangulation is applied when the researcher uses more than one data collection instrument to measure variables. Data collected using questionnaire was confirmed through use of interview schedule which had related questions targeting the education officers and the head teachers. Pre-testing also helped in enhancing the reliability of the instrument as being a consistent measure of the concept being measured.

### 3.6 Data Collection Procedure

Three research assistants were recruited and trained on the objectives of the survey. The District Education Officer, Officer in charge of Special Education, the Head teacher and teachers from the sampled schools were briefed on the purpose of the study. Questionnaires were then administered to school heads and teachers on agreed dates; while observations were made to assess the conditions of available facilities and their accessibility to children with special educational needs. General information about the school was given by the head teachers or their designees. Information concerning the type of special needs of children was given by Officer in charge of special education, head teachers or teachers in charge of special education.
3.7 Data Analysis

The data collected was coded first to enable analysis to be done. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze data from which answers to the research questions were found. Descriptive statistics according to Gay (1992) are methods used to derive from raw data certain indices that characterize or summarize the entire set of data. Data analysis was facilitated by use of Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) software. The study used both quantitative and qualitative analysis. Quantitative data included use of frequency tables and percentages to present and summarize the information obtained while qualitative data included responses from open ended question items which were analyzed in narrative form.

3.8 Ethical Considerations.

There are several ethical issues which must be dealt with when conducting a research study. The American Psychological Association (APA) has developed guidelines for the ethical practices of conducting research. These guidelines included discussing the limits of confidentiality, maintaining confidentiality, maintenance of records, disclosures, use of confidential information, approval by authority to carry out the research, informed consent, sharing data, providing participants with information about the study, reporting results, avoiding plagiarism which was fundamental in carrying out the research.
3.9 Operationalization of Variables

Table 1: Operationalization of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Measurement Scale</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To establish how learner-based factors influence implementation of inclusive education in public primary schools</td>
<td><strong>Dependent</strong> Implementation of inclusive education</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self esteem</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assess the resources available and their accessibility to children with special needs in public primary schools.</td>
<td><strong>Dependent</strong> Implementation of inclusive education</td>
<td>Learning materials,</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding,</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning environment</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special needs teachers.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explore the level of awareness among teachers towards inclusive education in public primary schools.</td>
<td><strong>Dependent</strong> Implementation of inclusive education</td>
<td>Positive perceptions</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social interactions</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To assess the level of training among teachers implementing inclusive education in public primary schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Independent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of inclusive education</td>
<td>Level of training on inclusive education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trained/speciﬁed teachers Flexible curriculum, Content of training</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Ordinal</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter is a documentation of the results on the research that sought to investigate challenges facing implementation of inclusive education in Matete District, Lugari Sub County; Kenya. Data was analyzed using descriptive tools; findings were then interpreted using frequencies and percentages while presentation was done using tables. Data findings were then linked with the researcher’s opinion as well as the existing body of knowledge for an elaborate interpretation and discussion. The chapter is organized in sections beginning with response rate, demographic information and subsequent sections have been organized as per the research objectives.

4.2 Response Rate

The study targeted 25 head teachers/designees, 25 special needs teachers and 132 general classroom teachers out of which 25 head teachers/designees, 25 special needs teachers and 132 general classroom teachers responded/duly filled in the questionnaires. This contributed to 100% to the response rate for head teachers/designees, 100% for special needs teachers and 100.0% for general classroom teachers.

4.3 Demographic Information

4.3.1: Personal Data

This subsection describes the basic statistical characteristics of the respondents studied. This included the level of education, previous or
current contact with pupils with special needs, years of contact with the pupil and type of special needs the pupil had.

The results in Table 4.3 below indicate that 19 (76.0%) of the special needs education (SNE) teachers had their level of education at tertiary college while 4 (16%) were undergraduates.

**Table 2: Level of education for special needs teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tertiary college</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postgraduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the head teachers represented by 20 (80%) had also attained their education at tertiary college as well as the general classroom teachers represented by 90 (64.4%).

**Table 3: Level of education for general classroom teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tertiary college</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postgraduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This did not have any significant statistical difference because all the respondents were found to be literate and they understood the contents of the questionnaires. The better part of the SNE represented by 23 (92.0%) acknowledged to have had either previous or current contact with persons with disability as compared to 2 (8%) of them whose responses were negative. The types of special needs familiar the respondents are shown in Table 4.3.3 below:

**Table 4:** Types of special needs acknowledged by the SNE teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of special needs</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual/hearing impairment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mental disability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical disability</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotional/behavioural disorders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none of the above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was also reflected among the majority of the general classroom (GC) teachers in Table 4.3.4 of whom 131 (99.2%) agreed to have had contact with special needs pupils. This showed that pupils with special needs were common either as family members, friends, neighbours and pupils.
Table 5: Types of special needs acknowledged by the GC teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of special needs</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual/hearing impairment</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mental disability</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical disability</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotional/behavioural disorders</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none of the above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Influence of Learner-based factors as a challenge facing the implementation of Inclusive Education

4.4.1: Respondents aware of pupils with special needs

The results showed that slightly more than half of the SNE represented by 13 (52.0%) were fully aware of pupils with special needs in their respective schools while 11 (44.0%) acknowledged to be partially aware. On the other hand, 68 (51.5%) of the GC teachers fully knew pupils with special needs in their respective schools. This shows that majority of the respondents were conscious on issues of special needs among pupils.

4.4.2: Definition of inclusive education

According to the Officer in charge of special education in Matete District, inclusive education is barrier free education for both the handicapped and non handicapped pupils sharing the same resources. It aims at minimizing segregation of pupils with special needs and ensuring that they also attain the same objectives as the non handicapped pupils. The head teachers defined inclusive education as having children with
disabilities enrolled in normal public schools. The education officer and the head teachers categorized the special needs in Matete District as visually handicapped, mentally challenged, physically challenged, hearing impairment, learning disabilities, health impaired and communication disorders. Table 4.4.2.1 below shows the categories in which inclusive education applies as understood by the GC teachers.

Table 6: Definition of Inclusive Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of inclusive education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>visual/hearing impairment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mental retardation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotional disorders</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical disability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all the above</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident that half of the respondents by 66 (50.0%) appreciated the fact that inclusive education entails visual/hearing impairment, mental retardation, emotional disorders and physical disabilities. Only one of the respondents representing 0.8% felt that inclusive education is synonymous to physical disability.

4.4.3. Benefits of Inclusive Education

The District Education Officer outlined benefits of inclusive education to include: improved academic achievement, increased retention and increased transition for pupils with special needs. The head teachers outlined the benefits of inclusive education as: increased socialization and increased enrollment rate of pupils with special needs. The results showed
that 20 (80.0%) of the SNE teachers agreed that pupils with special needs benefit from inclusive education while 5 (20.0%) disagreed. In addition, 106 (80.3%) of the GC teachers also agreed that inclusive education is beneficial to pupils with special needs while 26 (19.7%) disagreed.

This indicates that a high number of the respondents embraced the idea of inclusive education. However, few of the respondents had reservations on whether children with special needs benefited from inclusive education. They sighted reasons for their disagreement as lack of specialized staff and facilities to meet the needs of the children.

### 4.4.4: Motivation of pupils with special needs

When the respondents were asked on what motivates pupils with special needs to join public primary schools, 13 (52.0%) of the SNE teachers cited peer interaction as the main reason while 6 (24.0%) stated learning environment and 5 (20.0%) thought that school feeding program acted as a motivator. On the other hand only one respondent representing 4.0% acknowledged play facilities as motivation for pupils with special needs to join public primary schools. This is summarized in Table 4.4.4.1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivators stated by SNE teachers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school feeding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning environment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer interaction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>play facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7: SNE teachers’ response on motivators of inclusive education
According to the GC teachers, 78 (59.1%) of them cited peer interaction as the main reason while 18 (13.6%) stated learning environment and 19 (14.4%) thought that school feeding program acted as a motivator. However, one respondent representing 0.8% cited funding as a factor motivating pupils with special needs to join public primary schools. This is shown in Table 4.4.4.2 below:

Table 8: GC teachers’ response on motivators of Inclusive Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivators stated by GC teachers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school feeding</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning environment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer interaction</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>play facilities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents pointed out peer interaction and this depicts the aspect of socialization which did not come out as a challenge to inclusive education.

Regarding the Special Needs Policy, 20 (80.0%) of the SNE teachers were aware of the policy while 5 (20.0%) were not aware. In addition, 105 (79.5%) of the GC teachers were aware of the policy while 27 (20.5%) were not aware of the existence of the policy. This shows majority of the respondents knew about the existence of the policy on inclusive education. Nevertheless, slightly more than half of the SNE teachers represented by 14 (56.0%) and 70 (53.0%) of the GC teachers felt
that the rate of implementing the Special Needs Policy is fair. However, 6 (24.0%) of the SNE teachers and 40 (30.3%) of the GC teachers were not aware that the implementation of the policy is already in place in Matete District and this is probably associated with the frequency with which the pupils were assessed cited by the GC teachers as shown in Table 4.4.4.3 below.

Table 9: GC teachers rating on Frequency of assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of assessments</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, 14 (56.0%) of the SNE teachers and 62 (47.0%) of the GC teachers rated the participation of pupils with special needs in class as fair and this rules out the fact that inclusive education decelerates self esteem. However, 14 (56.0%) of the SNE teachers cited poor academic performance of pupils with special needs as a key impediment to inclusive education. On the issue of absenteeism, 11 (44.0%) of the SNE teachers and 57 (43.2%) of the GC teachers rated it as fair and this could pose a challenge to implementation of inclusive education. Absenteeism encourages school drop outs among pupils with special needs as well as poor academic performance.
4.5 Influence of resources as a challenge facing the implementation of Inclusive Education.

Table 4.5.1 below gives a summary on the views of the GC teachers on whether the needs of pupils with special needs have been met or not. 80 (60.6%) of the GC teachers partially agreed while 37 (28.0%) felt that the needs of pupils with special needs have not yet been met.

Table 10: Whether Needs of pupils with special needs are met or not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs are met or not</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not yet</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substantially</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, 15 (60.0%) of the SNE teachers partially agreed that needs of pupils with special needs have been met while 8 (32.0%) disagreed. This is as a result of the condition of classrooms and buildings of which 19 (76.0%) of the SNE teachers and 106 (80.3%) of the general classroom teachers rated the general condition as poor. This could be associated with lack of adequate funding as unanimously agreed by all the 25 (100.0%) SNE teachers and 132 (100.0%) of GC teachers. The main source of funding as cited by 102(77.3%) of the GC teachers and 15 (60.0%) of SNE teachers was from the Government (Kshs.2000/= per term per pupil). However, this funding was not consistent and this hampered to a large extent implementation of inclusive education. A fraction 8 (32.0%) of the SNE teachers and 68 (51.5%) of GC teachers
mentioned the availability of special needs teachers as the main resource available compared to learning materials and funding.

The response by the GC teachers on resources required for successful implementation of inclusive education is shown in Table 4.5.2 below:

Table 11: Resources Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources required</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school restructuring</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching aids</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revised curriculum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of the above</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the contrary, the 11 (44.4%) of SNE teachers cited the deployment of special needs teachers in public primary schools as the main resource required. The Education officer cited more staffing, restructuring of schools, funding, teaching/learning aids and transport facilitation as resources needed most. This was similarly mentioned by the head teachers although they emphasized on allocation of more funds to facilitate inclusive education.
4.6 Level of awareness as a challenge facing the implementation of Inclusive Education

Regarding the fact that pupils with special needs have a right to education in a general classroom, majority of the GC teachers represented by 111 (84.1%) were in agreement while only 11 (15.9%) disagreed on the statement. Similarly 21 (84.0%) of SNE teachers also agreed on the fact that inclusive education is a basic right while 4 (16.0%) disagreed. This implies that most of the respondents are aware of inclusive education.

Table 4.6.1 below shows the responses from SNE teachers on whether inclusive education promotes social independence or not. It is evident that 24 (96.0%) of the SNE teachers agreed that inclusive education promotes social independence as compared to one who disagreed.

Table 12: IE promotes social independence (SNE teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IE promotes social independence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, 123 (93.2%) of GC teachers also agreed that inclusive education promotes social independence and therefore learner based characteristics may not be a barrier.

When asked whether the teachers were well equipped to handle pupils with special needs, 19 (76.0%) of the SNE teachers and 97 (73.4%) of the GC teachers disagreed. Based on observations around the schools, it
was evident that the respondents were aware that the facilities within the schools did not meet the minimum standards to support inclusive education. The results show that 20 (80.0%) of SNE teachers and 117 (88.6%) of GC teachers agreed that the facilities do not meet the basic needs of pupils with special needs. It was noted as shown in Table 4.6.2 below that 21 (84.0%) of the SNE teachers and 111 (84.0%) of GC teachers did not fully understand the contents of the Special Needs Policy. This is a great challenge as far as implementation of inclusive education is concerned as the teachers do not understand their responsibilities.

Table 13: Teachers fully understand the contents of the Special needs Policy (SNE teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents of SN policy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Training of teachers as a challenge facing the implementation of Inclusive Education

The results show that 23 (92.0%) of the SNE teachers and 112 (84.8%) of the GC teachers acknowledged to have been trained. In addition, 13 (52.0%) of SNE teachers and 68 (51.5%) of the GC teachers rated the content of the training materials as fair. It was noted that 20 (15.2%) of the GC teachers had not been trained on special education.
The results also indicated that 15 (60.0%) of SNE teachers and 90 (68.2%) of the GC teachers stated that there is no specific curriculum adapted for pupils with special needs. Nevertheless, 8 (32.0%) of SNE teachers and 42 (31.8%) of the GC teachers were positive that there is existence of an adapted curriculum for special needs. In addition, 15 (60.0%) of the SNE teachers and 94 (71.2%) of the GC teachers agreed that training on special needs should be conducted for all the teachers. The teaching materials used by the SNE teachers included books, visual aids and hearing aids.

The results also show that 5 (20.0%) of the SNE teaches mentioned the use of hearing aids while 7 (28.0%) cited the use of visual aids as teaching materials. This is evident that teaching materials are inadequate as much as the teachers have been trained. The Education Officer stated that there are books for sign language which are used as instructional materials but they are very expensive (each book selling at Kshs.2000/=). The available teaching materials were sourced from KIE but they were not enough. The head teachers also acknowledged that inadequate teaching materials have contributed to poor performance among pupils with special needs.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS,
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter is a documentation of the study summary of findings, discussion of findings, conclusions made from the findings and culminates into the researcher’s recommendations for action and further research.

5.2 Summary of Findings
This study was done to assess the challenges facing implementation of inclusive education in Matete District, Lugari Sub County; Kenya. The objectives of the study included: to establish how learner-based factors influence implementation of inclusive education, to assess the resources available and their accessibility to children with special needs, to explore the level of awareness among teachers towards implementation of inclusive education and to assess the level of training among teachers implementing inclusive education in public primary schools in Matete District.

The findings of the study show that the level of education among the highest number of respondents was tertiary college (76.0%) for SNE teachers, 80% for head teachers and 64.4% for GC teachers. 92.0% and 99.2% for SNE teachers and GC teachers respectively stated that they had previous or current contact with pupils with special needs. On learner based factors influencing implementation of inclusive education, the types of special needs stated by both the SNE and GC teachers included: physical disability, visual impairment, hearing impairment, mental
disability and emotional disorders. In addition, 52.0% of SNE teachers and 51.5% of GC teachers were fully aware of pupils with special needs either in their respective classes or within the school environment.

When asked about motivation of pupils with special needs to join public primary schools, 52.0% among SNE teachers and 59.1% of GC teachers cited peer interaction as the key motivator. Out of the 25 SNE teachers, 80.0% agreed that a pupil with special needs benefits from inclusive education compared to 20.0% who disagreed. On the other hand, 80.3% of the GC teachers also agreed that a pupil with special needs benefits from IE while 19.7% disagreed. The results also showed that 80.0% of SNE teachers and 79.5% of GC were aware of the Special Needs Policy.

However, slightly more than half of the SNE teachers represented by 56.0% and 53.0% of the GC teachers felt that the rate of implementing the Special Needs Policy is fair. Majority of the general classroom teachers rated the frequency of assessing pupils with special needs as occasional represented by 44.7%. On the other hand, 56.0% of the SNE teachers cited poor academic performance of pupils with special needs as a key impediment to inclusive education. On the issue of absenteeism, 44.0% of the SNE teachers and 43.2% of the GC teachers rated it as fair.

Concerning training on inclusive education, 92.0% of the SNE teachers and 84.8% of the GC teachers acknowledged to have been trained. In addition, 52.0% of SNE teachers and 51.5% of the GC teachers rated the content of the training materials as fair. In addition, 60.0% of SNE teachers and 68.2% of the GC teachers stated that there is no specific
curriculum adapted for pupils with special needs. 60.0% and 71.2% of SNE and GC teachers respectively agreed that training on special needs should be conducted for all the general classroom teachers. On availability of resources, 60.6% of GC teachers and 60.0% of SNE teachers partially agreed that the needs of the pupils have not been met. This was attributed to 76.0% of the SNE teachers and 80.3% of the general classroom teachers who stated that the condition of the facilities was poor. The main source of funding as cited by 77.3% of the GC teachers and 60.0% of SNE teachers was from the Government of Education allocated by the Ministry; (Kshs.2000/= per term per pupil). Nonetheless, 100% of both the respondents agreed that it was inadequate and unreliable.

On level of awareness, 84.1% and 84.0% of GC and SNE teachers respectively understood that inclusive education is a basic right for pupils with special needs and 96.0% of SNE teachers agreed that the program did not have a negative effect on the pupils. Despite having majority of the respondents having received training on special needs, 76.0% of the SNE teachers and 73.4% of the GC agreed that teachers in public primary schools were not fully equipped to handle pupils with special needs. In addition, 84.0% of both SNE and GC teachers stated that the facilities within the school were not designed to meet the standards of pupils with special needs. Moreover, 84.0% of the respondents did not fully understand the content of Special needs Policy.

5.3 Discussion of Findings

5.3.1: Demographic Information

The findings of the study show that the level of education among the highest number of respondents was tertiary college. 92.0% of SNE
teachers and 99.2% of GC teachers stated that they had previous or current contact with children who had special needs. This included family members, friends, pupils and neighbours. This showed that majority of the respondents were able to relate the concept of inclusive education to pupils because their experience.

5.3.2: Influence of learner based factors on implementation of inclusive education.

On learner based factors influencing implementation of inclusive education, the types of special needs stated by the respondents included: physical disability, visual impairment, hearing impairment, mental disability and emotional disorders. In addition, 52.0% of SNE teachers and 51.5% of GC teachers were fully aware of pupils with special needs either in their respective classes or within the school environment. However, 46.3% of the GC teachers were partially aware of pupils with special needs within their respective schools compared to 2.3% who were completely unaware.

When asked about motivation of pupils with special needs to join public primary schools, 52.0% of SNE teachers and 59.1% of GC teachers cited peer interaction as the key motivator. This insight ties into the Freudian theory of identification through observation of learned behavior from the peers around them. Bandura and Walter (1977), who were two other researchers who expanded on the exploration of Sigmund Freud’s identification concept of identification through modeling, realized that new behavior can be attained by observation; for example, when a pupil sees a peer being praised for their hard work, the student learns to try that
behavior in hopes of pleasing the teacher and being praised also (Miller, 2011).

On the other hand, other factors stated by the respondents as motivators for pupils with special needs included school feeding programs, play facilities and funding. However, this did not have a greater influence on promoting inclusive education and rated low hence posing as a challenge. 80.0% of SNE teachers and 80.3% of GC teachers agreed that pupils benefit from inclusive education while 80.0% of SNE teachers and 79.5% of GC teachers were aware of the Special Needs Policy. Slightly more than half of both respondents felt that the rate of implementation is fair and frequency of assessing pupils was occasional as stated by the GC teachers represented 44.7%. It was also noted by 44.0% of SNE teachers while 43.2% of GC teachers cited that pupils with special needs were occasionally absent in school and this resulted in poor academic performance.

Occasional assessment of pupils with special needs was attributed to lack of proper and equipped assessment centers within the area of study. This was evident from 56.0% of SNE teachers who cited poor performance among pupils with special needs on standardized tests of reading and maths. According to Jull (2008) affirms that ordinary learners and challenged learners have different modes of understanding thus making one ahead of the other. The challenged students are not fast learners thus they need more attention while handling them. Inaccessible environment, lack of support from teachers and school make most of the learners repeat or drop out of school thus not boosting their morale.
5.3.3: Influence of training on implementation of inclusive education

Concerning training on inclusive education, 92.0% SNE teachers and 84.8% of GC teachers been trained although the content was inadequate. According to Agbenyega (2006), many regular education teachers who feel unprepared and fearful to work with learners with disabilities in regular classes display frustration, anger and negative attitude toward inclusive education because they believe it could lead to lower academic standards (Gary, 1997; Tiegerman-Farber, 1998). In addition, 60.0% of SNE teachers and 68.2% of GC teachers stated that there was no specific curriculum adapted for pupils with special needs and 71.2% of GC teachers agreed that training on special needs should be conducted for all the general classroom teachers.

Combs et al, (2010) pointed out that pupils with special needs are deprived of a suitable education when they are taught at a mismatched level with students who are significantly above their level. This can negatively affect a student’s sense of self-esteem and dignity. Even in physical education classes, students with physical disabilities are disadvantaged because the curriculum is not geared to include them.

5.3.4: Availability of Resources and their accessibility to children with special needs.

On resources, 60.6% of GC teachers and 60.0% of SNE teachers agreed that the needs of pupils with special needs have not been met attributing to 80.0% of GC teachers who stated that the conditions of the facilities was poor. This could be due to lack of adequate funding as majority of the respondents cited the Government (Ministry of Education) as the main source of funding for inclusive education. In addition, 100%
of the respondents agreed that it was inadequate and unreliable. Charema and Peresuh, (1996) highlighted the issue of inadequate facilities and lack of relevant materials as one of the major obstacles to the implementation of inclusive education in developing countries. A study carried out by (Kristensen and Kristensen, 1997) in Uganda and another by Kisanji (1995) in Tanzania, both indicated that in most regular schools where children with disabilities were integrated, the required materials were not provided or were inadequate.

5.3.5: Level of awareness among teachers implementing inclusive education.

On level of awareness, 82.6% of the respondents understood that inclusive education is a basic right for pupils with special needs and 46% believed that the program did not have a negative effect on the pupils. In addition, 85.7% stated that the facilities within the school were not designed to meet the standards of pupils with special needs. The standards stated by the respondents included: ramps, wide doors to allow entry of wheel chairs, adaptable desks, classrooms to have enough lighting and they should be well ventilated.

Similarly, both the SNE and GC teachers represented by 84.0% did not fully understand the content of Special needs Policy but they were aware that the policy was in existence. This creates room for laxity among the teachers and lack of proper direction on what is expected from them concerning inclusive education. Bennett and Katzenmeyer (1997) stated that teachers perceived that their professional knowledge and skills were inadequate to effectively teach students with disabilities in regular schools. Furthermore, the teachers expressed fear and concern, that because they do
not have the required knowledge and expertise to teach students with disabilities who are included in their regular classes; it is contributing to a reduction in the academic success of their schools.

5.4 Conclusion

The study concludes that implementation of inclusive education in public primary schools in Matete is in existence although only 25 schools are currently compliant. The Special Needs Policy acted as a key eye opener for schools on issues of inclusive education. Learner based factors were assessed on motivation, performance, participation and retention.

It is evident that learner based factors greatly influenced implementation of inclusive education in schools. While peer interaction emerged as the key motivator, learning environment and funding turned away pupils with special needs from the schools. In addition this interfered with the retention of the pupils in schools due to absenteeism and finally drop outs. The study also concludes that lack of frequent assessment of pupils with special needs resulted in misplaced priorities thus compromising on the needs of the pupils.

On resources, the assessment of the available facilities and buildings revealed lack of ramps, small door ways that could not allow wheelchairs through, inadequate lighting, no proper ventilation, inappropriate desks and instructional methodologies, improper latrines and inadequate funding. Learning materials were very costly and not affordable and the main supplier for the schools was the KIE. The main source of funding was the government while the funding from the NGOs, private sectors and self sponsoring was nearly nonexistent. The
inadequacy of the resources posed the greatest challenge facing implementation of inclusive education.

Inadequate training of teachers on inclusive education was also a contributing factor to the slow rate of implementing inclusive education. Despite majority of the teachers having been trained, the content and methodology of training was wanting. The study also noted that the special needs teachers did not have adequate teaching materials such as books and dictionaries which were very expensive to acquire. This necessitated the teachers to use the instructional methodologies used by the pupils without special needs.

On level of awareness, the study concludes that majority of the teachers understand that inclusive education is a basic right for pupils with special needs. It also promotes social independence among children with special needs and has positive effects on their emotional development. However, the general classroom teachers perceive themselves as not having adequate needed to handle children with special needs. The assessment also reveals that the teachers are aware that the facilities within the schools are not designed to meet the needs of pupils with special needs. Notably, teachers acknowledged that as much as they are aware of the Special Needs Policy, they are yet to understand the contents.

5.5 Recommendations

In increasing the rate of implementation and making it a success program in public primary schools; the researcher recommends the following:
1. The Ministry of Education to invest in establishment of a well equipped resource centre which will be used to determine different types of special needs and enhance proper diagnosis for correct placement of pupils with special needs in public schools. The resource centre will also serve a basis for identification of children with special needs who can join public primary schools.

2. There should be co-operation between donor organizations and naturally relevant personnel in the District. When all participants, Governments, NGOs, teachers, students, parents and communities take action and join their efforts, the goal of achieving equality of access and opportunities for children/youth with special needs can become a reality.

3. Stakeholders should be trained to use locally available resources in order to improvise and sustain inclusive education. These include officials in education, policy makers and other related relevant personnel. Children with disabilities have immense potentials, which remain untapped. Through inclusive education, these potentials can be exploited and put to productive and profitable use to benefit the family, the society and the country.

4. The Government to enforce the existing laws that require learning institutions to restructure facilities in order to cater for pupils with special needs.

5. The government to review the allocation of funding for inclusive education and increase the budget to cater for restructuring of schools and facilitation of Education officers.

6. The Ministry of Education should consider training all the teachers on special needs and conduct refresher trainings for teachers who have already been trained. In addition, the content and
methodology of training should be improved to meet the objectives of inclusive education. This will also increase the number of trained teachers assigned to handle pupils with special needs who are currently understaffed.

7. The ministry of education in collaboration with relevant stakeholders should consider revising the curriculum to adapt it to the needs of pupils with special needs.

8. The Ministry of Education needs to sensitize stakeholders on the contents of Special Needs Policy in providing direction on the objectives of inclusive education.

5.6 **Recommendations for further research**

The following areas have been recommended for further research concerning inclusive education:

1. Further studies should be conducted on challenges facing public secondary schools.

2. Further studies to be conducted on effectiveness of inclusive education in public primary schools focusing on the benefits.

3. Further studies on barriers and opportunities of inclusive education in other counties within the country.
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Appendix a: Questionnaire for Teachers

INTRODUCTION

Dear participant,

My name is Dorothy Amalemba. I am a post graduate student at the University of Nairobi—Eldoret Sub-Centre, carrying out a research on “Challenges facing implementation of Inclusive Education in public primary schools in Matete District”. The research is purely academic and any information provided shall be treated with confidentiality. This questionnaire has the following sections: Personal data, learner based factors, Resources, Level of awareness and Training. The questionnaire will take approximately 30-45 minutes to complete. Please answer each set of questions carefully. The results will be used in planning and implementation of programs on inclusive education. Your participation will contribute to the success of this research.

**Inclusive education** means a pupil with disability unconditionally belonging to and having full membership of a regular classroom in a regular school and its community.

Thank you. Respondents Consent:

……………………Date:……………………

(PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME)

SECTION A: PERSONAL DATA

1. Gender: Male[ ] Female[ ]
2. Age: Below 20 years[ ] 21-35[ ] 36-50[ ] Above 50[ ]
3. Level of Education:  Primary [ ] Secondary [ ] Tertiary
   College [ ] University [ ] Post Graduate (Specify)

4. Have you had previous or current contact with pupils with disabilities?
   Yes [ ] No[ ]

5. Year of Contact  0[ ] <1 [ ] 1-5 [ ] 5-10 [ ] >10

6. What type of disability did the person have?
   Visual/Hearing impairment [ ] Mental disability [ ]
   Physical disability [ ] Emotional/ behavioural disorders [ ]
   None of the above [ ]

SECTION B: LEARNER BASED FACTORS

7. Are you aware of pupils with special needs in your classroom?
   Not yet [ ] Partially [ ] Substantially [ ] Fully [ ]
   Name the type of disability(s)……………………………………………………………

8. What motivates pupils with special needs to join regular public primary schools?
   School feeding [ ] Learning environment [ ] Peer interaction [ ]
   Funding [ ]
   Play facilities [ ]

9. When you reflect on your definition of inclusion, to which categories of disability does your definition apply? Tick appropriately.
   Visual/hearing impairment [ ] mental retardation [ ]
Emotional/behavioural disorders [   ] Physical disabilities [   ]
All the above [   ] Others (Specify)

10. Do you think a pupil with special needs benefits from inclusion?
   Strongly Agree [   ] Agree [   ] Disagree [   ] strongly Disagree [   ]
   Give reasons for your answer in question 10.

11. Are you aware of the special needs policy?
   Yes [   ] No [   ]
   If yes, how would you rate the implementation of the special needs policy?
   Excellent [   ] Good [   ] Fair [   ] Poor [   ] unaware [   ]
   Give reasons for your answer in question 12.

12. How frequent do you assess pupils with special needs education?
   Never [   ] rarely [   ] occasionally [   ] Often [   ]
   Always [   ]

Please tick the box that best describes your rating on the statement.
Consider a disabled child you have interacted with in your school;
please tick the box that best describes your rating on the statement
placed in the item column regarding that child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Child actively participates in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
academic activities such as painting.

15. Child has consistently gained higher grades on standardized tests of reading and maths

16. Fewer absences from school

17. Fewer referrals for disruptive behaviour

18. Child can express himself/herself verbally or non verbally

SECTION C: TRAINING

19. Have you received any training on special education (Course work, Workshop, Seminar)?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

20. If yes, how would you rate the content of the training? If No, tick on the untrained options in questions 20 and 21.
   Excellent [ ] Good [ ] Fair [ ] Poor [ ] untrained [ ]
Give reasons for your answer in question 20.
...........................................................................................................................................

Books [  ] Visual Aids [  ] Braille [  ] Hearing Aids [  ] untrained [  ]
Others (Specify) ........................................................................................................................

22. Do we have a specific curriculum for children with special needs?
Yes[  ] No[  ]
If No, what suggestions would you put forward concerning development of curriculum for special needs education?
...........................................................................................................................................

23. Who would you recommend to be considered for training on special needs?
Head teacher [  ] special needs teacher [  ] general classroom teacher [  ] parents [  ]
Give reasons for your answer in question 23.
...........................................................................................................................................

SECTION D: RESOURCES

24. What materials do children with special needs use while in school?
Hearing aids [  ] Wheel Chairs [  ] Reading aids [  ]
All of the above [  ]
None of the above [  ] Others (Specify) [  ]..........................

25. Do you think that the needs of the majority of children with disabilities are met in your classroom?
Not yet [  ] Partially [  ] Substantially [  ] Fully [  ]
Give reasons for your answer in question 25.

26. How would you rate the condition of buildings and classrooms in the school in relation to special needs? Excellent[  ] Good[  ] Fair[  ] Poor[  ] Very Poor[  ]
Give reasons for your answer in question 26……………………………………………………………………..

27. What resources are available for infrastructure in relation to special needs education in regular public schools?
Funding [  ] Special needs teachers [  ] Learning materials [  ] Transport aids [  ] Others (Specify)
…………………………………………………………………..

28. What resources do teachers need to successfully implement the special needs policy on inclusive education?
School restructuring [  ] Training on special education [  ]
Materials for teaching [  ] Revision on curriculum [  ]
All the above [  ]
Others (specify) ……………………………………………………. 

29. What is the source of funding to cater for special needs education?
Government [  ] NGOs [  ] Private Sector [  ]
Self sponsored [  ] Others (specify) ………………….

30. Is the funding adequate to cater for inclusive education in public primary schools?
Yes [  ] No [  ]

SECTION E: LEVEL OF AWARENESS
Please tick the box that best describes your agreement or disagreement with the statement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
31.   | Children with special needs have a basic right to receive their education in the general education classroom |          |       |                |
32.   | Inclusion promotes social independence among children with special needs |          |       |                |
33.   | Inclusion will likely have a negative effect on the emotional development of children with special needs. |          |       |                |
34.   | General education classroom teachers have the skills needed to work with children with special needs. |          |       |                |
35.   | Facilities available are designed to meet the needs of children with special needs. |          |       |                |
36.   | Teachers fully understand the contents of the Special needs Policy |          |       |                |

THANK YOU!
Appendix b: Sample Size Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>5.0%</th>
<th>3.5%</th>
<th>2.5%</th>
<th>1.0%</th>
<th>5.0%</th>
<th>3.5%</th>
<th>2.5%</th>
<th>1.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>1119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>2173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>2565</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>2890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>3288</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>3842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>4211</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>5165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>4899</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>2098</td>
<td>6239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>6939</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>1285</td>
<td>2399</td>
<td>9972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>8056</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>2520</td>
<td>12455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>8514</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>2563</td>
<td>13563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>8762</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>2585</td>
<td>14227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>9248</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>2626</td>
<td>15555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>9423</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>2640</td>
<td>16055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>9512</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>2647</td>
<td>16317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>9567</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>2651</td>
<td>16478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>9594</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>2653</td>
<td>16560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>9603</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>2654</td>
<td>16584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,000,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>9603</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>2654</td>
<td>16586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Copyright, The Research Advisors (2006). All rights reserved.
Appendix c: Letter of Transmittal

Dorothy Musavi Amalemba,
University of Nairobi,
Department of Extra Mural Studies,
Kapenguria Extra Mural Centre,
P.O Box 460,
Kapenguria.
Tel: +254 723 546 191

Dear Respondent,

Ref: Participation in the Research

I am a post graduate student at the University of Nairobi at the Department of Extra Mural Studies based in Eldoret. I am currently carrying out a research on challenges facing implementation of inclusive education in public primary schools in Matete District, Lugari, Sub County. You are kindly requested to take part in the study. In order to ensure utmost confidentiality do not write your name anywhere in this questionnaire.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Yours faithfully,

Dorothy Musavi Amalemba
L50/73021/2012.
Appendix d: Interview Guide for Education Officers

Time of Interview: ____________________________

Date: _______________________________________

Place: _______________________________________

Interviewee designation: _______________________

1. What is your understanding on the concept of inclusive education?
2. Do you have pupils with special needs in public primary schools in Matete District?
3. How were the pupils identified?
4. What type of special needs have been observed or reported in public primary schools in Matete District?
5. What benefits are associated with inclusive education in Matete District?
6. What facilities are available to facilitate inclusive education in Matete District?
7. Have you received any training on inclusive education?
8. Are the teachers in public primary schools in Matete District trained on special education?
9. What is the content of the training for those who have been trained?
10. What teaching aids do the teachers use for special needs education?
11. What learning materials do the pupils with special needs use?
12. What is the source of funding of inclusive education?
13. What is the role of Ministry of Education towards inclusive education in Matete District?
14. How would you rate the level of awareness among teachers on special needs policy?
15. What adaptations have been made on the curriculum to suit special needs education?

16. Do you see yourself as an inclusive educator?

17. What do you see as positive factors with regard to your role as an inclusive educator?

18. What do you see as obstacles to your fulfilling your role as an inclusive educator?

19. What are your suggestions in addressing the obstacles of inclusive education?
Appendix e: Authorization Letter

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Telephone: 020-2676793
Email: Deo.matete@yahoo.com
When replying please quote.
Ref No: MAT/EDURES/VOL/1

REPUBLIC OF KENYA

District Education Office,
Matete District
P.O. Box1755 - 50205
WEBUYE
DATE: 12/06/2013

Dorothy Maszvi Amalemba
University of Nairobi
Dept of Extra-Mural centre
Kapenguria Extra Mural Centre
P.o Box 460
Kapenguria.

RFF: AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT RESEARCH ON CHALLENGES FACING INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Following your request for assistance to carry out a study on challenges facing implementation of Inclusive Education in public primary schools in Matete District, Lugari Sub-County you are therefore authorized to visit all the primary schools with special units.

You are also requested to report to the school head teachers

Thanks

Kosgei Kipruto
DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICER
MATETE DISTRICT