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ABSTRACT

The study investigated challenges facing the implementation of inclusive education in public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County of Kitui County. This was based on the fact that children with special needs who pass through inclusive education curriculum in primary schools are forced to pursue their secondary education in special schools while others do not proceed to secondary school. The objectives of the study were to examine challenges in the enrolment of SNE learners, human resource-related challenges, challenges in the provision of learning facilities, challenges faced in curriculum delivery and challenges in relation to teachers’ attitudes towards the implementation of inclusive education. The study may provide crucial information to educational stakeholders on the need to promote inclusive education in secondary schools. The study adopted a descriptive survey design and targeted 11 principals and 60 teachers from which a sample of 10 principals and 40 teachers was selected. The study instruments included questionnaire for teachers, interview schedule for principals and an observation guide. Pilot study was done to establish validity and reliability of research instruments. Content analysis was used to analyze qualitative data while descriptive statistics were used to analyse quantitative data. The results show that majority of schools have not embraced the inclusive education programme. The results also show that majority of teachers have not been adequately trained on how to handle SNE learners and that majority of schools did not have well-structured learning facilities while those that had the facilities were very inadequate. The study findings equally showed that majority of schools were ill-equipped with teaching and learning resources for SNE. It was also revealed that most teachers feel that the current curriculum is not suited for SNE learners which may explain why most schools are yet to implement the inclusive education curriculum. Lastly, the findings revealed that teachers have a positive attitude towards inclusive education but are sceptical about participating in the implementation of the curriculum. In view of the findings, the study recommended that the Ministry of Education compels schools to ensure that SNE learners are admitted in public secondary schools under the inclusive education programme. The government should also allocate funds to public secondary schools to help them procure SNE facilities and facilitate the pre-service and in-service training for SNE teachers. Sensitization campaigns to parents of special needs children on the importance of taking their children to mainstream schools under the inclusive education programme should be done. A study should be replicated to the rest of the country and also include private secondary schools. A similar study should also include SNE students and parents whose views could contribute towards establishing challenges facing enrolment of SNE learners in public secondary schools.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

The Education For All goal, EFA Goals (1990) provide a broad and comprehensive view of education and its critical role in empowering individuals and transforming societies. Its key points and principles include universal access to learning; a focus on equity; emphasis on learning outcomes; broadening the means and the scope of basic education; enhancing the environment for learning; and strengthening partnerships. Tragically, reality has fallen far short of this vision: millions of people are still denied their right to education and the opportunities it brings to live safer, healthier, more productive and fulfilling lives.

The barriers to achieving Education for All are formidable but must be overcome. Education for children and youth is a global issue. International organizations like the UN agencies, the World Bank and others all point to how important investment in quality education is; for individual health, cohesive societies and sustainable economies. Inclusive education is on the global agenda for education and investment strategies to promote EFA and MDGs. There is need for creation of safe, healthy, inclusive and equitably resourced educational environments that are conducive to excellence in learning for all (World Education Forum, 2000).

Under the inclusive education schools must recognize and respond to the diverse needs of students, accommodation of both different styles and rates of learning and ensuring quality education to all through appropriate curricula, organizational arrangements, teaching strategies, resource use and partnerships with their
communities (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization – UNESCO, 1994). The statement signed by ninety-two governments, was the first international recognition that in order to meet the needs of students with special needs, the goal for these students should be changed from inclusion in education to inclusive education. Regular schools with this inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building an inclusive society; moreover, they provide an effective education to the majority of children and improve the efficiency and ultimately the cost-effectiveness of the entire education system.

The Education for All - EFA Goals, Article 3 (1990) states that the learning needs of the disabled demand special attention and that steps must be taken to provide equal access to education by all. Similarly, Article (6) lays emphasis on enhancing the learning environment for all. That the society must ensure that all learners receive the nutrition, healthcare and general physical and emotional support in order to fully participate in and benefit from education. Here, inclusive education implies that children and youth with special educational needs should be included in the educational arrangements made for the majority of children.

In 1954, disability advocacy groups launched a series of legal encounter based on the argument that separate segregated special education schooling is inherently unequal and therefore, unconstitutional (2007). Ainscow (1994) posits that the practice of inclusive education as “while inclusive schools provide a favourable setting for achieving equal opportunity and full participation, their success requires a concerted effort, not only by teachers and school staff, but also by peers, parents,
families and volunteers”. Heller, Holtzman, and Messick (1982) found that special education of children’s classification and placement is ineffective and discriminatory. Things are now changing in all countries especially under developing countries. There has been growing interest in positive behaviour supports as a school-wide approach for creating positive and supportive environments (Pless & Maak, 2004). Schools in Newark, Delaware were reported to have included children in regular education classrooms for the past twenty years (1995). The number of students with learning, behavioural, and other educational disabilities being taught in general education classes has more than tripled (United States Department of Education, 2001). According to Government of Pakistan (2009), Pakistan government is encouraging inclusive and child-friendly education in national education programme.

Research showed that the benefits of inclusion for children with and without disabilities (Baker et. al, 1994). Special children should acquire same knowledge in same environment as normal children obtaining. There is potential benefit inherent in an integrative approach even for special children (Pless & Maak, 2004). Staub and Peck (1994) revealed in their study that non-disabled peers pointed to inclusion as a positive and constructive experience for non-disabled and disabled students, which help to build a basis for community and friendships. Furthermore, Landorf and Nevin (2007) integrate the concepts of global education with inclusive education to define inclusive global education as a pedagogical and curricular stance. Moreover, Tanner, Linscott, and Galis (1996), noted that non-disabled peers did not pick up undesirable behaviours from their disabled peers.
Prior to 1994, the general education system in South Africa enforced separate education for “indians”, “blacks”, “coloureds” and “whites” and this led to discriminatory practices that excluded the majority from access to quality education. This resulted in the duplication of functions, responsibilities and services and vast disparities in per capita funding between the different education departments (Lomofsky & Lazarus, 2001). Each department of education had a dual system that separated learners with special educational needs from the so-called “normal learners.” Learners with special educational needs were placed in special schools, and the so-called “normal learners” in mainstream schools. However, not all of these departments of education made provision for learners with special educational needs (black communities were severely marginalized), and thus many were ‘mainstreamed by default’ (Lomofsky & Lazarus, 2001).

The 1994, democratic elections in South Africa marked an end to the apartheid education system and ushered in new changes. These changes included, among other things, the creation of a single education system and the development of a policy that is committed to human rights and social justice. Such commitment is evident in key policy documents, including:

- The White Paper on Education and Training in a Democratic South Africa (Department of Education, 1995) which discusses the importance of addressing the needs of learners with special needs in both special and mainstream schools;
- The South African Schools Act (Republic of South Africa, 1996) which compels public schools to admit learners and to serve their educational requirements without unfairly discriminating in any way;
• The White Paper on an Integrated National Disability Strategy (Ministerial Office of the Deputy President, 1997) which recommends specific action that will ensure that people with disability are able to access the same rights as any other citizen in South Africa; and

• The National Commission on Special Educational Needs and Training and the National Committee on Education Support Services Report (Department of Education, 1997) which identified barriers that lead to the inability of the education system to accommodate diversity.

All of the above legal frameworks are based on international human rights agreements, such as the Salamanca Statement, which support the development of an education system that recognises a wide range of diverse needs and ensures a wide range of appropriate responses (UNESCO, 2005). These frameworks articulate the goals of equity and the rights of all learners to equal access to educational opportunities. The South African Government’s commitment to “education for all” led to the development of a policy on inclusive education and training. This policy is entitled: Education White Paper 6: Special Needs Education: Building an Inclusive Education and Training System (Department of Education, 2001a). This policy formally came into effect in 2001. Several initiatives have been embarked upon to facilitate the effective implementation of an inclusive education system in South Africa in recent years, particularly through two international donor funded pilot projects: The South African Finnish Cooperation Programme in the Education Sector (SCOPE) and the Danish International Development Assistance (DANIDA) programme. The SCOPE and DANIDA pilot projects were viewed by the Department of Education as
experimental. They offered a field-testing learning experience that was to inform the implementation of Education White Paper 6 (Department of Education, 2004a). Through these projects, inclusive education was implemented in KwaZulu-Natal, the Eastern Cape, the North West, the Northern Cape and Mpumalanga provinces, from 2000 until 2003. The SCOPE and DANIDA pilot project evaluation reports (Da Costa, 2003; Department of Education, 2002) revealed that while inclusive education policy is considered to be the appropriate strategy for addressing the diverse needs of all learners in South Africa, the implementation of this policy is complex.

In Kenya, the Ministry of Education in conjunction with DANIDA set up Educational Assessment and Resource Centres (EARCs) all over the country in 1984, for assessment of learners with special educational needs. The Kenya National Association for the Deaf (KNAD) was formed in 1987 to advocate for the welfare and constitutional rights of the deaf people. Also in collaboration with University of Nairobi, KNAD founded a KSL Research project to prepare instructional materials for use in schools. In 1998, the Kenya Broadcasting Corporation (KBC) initiated Sign Language interpreting services to ensure accessibility of information to the hearing impaired (HI). Republic of Kenya (2006) set specific objectives and targets to ensure all educational institutions are disability friendly; classrooms and school environment. The USAID, OPEC and ADB support the sector in provision of infrastructure in liaison with the Ministry of Public Works through Kenya Education Support Sector programme (KESSP). Table 1.1 presents a summary of costs of SNE capitation grants in million Kenya shillings:
Table 1.1: Special Needs Education Capitation Grants in Million Kenya Shillings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>302.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>265.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>292.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>317.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>326.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1503.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The table shows an upward trend in financing of SNE by the Government of Kenya. This is a proof to increasing importance attached to this sector of education. The Republic of Kenya Budget speech (2009/10) article 68 recognizes that disability is not inability; two hundred million shillings interest free revolving fund was allocated towards business ventures by the challenged persons in the country. This was meant to give impetus to the challenged persons towards equity with the mainstream society.

Republic of Kenya - The Sessional Paper Number One (2005), states that to attract more SNE learners, initiatives on clear policy framework and, financial support through grants and grants in aid and bursaries must be given to educational institutions. This called for mobilization, strengthening and awareness creation programmes to develop and implement a flexible curriculum that is learner-centred and friendly; in addition, there was urgent need to make all learning institutions...
truly inclusive by removing key barriers. An SNE policy was required to streamline the sector. This had been deliberated on in a Republic of Kenya - Report on National Conference on Education and Training (2003) which called on the MoE to develop a national policy that comprehensively defines all areas of SNE, backed by legal framework, articulating any necessary affirmative action in employment, access to higher education, provision of mandatory assessment and guarantee of placement of SNE learners into regular schools. The government of Kenya was to ensure that the SNE learners are able to access specialized medical treatment both in hospitals and within institutions. The demand for SNE at all levels in Kenya has increased as a result of the government’s commitment to Universal Primary education (UPE) since 2003. According to KSDC (2001) statistics, the HI population has grown from 1710 in 1982 to 6000 in 2001 and that 30% of this population was out of school. This has created opportunity for a large number of children to enrol in the primary schools.

1.2  Statement of the Problem

According to the Kenya Education Sector Support Programme Report (July 2005), it is estimated that 10 per cent of the total population of Kenya is made of people with special needs. This is about 3 million persons with about 25 per cent of these being children of school-going age which is a total of 750,000 children. An estimated 90,000 of these children have been identified, assessed and about 18,600 enrolled in educational programmes for children with special needs. This implies that 90 per cent of children with special needs are either at home or in regular schools with little or no specialist assistance, inadequate provision of facilities and poor curriculum delivery (Republic of Kenya, 2005). The few who enrol in
primary schools fail to get placement in regular secondary schools with most of them being referred to special schools which are far and beyond the reach of children from poor backgrounds. A number of them end up in vocational training institutions yet they had qualified to proceed with secondary school education. Others abandon education all together. It is on this basis that the researcher sought to investigate challenges facing curriculum implementation of inclusive education.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate challenges facing curriculum implementation of inclusive education in public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County of Kitui County.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

Specifically, the objectives of this study were to:

i) Examine challenges facing enrolment of SNE learners in inclusive education in public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County.

ii) Assess challenges in the provision of school facilities facing curriculum implementation of inclusive education in public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County.

iii) Examine the challenges in relation to curriculum delivery methodologies used by teachers in public secondary schools to teach learners with special education.

iv) Establish ways in which teachers’ attitudes towards inclusive education influence the implementation of SNE curriculum.
1.5 Research Questions

i) What are the challenges facing the enrolment of SNE learners in inclusive education in public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County?

ii) What are the challenges in the provision of school facilities and personnel facing the implementation of the inclusive education curriculum in public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County?

iii) What are the challenges in relation to curriculum delivery methodologies in the inclusive education programme in public schools relevant to learners with special education needs.

iv) In which ways do teachers’ attitudes towards inclusive education affect the implementation of the SNE curriculum?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The findings of the study on the curriculum implementation challenges facing inclusive education in Kenyan public secondary schools may benefit the Kenyan government and the various stakeholders in education. The major benefit may be in helping education stakeholders in laying strategies that would increase opportunities for inclusive education in all sectors of education. The information gained in the study may probably provide solutions to existing challenges that faced inclusive education in Kenyan secondary schools. The findings may also assist the Government in achieving equitable resource allocation, both material and human. In particular, the Ministry of Education may benefit from the study through gaining information that may guide future curriculum design and review, training skills for the human resource and in crafting appropriate assessment and evaluation of SNE learners. Subsequently, this may contribute towards achievement of the national goals of education and the Vision 2030 in the Kenyan context and globally, the MDGs and EFA Goals.
1.7 Limitations of the study

The limitations of this study were:

i) Difficulty in obtaining accurate data on government funding since the schools operate on segmented data management systems.

ii) The numbers of students integrated in regular classes limited the choice of sample study.

iii) The stigma associated with disability affected respondent’s honesty in answering questions especially in relation to their teachers, parents and peers.

1.8 Delimitations of the Study

The delimitations of this study were:

i) The study was confined to public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County which means that the findings can only be generalised to other parts of the country with a lot of caution.

ii) The study also only targeted principals, teachers and students leaving out parents who are key stakeholders and whose views may be of much importance to the study.

1.9 Assumptions of the Study

The assumptions of this study were:

i) Respondents in public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County are aware of the inclusive education programme.

ii) Mutitu Sub-County has children with various special needs who require access to formal education.

iii) Respondents provided accurate and uninfluenced responses to the research items.
1.10 Theoretical Framework

This study is based on the theory of education production function. The production function is used to determine the maximum product which can be derived from a given combination of inputs. The output of the educational process, that is, the achievement of individual students is directly related to a series of inputs, (Hanushek, 1979). According to Psacharopoulos and Woodhall (1985), the term refers to the process by which inputs are converted to outputs. A simple production function for education would be $A = f (T,B,E\ldots \text{ and so on})$. Where $A =$ achievement, $T =$ Teacher – Pupil ratio, $B =$ Books and other materials $E =$ Equipment and so on. The education production function is far more complex than this and includes many more variables such as family background and socio-economic factors which are other determinants of pupil achievement.

Applied to this study: $A = f (M, P, T, C, S\ldots)$

Where:

$A =$ Achievement which denotes successful implementation of the inclusive education policy of children with special needs in public secondary schools.

$M =$ Monetary funds

$C =$ Relevant curriculum

$P =$ Physical facilities and resource materials

$S =$ Support services from other sectors

$T =$ Teachers trained in special education

$F$ which is a constant is an estimated coefficient which denotes the level to be optimised for each of the inputs, (Psacharopoulos & Woodhall, 1985).
1.11 Conceptual Framework

The study investigated the challenges faced in implementing inclusive education for the HI using the following variables:

i) Enrolment

ii) Human resource

iii) Learning facilities’ provision

iv) Curriculum delivery

v) Teachers’ attitudes towards inclusive education.
The figure 1.1 presents the conceptual framework used in the study

**Figure 1.1: Diagrammatic representation of relationship among study variables**

- Enrolment of SNE students
- Provision of school facilities and personnel
- Curriculum delivery methodologies
- Teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education
- Implementation of Inclusive Education for the SNE students

**Independent Variables**
Source: Researcher

As shown in Figure 1.1, the independent variables are enrolment of SNE student, provision of school facilities and personnel; curriculum delivery methodologies and teacher’s attitudes towards inclusive education. The dependent variable is the implementation of inclusion education for SNE students.
1.12 Definition of Terms

**Deaf Culture:** Refers to a term applied to the social movement that holds deafness to be a difference in human experience rather than a disability. For this study, it will refer to all those values embraced by the HI and not necessarily by the mainstream society.

**Hard of hearing:** Refers to a situation where a person is unable to successfully process linguistic information.

**Hearing Impaired/Deaf:** Refers to a person(s) who suffer(s) from some hearing loss.

**Inclusion:** Refers to the process of increasing the participation of students with disabilities in, and reducing their exclusion from, curricula and communities of local schools; restructuring the cultures. It ensures the quality of education to all students through appropriate curricula, support and teaching strategies and accepting that inclusion in education is one aspect of inclusion in society.

**Inclusive Education:** Refers to an approach to educating students with special educational needs. Under the inclusion model, students with special needs spend most or all of their time with non-disabled students in same schools attending same classroom lessons and taught by the same teachers.

**Integration:** Refers to the education of children with special needs in mainstream school settings or in regular schools.

**SNE Learners:** Refers to those learners with special learning needs and requiring instructional adaptation in order to learn successfully.

**Special School:** Refers to a school catering for children with special needs.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews related literature to the study. The areas under which literature review was done included: the concept of inclusive education, challenges facing inclusive education, attitude of teachers’ towards education and summary of the literature review.

2.2 Concept of Inclusive Education

Inclusion in education is an approach to educating students with special educational needs. Under the inclusion model, students with special needs spend most or all of their time with non-disabled students. Implementation of these practices varies. Schools most frequently use them for selected students with mild to severe special needs (Allen & Schwartz, 2000). According to Scheyer (1996), inclusive education differs from previously held notions of ‘integration’ and ‘mainstreaming’, which tended to be concerned principally with disability and ‘special educational needs’ and implied learners changing or becoming ‘ready for’ or deserving of accommodation by the mainstream. By contrast, inclusion is about the child's right to participate and the school’s duty to accept the child. Inclusion rejects the use of special schools or classrooms to separate students with disabilities from students without disabilities. A premium is placed upon full participation by students with disabilities and upon respect for their social, civil, and educational rights. Fully inclusive schools which are rare, no longer distinguish between "general education" and "special education" programmes; instead, the school is restructured so that all students learn together (Scheyer, 1996).
Many research studies give different views about the issue of inclusive education. Stainback and Stainback’s (1984) study supports the philosophy of inclusive education. Schiller, Coutinho, and Kaufman (1993) concluded that educational changes and reform initiatives require special education to be united with regular education. Case of Pakistan is different here. UNICEF (2003) concluded that, there is a very big gap between contemporary education and special inclusive education in Pakistan. According to Baker, Wang and Walberg (1994), there is small to moderate beneficial effect of inclusive education on special needs children. In the same study, authors illustrate that inclusive education is feasible and effective on all children, especially those with special needs.

Quality inclusion is not merely determined by student placement, but rather is based on creating an environment that supports and includes all learners (Villa & Thousand, 2000). On the other hand, Cochran-Smith (1999) insists that there are no recipes, no best practices, and no models of teaching that work across differences. Hehir (2002) posits that more fundamental school norms and beliefs lie behind in relation to physical disability and inclusion. Staub and Peck (1994), conclude that inclusive education reduces fear of human differences, growth in social cognition, improvements in self-concept, development of personal principles, warm and caring friendships.

schools together with the other children. It is only in cases where the child's needs cannot be met in a regular school that such a child should be taken to a special school. A learner with special needs in education should be given the necessary support whether he/she is attending a regular or special school." According to the Kenya Deaf Resource Centre, public secondary schools in Kenya lack the necessary resources, training, and equipment to accommodate hearing impaired students. Many teachers have not undergone training in sign language and the few who have attended poor fluency in Kenyan Sign Language (Republic of Kenya, 2007).

2.3 Challenges Facing Curriculum Implementation for Inclusive Education

Implementation of inclusive education has not been without challenges. This is due to the characteristics of the SNE students that call for the need to provide classroom situations suitable for both hearing and non-hearing students. Some of the challenges are discussed as follows:

2.3.1 Challenges in Enrolment of SNE Students

Not only is lack of access to schooling a violation of Article 28 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, which states the rights of all children to free primary education (UNICEF, n.d), but this lack also potentially maintains the cycle of poverty as without education, an educationally excluded adult may not be able to work to earn a living or participate in political processes (Tomasevski, 2003). Despite this, there is no indicator in the Education For All (EFA) Global Monitoring Reports for enrolment, dropout, or attainment of SNE children. In fact,
there is no disability indicator at all which is potentially excluding millions of children from a high-profile global campaign in which they were vaguely included in the category of “children in difficult circumstances” in EFA goal two at the Dakar Conference (World Education Forum, 2000) where the drive for Education For All was finally agreed by 92 countries. Hence, although EFA is about ‘all’ children, it appears that children with disabilities do not count in the final analysis (Tomasevski, 2003).

Studies focusing on the perception of children with disabilities revealed that they like to study with other children but are unsure of their capabilities and fear the reaction of other children. Hayat (1994) found that most children who have disabilities were eager to attend ordinary schools as they found it pleasant to study and play with other children. They believed that this would improve their academic achievement and remove the stigma associated with disability. However, they feared that they might be teased or not be able to keep up with the class leading to most of them not enrolling in regular schools (Hayat, 1994). The current study sought to establish the extent to which SNE students are shying a way from enrolling in regular school for fear of stigmatisation.

Miles (2002) found that the attitude of society towards children with disabilities was not considerate and has led to many such students not being enrolled in regular public schools. The reasons for this are mainly superstitious. Disability is seen as a curse or punishment from God and sometimes it is associated with invasion by an evil spirit. While studying the attitudes of literate and non-literate persons, Akhtar (1994) reported that most literate respondents believed that children with
disabilities could lead a successful life. Non-literate respondents, however, often believed that disability was a curse. They believed that children with disabilities were a burden on society and therefore, saw little need to take them to school.

In another study, Akhtar (1994) found that most teachers of mainstream schools felt unsure about teaching these children leading to many SNE students being turned away from such institutions. Teachers in special schools believed that the most appropriate education for these children could only be provided in special schools. Nawaz and Saeed (2009) conducted a study on perceptions of primary school teachers and found that they were willing to include SNE children in their schools in separate classes, if resource teachers were available for support. Teachers also sought government support for training, financial incentives and provisions for inclusion in the educational policy. This shows that most teachers are not receptive of these students.

Hussain and Javed (1997) attempted to develop a plan for the mainstreaming of children with hearing impairment. They observed that inclusion of these children in regular classrooms was acceptable to many education experts in Pakistan. The strategy for inclusion, however, varied from one expert to another. They found that the special education experts who were administrators and senior teachers of children with hearing difficulties, were not ready to accept that there were deep-rooted and widespread negative effects of special education institutions on the education of children with hearing impairment and thus advocated for hearing impaired children to be enrolled in special schools. According to the findings by Hussain and Javed (1997), implementation of inclusive education needs proper
orientation for regular classroom teachers. Special schools were ready to initiate mainstreaming in their school (reverse mainstreaming). The local context of special institutions was often threatened, politicised and overprotective in connection with innovative plans such as inclusive education.

Sharif and Naz (2002) found that print media had not changed public attitudes to people with disabilities. It is clear that lack of awareness and education among the general public has been mainly responsible for the misconceptions and negative attitudes towards disability leading to low enrolments in regular learning institutions. Parents have mixed opinions about supporting education in special schools and inclusive education settings, whereas most teachers are in favour of providing education in special education settings. This is perhaps as a result of the lack of proper training and perceived barriers to dealing with the diverse needs of children in ordinary schools (Sharif & Naz, 2002). The current study sought to establish the extent to which efforts have been put in place to sensitise the public and teachers on the need to enrol SNE learners in regular schools.

2.3.2 Challenges in Relation to Provision of Learning Facilities

The quality and adequacy of resources such as physical facilities, equipment, teaching and learning materials have a direct bearing on quality of education as they determine how effectively the curriculum is implemented, (Republic of Kenya, 1999). Many factors, not least limited resources, have resulted in provision to meet special needs being expressed either in general terms of what is available rather than what is needed. Recommendations after assessment are usually very broad and the choices offered relate to location and what is available rather than to
what is needed. Services must be more precise about the different types of support they can give to children with different kinds of special educational needs, (Allen & Schwartz, 2000).

Over time, there has been a major backlog of infrastructure provision and a shortage of permanent classrooms, particularly in poor communities. At the same time, existing infrastructure is generally in poor condition due to lack of investment capital, poor construction standards and inadequate maintenance. The result of the sharp rise in numbers is poor conditions and overcrowding that are not conducive to good learning environment, (Republic of Kenya, 2005). The SNE learners have not had specific resources put in place for them. Classrooms do not suit their needs. Thus, denying them accessibility and equalisation of opportunities, (Republic of Kenya, 1999).

Marked progress has been made in getting new buildings, classrooms and teachers for a rapidly increasing child population. This in itself is a highly significant accomplishment. However, in planning of new buildings and in securing school facilities and equipment, the tendency has been to make only minor changes from the arrangements of the past, on the assumption that the same equipment and instructional materials could serve equally well for the nurturance of all forms of abilities in all children, (Klausmeier & Goodwin, 1976).
The Taskforce (2003) on implementation of free primary education highlights a description of some modifications needed for inclusive education such as:

i) Provision of barrier free environment within compounds used by children who are deaf, blind, mentally and physically handicapped.

ii) Build adapted toilets, bathrooms and bars to assist the children to hold unto while bathing, showering and toileting.

iii) Avoid doorsteps, instead have ramps with recommended gradient, dormitories and playgrounds.

iv) All classrooms should be spacious, well lit and well-ventilated, (Republic of Kenya, 2003).

Children with disabilities often need specialised aids to move about, to read and write or to hear. For example, children with severe hearing impairments require hearing aids where necessary, (Republic of Kenya, 1999). KISE (2007) gives a comprehensive summary of special equipment and devices that may assist learners with hearing impairment as audiological equipment such as individual hearing aids. Teachers should ensure that material and equipment are in good working order. It is frustrating for any child to try to steer a wheel toy that has a bent axle. Teachers must make sure that everything has a place and, when not in use everything is in it’s place, (Allen & Schwartz, 2001).

Once children with disabilities have been assessed at Educational Assessment and Resource Services (EARS) and the outcome referred to medical doctors for confirmation, it is the parents who decide whether they wish their children to attend residential schools, integrated programme or regular schools. Choices are
limited because demand is higher than existing facilities can meet, (UNESCO, 1995). This further negates the idea of integrating students with special needs in ordinary schools, (Karanja, 2003). The current study therefore, sought to investigate the extent to which provision of facilities is a management challenge facing the implementation of inclusive education in public secondary schools in Mutitu District.

2.3.3 Challenges in Relation to Provision of Human Resource

The mere act of placing children with disabilities together in regular schools does not ensure inclusion. Teachers must take that responsibility. Particular skills are needed to facilitate successful interaction. Effective inclusion requires specific planning and implementation by teachers whose responsibilities include structuring a learning environment in which children with and without disabilities are helped to participate together in a variety of activities related to all areas of development, (Allen & Schwartz, 2001).

In her study on the challenges faced by educators in implementing inclusive education in primary schools in the EThekwini Region of Kwa Zulu Natal, Gwala (2006) revealed that educators do not show an understanding of inclusive education and are uncertain of their roles. The educators' lack of knowledge, little or no experience, uncertainty about roles, inadequate training in teaching learners with barriers in learning and development result in a high percentage of educators holding negative attitudes towards inclusion of learners with barriers to learning in regular classrooms. The researchers observe that a remarkable number of educators are uncertain about inclusion of learners with barriers to regular classrooms. Based
on the views of the educators, it was concluded that educators’ attempts are influenced by the tradition of referring learners with barriers to learning and development outside specialists who assessed, wrote evaluative reports, gave counselling to both learners and their parents, prepared and implemented educational programmes and provided preventative programmes. The study revealed that teachers need quality comprehensive pre-service and in-service training (Gwala, 2006).

The introduction of Free Secondary Education (FSE) tuition resulted significantly increased enrolment in secondary schools. However, this phenomenal increase has presented secondary education some significant challenges especially to teachers who have to provide education to larger class sizes. Furthermore, the new policy on inclusive education means many teachers need skills to help them continue to provide relevant and supportive services to all students (Republic of Kenya, 2007).

The shortage of competent teachers, school psychologists, guidance counsellors, curriculum supervisors and administrators continues. Even with the best facilities, the education of children cannot be better than the personnel doing the work. The abilities of many children will continue to go unidentified – much less well provided for – until society recognises the importance of well-educated and competent school staff and give the necessary financial support to schools, (Klausmeier & Goodwin, 1976).

Special needs education teachers in the country are mainly trained at Kenya Institute of Special Education (KISE), Kenyatta and Maseno universities. Since
KISE was established, she has trained teachers at diploma and certificate levels through residential and in-service courses. Maseno and Kenyatta universities have also been training SNE teachers. The taskforce established that there are approximately 6,255 SNE teachers trained in Kenya by the year 2005. When this number is weighed against the number of learners both in primary and secondary schools with SNE, the demand for trained SNE teachers becomes very high, (Report of the Taskforce, MoE, 2005).

The government through the TSC should provide schools with qualified teachers in special education, and include such teachers in all teacher development programmes, (Republic of Kenya, 1999). The professional role of a teacher is a demanding one and stretches from teaching, curriculum development, examination processing, pedagogical material preparation and evaluation, to modelling the behaviour of the students. Indeed, to perform these enormous tasks effectively, teachers should devote their time not only to the maintenance of professional ethics, but also to invest a lot of effort in effectively enhancing their professional development to the fullest, (Okumbe, 2001). Many factors influence the learning of a student, but within the classroom situation, the teacher is of critical importance. The teacher who is open to new ideas and experiences expands the dimensions of student interests. It is, therefore, necessary to improve the quality of teachers (Republic of Kenya, 1999).

Teachers of disabled children should have an understanding of the diverse theoretical approaches to the field, knowledge of diagnostic procedures, skills in the art of clinical teaching, and familiarity with teaching techniques and materials,
(Lerner, 1976). Teacher education must be adjusted to a situation with a greater diversity of learner backgrounds. Topics like differentiation and individualisation, adapted education and special needs education, must be included in the curriculum for all teachers, (Hannu, Marja & Heikki, 2006). All these call for a dynamic, responsive and well co-ordinated system of in-service training so as to equip teachers with skills and capacities to deliver the curriculum, (Republic of Kenya, 2005). The current study sought to establish the preparedness levels of teachers in implementing inclusive education in public secondary schools.

2.3.4 **Challenges in Relation to Curriculum Relevance**

The success of an inclusive school system which serves all children depends on a flexible and relevant curriculum that can be adapted to the needs of each learner. All learners cannot reach the same level of competence and do not learn at the same pace, (Hannu, Marja & Heikki, 2006). An appropriate curriculum is broad-based; it includes physical, social, emotional and intellectual goals. Children will progress at different rates; thus, individualised planning and instruction are important parts of a developmentally appropriate primary curriculum. Therefore, one goal of the secondary curriculum should be to establish a foundation for lifelong learning and to create a positive school experience for the learner. Activities that help students increase self-esteem and help them increase their confidence and competence are also important curricular goals, (Allen & Schwartz, 2001).

Characteristics of inclusive education include exercising flexibility with regard to the individual learner’s capabilities and placing his/her needs and interests at the
core. Placing the learner at the centre of teaching and learning does not imply he/she will be taught and will learn subject matter and content separately. Instead, it implies appreciation of the learner’s differences in understanding, feelings, social and perceptual skills. Within the framework of the classroom, individual adaptations can be made. Furthermore, inclusive education involves learners supporting one another according to their abilities and strengths; it is about seeing differences as opportunities for learning, (UNESCO, 2005).

It is argued that, the working basis for defining special education is the degree of variation in essential characteristics or dimensions by which ordinary education is modified or supplemented to meet special needs, (Lynch, 1994). Given that there is a standard or common curriculum for primary and secondary schools, then the need for more and more modification or variation, the greater the degree of complexity of a learner’s learning difficulties. This may range from assistance to follow the standard curriculum to a significantly different variation of that curriculum for those with profound and multiple degree of disability, (Lynch, 1994).

Text and illustrations given in textbooks should be interesting and relevant to situations in which the learners live and are expected to apply their knowledge and skills. Information should be accessible regardless of a learner’s functional limitations. For example, simplified text can enable poor readers to comprehend the information presented while large print can facilitate reading for persons with low vision or reading difficulties, (Hannu, Marja & Heikki, 2006).
An exam system that does not restrict any disabled learner’s chance of promotion and completing school is also a quality factor. A learner who is blind may need to do the exam orally instead of in writing. A learner with an intellectual impairment disability should be allowed to show acquired skills even if they lie outside the core curriculum for the majority of learners, (Hannu, Marja & Heikki, 2006).

Examinations such as Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education are particularly daunting and harrowing for students with disabilities who are examined without due regard for reasonable accommodation for measures in view of their disabilities. The Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC) has not put in place effective measures to ensure that children with disabilities are tested for what is within their knowledge in view of their disabilities. For example, there is no cognisance by an examiner that the poor quality of a pupil’s handwriting may arise from the fact that he/she is using the mouth or feet to write in view of that disability, (Kenya National Commission on Human Rights Report, 2007).

In Kenya, curriculum development is a prerogative of the Kenya Institute of Education (KIE), which has a division of special needs education (SNE) which being a division of KIE does not have full mandate and freedom to carry out its functions effectively. Furthermore, the staff are lacking and its manpower is not specialised in curriculum development for special needs education. The results of such a composition is that the curriculum developed from a central place like KIE is rigid and does not have the quality of flexibility needs for special needs education. The expected outcome is, the curriculum from KIE is uniform for all
learners of special needs education. This is unrealistic given the diverse nature of disabilities, (Ministry of Education, 2003).

Thus, the curriculum given to schools does not benefit individual learner’s needs and the end result is a graduate who has not benefited from the experiences received in school. This fact can discourage others who may not see the importance of special needs education. Curriculum materials are developed without involvement of important stakeholders like the teachers and no piloting is done no in-servicing teachers on how to use the materials developed, (Omorwa, 2005). The current study will investigate the management challenges facing the implementation of inclusive education.

2.3.5 Challenges in Relation to Teachers’ Attitude towards Inclusive Education

The most critical of all the barriers to free universal education for students, particularly those with disabilities are negative attitude and prejudice. Some people still attribute the causes of disabilities to curses from the gods (Agbenyega, 2005; Avoke, 2002; Oliver-Commey, 2001). For instance, the women wing of the Ghana Society for the Physically Disabled (GSPD), an advocacy group, when they were asked during their working visit to the Northern Region of Ghana about the situation of disabled persons in the villages, reported the following:

They will say of the disabled children - especially when they are newly born -- that that one is not a human being. It's a fairy, a spirit, a snake, and they will find a way of doing away with that child! Others, they will not kill their child but they will hide the child. They wouldn't like
anybody to know, because the person will say, oh, you are not a good person, that's why God has given you such a child with disabilities. And only later through neglect that child is killed off.

A man had his disabled daughter in the room for 27 years, before she was sick and she died. He never took her to a doctor, so it was only then that we heard of her.

Sometimes when others get a child with a disability, they consult soothsayers - people who claim that they can see the future of somebody, or foresee things that have happened, or are going to happen. So when they consult these people, sometimes they give them some concoctions to come and give the child. They say if the child is not a fairy, the child will not die. But, if the child is a fairy, the child will die (Nepveux, Mwinibalono, & Kuomkugri, 2004).

This is consistent with what Agbenyega (2005), Avoke (2002), Ghana Education Service (GES) (2004) noted that negative attitude and persistent low regard for students with disabilities poses a serious barrier to social and educational inclusion in Ghana. The challenge is how to remove these barriers to open the way for social and educational inclusion. Some disability organizations in Ghana; Ghana society for the Physically Disabled (GSPD) and Ghana Society for the Blind (GSB) all called for inclusion of students with disabilities in society and regular schools. These requests are important and necessary as it is noted that traditional representations and practices of special
education do not offer persons with disabilities opportunities for social and educational inclusion (Kochhari, West, & Taymans, 2000; Loreman, 1999). Inclusive schooling offers new hope for school success and social integration for persons with and without disabilities (Bennett, DeLuca, & Bruns, 1997).

Beliefs about disability, ethnicity, attitude and concerns of teachers can influence the practice of inclusive education, the quality of educational materials and instruction students receive (Leyser & Tappendorf, 2001; Nieto, 1997; Sharma & Desai, 2002; Wilczenski, 1992). Many regular education teachers who feel unprepared and fearful to work with disabled in regular classes display frustration, anger and negative attitude towards inclusive education because they believe it could lead to lower academic standards (Gary, 1997; Tiegerman-Farber & Radziewicz, 1998). Additionally, access to resources and specialist support affects teacher confidence and attitudes toward inclusive education (Bennett, DeLuca, & Bruns, 1997; Wolery, Anthony, Snyder, Werts, & Katzenmeyer, 1997).

It is argued that when teachers gain extensive professional knowledge needed to implement inclusive programmes, they may succumb to it (Avramidis, Buylis, & Burden, 2000). The majority of studies that investigated educators’ concerns and attitude to inclusive education were conducted in Western countries (D'Alonzo, Giordano, & Vanleeuwen, 1997; Harvey, 1998; Heflin & Bullock, 1999). Although they provide significant information and scaffolding for inclusive practice in developing countries, these studies do not adequately address issues that are relevant to the Kenyan context. This study is, therefore, important in examining teachers' concerns and attitudes towards inclusive education in Kenya.
Through a review of research, both positive and negative teacher attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities are typically found. From studies reviewed, many of the concerns from teachers are valid, and there are important factors behind teacher attitudes that can assist schools to improve inclusion experiences. McLeskey and Waldron (2002) found one negative teacher attitude toward inclusion was that the students in the classroom without disabilities noticed the differences between themselves and their peers, and rejected them by labelling and/or calling them names. According to the authors, inclusion can give all students more knowledge about each other’s differences as they learn and interact in the same classroom.

Schools are very busy places and teachers often may find it difficult to find time to complete even their basic everyday duties. Inclusion overwhelms many teachers because they see it as increasing their workload in several ways. Jones et al., (2002), found that teachers saw their workload increasing during the inclusion of students with disabilities into their classrooms because they viewed the academic needs of these students as different in quantity and quality than the general education students. For instance, teachers may already feel they don’t have enough prep time to prepare for their daily lessons, so when the idea of having student’s with disabilities in their classroom arises, they may feel overwhelmed that they simply will not be able to accommodate the individual needs of students. Besides the additional workload, it appears some teachers believe that some students with disabilities do not gain a lot themselves academically or socially from inclusion.
In their study, Jones, Thorn, Chow, Thompson, & Wilde (2002) questioned the value of having a student with an emotional behaviour in the classroom if the student gains little academic or social benefit while disrupting the rest of the class. However, according to Chow and Winzer (cited in Jones, Thorn, Chow, Thompson, and Wilde, 2002) “exposure to special needs students tends to increase teachers’ confidence levels” (p.628). It appears that teachers must be knowledgeable about the benefits of inclusion, as well as ways it can be successful without overwhelming or burdening them with extra work. It also appears that their attitudes may become more positive with increased positive experiences with disabled students in their classrooms.

According to Shade and Stewart (2001), teachers report frustration, burden, fear, and inadequacies because they don’t believe they have the abilities to meet the individual needs of students with special needs in their classrooms. Overall, scholars such as Voltz, Brazil, and Ford (2001) and McLeskey and Waldron (2002), indicate that the most crucial factor behind positive teacher attitudes towards inclusion is that there is a support system in place. This basically means that the whole school needs to be supportive of inclusion and its benefits with support coming from all directions. Some examples of support are special education and general education collaboration and consultation, in class support for general education teachers such as team teaching or a teacher’s aide, ample time for planning, and on-going in-services or conference opportunities (McLeskey & Waldron, 2002). All of these opportunities provide, not only support from many directions, but in the field of special education. With these supports, the general
education teachers should gain a strong sense of empowerment and be less fearful that they will not be able to handle their classrooms.

“Successful inclusion is defined, at least in part, by the ability of teachers to expand the borders of the circle of tolerance and make a broader range of behaviours ordinary in their classrooms” (McLeskey & Waldron, 2002:67). Several scholars such as Voltz, Brazil, and Ford (2001), McLeskey and Waldron (2002), Shade and Stewart (2001), and Heflin and Bullock (1999), indicate that support throughout the school is the most significant factor that will increase positive teacher attitudes and acceptance of inclusion. If students are identified as benefiting from inclusion, then it is important that all teachers accept to include them in their classroom. Without positive teacher attitudes, inclusion will return to being just a physical placement of students with disabilities and it will not improve the development of all students. With positive teacher attitudes, students with disabilities will be given more educational opportunities with their peers and will more likely benefit to the fullest extent.

A recent research by Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996), indicates that approximately two-thirds of the 10,560 general educators surveyed across the years agreed with the concept of inclusion, but their level of passion decreased when asked, "Are you prepared to teach children with disabilities in your classroom?" Their confidence decreased even further when questions deal with teacher readiness to make curricular or instructional modifications for identified students. This study will try to find the attitude of principles and teachers for inclusive education.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter gives information on the research methodology to be used. It contains details on: research design, study location, population, sample and sampling techniques, research instruments, reliability and validity of the research instruments, data collection, and methods of data analysis.

3.2 Research Design
The study adopted a descriptive survey design. This design is the most appropriate since it allows the researcher to study a relatively large population for accuracy of findings and is concerned with describing, recording, analyzing and reporting conditions that exist or existed (Kothari, 1985). This provides basis for analyzing the present situation and aid in making recommendations for future decision-making concerning the implementation of inclusive education in public secondary schools.

3.3 Study Location
The study was carried out in public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County. Mutitu Sub-County is located in Kitui County in the former Eastern Province and has a population of 88,000 people. The district is semi-arid with the main economic activities being subsistence farming (cultivation and animal keeping). The poverty levels in the district are high which means that implementation of inclusive education is faced with challenges related to inadequate resource allocation. The researcher picked on this location because he resides there and
therefore, would encounter minimal challenges when collecting data. Singleton (1993) observes that the ideal setting for any study, is one where the researcher has interest in, easily accessible and one that allows the researcher immediate support with the respondents.

3.4 Target Population

The study targeted 11 public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County with a population of 11 principals and 60 class teachers. The population included 3 boys’ boarding schools all of which are double-streamed with a population of 24 class teachers, 2 girls’ boarding schools which are also double-streamed with a population of 12 class teachers, 2 mixed boarding schools with 10 class teachers and 4 mixed day secondary schools with a population of 14 class teachers. Majority of principals have an experience of more than 5 years as school heads while most teachers have a teaching experience of below 2 years. The target population is as described in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Category</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of principals</th>
<th>Number of Class Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys boarding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls boarding schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed boarding schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed day secondary schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Sample Size and Sampling Procedure

Gay (1992) has recommended samples of at least a minimum of one third of the whole population. All the 11 secondary schools were selected for the study meaning that all the 11 principals were involved in the study. Using stratified sampling techniques, 40 class teachers were selected from each of the 11 schools. Schools were stratified based on the school categories to ensure that respondents were selected. Simple random sampling technique was used to select class teachers from each school category. This involved names of class teachers being written on small pieces of paper which were folded and put in a small box. The box was stuffed to ensure that the papers were well mixed. A teacher who picked a piece of paper with his/her name was selected. If a paper was picked the second time, it was returned without the name being written down. Use of simple random sampling technique was aimed at ensuring that each class teacher had an equal chance of being selected to take part in the study. Table 3.2 presents the sample size of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Category</th>
<th>Population of Class Teachers</th>
<th>Sample of Class Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys boarding</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls boarding schools</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed boarding schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed day secondary schools</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher selected 14 out of 24 class teachers from the boys boarding schools which is 58.3% of the target population; 8 out 12 from girls boarding schools (66.6%); 8 out of 10 from mixed boarding schools (80.0%) and 10 out of 14 from mixed day secondary schools. The sample size is an adequate representation of the target population as according to Gay (1996), 10% to 20% of the population is sufficient sample for reliable findings.

3.6 Research Instruments

Interview schedule, questionnaires and observation guides were used to collect data from the respondents. Interview schedules were used to collect data from principals while questionnaires were used to collect information from teachers. The observation guide was used to countercheck against available learning facilities in schools. The researcher preferred questionnaires because they are easier to administer to respondents and are convenient for collecting information within a short span of time (Mulusa, 1990).

3.6.1 Interview Schedule for Principals

Interview schedule for principals sought information from the principals and on the implementation of inclusive education in public secondary schools in Mutitu District. The interview schedule was developed using open-ended questions for in depth information.

3.6.2 Questionnaire for Teachers

Questionnaires for teachers were divided into two sections; Section One sought demographic information of the teachers while Section Two contained items that sought information from teachers on the implementation of inclusive education in
public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County. The questionnaires for teachers were also developed using both closed-ended and open-ended questions for in-depth information.

### 3.6.3 The observation Guide

The observation guide contained a list of facilities against which the researcher counter-checked to confirm whether these facilities are available or not available and adequate or inadequate. The observation served to check against inaccurate information provided by principals and teachers.

### 3.6.4 Piloting

In this study, piloting helped the researcher to establish the reliability and validity of study instruments. The piloting also helped the researcher in gaining confidence with the study instruments before the real data collection. Questions that were likely to make respondents uncomfortable were noted and worked upon. Piloting for this study was done in 2 schools involving 2 principals and 8 teachers who were excluded from the main study.

### 3.6.5 Instrument Reliability

Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) define reliability as a measure of degree to which a research instrument yields consistent data after repeated trials. The study used the internal consistency and test-retest methods to test reliability. It was expected that a high degree of coherence in the way questions are answered by different respondents would be achieved. In test – retest, different respondents were required to answer the same questions with slightly different wording and the coherence of their answers assessed. If the average responses from the questionnaires was found
to be reliable, the reliability of the tests (instrument) was estimated by examining the consistency of the responses between the two tests.

### 3.6.6 Instrument Validity

Validity is defined as the degree to which the measured indicators really measure what they are supposed to measure (Kathuri & Pals, 2002). Validity was achieved when questions on how well the obtained data analysis is a representative of the concept under study. The study achieved both content and face validities where content validity refers to the representation of the study items on the instrument, as they relate to the entire domain of content being measured. The content validity measure must be sampled adequately and the domain of content the researcher claims it measures. This is determined subjectively by a thorough examination of the instruments by a panel of experts, literature searches, and pre-testing of open-ended questions (Wilkinson, 1991). Face validity refers to the appeal and appearance of the instrument. The researcher ascertained face validity of the instruments by subjecting the instrument to a team of experts in the area of study. Re-testing the study instruments was done to increase the likelihood of face validity.

### 3.7 Data Collection Procedures

The researcher sought authority/permit to conduct research from the Government through the Ministry of Higher Education. Once the research permit was issued, the researcher presented it to administration office in the district. This was followed by the researcher notifying the school administration of his intention to conduct the study in their schools before visiting each of his schools to administer the research tools. The researcher clearly explained the purpose of the study and
the procedure to follow to each category of respondents before data collection. This assured the respondents of confidentiality and anonymity of the data to be collected to maximize objectivity in giving responses. The questionnaires were independently filled by the respondents as the researcher carried out observation in the sampled schools. The respondents were given adequate time to fill in questionnaires. The researcher collected all the filled-in questionnaires in readiness for data analysis.

3.8 Data Analysis Procedure

The raw data collected were arranged and coded in readiness for analysis. Content analysis was used to analyze findings of respondents’ views on issues not arithmetically calculated while descriptive statistics were used to analyse closed-ended items. The researcher used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 17.00 for effective analysis of data. Data were presented using frequency distribution tables, bar graphs and pie-charts. Borg and Gall (1983) state that the most widely used and understood standard proportion is the percentage. The researcher computed the percentages of all study items and present them in chapter four.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

The researcher gave information to the respondents before data collection on the purpose of the study, anonymity of data collected and any other questions that the respondents raised. This helped in building on objectivity of the respondents in responding to questions.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION
OF FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter thematically presents data analysis, presentation and interpretation of findings according to research objectives. The objectives of the study were: to examine challenges facing enrolment of SNE learners in inclusive education, assessment of challenges in the provision of facilities facing curriculum implementation and delivery in Mutitu public secondary schools.

The last objective was to establish ways teacher’s attitudes influence the implementation of SNE curriculum. The results are reported in the following sections where data were presented in tables of frequency distributions, percentages, pie charts and bar graphs. In the reportage, the qualification of teachers was also included because without training in SNE the teachers cannot handle disabled students efficiency.

4.2 Demographic Information

The demographic information of principals and teachers professional qualifications, teaching experience and training in SNE education. A sample of 10 principals was interviewed while 40 teachers answered questionnaires. Content analysis was used to analyze findings of respondents’ views on issues not arithmetically calculated while descriptive statistics were used to analyse closed-ended items. Data were presented using frequency distribution tables.
4.2.1 Respondents’ Professional Qualifications

The study sought to establish teachers and principals levels of preparedness in the implementation of inclusive education in public secondary schools. A sample of 10 principals was interviewed while 40 teachers answered questionnaires. Their responses are highlighted on Figure 4.1.

Figure 4.1: Teachers Professional Qualifications

The findings show that majority of principals (70.0%) were holders of bachelor of education degrees while 30.0% of principals and 20.0% of teachers had master of education degrees. The findings further show that 30.0% of teachers were holders of diploma certificates while only 5.0% of them had postgraduate diploma certificates. These findings are an indication that most teachers and principals have the necessary qualifications and prepared to teach in public secondary schools.
4.2.2 Teaching Experience

The study sought to assess the teachers’ experience in the implementation of inclusive education in public secondary schools. A sample of 40 teachers answered questionnaires. Teachers were thus asked to state their teaching experience in years. Their responses are as presented on Figure 4.2.

**Figure 4.2: Teaching Experience**

The findings show that majority of teachers (57.5%) had a teaching experience of below 2 years. This is followed by 30.0% who had a teaching experience of 3 to 5 years while only 7.5% had a teaching experience of above 10 years. This is an indication that most teachers have little experience in the implementation of inclusive education in public secondary schools.

4.2.3 Training in SNE

The study sought to establish teachers and principals’ preparedness towards the implementation of inclusive education. A sample of 10 principals was interviewed while 40 teachers answered questionnaires on whether principals and teachers had received training in SNE. The results are as presented on Figure 4.3.
The findings revealed that majority of principals (80.0%) and teachers (85.0%) have not received training in SNE. Only 20.0% of principals and 15.0% of teachers had received SNE training. This training according to headteachers was general and was taught as a unit during pre-service training. This indicates that one of the challenges facing the implementation of the inclusive education programme is that school personnel have not received adequate SNE training to enable them to implement the inclusive education curriculum.

4.2.4 Principals’ In-service Training in SNE

The study sought to assess whether principals have had in-service training in SNE. A sample of 10 principals was interviewed asked whether they have had in-service training in SNE. The findings are as presented on Figure 4.4.
Figure 4.4: Principals’ In-service Training in SNE

![Pie chart showing 90% of principals have not received in-service training in SNE](image)

The results on Figure 4.4 showed that majority of principals (90.0%) have not received in-service training in SNE. This is an indication that they are inadequately prepared to implement the inclusive education programme. Principals who have not had in-service training in SNE said they had not been given an opportunity to be in-serviced. They also indicated that they have not been able to participate in in-service due to official commitment as the training is quite involving. The principal who indicated to have participated in SNE in-service training said it was during the in-service course on education management.

4.3 Challenges Faced in Enrolment of SNE learners

The first objective was to investigate challenges faced by schools when enrolling SNE learners. A sample of 10 principals was interviewed while 40 teachers answered questionnaires. The results are as presented in successive sub-sections.
4.3.1 SNE Learners Enrolled in Schools

Teachers were asked to state whether they have SNE learners enrolled in their schools. A sample of 40 teachers answered questionnaires. The findings are as presented on Figure 4.5.

Figure 4.5: SNE Learners Enrolled in Schools

The results of Figure 4.5 show that majority of teachers (75.0%) did not have SNE learners enrolled in their schools while 25.0% said they have. It was however revealed that most of the 25.0% of the school had students with physical impairment that could not prevent them from learning with able-bodied students. Only 2 (20.0%) principal said they had SNE students in their schools. The findings are an indication that majority of schools in Mutitu Sub-County have not embraced the inclusive education programme. Among the reasons given by the principals were that parents are not aware of their need to get education and the children have never been enrolled in mainstream schools. It was also established that majority of parents with special needs do not take their children who have completed primary education to secondary schools. One principal said that in most cases, learners with special needs are taken to schools for students with special needs purely.
These findings concur with Miles (2002) who found that the attitude of society towards children with disabilities was not considered and has led to many such students not being enrolled in regular public schools. The reasons for this are mainly superstitious. Akhtar (1994) reported that most literate respondents believed that children with disabilities could lead a successful life. Non-literate respondents, however, often believed that disability was a curse. They believed that children with disabilities were a burden on society and therefore, saw little need to take them to school.

Akhtar (1994) also found that most teachers of mainstream schools felt unsure about teaching these children leading to many SNE students being turned away from such institutions. Teachers in special schools believed that the most appropriate education for these children could only be provided in special schools. Nawaz and Saeed (2009) conducted a study on perceptions of primary school teachers and found that they were willing to include SNE children in their schools in separate classes, if resource teachers were available for support.

4.4 Challenges in Relation to Provision of School Facilities and Personnel

The second objective of the current was to assess challenges in relation to provision of school facilities and personnel facing public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County in the implementation of Inclusive Education Curriculum. A sample of 10 principals was interviewed while 40 teachers answered questionnaires. Content analysis was used to analyze findings of respondents’ views on issues not arithmetically calculated while descriptive statistics were used to analyse closed-ended items. Data were presented using frequency distribution tables. The findings are as discussed in the successive sub-sections.
4.4.1 Suggested Ways to Prepare Teachers to Handle SNE Learners

The researcher asked teachers to suggest ways in which teachers can be prepared to implement the inclusive education curriculum. A sample of 40 teachers answered questionnaires. The results are as presented on Table 4.3.

Table 4.1: Suggested Ways to Prepare Teachers to Handle SNE learners
(N = 40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should in-serviced in special education</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher trainees should be extensively trained in SNE</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organise seminars and workshops for teachers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify existing facilities to suit SNE learners</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide necessary SNE facilities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers should be in-serviced in special education, teacher trainees should be extensively trained in SNE, organise seminars and workshops for teachers, modify existing facilities to suit SNE learners, provide necessary SNE facilities. A study by Burrello and Wright (1992) reveals effective practice of principals who had participated in programming for the inclusion of students with disabilities. According to the study, special education elementary teachers of inclusive education show supportive practices towards inclusion. Baines et al., (1994) recognized the disappointment of school teachers who were meeting the needs of students with disabilities in the regular education classrooms without the support needed for the student, the teacher and the other classmates.
4.4.2 Availability of SNE learning facilities

To establish availability of teaching and learning facilities for SNE learning, a sample of 40 teachers answered questionnaires to state whether there were well-structured leaning facilities in schools. The results are as shown on Figure 4.6.

Figure 4.6: Availability of SNE Learning Facilities

The results show that majority of teachers (90.0%) said that there were no learning facilities in their schools while 10.0% said they had facilities. The findings further show that 50.0% of the principals indicated that they have facilities for the inclusive education programme. This is an indication that most public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County do not have well-structured learning facilities for the implementation of inclusive education curriculum.

According to Allen and Schwartz (2000), many factors have resulted in provision of learning facilities to meet special needs being expressed either in general terms of what is available rather than what is needed. Recommendations after assessment
are usually very broad and the choices offered relate to location and what is available rather than to what is needed. Services must be more precise about the different types of support they can give to children with different kinds of special educational needs.

According to UNESCO (1995), once children with disabilities have been assessed at Educational Assessment and Resource Services (EARS) and the outcome referred to medical doctors for confirmation, it is the parents who decide whether they wish their children to attend a residential school, integrated programme or regular school. Choices are limited because demand is higher than existing facilities can meet, (UNESCO, 1995). This further negates the idea of integrating students with special needs in ordinary schools, (Karanja, 2003).

4.4.3 Physical Facilities Available

To establish the types of physical facilities available in schools, a sample of 4 teachers who said they had learning facilities answered questionnaires to provide a list of these structures. The results are as presented on Figure 4.7.
The findings showed that half the number of teachers (50.0%) said they had ramps and well-ventilated classes respectively while 25.0% said they have classes/dormitory walls painted with bright colours. According to principals, among the facilities available were ramps alongside stairs, one principal indicated that there were wheelchairs, special beds (lower beds) and walking sticks. The principals recommended restructuring of buildings and passways to make them accessible by SNE learners, provision of walking aids such as wheelchairs and walking sticks, provide well-structured toilets, provision of equipment e.g. braille machines, wide doors and provision of modified furniture.

4.4.4 Availability and adequacy of Teaching and Learning facilities for SNE

To establish adequacy of teaching and learning resources for SNE, the researcher asked teachers to rate the adequacy of these resources. A sample of 40 teachers answered questionnaires. The results are as highlighted on Figure 4.8.
Results show that majority of teachers (75.0%) said that their schools are ill-equipped with teaching and learning facilities for SNE. This is followed by 17.5% who said they are moderately equipped while 7.5% are well-equipped. This is an indication that inadequate teaching and learning resources is a challenge facing the implementation of SNE in the inclusive education programme in public secondary schools.

### 4.4.5 Teaching and Learning Facilities Available in Schools

The researcher carried an observation exercise to determine availability and adequacy of teaching and learning facilities for the implementation of SNE curriculum.
Table 4.2: Teaching and learning facilities Available in Schools (N = 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching aids and instructional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing aids</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual aids</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps/levelled doorsteps</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted desks/furniture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted toilets/latrines</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-structured playgrounds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings show that majority of schools (80.0%) had teaching aids and instructional materials with only 20.0% having adequate teaching aids and instructional materials. All schools (100.0%) had textbooks which were adequate in 6 (60.0%) schools. It was however revealed none of the schools had hearing aids, visual aids and playgrounds facilities. These findings further show that most public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County do not have facilities for the implementation of inclusive education curriculum.

When asked to rate their schools in terms of availability and adequacy of teaching and learning resources for inclusive education, majority of principals rated them as below average. One principal observed that, “We have no child with special needs nor facilities for them.” Another principal observed that, “It has never been put into
consideration except for new buildings with ramp doorsteps.” Another principal stated that it was below average due to lack of adequate teaching and learning resources. One principal however observed that the school was fairly equipped as some teachers had received SNE training.

4.4.6 Teaching and Learning Facilities Required

Teachers were asked to list the teaching and learning facilities required to enable them to implement the inclusive education curriculum in their schools. A sample of 40 teachers answered questionnaires. The results are shown on Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special books for easy understanding</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braille machines and reading materials</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchairs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special toilets/latrines</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing aids</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable seats and lockers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified beds</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking calculators and computers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectacles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnifiers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifies sinks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified tables</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special learning kitty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results on Table 4.3 show that a higher number of teachers (32.5%) said that their schools needed special books for easy understanding in order to implement the inclusive education curriculum. This is followed by 30.0% who listed braille machines and reading materials, 27.5% listed wheelchairs while 25.0% listed special toilets/latrines and hearing aids.

4.5 Challenges in Curriculum Delivery Methodology

The third objective sought to investigate challenges facing the delivery of inclusive education curriculum. A sample of 10 principals was interviewed while 40 teachers answered questionnaires. Content analysis was used to analyze findings of respondents’ views on issues not arithmetically calculated while descriptive statistics were used to analyse closed-ended items. Data were presented using frequency distribution tables. The findings are as discussed herewith.

4.5.1 Most Common Teaching Methods

The study sought to establish the instruction methodology used by teachers to teach SNE learners in an inclusive education programme in public secondary schools. A sample of 40 teachers answered questionnaires stating the teaching methods they use to teach inclusive education. The results are as shown on Table 4.4.
Table 4.4: The most Common Teaching Method (N = 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total communication</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSL and SEE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oralism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results showed that majority of teachers (80.0%) said they are not sure of the common teaching method for SNE learners. This is followed by 70.0% who said they use total communication while 30.0% said they use KSL and SEE. This is an indication that majority of teachers with SNE learners in their schools are not implementing inclusive education curriculum.

4.5.2 Suitability of the Current Curriculum to SNE Learners

To assess the suitability of the current curriculum to SNE learners in an integrated system of education, a sample of 40 teachers answered questionnaires to state whether SNE learners are able to cope with this curriculum.

Figure 4.9: Suitability of the Current Curriculum to SNE Learners
The findings show that majority of teachers (80.0%) indicated that SNE learners cannot cope with the current curriculum while 20.0% said they can. This indicates that most teachers feel that the current curriculum is not suited for SNE learners which may explain why most public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County are not implementing the inclusive education curriculum. This is one of the challenges facing the implementation of SNE in Mutitu public secondary schools.

4.5.3 Relevance of the Current Curriculum to SNE learners

The study sought to find out the extent to which the current curriculum is relevant to teach SNE learners in an inclusive education system. A sample of 40 teachers answered questionnaires to rate the relevance of the current curriculum to SNE learners. The findings are as presented on Table 4.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very relevant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly relevant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very irrelevant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results showed that majority of teachers (52.5%) stated that the current curriculum is irrelevant for SNE learners followed by 20.0% who said it is relevant, 12.5% who said it is very irrelevant while 10.0% said it is relevant.
Majority of principals interviewed also noted that not all SNE learners can cope with the current curriculum specifically those with visual and hearing impairment. The findings indicated that most teachers feel the current school curriculum is irrelevant for SNE learners which might explain why most schools in Mutitu Sub-County have not implemented the inclusive education curriculum. It is, therefore, clear that relevance of the current curriculum is a challenge facing the implementation of SNE in public secondary schools.

These findings concur with Ministry of Education (2003) which notes that the curriculum developed from a central place like KIE is rigid and does not have the quality of flexibility needs for special needs education. The expected outcome is the curriculum from KIE is uniform for all learners of special needs education. This is unrealistic given the diverse nature of disabilities. Thus, the curriculum given to schools does not benefit individual learner’s needs and the end result is a graduate who has not benefited from the experiences received in school. This fact can discourage others who may not see the importance of special needs education. Curriculum materials are developed without involvement of important stakeholders like the teachers and no piloting is done nor in-servicing for the teachers on how to use the materials developed, (Omorwa, 2005).

4.5.4 Challenges faced in Curriculum Delivery for SNE

The study aimed at identifying challenges facing curriculum delivery for SNE members. The researcher asked teachers to state the challenges they face when delivering SNE curriculum. Their responses are presented in Figure 4.10.
The findings showed that a higher number of teachers (62.5%) said students missing words when reading was a major challenge facing the implementation of SNE. This followed by 50.0% cited difficulty in communication between teachers and learners while 37.5% said lack of skills by teachers was a major challenge facing the implementation of SNE curriculum.

An exam system that does not restrict any disabled learner’s chance of promotion and completing school is also a quality factor. A learner who is blind may need to do the exam orally instead of in writing. A learner with an intellectual impairment disability should be allowed to show acquired skills even if they lie outside the core curriculum for the majority of learners (Hannu, Marja & Heikki, 2006).

According to the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights Report (2007), examinations such as Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education are particularly daunting and harrowing for students with disabilities who are examined without
due regard to reasonable accommodation for measures in view of their disabilities. The Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC) has not put in place effective measures to ensure that children with disabilities are tested for what is within their knowledge and disabilities. For example, there is no cognisance by an examiner that the poor quality of a pupil’s handwriting may arise from the fact that he/she is using the mouth or feet to write in view of that disability (Kenya National Commission on Human Rights Report, 2007).

4.6 Teachers’ Attitude Towards SNE Learners

The fourth objective of the study was to assess the challenge posed by teachers’ attitudes towards inclusive education on the implementation of the inclusive education curriculum in public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County. A sample of 10 principals was interviewed while 40 teachers answered questionnaires. Content analysis was used to analyze findings of respondents’ views on issues not arithmetically calculated while descriptive statistics were used to analyse closed-ended items. Data were presented using frequency distribution tables. The findings are as presented on Table 4.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are in adequately prepared to handle SNE learners.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers fear handling SNE learners.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive education leads to lower academic grades.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are confident with teaching SNE learners.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive education exposes learners to ridicule.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive education helps learners to identify each other weaknesses thus help each other.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inclusive education increases workload to teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive education increases workload to</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students with disabilities do not gain a lot themselves academically or socially from inclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive education denies teachers time to</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepare for lessons.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers are given enough support when implementing inclusive education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students with disabilities do not gain a lot</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>themselves academically or socially from</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclusion.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are given enough support when</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementing inclusive education.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings revealed that most teachers feel they are not adequately prepared to handle SNE learners. This is according to 35.0% who disagreed with the notion that teachers are adequately prepared to handle SNE learners while 17.5% strongly disagreed. The findings also showed that most teachers fear handling SNE learners. This is seen by 42.5% who said they agree with this statement while 12.5% strongly agreed. The findings also showed that teachers are not confident with teaching SNE learners. The results show that 22.5% of teachers said they strongly disagree with the notion that teachers are confident with teaching SNE learners while 20.0% disagreed. The study also shows most teachers disagreed that inclusive education leads to lower academic grades. Majority of teachers (60.0%) disagreed while 20.0% strongly disagreed. Most teachers also disagreed with the notion that inclusive education exposes learners to ridicule. According to the findings, 50.0% disagreed while 22.5% strongly disagreed. Most teachers also felt that inclusive education helps learners to identify each other’s weaknesses. The results showed that 62.5% of teachers agreed with this while 25.0% strongly disagreed. Most teachers also felt that students with disabilities gain a lot academically or socially from inclusion.

Most teachers also felt that inclusive education increases workload to teachers as 40.0% of the agreed while 30.0% strongly agreed. Most teachers felt that inclusive education does not deny teachers time to prepare for lessons. This is according 35.0% of teachers who agreed with this statement while 10.0% strongly disagreed. This concurs with Jones et al., (2002) who found that teachers saw their workload increasing during the inclusion of students with disabilities into their classrooms because they viewed the academic needs of these students as different in quantity and quality than the general education students. For instance, teachers may already
feel they don’t have enough prep time to prepare for their daily lessons, so when the idea of having students with disabilities in their classrooms arises, they may feel overwhelmed that they simply will not be able to accommodate the individual needs of students.

The findings are an indication that teachers have a positive attitude towards inclusive education but are sceptical about participating in the implementation of the curriculum. This is because majority of them have not been trained in SNE and therefore, are not confident of handling SNE learners. As a result, most schools have not implemented the inclusive education system. The findings are in agreement with McLeskey and Waldron (2002) who observed that through a review of research, both positive and negative teacher attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities are typically found. From studies reviewed, many of the concerns from teachers are valid, and there are important factors behind teacher attitudes that can assist schools to improve inclusion experiences. McLeskey and Waldron (2002) found one negative teacher attitude towards inclusion was that the students in the classroom without disabilities noticed the differences between themselves and their peers, and rejected them by labelling and/or calling them names. According to the authors, inclusion can give all students more knowledge about each other’s differences as they learn and interact in the same classroom.

According to Shade and Stewart (2001), teachers report frustration, burden, fear, and inadequacies because they don’t believe they have the abilities to meet the individual needs of students with special needs in their classrooms. Studies by Voltz, Brazil, and Ford (2001) and McLeskey and Waldron (2002), indicate that the most crucial factor behind positive teacher attitudes towards inclusion is that there is a support system in place.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

5.2 Summary of the Findings

The purpose of the study was to investigate management challenges in the implementation of inclusive education in public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County of Kitui County. The study examined challenges in the enrolment of SNE learners, human resource related challenges, challenges in the provision of learning facilities, challenges faced in curriculum delivery and challenges in relation to teachers’ attitudes towards the implementation of inclusive education.

The study adopted a descriptive survey design and targeted 11 public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County with a population of 11 principals, 60 teachers from which a sample of 7 principals and 28 teachers were selected for the study. The study instruments included questionnaire for teachers, interview schedule for principals and an observation guide. Piloting of instruments was done to help the researcher in establishing the reliability and validity of study instruments. The raw data collected were arranged and coded in readiness for analysis. Content analysis was used to analyze findings of respondents’ views on issues not arithmetically calculated while descriptive statistics were used to analyse closed-ended items. The researcher used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 17.00 for effective analysis of data. Data were presented using frequency distribution tables, bar graphs and pie-charts.
5.2.1 Challenges Faced by Schools When Enrolling in SNE Learners

The first objective was to investigate challenges faced by schools when enrolling in SNE learners. The results that majority of schools have not enrolled SNE learners indicate that majority of schools have not embraced the inclusive education programme. Among the reasons given by the principals were that parents are not aware of the need to take special needs children to school. It was also observed that majority of parents with special needs have completed primary education have not taken any initiative to enrol them in secondary schools. One principal observed that in most cases, learners who are diagnosed with special needs are taken to special schools.

5.2.2 Assessing human resource challenges facing public secondary schools in the implementation of Inclusive Education Curriculum

The second objective of the current was to assess human resource challenges facing public secondary schools in the implementation of Inclusive Education Curriculum. The results showed that majority of teachers in public secondary schools have not been adequately trained on how to handle SNE learners. It was suggested that teachers should be in-serviced in special education and that pre-service training should put more focus on SNE.

5.2.3 Investigate the Challenges in the Provision of Learning Facilities

The third objective was to investigate the challenges in the provision of learning facilities. The results showed that majority of schools did not have learning facilities in their schools while those that had, the facilities were very inadequate. Among the physical facilities available in schools included rumps, well-ventilated
classes, classes/dormitory walls painted with bright colours. Others included wheelchairs, special beds (lower beds) and walking sticks. The results further showed that majority of schools were ill-equipped with teaching and learning facilities for SNE. From the observation exercise, majority of schools had teaching aids and instructional materials for students without impairment but lacked those for SNE learners. Respondents observed that their schools needed special books for easy understanding in order to implement the inclusive education curriculum using braille machines and reading materials.

5.2.4 Investigate challenges facing the delivery of inclusive education curriculum

The fourth objective sought to investigate challenges facing the delivery of inclusive education curriculum. The findings showed that most teachers feel that the current curriculum is not suited for SNE learners which may explain why most public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County are not implementing the inclusive education curriculum. The results also showed that majority of teachers and therefore, a feeling that the current school curriculum is irrelevant for SNE learners. Among the challenges experienced in the implementation of SNE curriculum included students missing words when reading, difficulty in communication between teachers and learners and lack of skills by teachers.

5.2.5 Assess teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education curriculum

The last objective of the study was to assess teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education curriculum to determine whether it is a challenge facing the implementation of the inclusive education programme in public secondary schools.
The findings revealed that teachers have a positive attitude towards inclusive education but are sceptical about participating in the implementation of the curriculum. This is because majority of them have not been trained in SNE and therefore, are not confident of handling SNE learners. As a result, most schools have not implemented the inclusive education system.

5.3 Conclusion of Findings

The study established that public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County have not implemented the inclusive education because of parental failure to take their children to mainstream public secondary schools with some opting to take their children to special schools. It was also established that due to lack of facilities and inadequate training of SNE teachers and principals, most schools are not keen on admitting SNE students under the inclusive education curriculum. It was established that majority of teachers have not received SNE training either during pre-service or in-service training. Schools also lack physical facilities and teaching and learning resources for SNE. There was also a general feeling among principals and teachers that the current school curriculum was irrelevant to the needs of SNE learners thus inability of the public secondary schools to fully implement the inclusive education curriculum. The findings lastly revealed that teachers have a positive attitude towards inclusive education but are sceptical about participating in the implementation of the curriculum. This is because majority of them have not been trained in SNE and therefore are not confident of handling SNE learners.
5.4 Recommendations of the Study

In view of the findings, the study makes the following recommendations:

i) The study recommends that the Ministry of Education should put in place measures to compel schools through monitoring and capacity building such as training to ensure that SNE learners are admitted in public secondary schools under the inclusive education programme.

ii) The government should allocate extra funds to public secondary schools to help them procure SNE facilities so as to prepare the schools to implement SNE curriculum. This will enable inclusive curriculum to be implemented without problems.

iii) The government should facilitate the training of more SNE teachers by ensuring that teacher training colleges avail more places for SNE teacher trainees. This will enable teachers to handle SNE learners with confidence and have positive attitude towards them.

iv) The government and other stakeholders should facilitate SNE in-service training for teachers in public secondary schools in order to prepare teachers for the implementation of SNE curriculum.

v) The government and other stakeholders should conduct sensitization campaigns to parents of special needs children on the importance of taking their children to mainstream schools under the inclusive education programme so as to ensure that more of such children are enrolled in schools.
5.5 Suggestion for Further Research

In view of the delimitations of the study, the researcher suggests further research in the following areas:

i) The study was confined to public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County leaving other districts in the country. The study also left out private secondary schools. A similar study should be replicated to the rest of the country including private secondary schools.

ii) The study also targeted teachers and principals leaving out students and parents of special needs children whose views could have contributed towards establishing challenges facing enrolment of SNE learners in public secondary schools. A similar study should be done involving these stakeholders.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX ONE

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PRINCIPALS

1. What is your highest professional qualification? .................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................

2. Have you ever been trained to teach learners with special educational needs? 
(Explain your answer).............................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................

3. Apart from training as a teacher, have you undergone any in-service training 
related to management of special educational programmes? (Explain your 
answer).................................................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................

4. Are there students with special needs enrolled in your school? (Explain your 
answer) ..................................................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................

5. Please fill this table to show the enrolment of students with special needs in 
your school for the given period of years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of pupils with special needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. From your personal knowledge, do you know any student with special needs who would have been enrolled in your school, but for one reason or another was not enrolled?

7. What in your opinion can be done to increase the enrolment of students with special needs in your school?

8. Are there physical facilities in your school to accommodate learners with special needs?

9. If yes, in what ways are the physical facilities in your school structured to accommodate learners with special needs?

10. What needs to be improved in the physical facilities to accommodate learners with special needs in your school?

11. How would you rate your school in terms of availability and adequacy of teaching and learning resources for children with special needs? (Explain your answer)
12. Are the available teaching and learning resources in your school appropriate for learners with special needs? .................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

13. If yes, state why you think the available teaching and learning resources are appropriate for learners with special needs ...................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

14. If No, what type of teaching and learning resources do you think should be provided for learners with special needs in your school? ..........................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

15. How would you rate the government’s contribution towards improvement of service delivery for students with special educational needs in your school? ....
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

16. How would you rate the level of financing the education of children with special needs in your school?
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

17. Other than the funds allocated by the government, do you have other sources of financing special education in your school? ..........................................
........................................................................................................
18. If Yes, please state the financier(s) ........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

19. Are the funds sufficient? ........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

20. In your opinion, can learners with special needs cope with the present school curriculum? ............................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

21. How relevant is the curriculum offered for the children with special educational needs? ............................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

22. Do you think teachers in your school are adequately prepared to handle learners with special educational needs? ...........................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

23. If Yes, what makes you think that teachers in your school are adequately prepared to handle learners with special educational needs? ..........................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

24. If No, please state what should be done so that teachers in your school can adequately handle learners with special educational needs. ..........................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
25. What is your opinion about the inclusive education policy of children with special needs in public primary schools?

26. Please give suggestions on how the implementation of inclusive education policy can be improved in public secondary schools.
APPENDIX TWO

TEACHERS QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of the study is to investigate challenges facing implementation of inclusive education in public secondary schools in Mutitu Sub-County. Do not write your name. Answer all the questions given as honestly as possible by following instructions given in each section. Data collected will be used solely for academic purposes and treated confidentially. (Tick in the box the choice(s) that apply to you or fill in the blank spaces).

SECTION 1 - Background Information (Tick)

1. What is your qualification?
   Post graduate [ ] Degree [ ] Diploma [ ]

2. Do you have Special Needs Education training?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

3. Your teaching experience in years:
   0-2 [ ] 3-5 [ ] 6-10 [ ] Above 10 [ ]

4. Your gender:
   Female [ ] Male [ ]

5. Your teaching subjects: ........................................................................................................................................
SECTION II: Challenges in Enrolment of SNE Learners

6. (a) Are there students with special needs enrolled in your class?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

(b) Are there students with special needs who enrolled in your class but dropped out?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

(c) Please state reasons why you think they dropped out of your school:

...........................................................
...........................................................
...........................................................
...........................................................

(d) From your personal knowledge, do you know any student with special needs who would have been enrolled in your school, but for one reason or another is not enrolled?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

(e) What in your opinion can be done to increase the enrolment of students with special needs in your school?

...........................................................
...........................................................
...........................................................
...........................................................

SECTION III: Challenges in relation to Human Resource

7. (a) Do you think you are adequately prepared to handle learners with special educational needs?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

(b) If Yes, what makes you think that you are adequately prepared to handle learners with special educational needs?

...........................................................
...........................................................
...........................................................
...........................................................
(c) If No, please state what should be done so that teachers in your school can adequately handle learners with special educational needs


SECTIon iv: Challenges in relation to learning facilities

8. (a) Are there physical facilities in your school to accommodate learners with special needs? Yes [ ] No [ ]

(b) If Yes, in what ways are the physical facilities in your school structured to accommodate learners with special needs?

(c) What needs to be improved in the physical facilities to accommodate learners with special needs in your school?

9. (a) How would you rate your school in terms of availability and adequacy of teaching and learning resources for children with special needs?

   Ill-equipped [ ] Moderately equipped [ ]

   Well-equipped [ ]

(b) Are the available teaching and learning resources in your school appropriate for learners with special needs? Yes [ ] No [ ]

(c) If Yes, state why you think the available teaching and learning resources are appropriate for learners with special needs
(d) If No, what type of teaching and learning resources do you think should be provided for learners with special needs in your school?

SECTION V: Challenges in Curriculum Delivery

10. (a) In your opinion, can learners with special needs cope with the present school curriculum?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

   (b) How relevant is the curriculum offered for the children with special educational needs?
   Very relevant [ ] Relevant [ ] Fairly relevant [ ]
   Irrelevant [ ] Very irrelevant [ ]

11. What is your most common teaching method to the HI?
   Total Communication [ ] Oralism [ ] KSL & SEE [ ]
   Others (specify)...........................................................................................................

12. What learning challenges do you face in curriculum delivery to the HI?
    .................................................................................................................................

13. In your opinion, what recommendations would you make for teaching and learning of the HI learners to be more effective?
    .................................................................................................................................
SECTION VI: Teachers’ Attitude towards Inclusive Education

13. The following statements are aimed at determining the attitude of teachers towards inclusive education. Please tick where appropriate.

**Key:** SA – Strongly Agree, A – Agree, U – Undecided, D – Disagree, SD – Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are inadequately prepared to handle SNE learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers fear handling SNE learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive education leads to lower academic grades.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are confident with teaching SNE learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive education exposes learners to ridicule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive education helps learners to identify each other’s weaknesses thus help each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive education increases workload to teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive education denies teachers time to prepare for lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with disabilities do not gain a lot themselves academically or socially from inclusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are given enough support when implementing inclusive education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. In what ways can the attitude of teachers towards inclusive education be enhanced?

THANK YOU FOR FILLING THE QUESTIONNAIRE
### APPENDIX THREE

#### OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching aids &amp; instructional materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Textbooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hearing aids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Visual aids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ramps/levelled doorsteps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adapted desks/furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Adapted toilets/latrines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Well structured playgrounds Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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