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ABSTRACT
The study investigated the factors that influenced low enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in integrated primary schools. It further explored possible intervention measures that may be employed to mitigate the situation. The study was conducted in selected schools in Runyenjes (Embu East) and Manyatta (Embu North) sub-counties in Embu County. The location was purposively chosen in order to enable the researcher easy access to the respondents. Again, factors that limit enrollment and retention of girls with disabilities were worth investigating because the government of Kenya provides free primary education for all school going age children although the programme does not address fully the education of children with special needs. Questionnaires, interview schedule and focus group discussion (FGD) were the tools adopted for data collection. The data collected was qualitatively and quantitatively analyzed. That is, thematically and frequencies and percentages. Poverty, low distances to school, negative attitude, time wastage by teachers, drug and substance abuse, security, household chores, boy preference, pregnancies and early marriages were the factors established to influence enrollment and retention of girls with disabilities in school. Based on the findings of this study, intervention is required to advocate for equity and access to education among all children at household and community levels. The government should ensure that parents of girls with disabilities must enroll them in school when they attain school going age and the education of children with disabilities should be made free.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUNDS TO THE STUDY

1.1 Introduction

The focus of this chapter is the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research objectives and questions, assumption of the study, limitation of the study, delimitation of the study, significance of the study, the theoretical frame work, conceptual frame work, operational definition of terms and conclusion.

1.2 Background to the Study

Women’s education has come a long way. Earlier in Britain, only the daughters of the wealthy had access to education (Jane French, 1990). The likes of Jane Austen or the Bronte Sisters (Jane French, 1990). They mainly learnt at home, usually from a governess. Sometimes they would share a tutor with their brothers at home, until the boys went away, as was customary, to one of the great public schools. Also “a daughter’s” prospects would be cheerfully sacrificed to pay an expensive education for the sons: and while there were excellent day schools for boys, there were none for the daughters of the middle and upper classes” (Jane French, 1990).

Moreover, the context of industrial development, population growth and social concern, the demand for a system of state education, free and fair to all began to grow. As late as the 1860s, there was a general feeling that education for girls in particular was socially and morally dubious as well as being a waste of time and resources. In the report of the Commissioners to the Inquiry Commission in 1869, James Bryce in French (1990) observed that:” although the world has now existed for several thousand years, the notion that women have minds as cultivatable and worth cultivating as men’s minds is
still regarded by the ordinary British parent as an offensive, not to say a revolutionary paradox”.

In Africa, however there was low participation of women in colonial education compared with that of males. Usually, girls were not sent to school, and the few that were, received an education that prepared them neither for equal competition in the job market nor for self-employment in any way that gave them adequate economic independence, dignity, or self-esteem. They were employed only as nurses, lady physicians (not doctors), school mistresses and secretaries. However, even in these selected areas, women were denied access to any position requiring them to exercise authority over men, thus subordination of women in public positions of power and decision making. Education that guaranteed employment in the more prestigious and better paying jobs was exclusively for men and was logically closed up for the women (Robertson, 1986)

However, after the World Conference on Education for All (EFA), held in Jomtein, Thailand, in 1990, many countries embraced universal education for all (UNESCO, 1996). Kenya was not left behind. This was evident from the various products by the government such as the Koech Report (1999), referred to as “The Totally Integrated Quality Education and Training”(TIQET), which emphasized on ways and means of improving access, equity, relevance and quality with special attention to gender sensitivity, groups with disabilities and other disadvantaged groups; the Children’s Bill of Rights (2001) which included education as a right to every child regardless of any kind of distinction; the Persons with Disability Act (2003) which stated that, “No person or learning institution should deny admission to a person with disability to any course of study by reason only of such disability; if the person has the ability to acquire substantial
learning in that course, learning institutions should take into account the special needs of persons with disabilities with respect to entry requirements, pass marks, curriculum, examinations, auxiliary services, use of school facilities, class schedules, physical education requirements and other similar considerations.

Special schools and institutions, especially for the deaf, the blind and the intellectual disabilities, should be established to cater for formal education, skills development and self-reliance. Hence the Kenya National Plan of Action for persons with disabilities (1999-2009); the Free Primary Education (FPE) introduced in 2003 and finally the Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2005 on a policy framework for Education, Training and Research, which stated that special education was important for human capital development as it prepared those who are most likely to be dependents to become self-reliant not forgetting the contemporary philosophy of inclusion.

Studies showed that even the few girls who enrolled in schools were in danger of dropping out than boys (UNESCO, 1996). The low enrolment and high dropout rates of girls was the reason why there was need for the removal of obstacles that hampered girls participation in education all over the world (UNESCO, 1996). Hence, there is need to find out whether it was the same for the girl child with disability by looking into the factors that contribute to the low enrolment and retention rates and establish intervention measures to prevent this occurrence.

A study carried out by the republic of Kenya in 1997, revealed that in Kenya, participation of girls in primary education was very low. According to this study of students entering standard one only 80 percent of the girls reached standard four and 35 percent entered standard eight (republic of Kenya, 1997). While these figures referred to
students without disabilities, The rates could be even lower for students with disabilities. Hence, the need to investigate the situation for the girls with disabilities close to twenty years down the lain.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Although the government of Kenya has committed itself to providing Education to all school age children regardless of any kind of distinction, special education has not received much attention in terms of enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities. Girls with disabilities are often hidden from the public and women with disabilities are absent from community activities such as social gatherings and political meetings (Muigai, 1998). A gender analysis report on disability in Kenya noted that disability limited educational opportunities more significantly for women than men, thus their enrolment and retention rates remained low (Mildred, 2002).

The information sourced from the offices of the DEO and EARC showed that out of 30,268 girls enrolled in primary schools in Embu County as per 2008, only 219 had the four traditional categories of disabilities, i.e. Mentally Handicapped (MH), Physically Handicapped (PH), Hearing Impaired (HI) and Visually Impaired (VI). The number was quite minimal compared to the overall enrolled number of girls. This information clearly pointed to the significant gap between the enrolment and retention rates of girls without disabilities and those with disabilities.

Minimal intervention has been undertaken to find out why girls with disabilities continued to register low enrolment rates. Studies done had tended to focus on the education of girls without disabilities such as Chege and Sifuna (2006), while not much attention was given to the education of girls with disabilities. Thus, the current study
investigated factors that influenced low enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in integrated primary schools in Embu County, Kenya.

1.4 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify factors that affect enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in integrated primary schools and further explored possible interventions that could be employed to mitigate the current situation in Embu County.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The study sought to:

(i) Investigate the factors that influence low enrolment rates of girls with disabilities in integrated primary schools in Embu County

(ii) Explore the factors that influence low retention rates of girls with disabilities in integrated primary schools in Embu County.

(iii) Establish strategies of improving enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in integrated primary schools in Embu County.

1.6 Research Questions

(i) What are the factors that influence low enrolment rates of girls with disabilities in integrated primary schools in Embu County?

(ii) What are the factors that influence low retention rates of girls with disabilities in integrated primary schools in Embu County?

(iii) What strategies can be put in place to improve enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in integrated primary schools in Embu County?
1.7 Assumptions of the Study

The study made the following assumptions:

(i) That, the respondents would avail themselves and co-operate to provide reliable responses.

(ii) That, the instruments of data collection would reach the targeted population this is because sometimes they do not reach the targeted respondents and especially those sent through post office or other people.

(iii) That, the researcher would find a sponsor to fund the research, that is, data collection

(iv) That, the researchers would generate recommendations on how to mitigate the practice and provide areas for further research on the enrolment and retention of persons with disabilities in schools based on the findings of the study.

However, (iii) assumption was not met and therefore, the researcher funded herself solely. The other assumptions were met.

1.8 Scope and Limitations/Delimitation

1.8.1 Scope

(i) The study was limited to Embu County of Eastern province of Kenya.

(ii) The study was limited to 4 integrated primary schools. That is, 1 for MH, 1 Small home for PH, 1 integrated program for VI and 1 integrated program for HI.

(iii) The study was further limited to 17 parents of children with special needs who were in school, 12 teachers and 17 learners with special needs in these schools and 4 head teachers.
1.8.2 Limitations

i. Poor road infrastructure was a limitation in that most roads were not all weather friendly.

ii. As much as there were other factors outside school that influenced enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in integrated primary schools, the study was limited only to socio-cultural beliefs and practices, family socio-economic factors and school-related factors.

1.9 Significance of Study

The study may contribute to the literature on enrolment and retention of girls. The findings may provide useful information to education officials, policy makers, and other stakeholders to formulate responsive policies and set strategies in place that may alleviate the low enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in integrated primary schools. The findings may also sensitize stakeholders on the factors that influence enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in the selected primary schools in Embu County and thus be able look for solutions to the vice. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) such as the Kenya Society for the Blind (KSB), Association of the Physically Disabled of Kenya (APDK), United Nations Children’s Educational Fund (UNICEF), and other organizations would hopefully realize education challenges of GWD and make decisions on relevant intervention measures.

1.10 Theoretical Framework

This study was based on a theoretical model of learning by Chinapah Viyagum (1984). The model emphasizes equal rights to education irrespective of any distinctions among children and equal access to different types and levels of education. It urges that children should have equal treatment in terms of teacher behaviour as well as teacher
learner relationships and interactions. The model identifies school inputs such as teacher education, teacher training, political stability, class size, student-teacher relationship, school facilities, adequacy of teaching materials and resources as well as the school administration as vital factors in participation (enrolment and retention) of pupils in schools.

The model summarizes the way the home and school environmental characteristics and processes interact to influence schooling. The home characteristics such as parental socio-economic status together with religious values pre-determine the parent’s beliefs and practices as well as attitudes towards education especially girl child education and more so the girl child with disabilities. These characteristics determine stereotypes that exist that pre-determine the fears of the parent and the girl’s ambition as well as pre-occupation. The parental socio-economic status and home possessions directly influence the home processes such as the parents’ support to the school in terms of paying fees, buying books, paying for examinations, feeding programmes and so on.

School characteristics such as school type, whether day or boarding, greatly influence participation in education especially for girls with disabilities. Teacher quality, class size and teachers’ salaries determine the teachers’ morale and interest in teaching. It also determines the quality of teaching and learning in the school. The home processes such as parental economic support of school needs influence the physical facilities that exist in the schools and the teaching aids that are available to the teachers and the learners. The home and the school characteristics as well as the home and school processes are inter-twined hence play concurrent roles in the process of schooling, that is, enrolment and retention.
Drawn from this theory were different aspects that influence education, that is, enrolment and retention depending on the interplay between numerous variables and their possible patterns of influence on each other. In this study, enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities was identified as the dependent variable and was influenced by factors such as socio-cultural, family and community socio-economic background and school-related factors which were identified as the independent variables.
1.11 Conceptual Framework

Figure 1.1: A Conceptual framework based on the theoretical model of learning.

What the structural model (Figure 1.1) indicated was that the socio-cultural beliefs and practices such as causes of disability, religion, female genital mutilation (FGM), early marriages and attitudes towards persons with disabilities influenced enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in schools. The figure also indicated that the socio-economic background of the family and the community at large such as parental level of education and income, family size, economic activity, resource availability and allocation such as Community Development Fund (CDF), child Labor influenced enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in schools. The model too indicated the school-related factors such as distance, personnel (staffing and qualifications/training), environment, curriculum, teaching/learning materials and transport levies influenced enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in schools. The model, therefore, suggested that if the independent variables were geared towards positive influence by means and ways of improving the good ones and eradicating the bad ones, then the outcome would be high enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in schools.
1.12 Operational Definition of Terms

Disability  A disorder or condition that limited use of the whole body parts or senses completely.

Enrolment  Means to join a learning institution officially, that is, through registration.

Girls with Disabilities  In this study these are the girls with the four traditional disabilities that is Deafness, visual impairment, intellectual disabilities (mental handicapped) and physical disability.

Handicap  Condition that hindered somebody from doing something or made it difficult to do something. It could be physical or mental.

Hearing Impairment  Referred to total or partial loss of the sense of hearing.

Integration  Refers to the process of educating children with special needs together with those without special needs in schools without necessarily making changes in the curriculum provision or the learning environment (Ndani and Murugami, 2009).

Mentally Handicapped  Children who were significantly below average in intellectual functioning,

Participation  In this study it means access and retention in schools that is learners enroll and remain school to the end of the cycle.

Physically Handicapped  Having a part of the body that limits somebody from performing duties to normal expectations.

Regular school  These are schools/classes for the “abled” learners.

Retention  In this study retention refers to the act of remaining in school after enrolment or registration.

School -Related Factors  Those factors such as facilities, levies, security among many, within the school that contribute to enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in school.
**Small Homes**  This is the place within the regular school where PH learners stay after school since majority of them could not make it as day scholars.

**Socio Cultural Factors**  In this study the term refers to societal practices and beliefs such as FGM, causes of disabilities that contributed to low enrollment and retention of girls with disabilities in school.

**Socio-Economic Factors**  Referred to ways and means of earning a living or sources of income.

**Special Units**  These were separate classes within the regular school accommodating SNE learners.

**Visual Impairment**  Referred to loss of vision. That is, having sight problems or the inability to see well.

### 1.13 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the researcher has presented the necessary sub endings and their content as indicated in the introduction. The next chapter provides a review of related literature.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.

2.1 Introduction

The chapter provides related literature on the factors that influence low enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in education. The literature mainly touched on the socio cultural beliefs and practices, the social economic and the school related factors. Gaps were identified as literature was being reviewed.

2.2 An Overview on Girls and Women with Disabilities

Ten years back, Sixteen percent of all women had disabilities (Dawn Ontario Fact Sheet, 2004). “Despite their significant numbers, girls and women with disabilities, especially in the developing countries (in the Asian and Pacific Region), remained hidden and silent. Their concerns are unknown and their rights overlooked. Throughout the region, in urban and rural communities alike, they had to face the major problems of triple discrimination by society; not only because of their disabilities, but also because they were females and poor” (ILO Ability Asia, 2004). These studies were confirmed by presentations made to the UN Experts Seminar on Women and Disability Vienna, 1990, which showed that in many countries, the norm is that a girl with disability would be hidden at home (Dawn Ontario Fact Sheet, 2004).

In Kenya, over 80,000 children with various disabilities had been identified by the end of 1996 through Educational Assessment Resource Centres. Special Institutions can only accommodate 12,000 children with disabilities. This means that about 70,000 were in their homes possibly awaiting placement (Ministry of Education, 1996). There are many factors that limited the participation of persons with disabilities in the field of education that calls for investigation.
2.3 Factors Influencing Enrolment of Girls with Disabilities in School.

The objective seeks to investigate those factors that may lead to low enrolment of girls with disabilities in school. There are therefore a number of factors that influence education for girls and women with disabilities. Culturally, the woman’s place in society was in the home and therefore, education for girls and women with disabilities was seen as a distant dream (ILO Ability Asia, 2004). Although this is changing with the emergence of Special Needs Education (SNE), the society looks at them as inferior with majority being sceptical about their worth.

Cultural beliefs about the causes of disability contribute to the negative attitude towards persons with disabilities. Such beliefs include taboos, witchcraft and curses hence are viewed as outcasts. Barasa (1997) and Otiato (1996) observed that people with disabilities were seen as cursed, demon possessed and mad, which led to their discrimination. This had negative effect on the families and resulted in hiding these children from public to avoid ridicule. This might then lead to sexual abuse within the family (Dawn Ontario Survey, 1986). Maleche (1972) argued that even the cultural placement of girls which is based on beer, food, dress, children and gossip, did not encourage girls to develop high aspiration for education.

The traditional practice of males being fed before females, and the female child receiving leftovers resulted in the female child being malnourished. It is that food is a basic need hence, a child who is underfed cannot participate well in education since hunger may lead to absent-mindedness in class, absenteeism, truancy and even eventual dropping out of school. Thus, in countries where “son preference” was culturally
dominant, girls with disabilities were particularly endangered (Dawn Ontario Survey, 1986).

Cultural practices such as female genital mutilation (FGM) and early marriages lead to indiscipline and eventual dropout of school. Many initiated girls find it difficult to return to formal education or concentrate on studies because their next expectation was marriage (Njau & Wamahiu, 1994). Initiation ceremonies created several dilemmas for girls, affected their school attendance and academic performance and eventual drop out of school. First the scheduling of initiation ceremonies quite often conflicted with the school calendar, which leads to absenteeism from school. Secondly, initiated girls not only have a negative influence on their uncircumcised peers, but are also rude towards the uncircumcised especially female teachers. They thus become in disciplined and, consequently, their academic performance decline sharply, eventually becoming truant and drop out of school. Thirdly, although initiation marks the passage from childhood to adulthood, school authorities continue to treat initiated girls who returned to school as children. They expected them to participate in certain activities and punished them in a manner that is considered inappropriate for adults, especially for the girls who perceive themselves as adults following the initiation ceremonies. These factors could contribute to withdrawal from school (Chege & Sifuna, 2006).

Security of these girls to and from school is also a contributing factor to their participation in education. Parents are not sure whether to leave the girls with disabilities to go to school on their own, accompany them, or remain at home altogether.

The parents’ level of education, occupation and income levels played a significant role in the participation in education (Anderson, 1967). The higher the level of education, the better the income. According to Juma, (1994), educational experience and outlook of
parents was transmitted to their children. Educated parents, therefore, due to their high income levels, enrolled their children in school, encouraged them to study by availing relevant and adequate learning materials such as books and ensuring completion of their education (Tyler, 1977). The socio-economically poor parents might not afford most of the necessities for their children and especially children with disabilities (Tyler, 1977).

The need for additional income contributed to families viewing girls as a source of income through bride price, child labor and sometimes prostitution among others (Chege & Sifuna, 2006). According to UNICEF (1989), child labor was a predominant factor that influenced participation in primary schools especially in poor families. In many communities, child labor was critical for the survival of some households and schooling presented a high opportunity cost to those sending children to school (Chege & Sifuna, 2006). Girls were the mostly affected. Children from poor families felt obliged and were sometimes forced by their parents to get involved in income generating activities so as to contribute to the family’s survival. Also, in poor families, the high economic value in form of bride price accorded to marriage in many communities, took on a significant meaning, particularly as girls approach puberty, thus, impacted negatively on female participation in education (Cammish & Brock, 1994). Girls with mild mental retardation looked normal and were, therefore, subjected to the cultural practices and beliefs such as FGM and early marriages just like the ‘normal’ girls.

Cash crop farming which is the major economic activity in Embu County has declined to very low levels in the recent years rendering many families helpless, hence low participation in education for both boys and girls, “abled” and “disabled” alike and leading to child labor, prostitution and early marriages, even though this contravened the Children’s Bill of Rights (2001), “which states “no child shall be subjected to any kind
of labor” and that “every child has a right to education without discrimination whatsoever.” According to Nkinyangi (1980), the underlying problem in regard to early withdrawals from school was the inability of the family to pay the cost of education and that the girls tend to be the victims of drop out as opposed to boys in families with low socio-economic status. In situations where parents cannot pay for boys and girls, the latter were the obvious sacrifice and more so if having disabilities. Nkinyangi (1980), observes that girls who, therefore, went to school and proceeded through school unimpeded were a select group determined not only by the socio-economic status of the family, but also by prevailing sexist attitudes regarding the perceived costs and benefits of girls education.

Distance between home and school may affect participation. According to a UNICEF study carried out in six focus counties (Nairobi, Baringo, Mombasa, Garrisa, Kwale and Kisumu) in 1998, the proximity and access to primary school was a predetermining factor to participation in primary education. In this case, special needs education institutions, that is, the integrated programmes, are very much distanced from one another. This, therefore, may hinder participation of girls with disabilities in primary education. In Ghana and Egypt, researchers established that long distance to primary schools deterred girls’ participation but not boys (Hertz, 1991).

Adequate and accessible facilities are a necessity for children with disabilities and especially the PH due to their use of wheelchairs and the VI who use the cane for mobility. They need to access buildings such as classrooms and toilets and if the environment is not disability friendly, then this might lead to lack of participation in education for these children. One of the challenges relating to access and equity in education is inappropriate infrastructure, inadequate facilities and lack of equipment.
(Sessional Paper No. 1, 2005). The physical environment in the classroom needs to be
disability friendly too. For instance, where frequent movement is needed, especially
during science classes, sufficient space, clear open pathways are a necessity for VI
students using canes by rearranging desks. Without such enabling environment, the VI
students may feel neglected, hence frustrated and eventual dropout of school.

Another problem emanates from the legal framework in education, whereby Acts and
legal notices related to education also impede on the education of persons with
disabilities. The National Council of Churches of Kenya (1998) observed that, the
Education Act and supporting legal notices such as University Act, Higher Education
Loans Act among others, showed that it was the lack of consideration of persons with
disabilities in these statutes that fostered discriminatory practices in the education
system. Mugenda (1998), for example, observed that children with disabilities were
sometimes denied chances to learn in regular schools because the head teachers feared
they might contribute to the lowering of the mean score in the national examinations.
Because there was no legal legislation enacted to deal with such cases, such acts went
unpunished, further increasing discriminatory practices. As a matter of fact, early this
year (2014), a parent of a girl with disability who considered me a specialist in the area
of special needs education; consulted me because her daughter who was supposed to go
to class eight was forced to repeat class six to avoid lowering the school’s mean score in
the Kenya certificate of primary education (KCPE). I, therefore, referred her to the
Educational Assessment and Resources centre (EARC) for assistance.

The curriculum is another concern in special education. Barasa (1997) observed that,
although the Kenya Institute of Curriculum development (KICD) has a department that
develops the curriculum to be followed by special education, it is yet to become
disability friendly. There are frequent syllabus changes in the school curriculum that impact negatively on the learners with disabilities, especially those with visual disabilities because Braille material is expensive and takes long to produce. Also, the communication barriers experienced by the deaf have been ignored in the curriculum, as there is no policy on sign language which in turn posed serious challenges to learners with HI. This might lead to school drop out. This study, therefore, intended to find out whether the cited factors have a role to play in the low enrolment of girls with disabilities in school.

2.4 Factors that Influence Retention of Girls with Disabilities in School.

This objective seeks to explore the factors that may contribute to low retention in girls. Thus, one of the obstacles facing the provision of education to persons with disabilities is inadequate trained personnel and especially the support staff. For instance, there is a severe shortage of speech therapists, sign language interpreters, Braille transcribers, teacher aids, physiotherapists, occupational therapists and technicians to repair and maintain machines and learning aids whose services are of great importance to the success of special needs education. Even when and where there are appropriate personnel, improper distribution had been cited. The MOE and NCCK special needs education workshop (1998), observed that some teachers trained to handle the deaf were posted to special schools for the blind.

Also, pedagogical factors such as classroom dynamics for instance poor methods of delivery, inefficient teaching, lack of proper qualifications for some teachers handling children with special needs in the integrated programmes, lack of knowledge of the subject matter and lack of commitment of teachers. Such factors made learners lose interest in learning (Maleche, 1972). Teachers might lack commitment due to lack of
motivation for example, poor remuneration that leads to laxity and sometimes low personnel turnover. The 10% allowance paid to teachers handling SNE is not commensurate with the tasks they perform. Motivated teachers are satisfied and, therefore, enjoy their work, becoming more effective and therefore motivate their students too to realize greater achievements (Craig, 1992).

Again, lack of sufficient and appropriate teaching and learning materials for children with disabilities might lead to boredom and an eventual drop out from school. The government does not provide specialized equipment essential for the habilitation, rehabilitation, teaching and learning blaming it on shortage of funds and cost of such materials and especially for the HI and VI such as speech Laboratories, audiological equipment, magnifiers, white canes and personnel such as speech therapists to name but a few (The 8th Development Plan, 1988) and also special desks for PH leaving everything to donors and well wishers. Otiato, (1996) urged that, library services for persons with disabilities are absolute.

Teacher attitude towards the children with disabilities influence their participation in education. Children with disabilities, like other “normal” children, could be comfortable and secure when they feel that they are accepted, appreciated and liked. They could be equally uneasy and insecure when they feel rejected (Julienne, F. 1982) According to Cleugh (1968), “Special educational treatment depends not on policy and organization, but on the human qualities of the teachers”. It is assumed that if, through certain educational techniques, one can modify the attitudes of teachers towards a realistic acceptance of children with handicaps. These attitudes of acceptance on the part of the teacher would also influence children in the direction of realistic acceptance (Julienne, F. 1982). For example, teachers might have high expectations for boys and vice versa for
girls and especially girls with disabilities, a sexual division of labor in work and play activities in the classroom and the school. There are also teachers who are lazy and therefore do not teach resulting in indiscipline of students. It was observed that teachers passed time in the staffroom or elsewhere either chatting or doing other things while classes remained untaught and the syllabus remained uncovered (UNICEF, 1998).

More serious was the issue of sexual violence and abuse in some schools, with the main offenders being teachers, workers in boarding schools and school peers. The abuse, which ranges from verbal harassment to physical abuse, leads to withdrawal from school, unwanted pregnancies, and the death of boys and girls through HIV/AIDS (GOK & UNICEF, 1998). This increased parents’ fear of taking children to school especially girls and more so girls with disabilities (FAWE, 1995).

Repetition, a phenomenon that refuses to go away is another factor that may influence participation of children with disabilities in education. School achievement of disadvantaged children is characterised by a cumulative-deficit phenomenon. Under the usual school curriculum, the achievement pattern of these children is such that they fall increasingly behind their non-disadvantaged peers in school subjects approximately three years behind grade norms. One of the consequences of this cumulative-deficit is that dropping out of school is much more frequent and this in turn leads to less mobility and opportunity in the occupational sphere. Another factor that compounds the achievement problem, hence repetition or drop out of school is the negative evaluations of these children by teachers who have negative attitudes towards them and then blame the parents and the children for classroom difficulties. The negative evaluations are due to poor supervision of teachers by the responsible parties. School drop out impacts negatively on the retention as children do not remain in school as required by education
policy. This study, therefore, was intended to investigate whether the cited factors have a role in the low enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in primary education in the integrated primary schools in Embu County.

2.5 Summary of Literature Review

From this literature review, it is evident that girls and women’s education is important for a number of reasons. However it is faced with diversified impediments which require in-depth investigation. Despite the various policies on education and numerous studies on girls’ education, limited studies have been carried out on education for girls with disabilities. Studies done have established diversified reasons as to why girls’ participation in education is lower than that of boys, these include, educational policies, economic background, curriculum, cultural and school-related factors among others. Low attention has been accorded to education of girls with disabilities. According to information sourced from the DEOs office and the EARC in Embu County the enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities is still low despite the FPE.

High enrolment and retention rates in education are found in the agriculturally rich areas (Eshiwani, 1985). The current study therefore, intended to deeply analyse the factors that influence low enrolment and retention rates and establish interventions in integrated primary schools that would increase enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in Embu County.

2.6 CONCLUSION.

In this chapter, literature related to the factors hindering enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in school is reviewed. A number of related scholarly literatures has been cited. The next chapter discusses research design and methodology.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
Methodological procedures employed in carrying out the research are laid down in this chapter. Research design and locale, population, sampling techniques and sample size determination, research instruments, data collection, data analysis and conclusion are discussed.

3.2 Research Design and Locale

3.2.1 Research Design
Descriptive survey was used to determine the causes for the current state of enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in primary schools in Embu. This design was used because Mugenda (1999) observed that descriptive survey is used to determine reasons or causes for the current status of the study. Survey allows collection of a large amount of data from a sizeable population in a highly economical way. A survey approach gives the researcher more control over the research procedure (Saunders, Lewis, and Hill, 2000). Descriptive survey designs are used in preliminary and exploratory studies to allow the researchers to gather information, summarize, present and interpret data for the purpose of clarification (Orodho, 2004). This design, therefore, is good for the current study as it seeks to investigate the cause of low enrolment and retention rate of girls with disabilities in Embu County.
3.2.2 Research Variables

In this study, the independent variables were the cultural, economic, and school-related factors because they were already constants and therefore, not manipulative. The study investigated how these independent variables either limited or enhanced enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in primary education which were the dependent variables.

3.2.3 Location of the Study

The study was conducted in Runyenjes (Embu East) and Manyatta (Embu North) sub-Counties, Embu County, in Kenya. Embu County is situated approximately 150 kilometers away from Nairobi. It is located between Kirinyaga and Tharaka Nithi Counties on the slope of Mt Kenya. It has two rainy seasons per annum, one coming in the month of April and the other in October. The major crops grown are coffee, tea, maize, beans and bananas. This locale was chosen as it was easy to access the respondents and also due to its familiarity to the researcher.

3.3 Population

In this study population is the total number of all the girls with disabilities in Embu County represented by the sample. The population was all the girls with disabilities in the forty (40) integrated schools having the four main traditional categories of special needs, that is, MH, PH, HI and VI. The population comprised 169 learners, 118 teachers, 36 head teachers, and 165 parents. The rates of enrolment and retention were collected from the DEOs and EARC offices in the year 2008 and revisited in 2011 to ascertain whether the numbers remained the same or they had changed with time.
3.4 Sampling Technique and Sample Size Determination

3.4.1 Sampling Technique

Integrated programmes for learners with disabilities in Embu County were stratified in accordance with the four main categories of disabilities namely the MH, PH, VI and HI. Stratification was used in the study because it ensured that certain sub-groups in the population were represented in the sample in proportion to their numbers in the population itself (Orodho, 2004). Simple random sampling was employed in selecting one programme for MH and PH strata while purposive sampling was employed in selecting one programme for VI and HI strata respectively. Random sampling was used because it ensured that all the respondents had an equal chance of being selected for the study.

Random sampling was also free of systematic bias that might have stemmed from choices made by the researcher, and it enables the analyst to estimate the probability of any finding occurring solely by chance (Gorard, 2001).

Random sampling was done using the ballot method devised by the researcher. Names of the stratified institutions were written on small pieces of paper and folded uniformly and then placed in 4 separate containers according to the stratification. The researcher then mixed them up well and then picked up a specified number of the folded pieces of paper from each of the four containers to proportionately represent the ratio of the different categories in the integrated programmes in Embu County.

In addition Random sampling technique was also used for the regular teachers in the sampled institutions. This was because the special education teachers were automatically involved in the study. Only two regular teachers from every sampled institution were sampled as respondents to the study; one teacher from the lower primary and the other
from the upper primary. This, therefore, amounted to three teachers per sampled institution including the special education teacher. Names of classes 1 to 3 and 4 to seven were written on small pieces of paper, then folded uniformly and placed into 2 separate containers. The researcher carefully mixed them up and then picked up the specified number of pieces of paper, that is, 1 from each of the containers.

The sampled classes in each institution were not included in the remaining institutions. This procedure was employed till the four study institutions were covered. Head teachers of the sampled institutions were the only respondents to the study. Ten parents of the learners with MH, 4 parents of learners with PH, 2 parents of learners with HI and 1 parent of learners with VI were involved in a focus group discussion bringing the total to 17 parents.

3.4.2 Sample Size

Gay (1976) suggested that, for descriptive studies, ten percent (10%) of the accessible population was enough. Slavin (1984) observed that, due to the limitations in time, funds and energy, a study could be carried out from a carefully selected sample to represent the entire population. In this view, therefore, out of a total population of 488, a total of 50 respondents which constituted ten point two five percent (10.25%) were sampled.
Table 3.1: Sample Size for each Category of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>488</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Research Instruments

The study employed different instruments for data collection. Questionnaires were used for teachers; interview schedules for head teachers and focus group discussions (FGD) for parents and students who did not have the ability to respond to questionnaire.

3.5.1 Questionnaire

A questionnaire enables a researcher to collect a lot of information within a very short period of time (Orodho, 2004). Moreover, a questionnaire makes the respondents feel free to note down their responses without any fear since they are not observed and they do not have to give their identification. This ensures confidentiality. Also, according to Best and Khan (1992), questionnaires enable the person administering them to explain the purpose of the study and the meaning of the items that may not be clear. Issues relating to disability, cultural beliefs and practices, socio-economic, school-related factors and education policy were included in the questionnaire. The questionnaire had 18 items.
3.5.2 Interview Schedule

An Interview Schedule was used to collect data from the head teachers. An interview schedule was used in data collection because it enabled a social encounter and respondents were more willing to respond in a socially acceptable and desirable way (Wiersma, 1986). They were also more willing to talk than write (Best and Khan, 1993). An interview gives a higher responding rate in a natural setting and the researcher can probe the respondents to express their views freely and openly. The interview schedule included issues touching on disability, cultural beliefs and practices, socio-economic and school-related factors. The interview schedule covered 16 items.

3.5.3 Focus Group Discussion (FGD)

A Focus Group Discussion approach was used to gather views from parents and girls with disabilities. A check list tool was developed and used as a guide for discussion. The instrument was chosen because according to Milkkelson, (1995) FGD was appropriate for soliciting information in the shortest time possible. Issues on disability, socio-cultural beliefs and practices, family socio-economic and school-related factors and education policy were targeted in the discussion. The FGD tool for learners had 20 items and the FGD for parents had 15 items.

3.5.4 Pilot Study

The aim of the pilot study was to help identify instrument deficiencies and making suggestions for improvement of the study. It was also meant to validate the research instruments and ascertain their reliability. Piloting was done in Tharaka Nithi County due to its similarity of settings and characteristics of respondents. There was also good transport infrastructure thus enabling easy access to the piloting institutions. The following institutions were used for piloting: Kibumbu integrated programme for PH;
Chuka Township integrated programme for MH; Njuri integrated programme for VI and Kangoro integrated programme for HI. These were deliberately selected. 8 parents were conveniently sampled for the pilot study, (4 parents of learners with MH, 2 parents of learners with PH, 1 parent of learners with HI and 1 parent of learners with VI). The respondents in the pilot study were not involved in the main study. From the findings of the pilot study, alterations were made on test tools which included, reframing, removal or addition of some questions.

3.5.5 Validity

Validity is defined as accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences, which are based on the study results (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). Validity can also be defined as the degree to which results obtained from an analysis of data actually represents the phenomena under study. According to Borg and Gall (1989), instrument validity is the degree to which the test measures what it purports to study. According to Borg and Gall (1989), validity of instruments is improved through expert judgment. As such, assistance was sought from the supervisors. Any ambiguities in the instruments were rectified according to results from the pilot respondents.

3.5.6 Reliability

The instruments were administered to the pilot respondents and scored manually. One week following the first administration, the same instruments were administered to the same respondents and the responses scored manually. A comparison of answers from the two administrations was made. A Pearson’s Product Moment formula for the test re-test was employed to compute the correlation coefficient in order to establish the extent to which the contents of the instruments were consistent in eliciting the same responses every time the instruments were administered. A correlation coefficient of 0.75 was
established which was considered high enough to judge the instruments as reliable for the study.

3.6.1 Logistical and Ethical Considerations

After Kenyatta University gave the researcher authority to go to the field through a letter after a successful proposal presentation, she obtained a research permit from the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education (National Council for Science and Technology). The researcher sought further authority from the District Education Officers (DEOs) and District Commissioners (D.C.s) of both Embu North (Manyatta) and Embu East (Runyenjes) sub-counties to visit the institutions. The researcher then visited the sampled institutions for establishment of rapport and made appointments with respondents. The respondents were informed on the intentions of the study and assured of confidentiality.

3.6.2 Data Collection

The researcher started with the furthest sampled school which was in Embu North Sub-County. Thus, she visited S.A, Manyatta integrated primary school which had HI learners. The researcher held a one-on-one focus group with the learners and parents of those learners. The two discussions were held separately. A one-on-one interview was held with the head teacher. However, the questionnaires for the teachers were given out to the three sampled teachers and were collected after one week.

Having done away with Embu North Sub-county, the researcher went to Embu East Sub-County where the other three sampled schools were located she first visited Nthagaiya integrated primary school where there was a VI learner. She had a discussion with the girl, her guardian, but separately, and then distributed the questionnaire to the three
teachers which were collected later on after one week. However, the one-on-one interview with the head teacher was not possible the same day as he was absent. The researcher went back the following day after being assured by the deputy head teacher that he (head teacher) would be present. True to his (Deputy) word, the head teacher was in and, therefore, I was able to conduct the interview.

3.6.3 Actual Data Collection

This section gives an account of how the data collection instruments were used. A research assistant was engaged in the process.

3.6.3.1 Questionnaires

Teachers were served with the questionnaires, and then the researcher discussed the issue at hand and agreed with them on how to fill the questionnaires. The researcher assured the respondents that it was not a test and, therefore, they should respond as honestly as possible. The filled questionnaires were collected by the researcher after one week.

3.6.3.2 Interview Schedule

The researcher met the respondents; (head teachers) introduced herself, established rapport and agreed on the date and time of the interviews prior to the exercise. The researcher employed a one-on-one interview with the informants. During the interview, the researcher asked the respondents to respond to the questions as honestly as possible and assured them that the information gathered would be confidential and would be used solely for research purposes.
3.6.3.3 Focus Group Discussion

Focus group discussions (FGD) were carried out with the seventeen girls with disabilities and seventeen parents who had children with disabilities in the sampled schools. During the FGD, the researcher established rapport, assured the respondents of confidentiality, importance of the information being sought and the need to answer the questions honestly. The research assistant recorded the discussion by way of note taking. The discussions were held separately for both parents and learners for every sampled institution.

3.7 Data Analysis

Qualitative data derived from interviews and FGDs was thematically analyzed. Descriptive analysis on quantitative data was performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Both frequencies and respective percentages were generated on variables from the interview that were proposed to influence enrolment rates, retention rates for girls with disabilities. Peil (1995) observed that percentages were easier to understand than the complex inferential statistics. Narrative passages, tables and pie charts were then used to convey the findings of the analysis.

3.8 CONCLUSION

The chapter outlined aspects of research design and methodology as outlined in the introduction section. The next chapter presents presentation of findings, interpretation and discussion.
CHAPTER FOUR
PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results and discussion of the findings of the study. The purpose of the study was to identify factors that affect enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in integrated primary schools in Embu County. The study was to further explore possible interventions that could be employed to mitigate the situation at hand. The respondents in this study were a set of sampled head teachers, teachers, learners and parents of girls with disabilities in the sampled schools. Questionnaires, interview schedules and focus group discussion methods were used in the data collection. The findings were reported in three categories namely the socio-economic, socio-cultural and school-related factors. Qualitative data was thematically analyzed while quantitative data derived from questionnaires was descriptively analyzed using frequencies and percentages.

4.2 Parents’ Background Information

4.2.1 Number of Parents Interviewed by Gender.

Table 4.1: Number of Parents Interviewed by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2. Types of Families.

**Figure 4.1: Types of Families Interviewed**

The parents interviewed 10 (60%) were married, 4 (21%) separated, single (never married) (7%) divorced (7%), and widowed 5%. (Figure 4.1).

4.2.3. Parents’ Education Levels

**Table 4.2: Parents Education Levels.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education  (N=17)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings on the education level of the parents showed that none of the parents had post secondary education. Majority of the parents (53%) had primary education level while 5(27%) had secondary education and 3 (20%) had no education at all as shown in
(Table 4.2). This reveals that illiteracy level in this region is high and therefore the fruits of education may not be known to many parents (Table 4.2).

4.2.4 Parents’ Levels of Income

Table 4.3: Income Generating Activities for Parents of Girls with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employments (Formal)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Worker</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The income generating activities for the parents of girls with disabilities were established that, 8 (46%) do farming, 1 (7%) in business, 3 (20%) in formal employment and 5 (27%) in casual Labor. The findings indicates that insignificant number of parents of the girls with disabilities had no formal employment and therefore relied mainly on low income from peasant farming, small business and working in the neighbours’ farms as casuals. Such income is not enough to sustain basic domestic requirements like, food, medical expenses and school fees (Table 4.3).

4.3 Factors Influencing Enrolment And Retention Of Girls With Disabilities In Schools

The study sought to establish the causes of low enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in schools.
4.3.1 Parent Analysis

Parents, 7 (100%) concurred that their level of education, occupation and income were the major factors influencing participation of girls with disabilities in school. Parents with high levels of education struggled to ensure that their children attain better levels of education. They also understood benefits of education. Parents with professional occupations like teaching, masons, and doctors had stable income and could pay school fees for their children. This establishment is in line with an earlier finding by Tyler (1977) that educated parents enrolled their children in school, encouraged them to study by availing relevant and adequate learning materials such as books and ensured completion of their education due to their high income levels, while the case was not the same for the socio-economically poor parents. Thus, in order to provide equity and quality to all regardless of any kind of social status, the government should make Special Needs Education free in totality.
4.3.2 Poverty

Table 4.4: Rates of Children Given Education Priority when Family Resources were Inadequate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poverty greatly hindered parents from taking their children to school even when they were of school going age. It was established that, 12 (73%) parents indicated strongly that, when resources were scarce, education of children without disabilities and especially boys would be considered first while 3 (20%) would consider girls with disabilities. However, as indicated in (Table 4.4), 1 (7%) would consider all children equally at whatever level of resources. The reason for giving boys preference was the belief that girls would leave the parents and get married, while boys would remain in the home to assist and take care of the parents in their old age. A study carried out by Chege & Sifuna (2006) cited the same. The fact that only seven percent (7%) of parents treated all children equally shows that a lot of advocacy is required to change their attitudes towards education for all categories of girls.
4.3.3 Household Chores

Table 4.5: Involvement in Household Chores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involved</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Involved</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the poverty levels of the parents, 14 (85%) were involved in household chores as compared to 3 (15%) who were not. The study established that 7 (42%) of parents did not enroll girls with disabilities deliberately but instead left them at home to do household chores and guard homes as they went about their daily activities. The reason given for not enrolling the girls with disabilities in school was that culturally the place of a woman was at home. It was believed that, girls without disabilities would get married while those with disabilities rarely got married since they would not make good wives. This kind of belief cuts across many continents as these results are similar to findings of a study by ILO Ability Asia, (2004) which found that home is the woman’s place. Those who would consider those with disabilities to school based it on the fact that education would make them become self-reliant.
4.3.4 Community Attitude Towards Girls with Disabilities

Table 4.6: Community Attitude towards Girls with Disabilities and their Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>GWD (N = 17)</th>
<th>PARENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage %</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study established that 11 (64%) of parents were of the view that the community had negative attitudes towards girls with disabilities while 6 (36%) viewed them positively. The study showed that the community had negative attitudes towards parents of girls with disabilities. However 5 (31%) of the parents said the community had positive attitudes towards them (Table 4.6). Those who had negative attitudes perceived girls with disabilities and their parents as outcasts, useless or hopeless as illustrated by studies of Barasa (1997) and Otiato (1996) which reported the negative attitudes by communities towards disability. This study shows that, 10 years down the line the Embu community still holds on such negative attitudes.
4.3.5: Community Perception towards Girls with Disabilities and their Parents

Table 4.7: Community Perception towards Girls with Disabilities and their Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Their parents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N= 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcasts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useless</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeless</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in (Table 4.7) clearly show that the perception of the community towards girls with disabilities and their parents was very negative. Majority of the parents interviewed 10 (59%) said that girls with disabilities are viewed as outcasts whose parents had sinned hence they were punished through curse 9 (50%), witchcraft 5 (30%) or taboo 3 (20%) compared to 12 (71%) by the community as well as their own parents. A third of the parents 5 (29%) perceived the girls as useless. A few 2 (12%) felt that the girls were hopeless while 5 (29%) felt the same for the parents.
Table 4.8: Reasons for Negative Perceptions on Girls with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason (N = 17)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curse</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchcraft</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taboo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results showed that 9(50%) of the respondents believed in curses, 5(30%) in witchcraft and 3(20%) in taboos. The negative attitude towards disability was greatly seen to have influence on the participation of girls with disabilities in school.

4.3.6: Parents Perception about themselves for being Parents of Girls with Disabilities

Table 4.9: Parents Perception about themselves for being Parents of Girls with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling (N = 17)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useless and worthless</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings of this study showed that about half 9 (53%) of the parents felt embarrassed of the situation they were in while 8(47%) felt useless and worthless.
4.3.7 Impact from the Parents own Negative Perception on Education of Girls with Disabilities

Table 4.10: Impact from the Parents own Negative Perception on Education of Girls with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hid the children for fear of ridicule</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled the children in school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewed the children as useless and worthless</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The negative perceptions impacted negatively on education of girls with disabilities and made some parents 11 (62%) to shy off and hid the children with disabilities from the public since they feared ridicule, 4 (23%) enrolled their girls with disabilities in school while 3 (15%) decided not to take them to school because they viewed them as useless and worthless. Unless communities and parents change their attitudes and appreciate that disability is not inability, the enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in schools will remain low. Muigai (1998), reported that girls with disabilities were hidden from the public and women with disabilities were absent from community activities such as social gatherings and political meetings.
4.3.8: Place of Women in the Society

Table 4.11: Place of Women in the Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place (N = 17)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home attendant</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the home</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this study established that the place of women in Embu community was considered in the home as shown by 12 (69%) respondents, 5 (31%) felt that the trend was changing whereby today some women are being involved in activities outside the home such as formal employment, political involvement, business among others (Table 4.11).

From these findings an Affirmative action may be introduced to compel parents with girls with disabilities to enroll them in school when they attain school age.

4.3.9: Security of Girls with Disabilities on the Way to, at and from School

Table 4.12: Security of Girls with Disabilities to, at and from School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place (N = 17)</th>
<th>Type of Insecurity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To and from school</td>
<td>Defilement /rape</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At School</td>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parents highly attributed the participation of girls with disabilities in primary education on safety. About 15 (90%) that parents felt the girls with disabilities were insecure because they risked being defiled while on the way to and from school while 2 (10%) feared other forms of abuse like harassment or bulling (Table 4.12). The girls were also not safe in school as revealed by the parents interviewed. (Table 4.12) shows that 12(67%) were sexually harassed while 5 (33%) complained of the girls with disabilities being bullied in school. The sexual harassment was associated with male teachers, school boys and other male workers. However, bulling was mainly done by male pupils.

4.3.10. Distance Between Home and School

Distance to school was one of the concerns by 60% of parents as a factor affecting enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities. A number of parents (27%) attributed it to communication, 7% type of school and 6% to severity of disabilities. This was because most of the integrated programmes were quite distanced from one another ranging from two (2 km) to ten (10km).

Some of the girls with disabilities could not walk to and from school alone and they had to be accompanied by their parents or siblings. Parents found it difficult to take their children to and from school everyday due to the fact that they still needed to fend for the family. This meant that those girls who lacked someone to accompany them to school remained at home.

The above finding concurs with earlier studies carried out by Hertz (1991) who established that in Ghana and Egypt, long distances to primary schools deterred girls’ participation in education but not boys.
Another study done by UNICEF (1998) in six focus districts (Nairobi, Baringo, Mombasa, Garrisa, Kwale and Kisumu) established that the proximity and access to primary school was a predetermining factor to participation in primary education. If this was happening to the “abled” then the case would be worse for GWDs.

The study showed that, some areas of Embu County had, and still have communication hitches. This was due to the fact that most roads were not all weather friendly and especially during the wet season. This meant that even where the parents could afford fare for their children, there were no vehicles making them to remain at home.

Bringing schools closer to villages will reduce distance covered and encourage more potential girls with disabilities to enroll. Parents who were economically endowed took their girls with disabilities to boarding schools and small homes.
4.3.11 Policy Guidelines Awareness

Table 4.13: Policy Guidelines Awareness by Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness (N = 17)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis showed that only 7 (39%) of the parents were aware of the policy guidelines in the education of learners with special needs as compared to 10 (61%) who were not aware (Table 4.13). This lack of awareness on policy guidelines regarding education of girls with disabilities could be a major contributor for low enrolment of girls with disabilities who have attained school going age. Of parents interviewed, 9 (54%) confessed that they were aware of cases of girls with disabilities of school going age but were not in school. Educating girls with disabilities will enable them get jobs and become more reliant and less burden to their parents. Some educated girls with disabilities are judges, lawyers, teachers, preachers among other professionals e.g. Cabinet Secretary Wakhungu, Judge Mumbi Ngungi.
4.3.12. Reasons given by Parents why some Parents’ of Girls with Disabilities of School Going Age do not enroll then in School.

Table 4.14: Reasons for not taking Girls with Disabilities of School Going Age to School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason (N = 17)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shame and ridicule</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useless and hopeless</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reasons given as to why the girls with disabilities of school going age were not in school were diverse. Majority 10 (59%) cited fear of shame and ridicule due to the negative attitude towards disability by the community, 3 (18%) ignorance, 2 (12%) viewed girls with disabilities as useless and hopeless hence no need to educate them. These parents need to undergo some seminars to realize that children with disabilities are still useful. They should be given some examples of the successful persons in life despite having disabilities. According to (Table 4.14), some parents 2 (11%) attributed their decision not to educate girls with disabilities to level of poverty in the area. Education facilities for girls with disabilities should be free so that even poor parents can access them for their children.
4.4. Learners’ Analysis Results

4.4.1 Family Characteristics

Table 4.15: Learners Family Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of family (N=17)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monogamous</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polygamous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of learners interviewed 11 (63%), came from monogamous families compared to 5 (32%) single parent family and 1 (5%) polygamous family. Polygamous families are sometime unstable and can affect children education; however such family setups are rare in Embu. Most of the learners 15 (89%) had their parents alive, while only 2 (11%) had no parents.

4.4.2 Siblings with Disabilities of School, going age and are or not in School

Table 4.16: Children with Disabilities and are or not in School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Siblings with disabilities of school</th>
<th>Siblings with disabilities and are in school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=17</td>
<td>F going age</td>
<td>F are in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the learners interviewed 4 (24%) had siblings with disabilities and half of these siblings were of school going age although only 13 (76%) of them were enrolled in school and 4(24%) of the siblings were not (Table 4.16). It is rarely in parents mind that
children with disabilities are entitled to education because they are not viewed as normal 
human beings and that is why the school going age is not detected when they attained it.

However, those learners with siblings of school going age and were not in school were 
asked the reasons behind it, they gave varying reasons. Most 12(70%) cited poverty as 
the main reason, that the parents could not afford assistive devices for the severely 
handicapped such as wheelchairs for the PH, glasses for the low vision, hearing moulds 
for the HI among others. Again, the same parents could not afford to take their children 
to schools with boarding facilities due to the poverty in question. However 30% of 
learners interviewed said they did not know why they were not being taken to school.
4.4.3 Unfair Treatment in the Family

Figure 4.2: Level of Unfair Treatment of GWD by Families

Learner’s analysis further showed that children with disabilities are not treated equally as other children. Of the interviewed learners 7(42%) indicated that parents of children with disabilities did not give them the same treatment with the other children. Those with disabilities were treated unfairly. The unfair treatment included abuse such as, name calling consisting of 6(38%) of the respondents), home guarding and household chores contributing 4(25%) and 3(19%) respectively. On discrimination, 18% of the learners cited that when parents bought clothes for the family, those with disabilities would either not be bought any at all, bought fewer and or of low quality. The level of discrimination on children with disabilities as reported by learners in this study is very saddening. This concurs with Barasa (1997) and Otiato (1996) study that people with disabilities were seen as cursed, demon possessed and mad, which led to their discrimination. So if disability is viewed by community as madness then you cannot expect parents to take mad boys and girls to school. Such belief should be corrected.
In fact, one girl lamented,

“In fact, one girl lamented, "Baba ambitaga murigo." (My father calls me a load.)

Another one said,

“Bambitaga kirimo.” (They call me a fool.)

One of the teachers narrated how one of the girls in her class had forced the mother to accompany her to school in order to report her (the mother) to the teacher, that the mother and the rest of the family members used to call her “Mundu wa ngoma.” (A mad person).

4.4.4 Disability and Participation in Education

Table 4.17: Disability as a Hindrance to Participation in School for Girls with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindrance (N = 17)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had to be taken to school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech problem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing problem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse (lack of concentration)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not able to perform extracurricular activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many 15 (86%) of the learners who participated in the FGD felt that disabilities hindered participation in education. They cited cases as: disabled children had to be taken to school (15%), others could not walk long distances (23%), some had speech problems (15%), while others had hearing problems (15%), were continually abused hence lacked
concentration (19%) and could not perform some extra-curriculum activities (13%) (Table 4.17) Facilitation in terms of provision of wheelchairs, hearing aids and other aiding equipment depending on type of disabilities are ways forward to boost enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in school. It is not practical for members of the family members to be supporting the girls with disabilities to school daily, thus affecting the levels of enrolment and retention in education.

4.4.5 Education of Women with Disabilities

Table 4.18: Are there well educated women with disabilities in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learners interviewed 12 (72%) pointed out that there were no well educated women with disabilities in the community while the rest, (28%) did not know.

This is because of the history of discrimination and negative attitude by the community towards people with disabilities. If girls with disabilities were not taken to school in the past then you cannot expect to have a learned woman at present.

However, if I was to give my own opinion as of today, I would say, there are with examples of people like cabinet secretary (CS) Wakhungu, Honourable Sinyo (former MP), among many more.
Table 4.19: Reasons for Lack of Well Educated Women with Disabilities in the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents saw no value for educating women with disabilities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useless/No marriage hope</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons given for the impediments were that parents saw no value for educating girls especially girls with disabilities and therefore, never took them to school (75%). Girls with disabilities were seen as useless because they would not get married (17%). However, (8%) said they did not know why women with disabilities were not well educated (Table 4.19). The negative attitude towards people with disabilities was more pronounced in the past compared to now. So the chances of getting learned persons with disabilities are quite rare.

The problem of female education is worldwide and worse for those with disabilities. A study carried out by ILO Ability Asia, (2004), observed that the woman’s place in Asia was in the home and therefore, education for girls and women with disabilities was seen as a distant dream, because they could not be wives, mothers, and homemakers. Thus, the findings of the current study are therefore in agreement with the earlier study carried out in Asia. A lot of community sensitization is required to demystify the belief that girls and women with disabilities are worthless.
4.4.6 Income Generating Activities of Parents of GWD as Reported by Learners

Table 4.20: Income Generating Activities to meet Children’s Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock sale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learners who took part in the study said their parents met their educational needs through income generated from, farming enterprise 12 (72%), engaging in casual work 3 (16%), doing some business 1 (6%) and income from sale of livestock (6%) (Table 4.20) a report which is similar to what parents reported. The farming enterprise which actually is the leading economic activity in terms of percentage, a large proportion of it is done on subsistence level while the small percentage grown for commercial, the revenue fetched from it cannot meet the school fees requirements and purchase devices such as wheelchairs, glasses, hearing aids and white cane for the girls with disabilities. So parents of children with disabilities have no resources to cater for their children’s school fees and other necessities. This finding is in agreement with that of Nkinyangi (1980) who observed that the inability of the family to pay the cost of education led to early withdrawals from school and that girls and especially girls with disabilities were the major victims. However, Embu being an agriculturally rich area, the finding contradicts an earlier study by Eshiwani (1985) that high enrolment and retention rates in education were/are found in the agriculturally rich areas. It is not so for girls with disabilities in
Embu County. Education of children with special needs should be made free to enable them attain the same standing in education with their counterparts, that is the “abled”.

4.4.7 Teachers Participation

4.4.7.1 Time Wastages by Teachers

Learners (44%) reported that teachers wasted a lot of their (learners) class time. Many times teachers were not in class during their time allocated for various lessons. The level of participation by teachers in school can indirectly influence the learner’s participation. When teachers’ participation is below standard it encourages absenteeism among pupils, pull out or even changing to other better schools. A study by UNICEF (1998) observed that teachers passed time in the staffroom while classes remained untaught or elsewhere either chatting or doing other things and the syllabus remained uncovered. This is in concurrence with the current finding. Teachers may lack commitment due to lack of motivation for example, poor remuneration that leads to laxity and also due to low personnel turn over. Motivated teachers are satisfied and, therefore, enjoy their work hence becoming more committed and effective hence motivating their students too Craig (1992).
4.4.8 Special Unit Teacher Involvement in Teaching the Regular Classes

Table 4.21: What happens when a Special Unit Teacher is teaching the Regular Classes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happening</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left alone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told to play outside</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told to go home</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joined regular classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left with another teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was established from learners (67%) that the arrangements in the schools was that, special unit teachers also taught the regular classes. So when the special unit teacher was not in class (sometimes teaching the regular classes), the learners with disabilities in the special unit were left alone 5 (30%), told to play outside 5 (30%), told to go home 2 (10%), asked to join the regular classes 2 (10%) or left with another teacher 3 (20%) (Table 4.21) To some extent this is discrimination, it is raw deal to girls with disabilities because is like they can only be taught after those without disability have been taught. This can contribute to low retention as girls with disabilities are likely to pull out when teachers discriminate upon them or when they are left idle.

From the findings, the government should employ and deploy enough teachers to all integrated schools to enable the special unit teachers remain in the units throughout without having to go to the regular classes leaving the units unattended. Again, from the experience gained from field work as I collected the data, teachers who handle the children with special needs do a lot and deserve better remuneration. It is good to
recognize the government’s effort in motivating them by increasing their special duty allowance but still, they deserve more at least 50% pensionable allowances.

4.4.9 School Environment for Girls with Disabilities

Most girls with disabilities 10 (59%) were happy with the school environment, terming it as disability friendly as compared to 7 (41%) who felt otherwise. Basing on the majority response, it was concluded that the environment of the schools was disability friendly hence conducive for their learning. However, 41% respondents who were not happy with environment is not a small number to be ignored. It shows that the environment though conducive to some extent, there were some areas not favourable to girls with disabilities with certain levels of disabilities and, therefore, a need to address the unfavorable areas. Sessional Paper No. 1 (2005) noted that the challenges relating to access and equity in education were inappropriate infrastructure, inadequate facilities and lack of equipment. School environment should be conducive to all to prevent frustration and eventual drop out of school.

4.4.10 Distance to School from Home

According to learners interviewed, schools were situated at average distance of three kilometers from the pupil’s homes (standard deviation of two kilometers). The furthest learners (although very few) were ten (10) kilometers away from the schools. Just like parents report, the long distances to schools are challenges to girls with disabilities who have to walk or be taken to school by parents. This finding is in agreement with earlier studies by UNICEF (1998) which observed that the proximity and access to primary education was a predetermining factor to participation in primary education. Another study by Hertz (1991), noted that in Ghana and Egypt long distance to primary schools
deterred girls’ participation in education. Integrated primary schools should be brought closer to the learners for better achievements in education.

### 4.4.11 Security of Girls with Disabilities on the way to, and from School

Table 4.22: Types of Insecurity faced by Girls with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danger (N = 17)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug Abusers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Rivers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to learners interviewed 10 (58%), it was not safe to walk alone to and from school as compared to 7 (42%) who thought otherwise. The dangers expressed were: fear of being attacked by drug abusers on the way 11 (67%). The drugs included miraa, alcohol and bhang. The other 6 (33%) feared crossing rivers (Table 4.22). Security of these girls to and from school was also a contributing factor to their participation in education. Parents were not sure whether to leave the girls with disabilities to go to school on their own, whether to accompany them, or whether they should remain at home altogether. The government should set up mechanisms to improve road security by involving area administration, police and the community itself and providing disability supportive equipment such as wheelchairs, white canes and glasses for such learners. The insecurity factor influenced participation in education. Parents were not sure whether to leave the girls with disabilities to go to school on their own, whether to accompany them or whether to let them remain at home altogether. As a matter of fact, one of the girl respondents lamented,”
“One day as I was going home from school, I came across a man walking towards the opposite direction. After passing each other, I was shocked to hear myself grabbed and suddenly knocked down to the ground. When I looked back, I realized it was the same man who I had come across earlier on. I tried to shout but he gagged me. He removed my pants and raped me”.

*Another one said,*

> “Nie ndithiicaga cukuru kuraura.” “I don’t go to school when it rains.”

*Asked why she said,*

> Niundu runji rwicuraga ngaremwa ni kuringa.” “Because the river swells up and I am unable to cross.”

### 4.4.12 Bullying of Girls with Disabilities in Schools.

**Table 4.23: Bullying in School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study established that in the 4(100%) sampled schools, 8(47%) girls with disabilities were bullied or sexually harassed as reported by learners. However, some learners 9 (53%), did not report any cases of bullying. The girls were harassed by the boys (88%) and school workers (12%) according to learner’s analysis. However, whenever the harassment cases were reported to the school management, the administration responded positively. The culprits were either punished 10(60%), cautioned against it 1(7%) or created awareness 6(33%) on living in harmony with girls with disabilities. This is a good indication that management has set up mechanisms for improving retention of girls with disabilities through penalty imposed on bullying offenders in schools.

4.4.13 Reaction of School Administration on Bullying.

Table 4.24: School Administration Response to Bullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punished</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautioned against it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created awareness on the need to live in harmony with GWD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.14 Rating of School Administration by Learners.

Table 4.25: How do you rate your School Administration in terms of the way they handle your issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite Good</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Compassion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.15 Evaluation of Teachers by Learners

Table 4.26: Time Wasting By Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response (N = 17)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.27: Liking/Disliking of School and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The administration treatment for girls with disabilities was termed as quite good as reported by 12 (71%), while some termed it fair 2 (11%). A few learners 3 (18%) however reported that school administration had no compassion toward girls with disabilities. In general administration should be commended for its healthy relationship with girls with disabilities and for protecting them through penalizing those who attempt to bully them. Retention will be high in this kind of environment.

Learners 11 (67%) had a feeling that their teachers wasted a lot of class time in the staffroom as compared to 6 (33%) who said that their teachers don’t waste time (Table 4.26). This (67%) concurs with an earlier study by UNICEF (1998) that teachers wasted pupil’s time in the staffroom chatting or doing other things while the classes
remained untaught and syllabus uncovered. Issues of teachers wasting time need to be fully addressed. Low retention can be triggered by idleness in class when pupils are left unattended.

However, 13 (77%) of them generally liked their school and their teachers compared to 4 (23%) who did not (Table 4.27). The reasons for liking their schools and the teachers were cited: pupils and teachers in the schools were friendly (60%); pupils were counseled to love their school and the teachers (40%). For those who did not like their schools and the teachers, the reason given was that some teachers did not know how to handle some disability cases such as the HI. So deploying teachers able to handle Hearing Impairment (HI) will improve attachment between teachers and girls with disabilities in school and this will improve both enrolment and retention.

4.4.15 Learners Policy Guidelines Awareness

Table 4.28: Policy Awareness and School Going Age and are not in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response (N = 17)</th>
<th>Policy Awareness</th>
<th>Awareness of girls with disabilities of school going age and are not in school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About 8 (47%) of learners were aware of the government policy on the rights of children, education included. The remaining 9 (53%) were not aware. (Table 4.28) shows that majority 11 (67%) of the learners were aware of girls with disabilities of school going age and were not in school and 6 (33%) did not know. More time for
advocating government policy on the rights of children, education included should be created in schools. The learners can be good ambassadors in the villages to make policy known to their parents and the community who will be obliged to enroll girls with disabilities in school after having known girls with disabilities rights and education benefits.

Table 4.29: Reasons for not being in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shame and ridicule</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability hindrance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Teachers’ Analysis

4.5.1 Teachers’ Characteristics

Table 4.30: Teachers Characteristics by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender (N = 12)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.31: Areas of Training for Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Specialization (N = 12)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Ed.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Different reasons were given as to why the girls in question were not in school. Hidden from the public by parents for fear of shame and ridicule 10 (58%), poverty 3(18%) and disability hindrance 4 (24%) as shown in (Table 4.29). The high percentage of fear of shame and ridicule is in agreement with the presentations made to the UN Experts Seminar on Women and Disability, Vienna 1990, that in many countries was still the norm that a girl with disability would be hidden at home (Dawn Ontario Fact Sheet, 2004). Other studies are in agreement with the finding are those by Barasa (1997) and Otiato (1996) which observed that people with disabilities were seen as cursed, demon possessed and mad leading to their discrimination. This impacted negatively on the family and resulted in hiding the children from public to avoid ridicule. This displays the negative attitude by communities towards persons with disabilities which should be eradicated to allow parents to appreciate all children equally and provide education to all without discrimination.

The areas of specialization as per teacher’s training in the sampled schools were as follows: MH 1(19%); PH 4(33%) and Inclusive Education 7 (58%) as indicated in (Table 4.31). The substantial number of teachers trained in special needs shows that schools in the areas have capacity to handle girls with disabilities. So the low enrolment and retention could not be attributed to lack of trained teachers but could be because of other factors like attitude, poverty and insecurity. Improper distribution of teachers could also be a contributing factor as observed by the MOE and NCCK education workshop (1998) that some teachers trained to handle the deaf were posted to special schools/units for the blind.
The study involved 4 (31%) male and 8 (69%) female teachers. Majority 9 (71%) were reported to have been trained to handle children with special needs (SNE). Only 3 (29%) of these teachers were not trained in Special Needs Education as in (Table 4.31).

4.5.2 Enrolment of Girls with Disabilities in Integrated Primary Schools

The average enrolment of children with disabilities in the schools according to interviewed teachers was 13 for boys and 6 for girls. The enrolment for girls was a half the enrolment for boys. Reasons for the low enrolment for girls as cited by teachers were as follows: safety, neglect and rejection, distance and poverty. Some of the teachers 4(36%) said that girls with disabilities were not safe on their way to and from school and also at school. They cited sexual abuse and bullying as the major insecurities for girls with disabilities. Most teachers 8 (70%) cited neglect and rejection by parents and community as the major impediment to enrolment of girls with disabilities. However, 8 (64%) of the teachers asserted that girls with disabilities were safe in school. Teachers reported crossing of rivers as a minor insecurity for both boys and girls. The average distance covered by the learners to and from school was 2.9 km according to the teachers. Thus, 8 (64%) of the teachers felt that distance had a lot of influence on the participation of children with disabilities in school, especially girls as opposed to 4 (36%) who felt otherwise. Three kilometers distance is quite long for girls with disabilities. It can only be possible with help of equipments like wheelchair or being taken to school by family member or staying in school. Without these measures, enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities would be a nightmare. Almost all teachers 11 (93%) asserted that majority of the parents of children with disabilities were poor hence they could not afford some necessities, for example, assistive devices such as wheel chairs for PH, glasses and white cane for VI, hearing aids for HI or even transport for children with moderate and severe disabilities.
4.5.3 Cultural Factors that affect Enrolment of Girls with Disabilities in Schools

Table 4.32: Cultural Factors that affected Enrolment of Girls with Disabilities in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor (N = 12)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignorance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of value attachment to education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety/security</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 12 100

According to the teachers involved in the study, cultural factors that affected participation of girls with disabilities in education were: lack of value attachment to education of girls with disabilities, 4 (30%), safety stood at 5 (43%) and ignorance was rated 3 (27%) as indicated in (Table 4.32). Negative attitudes towards girls with disabilities were an impediment to enrolment since the community had not seen the need to educate girls. Rape at which was 80% for girls with disabilities was cited as the major cause of insecurity. Any effort to address insecurity on the way and at school for girls with disabilities and positive change by community on perception towards disability will definitely improve enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in schools.

4.5.4 Economic Factors that affect Enrolment of Girls with Disabilities in School

Table 4.33: Economic Activities of Parents of Girls with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity (N = 17)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 17 100
Poverty among parents was cited by teachers (58%) as the main economic factor that affected enrolment of girls with disabilities in school. They reported that majority of the parents lacked money for basic needs especially those with large families as compared to those with small families and therefore could not afford to enroll girls with disabilities in school. Thus the smaller the family size the lesser the level of poverty. They noted that the higher the level of education, occupation and income the higher the chances of enrolment in school and vice versa: The same findings were observed by earlier studies carried out by other scholars notably Tyler (1977), Anderson (1967), Juma (1994) among others. As established in this study, parents of girls with disabilities have low levels of education. Only 27% of the girls with disabilities had secondary education and none of them had post-secondary education. Majority of the parents of girls with disabilities 12 (73%) had primary education or none at all. This resulted in poverty low socio-economic status despite their engagement in economic activities such as peasant farming at 16 (93%) or business 1 (7%) as shown in (Table 4.33). Thus, as much as some of the parents would like to have their children in school, they had no funds to support this idea. The government should economically empower all its citizenry and make special needs education wholly free to enable equal access to education to all.

4.5.5 School Related Factors Contributing to Low Enrolment of Girls with Disabilities in Integrated Primary Schools

4.5.5.1 School Environment

Table 4.34: Assessment of School Environment by Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Status in Schools</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this study 9 (71%) of teachers felt that school environment was friendly to girls with disabilities as opposed to 3 (29%) who felt it was not friendly. The only issue raised by teachers in the schools was lack of essential amenities such as special toilets and pathways for the PH. Some degrees of physical disabilities require special facilities like toilets and chairs modified to their comfort without which these parents hesitate to enroll their children in school where such facilities lack.

4.5.5.2 Teaching/Learning Resources

Table 4.35: Assessment of Teaching and Learning Materials by Teachers in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Materials</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enough</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that 6(50%) of teachers did not have enough teaching and learning materials. They therefore felt that this negatively influenced enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in schools. However, 6 (50%) felt that the available materials already in schools were enough though not in good condition as illustrated in (Table 4.35). However, the half that responded that there were enough materials though not in good condition contradicts an earlier study/statement by the 8th Development Plan (1988) which stated that the government does not provide specialized equipment essential for the habilitation, rehabilitation, teaching and learning blaming it on shortage of funds and cost of such materials and especially for the HI and VI such as speech Laboratories, audiological equipment, magnifiers, white canes and personnel such as speech therapists to name but a few. Another study that contradicts those teachers who
responded in the affirmative is of Otiato (1996) that library services for persons with disabilities were absolute.

Thus, the government should source for funds and provide all the necessities required in full provision of special needs education as it develops human capital since it prepares those who are most likely to be dependents to become self-reliance (Sessional Paper No. 1, 2005).

Learning materials like chalks, text and exercise books, manila papers among others are available. What teachers demanded was replacing those that are old and increasing the number to accommodate all. Teaching materials are not as much a problem as compared to supportive facilities and personnel among girls with disabilities.

4.5.5.3 School Administration

Table 4.36: Reasons for Administration not being to handle Girls with Disabilities in the Schools as reported by Teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over relied on special meetings resolutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacked knowledge on special cases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greed for money</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of all the teachers interviewed 6 (50%) condemned the administration saying that it was not effective in handling children with special needs especially girls with disabilities. The reasons given as to why they thought that the school administration was not effective in handling special needs matters were rated as follows: 33% were of the
view that the administration over relied on special meeting resolutions for various
decision making, while 33% felt the administration lacked knowledge on special cases
and 34% said the administration had greed for money as shown in (Table 4.36). This
meant that when the administration received money from the government, donors or any
other sources for improvement of special needs education (SNE) in their schools; they
usually spent it on other things rather than living up to the expectations of the money
providers’ objectives. It was noted that none of the school administrators sampled for
the study had training in special needs education. There is need for organizing some
seminars for school heads, parents and school board of governors on special needs
education. Sessional Paper No. 1, 2005 emphasised the importance of providing
guidelines and training to all policy implementers and stakeholders for faster and
inclusive take off.

4.5.5.4 Awareness of Policy Guidelines

Table 4.37: Policy Guideline Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response (N = 12)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study found that 7(62%) teachers were aware of policy guidelines on the education
of learners with disabilities as opposed to only 5(38%) who were not aware as indicated
in (Table 4.37).
4.5.5.5 School Guidelines Implementation and Awareness of Girls with Disabilities of School Going Age and are not in School

Table 4.38: Awareness of Guidelines’ Implementation and GWD of School Going Age not in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>If school guidelines were implemented</th>
<th>Awareness of girls with disabilities of school-going age and were not in school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, out of the 12 teachers, nine (79%) noted that these guidelines were not being implemented by schools. More than a half of the teachers 7(57%) interviewed said they were aware of cases of girls with disabilities of school-going age who were not enrolled in school as indicated in (Table 4.38). According to Sessional Paper No. 1, 2005, although the education guidelines were in place, they were not clear on the education of girls with disabilities. More policies need to be drafted that address particularly the girls with disabilities.

4.5.5.6: Reasons why Girls with Disabilities of School Going Age were not in School

Table 4.39: Why are Girls with Disabilities of School Going Age not in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N=12</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of ridicule</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of disability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Various reasons were given by teachers as to why girls with disabilities of school going age were not school where 5 (40%), cited fear of ridicule, 5 (40%) poverty and 2 (20%) severe disabilities. Ridicule leads to discrimination of children, Barasa (1997) and Otiato (1996). Community attitude towards disability and poverty level among parents had been reported by all the four categories of respondents (parents, pupils, teachers and head teachers) as major impediments in enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in school. This should therefore form a basis of addressing low enrolment problem in schools for girls with disabilities, especially convincing the community to accept children with disabilities like other children.

4.6 Head Teachers Responses

4.6.1 Schools Biographical Data

On average, the results from the schools sampled as provided by head teachers showed slightly higher enrolment for boys (303) as compared to girls at (291). All the four (4) schools had at least 4 girls with disabilities. That was translated to an average of two percent (2%) of the total number of girls enrolled in schools. The average number of male teachers per school was 4 (25%) compared to 12 (75%) for female teachers. There were more female teachers than male while the school enrolment had more male pupils than female. Why the presence of female teachers had not attracted more girls to enroll than boys was not clear.

4.6.2 Special Education Training

According to the findings, all the 4 schools (100%) had at least 1 teacher trained to handle learners with special needs. Areas of specialization were mental retardation (MH) Learning Disabilities (LD) and Inclusive Education (IE). The head teachers indicated that there were times when they experienced shortage of teachers both for
regular and special needs classes. The head teachers’ information revealed that schools have some capacity to handle all children’s needs and therefore low enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities could not be associated with SNE teachers.

4.6.3: Enrolment of Girls with Disabilities from 2007 to 2009 in Embu

The enrolment of girls with disabilities was 12 in 2007 in the 4 sampled schools. There was a decline of 17% in the enrolment in 2008 whereby only 10 were enrolled as shown in (Figure 4.3) However, in 2009 the number rose to 11 (10%). No reason was given for the sharp decline in enrolment in 2008.

4.6.4 Factors that Influence Enrolment of Girls with Disabilities in School

4.6.4.1 Cultural Factors

Half of the head teachers (50%) pointed out that negative attitudes towards disability both by parents and the community has adversely affected enrolment of girls with disabilities in schools. The negative attitude was due to the causes associated with disability, some of which were cited as witchcraft, curse or taboo. This kind of
community attitude was reported by Barasa (1997) and Otiato (1996) and over ten years later the communities still associate disability with taboos, witchcraft and curses. This contributes to the parents of children with disabilities shying off and hiding their children from public for fear of ridicule. The perception has not changed despite interventions by government, NGOs, churches and ministry of education among others pointing out that disability is not inability.

**Figure 4.4: Socio – Cultural Factors that Influenced Enrolment of Girls with Disabilities in Primary Schools**

4.6.5 Household Chores/Home Guards

Due to negative attitudes towards disability in the community, there was lack of value attached to the education of girls with disabilities. 1(30%) head teacher said that parents of girls with disabilities therefore, let them remain at home and involved them in household Chores as indicated in (Figure 4.4). They were also involved in household chores, including washing utensils, cooking, guarding homes and looking after younger siblings among others. Many studies have shown that parents use their daughters for
household chores at the expense of their education (Chege & Sifuna, 2006). 1(20%) head teacher revealed that the girls with disabilities were just let to stay at home because they were thought to be worthless and useless. The reason given as to why parents considered them worthless and useless was attributed to traditional beliefs that the place of a woman was taking care of the family. The parents of girls with disabilities felt that their girls with disabilities would never be married due to their conditions hence no need to educate them. Change of attitude towards the girl child with disabilities in the community and a change on the perception on cause of disability is the only way forward to improve girls with disabilities enrolment and retention in schools.

4.6.6 Socio-economic Factors Influencing Enrolment of Girls with Disabilities in Primary Schools

4.6.6.1 Poverty as Reported by Head teachers

The head teacher’s analysis showed that parents (80%) of girls with disabilities had not gone beyond primary school education. As noted earlier, their economic activities were only peasant farming and offering some casual Labor in farms. These parents could therefore not afford assistive devices for their children such as wheel chairs and crutches for PH, white cane and glasses for VI and hearing Aids for HI due to their poverty levels.

4.6.7 Other Factors Influencing Low Enrolment of Girls with Disabilities in School

4.6.7.1 Distance to the School

All head teachers were in agreement that the integrated primary schools were located faraway and much distanced from girls with disabilities homes and that those who went to school walked an average distance of 3.4km to and from school. This distance was too
long for a person with severe disabilities and therefore limited girls with disabilities who were potential learners from enrolment. If boarding facilities could be available in schools or any arrangement to transport girls with disabilities to schools or providing them with wheelchairs the problem of long distance will be lighter and this will encourage enrolment and sustain it. This finding is in concurrence with an earlier study by Hertz (1991), that distance deters girls’ participation in education but not boys.

4.6.7.2 Lack of/Poor Distribution of Qualified Personnel

All the four schools in the study had at least one teacher trained to handle children with special education needs as reported by head teachers. This agrees with teachers’ results as reported earlier in this study. However, the areas of specialization did not match the varying types of disabilities in some cases. Those teachers trained in special education were either for MH or LD. This resulted in little or no enrolment for those children suffering from HI, VI, and Emotional Disturbance. By training teachers widely to cover the above areas will encourage more girls with disabilities to enroll because their needs are met and can receive better attention.

4.6.7.3 School Levies

The head teachers reported that parents of children with special needs were required to pay some levies to school when enrolling them. The PH who resided in the small homes were required to pay for boarding facilities and maintenance. Those in special units were also required to pay for meals but, some parents were unable to meet the charges due to their social economic standing. This meant that their children remained at home. As a way out in this situation, the education for children with disabilities will be better if it was made free. This is a vulnerable group which needs maximum support from the parents, community and the government. The government should take responsibility of
providing them with education and other necessary requirements like clothes, wheelchairs, reading glasses, meals and boarding facilities.

4.7 Factors that Influenced Low Retention Rates of Girls with Disabilities in Embu County

The above objective sought to establish factors that influenced low retention rates of girls with disabilities in primary schools although, the data analysis results revealed that there was minimal or no drop out cases. The 4 head teachers sampled reported that when girls with disabilities enrolled in schools, most of them (80%) did not drop out. However a few (20%) dropped out. Retention of girls with disabilities therefore is not a big issue as compared to enrolment. More emphasis on addressing education of girls with disabilities should be put on enrolment because once the girls with disabilities have been enrolled in school, the chances of sustainability in school is high.

4.7.1 Pregnancy

Pregnancy was mentioned by head teachers (80%) as a cause of school drop out for girls and more so girls with disabilities. Some of the pregnancies were as a result of sexual harassment/abuse to and from school, at school and voluntary sex. Voluntary in the sense that these learners come from poor families and can easily be lured with money by their teachers and other school boys or men within the community. Imposing therefore, heavy penalty to the culprits especially those who forcefully impregnates girls with disabilities will be the only way out to improve retention.

4.7.2 Community Attitude Towards Education of Girls with Disabilities

Due to lack of value attached to girls’ education and especially girls with disabilities, the study established that, when parents had scarce resources to meet all their children’s
needs, then the girls with disabilities were the victims. They were either removed from school by their parents to pave way for their ‘abled’ brothers and sisters or they were chased away by the school administration for lack of payment of levies. Once they were chased away, it was established that majority of them did not return to school. All stakeholders for girl’s education should emphasize on the need for equal treatment among children, boys, girls and those with disabilities. Parents’ desire to educate their children should be spread equally among all children. So a lot of advocacy for equality on child treatment is required from all partners including, governments, NGOs, churches and other stakeholders.

4.8 CONCLUSION

The chapter presented the findings from the study and provided ground for drawing conclusion and generating recommendations. The next chapter focuses on Summary, Conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter summarizes results from parents, learners, teachers and head teachers on factors affecting enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in schools. It also draws some conclusions from the reported results and thereafter provides recommendations for future appropriate actions geared towards improving girls with disabilities enrolment and retention in school.

5.2 Summary
5.2.1 Parents’ Education and Enterprises
Education level among parents of the girls with disabilities in this study was found low. Few parents had primary education or secondary education. Even some had no formal education at all. In terms of economic activities, farming, business, formal employment and casual Labor workers were established as the sources of income for the parents in the region. Therefore parents of girls with disabilities were uneducated and also poor. Such factors can contribute negatively to enrolment and retention.

5.2.2 Security of Girls with Disabilities
Security to and from school was reported by parents, learners, teachers and head teachers as not very good for girls with disabilities. Cases of sexual harassment and abuse to and fro and at school were common which has resulted into poor enrolment because of fear by parents and girls with disabilities themselves.
5.2.3 Poverty and Priority Strategies in Embu County

Poverty level among parents of girls with disabilities versus levies demanded by head teachers in schools contributed significantly to low rates of enrolment and retention in schools in the region. Poverty was as a result of low income of parents who lacked good education to secure better paying jobs. The parents who were interviewed said that when resources were scarce, education of children without disabilities and especially boys was given priority. This was echoed by learners and teachers, who cited poverty among parents as the main setback in enrolment of girls with disabilities. According to the head teachers, some parents were unable to meet the charges due to their social economic standing.

5.2.4 Distance to School

According to the findings, learners in the study were of the view that some potential learners lived as far away as 1.5 to 10 km, while the teachers said they lived 1 -5km away and the head teachers felt they lived 2 – 5km away from the potential primary school for enrolment. Long distances combined with disability among these learners posed challenges in their bid to enroll and remain in schools.

5.2.5 Shortage of Teachers and School Environment

Shortages, time wasting and incompetence of some teachers in charge of girls with disabilities were mentioned as factors contributing to low enrolment. School environment was mentioned as another factor affecting enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in schools. According to the findings, the environment in schools was not friendly to girls with disabilities although majority of learners liked their schools and teachers.
5.2.6 Culture and Attitude among Parents and the Community

Negative attitude towards disability by both parents and community as having adversely affected enrolment of girls with disabilities in schools. The community associate disability to witchcraft, curses and taboos. The results showed that community had negative attitude towards girls with disabilities and their parents as well. Some parents shied off and hid the children with disabilities from the public. Therefore, cultural belief attached to disability is one of the factors contributing to low enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in schools.

5.2.7 Unequal Treatment among Children

The unfair treatment included abuse, name calling, home guarding while able brothers and sisters have gone to school. The learners cited that when parents bought clothes for the family, those with disabilities would either not be bought any at all, bought fewer and or of low quality. Unequal treatment among children with and without disabilities is contributing to low enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in schools. Those with disabilities felt discriminated upon and therefore suffered from low self esteem.

5.2.8 Household Chores/Home Guards

Girls with disabilities were involved in household chores at the expense of learning. Parents deliberately did not enroll their daughters with disabilities in school and instead left them at home to do household chores as well as guard homes. Head teachers said that parents of girls with disabilities normally left them at home and involved them in child Labor like washing utensils, cooking, guarding homes, and looking after their younger siblings, among others.
5.2.9 Pregnancies

Pregnancy was a cause of school drop out for girls and so girls with disabilities to some extent while drop out was attributed for early marriage and therefore both thoroughly affects retention in school for girls with disabilities. Some of the pregnancies were as a result of sexual harassment/abuse to and from school, at school and voluntary sex.

5.3 Conclusion

The study established various factors contributing to low enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in schools. The factors were:

(i) Low education status among parents of girls with disabilities
(ii) Insecurity on the way to and at school for girls and women with disabilities
(iii) High level of poverty in the region among parents
(iv) Prioritization of boy child education over girl child education
(v) Long distances to schools making it impractical for girls with disabilities
(vi) Class time wastage and lack of skills by some teachers to handle girls
(vii) Culture and Attitude among parents and community towards disabilities
(viii) Unequal treatment among abled children and those with disability
(ix) Child Labor among girls with disabilities
(x) Pregnancy, some through rape and forced marriages

5.4 Recommendations

5.4.1 Policy Recommendations

There is a need for more intervention to teach and advocate for equality in education access among all children in the community and at household level. There should be some organized learning forum in the community purposely for change of attitude so as to eradicate the community’s perception of disabilities associated with a curse, bad omen
The government may come up with a program to provide facilities like wheelchair and other supportive equipments so as to improve girls with disabilities mobility for them to easily access schools without having to be supported or guided by parents or siblings. Provision of boarding facilities would addressing mobility issues. Affirmative action should be introduced to compel parents with girls with disabilities to enroll them in school when they attain school age.

The girls with disabilities are vulnerable group which needs maximum support from the parents, community and the government. Policies touching on child abuse if reinforced in this region would really protect girls with disabilities and eventually give them opportunities in education. This will address issues raised Sessional Paper No. 1, 2005.

5.4.2 Recommendation for Further Research

The researcher recommends the following:

(i) The same study be carried out in the same location on boys with disabilities.

(ii) The study can also be carried out in different areas or countries.

(iii) The same kind of study can be carried out on other forms of disabilities not covered in this study, such as Learning Disabilities (LD), Emotionally Disturbed among others.

(iv) The study can also be done in institutions of higher learning such as secondary, tertiary and university education levels.


GOK, (1996). Indicators on Girls’ and Women Education; Nairobi Office, UNESCO.


APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

Please note that the information you give will be used for research purposes only and it will be treated with utmost confidentiality. Therefore, you are requested to be as honest as possible.

Sub-county ……………………………………………

School …………………………………………………….

Gender …………………………………………………………………………

1. (a) Are you trained to handle children with special needs education?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

   (b) If yes, specify area of specialization for instance, mentally retarded, visually impaired and so on………………………………………………………………………

   (c) If no, explain how you handle the children………………………………

   (d) What is the total enrolment according to gender?
   Boys…………Girls…………

2. (a) Do you think girls with disabilities are safe in school?
   Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know ☐

   (b) If no, please give reasons………………………………………………

3. (a) What are the approximate distances that children cover to get to school?
   1Km ☐ 3 Km ☐
   4Km ☐ Others (Specify)………………

   (b) Does this distance affect participation of girls with disabilities in primary education?
   Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know ☐

   (c) If yes, please explain………………………………………………………………………
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4. Does having disability affect participation of girls with disabilities in education?
   Yes ☐ No ☐
   If yes, please explain……………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. Is the environment disability friendly? Yes ☐ No ☐
   If no, give reasons……………………………………………………………………………………………………

6. (a) Are there enough facilities in the school?
   Yes ☐ No ☐
   (b) If no, explain how you cope with the situation…………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   (c) Are the facilities disability friendly? Yes ☐ No ☐

7. Are there enough teaching/learning materials? Yes ☐ No ☐

8. (a) What is the attitude of the school community towards children with disabilities?
   Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Don’t Know ☐
   (b) Give an explanation for your answer in (8a)…………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   (c) Do you think resources influence enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in schooling? Yes ☐ No ☐
   (d) Explain your answer (8c):……………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

9. (a) Is the school administration effective in handling special needs matters?
   Yes ☐ No ☐
   (b) If no, please explain………………………………………………………………………………………………

10. (a) Are you aware of any policy guidelines on girls’ education and especially girls with disabilities put in place? Yes ☐ No ☐
    (b) If yes are they implemented? Yes ☐ No ☐
11. Among the following cultural practices and beliefs, which one does not affect participation of girls with disabilities in primary education in your community?
   FGM  ☐    Early Marriages  ☐    Child Labor  ☐
   Religion  ☐    Don’t Know  ☐

12. (a) Are you aware of any girls with disabilities of school going age who are not in school?    Yes  ☐    No  ☐
   (b) If yes, why do you think they are not in school? Explain please
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………

13. Does security in the community hinder participation of girls with disabilities in primary education? Yes  ☐    No  ☐
   If yes, explain please……………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………

14. What is the major economic activity of parents of the children that you handle?
   Farming  ☐    Business  ☐    Employment  ☐    Don’t know  ☐

15. Do parents’ educational, occupational and income levels affect participation of girls with disabilities in primary education?
   Yes  ☐    No  ☐
   If yes, explain please……………………………………………………………………

16. Are you aware of any policy guidelines on the education of persons with disabilities put in place?    Yes  ☐    No  ☐

17. In your opinion, what other factors affect participation of girls with disabilities in primary education?………………………………………………………………………………
18. What do you think should be done to improve enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in schools? Explain please

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

Thank you for your co-operation.
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR HEAD TEACHERS

Please answer the items of the interview schedule as best as you can. The information you give will be used solely for research purposes and that it will be treated with confidentiality. The findings will be helpful to the improvement of participation of girls with disabilities in integrated primary schools.

Sub-county: ........................................

School: ........................................

1. What is the current enrolment in your school?
   (i) Boys .......... (ii) Girls .......... (iii) Total ...........

2. Of the total number of girls, are there any with disabilities?
   Yes ☐ No ☐
   (a) If yes, how many? .................................................................and
   (b) Where are they taught? Regular classes ☐ special classes ☐

3. Do you have teachers trained in Special Needs Education in your school?
   Yes ☐ No ☐
   If no, who handles the children with special needs? ..................clarify please.................................................................

4. (a) What is the enrolment and dropout rates of girls with disabilities in your school in the previous 3 years?
   (i) 2007 .......... Enrolment ☐ dropout ☐
   (ii) 2008 .......... Enrolment ☐ dropout ☐
   (iii) 2009 .......... Enrolment ☐ dropout ☐
   (b) What are the reasons for the dropout? .................................................................
5. (a) Are there certain funds and levies that the school expects the parents to contribute for its running and development?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

(b) If yes, do they influence participation of girls with disabilities in primary education? Elaborate please.................................................................

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

6. What are the approximate distances that pupils walk to school?

(i) shortest distance................. Km (ii) average distance................. Km

(iii) furthest distance................. Km

(a) Does the distance influence participation of girls with disabilities in education? Yes [ ] No [ ]

(b) If yes, please explain.................................................................

7. (a) Does security to and from school influence participation of girls with disabilities in primary education in your community?

Explain please.................................................................

(b) Are girls with disabilities safe in school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

(c) If no, please give reasons.................................................................

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

8. (a) What is the attitude of the community towards persons with disabilities?

Positive [ ] Negative [ ] don’t know [ ]

(b) Does it influence participation of girls with disabilities in education?

Please explain.................................................................

9. (a) Are you aware of any girls with disabilities of school going age who are not in school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

(b) If yes, why do you think they are not in school? Explain please..........................
10. What other disability-related factors influence enrolment and retention of girls with disabilities in education?

(i) ........................................ (ii) ........................................................................

(iii) .................................... (iv) ........................................................................

(v) .................................

Explain please .......................................................

11. What are the socio-cultural factors that influence participation of girls with Disabilities in primary education as compared to boys in the community?

(Rank them in order of importance please)

(i) ......................................................................................

(ii) ......................................................................................

(iii) ......................................................................................

(iv) ......................................................................................

(v) ......................................................................................

12. Does family socio-economic background influence participation of girls with disabilities in primary education as compared to boys in the community?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please explain ......................................................
13. Does the level of education of the parents of children with special needs influence participation of girls with disabilities in education? Please explain.

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

14. Does your school receive donations other than the FPE funds from local agencies such as the Community Development Fund (CDF) or Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)? Yes □ No □

If yes, please explain.................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................

15. Are there policy guidelines on the education of learners with special needs put in place? Yes □ No □

16. What do you think should be done to improve enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in schools?

Explain please...........................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................

Thank you for your co-operation
APPENDIX C

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION FOR LEARNERS

Please answer all the questions. Be as honest as possible. The information gathered will be treated confidentially.

Sub-county……………………………………

School……………………………………

General information

Type of family
(i) Monogamous Polygamous Single parent Foster

Are parents alive? Yes No

If no, who takes care of you?................................................................................

1. (a) Amongst your siblings, are there others with disabilities apart from you?

Yes No

(b) If yes, are they of school going age?

Yes No

(c) If yes, are they enrolled in school?

Yes No

(d) If no, give reasons why they are not enrolled in school

……………………………………………………………………………………......

2. Are you treated equally with your siblings by your parent (s)/guardians?

Yes No

If no, give reasons for your answer

……………………………………………………………………………………......

3. Does your disability hinder you from participating well in school?

Yes No

If yes, state how please

……………………………………………………………………………………......
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4. Are girls removed from school to be married off at tender ages in your community?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Are you involved in household activities by your parents?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Are there well educated women with disabilities in your community?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

   If no, what do you think could be the reasons? .................................................................
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

7. How does your family meet your educational needs? ......... .................................
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

8. (a) Is your teacher always in school? (For special units only).
   Yes ☐ No ☐

   (b) Does your teacher teach the regular classes? (For Special Units only)
   Yes ☐ No ☐

   (c) What happens to you when your teacher is not in school or is teaching the regular classes?
   (i) Left alone ☐ (ii) Left with another teacher ☐
   (iii) Told to go home ☐ (iv) Told to go and play in the field ☐
   (v) Told to join the regular classes ☐

9. Is the school environment disability friendly? E.g. physical facilities, teaching/learning materials, etc. Yes ☒ No ☐

10. How far is it from your home to school? E.g.
   (i) 1 Km ☒ (ii) 2 Km ☐
   (iii) 3 Km ☐ (iv) 4 Km ☐
   (v) Others specify ☐
11. Do you find it safe for you to walk alone to and from school?

If no, give reasons........................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................

12. (a) Are you harassed in school? For example, bullying or sexually?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, who harasses you? (i) Boys ☐ (ii) Teachers ☐ (iii) Workers ☐

(b) What steps does the school administration take in addressing the harassment?

Explain please........................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................

13. Do teachers waste class time in the staffroom or other places in your school?

Yes ☐ No ☐

14. Do you mix with the regular pupils? (For Special Units only)

Yes ☐ No ☐

15. How does the school administration treat you?

Explain please........................................................................................................

16. Do you like your school and teacher? Explain please........................................

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

17. Are you aware of Government policy guidelines on the rights of children?

Yes ☐ No ☐

18. (a) Do you know any girls with disabilities who are of school going age and are not

in school?

Yes ☐ No ☐

(b) If yes, why do you think they are not in school? Please explain...........

.................................................................................................................................
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19. In your opinion, what other factors do you think influence participation of girls with disabilities in primary education in your community?...............................

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

20. What do you think should be done to help those girls access education like yourselves? Explain please.................................................................

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

Thank you for your co-operation.
APPENDIX D

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION FOR PARENTS

The information you give will be used for the research purposes only and will be treated with confidentiality. It is, therefore, paramount that you give as honest answers as possible.

Sub-county: .............................................

Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ]

Marital status:
(i) Single [ ] (ii) Married [ ] (iii) Separated [ ] (iv) Divorced [ ]
(v) Widowed [ ]

If married, state family status? (i) Monogamous [ ] (ii) polygamous [ ]

1. What are your educational levels?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>No. of Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Post Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>No. of Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What are your income generating occupations?

3. Do your levels of education, occupation and income influence participation of girls with disabilities in primary education? Please explain..........................
4. When there is scarcity of funds in the family, whose educational needs do you meet first? (i) Boys ☐ Girls ☐
(ii) Without Disabilities ☐ With Disabilities ☐

Give reasons for your answer please…………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. (a) Are girls with disabilities involved in household chores girls do at home?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Please explain……………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………

6. (a) What is the community’s attitude towards

(i) Persons with disabilities?…………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

(ii) Parents of persons/children with disabilities?…………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

Explain please………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

(b). Does the attitude influence participation of girls with disabilities in primary education? Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, explain how……………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

7. What is the place of women in your community? Explain please………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

8. Does location of the integrated schools influence participation of girls with disabilities in primary education? Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please explain……………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

9. Is it safe for girls with disabilities to walk to and from school? Yes ☐ No ☐
If no, please explain………………………………………………………………………..

…………………………………………………………………………………………….

10. Are girls with disabilities safe in school? Yes ☐ No ☐

If no, give reasons………………………………………………………………………..

11. Are you aware of any policy guidelines in the education of learners with special needs put in place? Yes ☐ No ☐

12. (a) Are you aware of any girls with disabilities of school going age who are not in school? Yes ☐ No ☐

(b) If yes, why do you thing they are not in school?……………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………….

13. Are there other factors that influence participation of girls with disabilities in primary education in your opinion? Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, rank them in order of seriousness

(i) ...........................................................................................................

(ii) ..........................................................................................................

(iii) ........................................................................................................

14. From your own experience, do you think girls with disabilities are benefiting in the integrated primary schools? Explain please………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………….

15. In your opinion, what do you think should be done to improve enrolment and retention rates of girls with disabilities in schools?

Explain please…………………………………………………………………………..

Thank you for your co-operation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2008 – February 2010</td>
<td>Proposal Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2010- September 2010</td>
<td>Proposal Precaution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2010 – January 2011</td>
<td>Piloting of Research Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2010- December 2010</td>
<td>Corrections to the Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011-March 2011</td>
<td>Submission of Final Proposal to Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2011- August 2011</td>
<td>Approval of Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2011- June 2014</td>
<td>Thesis Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2014- November 2014</td>
<td>Thesis Corrections and Binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Budget Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Amount (Ksh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review (Travelling, photocopying etc)</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Visits to the Target Population</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Writing</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Research Instruments</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (Airtime, Security, Service, postage, internet, etc)</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Writing and Binding</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>185,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>