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ABSTRACT

Kenyatta University has the highest population of university students with disabilities (SWD) in Kenya and has been admitting SWD for more than 20 years. The purpose of this study was to analyze the social challenges facing included students with visual impairments (SWVI) and students with physical disabilities (SWPD) at Kenyatta University. The case study design was used to enable in-depth exploration of the research unit. The target population was the approximately 20,000 students without disabilities (SWOD) and 80 SWD in the undergraduate regular program at Kenyatta University, and the university administrators. Convenience sampling, random sampling and snowballing were used to select a sample size of 60 students (30 with disabilities and 30 without). Purposive sampling was used to select three university administrators. Questionnaires and an interview guide were used to collect the data. Data from the questionnaires were analyzed using descriptive statistics and correlation analysis, while that from the interviews were analyzed qualitatively. It was established that Kenyatta University had made significant effort to foster the social participation of SWD. To some extent, there were considerable positive interactions between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD. Besides, the student’s gender partly affected their social interactions. Nevertheless, more initiatives to foster social participation were needed, like sensitization on disability, increase of investment on projects for SWD, and more aggressiveness on the part of SWD. The collected data put into focus the role of Kenyatta University in facilitating social inclusion of SWD. Moreover, the information gathered could assist Kenyatta University in developing, implementing and evaluating its inclusive program, which could result in admission of more SWD in the institution.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.0 Introduction
Presented in this chapter are the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose, objectives, research questions, scope and delimitations of the study, assumptions of the study, theoretical framework, conceptual framework, and the operational definition of terms.

1.1 Background to the Study
The 21st century has seen a paradigm shift of special needs education from segregation to inclusion. Elementary and secondary schools worldwide are steadfast at providing inclusive education (Acedo, 2008). Higher education institutions, too, have embarked on inclusive education (Government Accountability Office, 2009). Inclusive education means that students with disabilities (SWD) access education in the regular education settings together with their non-disabled peers, with accommodations and adaptations made where necessary. Inclusion of SWD in general education systems is the best way to satisfy requirements of students and to use their talents (Pankajam, 2009), as well as to combat discriminatory attitudes, create welcoming societies and achieve education for all (UNESCO, 1994).
Over the past decade, the world has witnessed an increase in the number of young adults with disabilities accessing higher education. In 2004, 5% of undergraduates in the United Kingdom had disabilities (Fuller, Bradley & Healey, 2004). In New Zealand, the number increased from 3.3% in 1998 to 5.4% in 2004 (Dyson, 2005). Flexible learning environments adaptable to diverse educational needs, reduction of dropout rates, and quality assurance policies have helped to increase the number of SWD in higher education (OECD, 2011). This trend is bound to increase when inclusion becomes the norm in the provision of education in the world.

Most countries in Africa have no statistics to show the number of people with disabilities in higher education institutions. According to Kochung (2010), access to higher education by people with disabilities in Africa is still wanting. This results from “negative attitudes, discriminatory policies and practices, and inaccessible environment in higher education” institutions (Kochung, 2010). However, this trend is likely to change with the adoption of various world declarations on rights of persons; like the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNESCO, 1989), Jomtien World Declaration on Education for All (1990), and UN (2008) Convention on the rights of Persons with Disabilities. Some African countries that have ratified these declarations are South Africa, Uganda, Zambia, Namibia and Kenya.
In 2003, the Government of Kenya started implementation of Free Primary Education (FPE) as envisaged in the Education for All goal. The objective of the FPE is to ensure that all children of school-going age, including those with disabilities, access primary education. Following the implementation of FPE, the government directed all public schools not to deny admission to any child based on his or her disability. The government further provided funds to all schools, some of which were clearly earmarked to facilitate learners with disabilities (Kenya National Human Rights Commission Report, 2007). In the year 2011, the first lot of the FPE beneficiaries was in secondary school. It was a matter of time before it joined universities and other post secondary education institutions. Kenyan institutions of higher learning had to be ready to include this new generation of students.

Kenyatta University is among the 22 public universities in Kenya. According to Kimani (2012), implementation of inclusion at Kenya University was first recorded in July 1981 when the Dean of Students’ Affairs Disability Service Centre was opened by Honorable Charles Njonjo. The center was a resource room that had Braille equipment and offered transcription services (Braille to print and print to Braille). Students with physical disabilities (SWPD) were offered with some level of access to the university facilities while those with hearing impairments needed hearing aids as well as sign language interpreters.
Kenyatta University had a population of approximately 40,000 students as at July 2011. This included 84 SWD: 60 with Visual Impairments (VI), 20 with Physical Disabilities (PD), and 4 with Hearing Impairments. This was 0.21% of the total number of students in the university. Over the past years, the number of SWD at Kenyatta University had been increasing in tune with the world trends. For example, the number of SWPD increased from five in 2003 to 20 in 2011 (C. Oggah, KUSA Special Needs Secretary, personal communication, July 22, 2011).

Most buildings and paths at Kenyatta University are barrier free, in addition to having ramps for wheelchair users (Kimani, 2012). The lecture halls, as well as some ablution facilities in some hostels, have wide doors to allow entrance with wheel chairs. Students with visual impairments (SWVI) are offered Braille machines. The university library has a section for SWD where assistive devices are available. SWD have transport services at the university. Besides, dining halls have tables reserved for SWD. The Kenyatta University Students Association has the seat of a Special Needs Secretary that is preserved for SWD.

Of important notice is that inclusion is more than the provision of academic and environmental adaptations and modifications (Hung, 2005). Despite such adaptations and modifications, students might still experience social exclusion (Sachs & Schreuer, 2011). Hadjikakou and Hartas (2008) noted that, as the number of SWD attending institutions of higher learning is increasing, the students are
faced with many problems in accessing and participating in the institutions. On the same note, Sachs and Schreuer (2011) found out that SWD participated in fewer social and extra-curricular activities than their nondisabled counterparts did. Besides, Ash, Bellow, Davies, Newman and Richardson (2005) raised concerns about the absence of friendship networks between SWD and those without.

It is important for research about SWD in institutions of higher learning to focus on the social challenges that face them. Social challenges refer to the interpersonal problems that SWD might face while interacting with peers without disabilities. Such challenges are crucial as they threaten the very foundation of the inclusive orientations, which, according to UNESCO (1994), is to combat discriminatory attitudes, create welcoming communities, build inclusive societies and achieve education for all.

In addition, most studies on challenges of SWD in Kenya have hitherto focused on preschool, primary, and secondary schools (like Mundi (2009), Kahuthia (2007), Murithi (2008), Burugu (2005), Mwaura (2003) and Karugu (2001)). A focus on higher education institutions is now essential. Against this foregoing background, the researcher sought to analyze the social challenges that faced SWD at Kenyatta University.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Provision of academic support and barrier free environments might seem to be sufficient for the inclusion of SWD in institutions of higher learning. However, such a perception fails to take into account the social challenges that SWD might be facing while interacting with students without disabilities (SWOD) in the institutions. Hung (2005) noted that the simple act of including SWD in educational institutions does not guarantee change of perceptions towards disability. There is, for example, an alarming trend showing that SWD participate in few social activities in institutions of higher learning. A question, thus, arises as to why there is minimal social participation of SWD in institutions of higher learning as well as what can be done to increase their participation. Ash, Bellow, Davies, Newman & Richardson (2005) have, for example, established gaps in social inclusion of SWD in higher education institutions, which include absence of friendship networks between SWD and SWOD. There is need, therefore, to focus on the social challenges facing SWD in institutions of higher learning in order to explain the discrepancy in social inclusion and increase their friendship networks. This is because such social challenges might threaten the tenets of inclusive orientations as envisaged by UNESCO (1994), which are to combat discriminatory attitudes, create welcoming communities, build inclusive societies and achieve education for all. Following on this, the current study attempted to look into the social challenges that faced included SWVI and students with physical disabilities (SWPD) at Kenyatta University.
1.3 Purpose

The purpose of this study was to analyze the social challenges that faced included SWVI and SWPD at Kenyatta University.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The following objectives were developed for the study:

1. To establish the social interaction patterns between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD at Kenyatta University.
2. To find out the relationship between gender and the social interaction of SWVI/SWPD and SWOD at Kenyatta University.
3. To determine the initiatives put in place to encourage SWVI and SWPD to participate in social activities at Kenyatta University.

1.5 Research Questions

The following research questions were developed for this study:

1. What are the social interaction patterns between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD at Kenyatta University?
2. What is the relationship between gender and the social interaction patterns between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD at Kenyatta University?
3. What are the initiatives put in place by Kenyatta University that encourage SWVI and SWPD to participate in social activities?
1.6 Significance of the Study

A study on inclusive practice at the university level is likely to take the ongoing debate on inclusive education in Kenya to new dimensions. Proponents of inclusion view inclusive education as the best means of ensuring that SWD develop to their full potential. On the other hand, opponents posit that inclusion might lead to further isolation of SWD, especially when there are no proper policies to support the practice. In Kenya, such inclusion debate has focused mostly on primary and secondary education. The current study might influence scholars and other inclusion advocates to focus on inclusion in institutions of higher learning. Besides, the collected data are likely to put into focus the role of Kenyatta University in facilitating social inclusion of SWD. In addition, the information gathered from the study may assist Kenyatta University in developing, implementing and evaluating its inclusive program, which may result in admission of more SWD in the institution. To students, the study might illuminate their role in implementing inclusive programs, as well as sensitize them on the same.

1.7 Delimitations and Limitations of the Study

The following were the delimitations and limitations of the study.

1.7.1 Delimitations of the Study

The study was carried out in one public university, Kenyatta University, and, thus, the data obtained may not be reflective of the situation in other institutions of
higher learning in Kenya. As also noted by Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a case study, like the current one, is, sometimes, limited in terms of generalizing the research findings. In addition, other campuses of Kenyatta University were not reached, as the study only targeted the main campus of the institution. Besides, the study targeted students in the regular study program and, as a result, students in the Institute of Open Learning and Institutional Based Program were left out.

1.7.2 Limitations of the Study

The study focused only on SWPD and SWVI, as they were the documented and available categories among the students in the regular study program (C. Oggah, KUSA Special Needs Secretary, personal communication, July 22, 2011). According to the KUSA Special Needs Secretary, all students with hearing impairments were in the institutional based program and, as a result, they were not available for the study. Besides, students with other disabilities such as learning disabilities and emotional or behavioral disorders were not documented by the university and, thus, were not included in the study.

1.8 Assumptions

It was assumed that:

1. SWD interact with SWOD at Kenyatta University.
2. The targeted respondents would understand the questions, answer them honestly, and to the best of their abilities.
1.9 Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

The following is the theoretical and conceptual framework of the study.

1.9.1 Theoretical Framework

The study was guided by the symbolic interaction theory as proposed by Mead (1934) and Blumer (1969). The theory explains how people relate with each other by proposing that the social world consists of symbols that individuals use for interaction. It posits, “human beings do not act individually, but interact with each other,” thus reacting to each other (Kombo & Tromp, 2006, p. 57). According to this theory, behaviors and opinions of a group in which an individual belongs to and by an individual’s personal networks have a significant influence on the individual.

The subjective aspects of social life are particularly important in symbolic interaction theory. Human beings are viewed as pragmatic actors who continually adjust their behavior to the actions of others (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). They do this by interpreting the actions, through denoting them symbolically and treating the actions and their performers as symbolic objects. Human’s process of adjustment results from the ability to use his/her imagination to rehearse alternative actions before acting. The process is also assisted by the human’s ability to think and react to his/her own actions and even himself/herself as a
symbolic object. Thus, humans are seen as active and creative participants able to construct their social world.

This means that the cultural, social and/or religious values inculcated in a person are very significant in the way the person views and relates with others in the society. For instance, seeing a visually impaired person beg in the streets may lead to the view that people with disabilities cannot provide for themselves. This could result in negative attitudes towards people with disabilities as they are seen as dependent on the sympathy of the non-disabled. If such persons with negative attitudes join an inclusive institution, their interactions with people with disabilities will be influenced by the negative perceptions. The same can be said of the influence of gender on interactions. A particular gender might be friendlier to SWD as it is associated with kindness or empathy.

On the other hand, the non-disabled student who sees a student with a disability attending the same class with him/her, sitting the same examinations, living in the same hostel with him/her, among other things, may construct positive views towards people with disabilities. An example of such views could be that given opportunities, people with disabilities can function as well as their non-disabled counterparts. Such values will shape how this person interacts with people with disabilities. The same case can be said of people with disabilities themselves. How they interact with their non-disabled peers in the social environment will determine
the values they will uphold. If the non-disabled counterparts freely intermingle with them, are ready to form friendships, are helpful in facilitating mobility, and such like things, the SWD may develop positive attitudes and nurture friendships with them.

Besides, if the social environment has initiatives to support the social interaction of people with disabilities and people without disabilities, it is likely that the two groups will nurture friendships. The two groups will denote such initiatives as "symbols" to encourage them to interact. For instance, the presence of extracurricular activities involving both SWD and SWOD will lead to further personal interactions between the two groups.

The symbolic interaction theory was relevant in the current study in explaining the way individuals interacted in the society. Socially learnt attributes like gender and the presence or lack of "symbols" like friendship networks might affect the way students interact at Kenyatta University. Besides, initiatives to encourage participation in social activities and extra-curricular activities that involve both SWD and SWOD might determine the social participation of SWD in the target institution.
1.9.2 Conceptual Framework

As illustrated in Figure 1 (pg. 12), the social challenges faced by SWVI/SWPD at Kenyatta University might arise from the inter-student social interaction patterns, influences of gender, and the initiatives available to support social interaction. The study sought to assess and establish how these factors influenced the social challenges faced by SWVI/SWPD at Kenyatta University.

**Figure 1: Social Challenges Facing SWD at Kenyatta University**

- **INDEPENDENT VARIABLES**
  - Inter-student social interaction patterns
  - Initiatives to support social interaction between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD
  - Gender of SWVI/SWPD and SWOD

- **DEPENDENT VARIABLE**
  - Social challenges faced by SWVI/SWPD

Source: Researcher
1.10 Operational Definition of Terms

Administrators: The Kenyatta University dean of students, the director of the directorate of sports and games of Kenyatta University, and the director of Kenyatta University Directorate of Disability Services.

Aesthetic Appearance: Physical attractiveness of a SWD defined by not using assistive devices like wheelchairs, crutches and white canes.

Disability: A restriction or lack of ability to perform an activity in the manner considered normal. It results from impairment.


Impairment: Loss of functional ability.

Inclusion: A philosophy focusing on adjusting the home, the school and the society to ensure all persons, despite their differences, have the opportunity to interact, play, learn, work, experience the feeling of belonging, and develop to their full potential.

Initiatives: Equipment, resources, activities, and support systems put in place by the university to promote participation of SWD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Physical disabilities:</strong></th>
<th>Disabilities resulting from impairments limiting capability of one’s gross or fine motor skills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular study program:</strong></td>
<td>Students are admitted on a full time basis. The opposite are students in the Institute of Open Learning or Institutional Based Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social challenges:</strong></td>
<td>Interpersonal problems that SWD face while interacting with peers without disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social interaction patterns:</strong></td>
<td>Refers to whom students share accommodation facilities with, engage in friendships, conversations, and sports/games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students with disabilities:</strong></td>
<td>Learners with mental retardation, hearing, visual, or physical disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students without disabilities:</strong></td>
<td>Learners identifying themselves as not having mental retardation, hearing, visual or physical disabilities; also referred as non-disabled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual impairment:</strong></td>
<td>Loss of sight resulting to either being blind or partially sighted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction
This chapter presents the review of related literature based on themes arising from the objectives of the study. These are the concept of social inclusion, SWD in institutions of higher learning, social interactions between people with disabilities and non-disabled counterparts, challenges facing SWD in social interactions, gender as a variable influencing interactions, and initiatives to encourage participation of people with disabilities in social activities. The chapter ends with a summary.

2.1 The Concept of Social Inclusion
In his definition of inclusion, Murithi (2008) emphasizes the need to adjust the environment to the needs of the individual, rather than vice-versa. This is in an attempt to make the individual to participate fully in the society like the counterparts without disabilities. Other important aspects that Murithi (2008) mentions are an “opportunity to interact” and “experience the feeling of belonging.” Hence, the idea of healthy interactions between people with disabilities and people without disabilities is given significant weight in the pursuit of inclusion.
Lipsky and Gartner (1996) define inclusion as the provision of services for SWD, including those having severe impairments, in “the neighborhood school, in age-appropriate general education classes, with the necessary support services and supplementary aids both to assure the child’s academic, behavioral and social success”. This is in order to prepare the child to fully participate and contribute as a member in the society. Apart from academic success, this definition includes the aspect of behavioral and social success, thus hinting at the importance of social inclusion.

Hakapaino, Savolainen, Kokkalla and Alasuutari (2000) assert that inclusion means physically being in the same place and participating in the same activities just like the other students. This means that there should be equal emphasis on participation of SWD in both academic and social activities. According to Hakapaino, et al. (2000), inclusion further calls for social acceptance and belonging. Thus, there cannot be successful inclusion when SWD lag behind in social participation.

Kenya lacks a policy document on inclusion. However, the country is a signatory to UNESCO (1989) Convention on the Rights of the child and UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with disabilities (2008), both of which address issues of inclusion. Besides, Kenya's ideas on inclusion are presented in the Taskforce Report on Special Needs Education in Kenya (GOK, 2003) and the National Special
Needs Education Policy Framework (MOE, 2009). The Special Needs Education Taskforce Report (GOK, 2003) backs the Education For All goal and asserts that inclusive education is pegged on identifying the potential barriers that may prevent a child with a disability from full participation in an education setting. An important point made by the Special Needs Education Taskforce Report is the importance of removing barriers before pushing for inclusion. Such barriers could be academic, physical or social like negative attitudes, fear, anxiety, or rejection by peers, adults and teachers, among others.

The National Special Education Policy Framework (MOE, 2009) has inclusive education as one of its policy provisions. It mandates the ministry of education to “recognize and reinforce inclusive education as one of the means for children with special needs to access education.” However, the Policy Framework posits that SWD lack active involvement in sports, cultural and recreational activities. As a result, it calls for “prior preparation and clear conceptualization of the philosophy of inclusive education” in order to avoid “emotional and social problems” to the students (MOE, 2009).

A common theme in the above literature is the significance of healthy social interactions in inclusive settings. The social wellbeing of individuals in an inclusive setting is as important as the academic wellbeing, among other things.
This is because inclusion calls for receptiveness to and accepting diversity, based on the principles of equity and entitlement.

2.1.1 SWD in Institutions of Higher Learning

Education in general and particularly post-secondary education, is a forecaster to gainful employment and career development, which may lead to a good quality of life (Dutta, Segurí-Geist, & Kundu, 2009; Getzel, Stodden, & Brief, 2001). This is even more significant to students with physical and sensory disabilities, who can only pursue jobs that require fewer physical skills and abilities (Kendall & Terry, 1996; McGeary, Mayer, Gatchel, Anagnostis & Proctor, 2003). It is, therefore, important for people with disabilities to access education (Dowrick, Anderson, Heyer & Acosta, 2005; Rimmerman & Araten-Bergman, 2005; Haihambo, 2010).

Policies to promote inclusion of people with disabilities developed over the past 20 years are bearing fruits, and, thus, more SWD are gaining the prerequisites for higher education (OECD, 2011). The Jomtien Declaration of Education for All by 2015 has seen countries mobilizing financial, technical and human resources to give SWD “equal opportunities on an equal footing” with their peers by compensating for the repercussions of their disabilities (OECD, 2011).

The increasing number of SWD in institutions of higher learning can also be attributed to the strategies adopted by upper secondary schools and institutions
offering higher education; to build pathways to higher education and to prepare students in upper secondary school to cope with demands of transition to adulthood. Higher education institutions have come up with admission and support strategies to enable SWD to succeed in their studies, including (though to a lesser extent) to be well integrated in the institutions’ wide community (OECD, 2011). Such approaches include providing transport, housing, and students’ welfare associations, among other things.

Fuller, Bradley, and Healey (2004) reported that in the United Kingdom, 5% of undergraduates (26,000) in 2000/2001 had impairments. In the United States of America, the National Council for Education Studies as cited in Stanley (2000) has reported that in 1994, among the 14.5 million students enrolled in higher education institutions, 10% (1.4 million) at least had one disability.

In New Zealand, Dyson (2005) reports that the number of SWD in higher education increased from 7,500 in 1998 to 24,660 in 2004 (3.3% to 5.4% of all domestic tertiary students). Dyson attributes the opening up of higher education institutions to SWD primarily to the passing of the Human Rights Act in 1993, which recognized disability as an area of discrimination.

In the United Kingdom, until the 1990s, most universities were inaccessible to SWD and staff (Barnes, 2007). The change, according to Barnes, is due to
"politicization of disability by the international disabled people’s movement" and the rise of studies in the field of disabilities. This made the United Kingdom’s Quality Assurance Association to come up with a code of practice for SWD in higher education in 1999 (QAA, 2007).

The Australian Vice Chancellors’ Committee (AVCC) created guidelines to assist universities in providing inclusive programs to SWD in 1996. This document was updated in 2006 to include sections on campus life, policy and administration, and teaching and learning (AVCC, 2006). In addition, Australia has a website (CATS, 2007) which is dedicated to equip staff with inclusive pedagogy to ensure best practice standards.

The number of SWD in most institutions of higher learning in Africa is undocumented. However, UNESCO (1999) conducted a survey in 70 universities around the world, which included eight from Africa, concerning the provision for SWD. It was established that there were 177 SWD in Addis Ababa, 83 in Cape Town, 360 in Cocody, Ivory Coast, 87 in Dakar, 57 in Ibadan, one in Kigali and 24 in Zimbabwe. The University of Burundi had no data on the number of SWD. UNESCO (1999) noted that SWD were “less than one percent of the student body” in most of these universities. This echoed Kochung’s (2010) position that access to higher education by people with disabilities in Africa is still wanting.
Besides, UNESCO (1999) established that physical disabilities were the most common cases in institutions of higher learning. This was attributed to the visible nature of physical disabilities and, thus, such students were more likely to register as having disabilities. Visual impairments were the second most common category, including the blind and partially sighted. However, the case is different at Kenyatta University as there are more SWVI (60) than SWPD (20) (C. Oggah, KUSA Special Needs Secretary, personal communication, July 22, 2011).

Haihambo (2010) established that all institutions of higher learning in Namibia had admitted students with either observable or hidden disabilities. The author noted that support and provision for SWD were given in fragmented portions in the institutions and the aim of equity and equality in education had not yet been realized. There were challenges relating to physical accessibility, lack of alternative educational materials, lack of sensitivity as well as skills of staff, and shortage of support systems. Haihambo (2010) ascertained that despite the challenges faced in these institutions, SWD performed their academic duties to their best potential driven by individual personal philosophies of perseverance and courage.

The Kenya National Survey for People with Disabilities (2008) gives the number of people with disabilities in mid-level colleges as 2274 and in universities as 712. Despite increment of SWD in Kenyan institutions of higher learning, there is
limited information about social experiences and opinions of students in these institutions. Kimani (2012) conducted a case study on the implementation of inclusive education at Kenyatta University. The study involved 45 randomly selected SWD, 24 randomly selected lecturers and the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic). Questionnaires, interview guide and an observation checklist were used to collect data. Qualitative and quantitative approaches were used to analyze, present and interpret the collected data.

Kimani (2012) established that most of the resources and facilities at Kenyatta University were available and learning methods were average for SWD. It was also established that university facilities, transport and accommodation services in the university were accessible to SWD. Generally, SWD were comfortable in the institution. However, Kimani (2012) did not include the views of SWOD in the study. Besides, there were concerns of inadequate resources and facilities, as well as instances of stigmatization. The present sought to expound on Kimani’s (2012) study by including the views of SWOD and further exploring the social challenges faced by SWD at Kenyatta University.

2.2 Social Interactions between SWD and Non-disabled Counterparts

Various studies have focused on the social interactions of people with disabilities. For instance, a study by Sachs and Schreuer (2011) compared 170 SWD with 156 SWOD in institutions of higher learning in Israel. The students were obtained
through a snowball sampling method. Data was collected using a standard questionnaire- the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ), and a Biodemographic Student Background Questionnaire developed by the researchers. Data was analyzed both descriptively and quantitatively. It was found that though academic achievements and overall students' experiences were similar, SWD spent more time meeting demands of their studies, and participated in fewer social and extra-curricular activities. This is because the programs and supports in institutions of higher learning focused more on academic and physical accessibility than on reducing "the social gap, stigma, and isolation experienced by many SWD" (Sachs & Schreuer, 2011). It is evident that institutions of higher learning have a heavy task to reduce the gap in social inclusion of SWD.

On the other hand, Ash, Bellow, Davies, Newman and Richardson (2005) conducted a large questionnaire and interview study of six colleges of higher education in the United Kingdom. They found that the students did not always know the support services available at their institutions. Some concerns about absence of friendship networks between SWD and those without were also evident. This echoed Dyson and Millward’s (1999) statement that in Britain, there was a "mismatch between educational inclusion and social inclusion" when students leave the more supportive secondary education environment to further their studies or take on work.
In Israel, an examination by a public committee on implementation of the Equal Rights for Persons with Disabilities Act of 2005 established that higher education for people with disabilities improved chances for integration into society, in employment, and to lead dignified lives (Admon, 2007). This can be taken to arise from the positive social interactions that happen between SWD and those without. The committee called for expansion of access to higher education institutions not only in policies, but also in support programs for SWD.

Examples of Kenyan institutions of higher learning that train SWD together with non-disabled counterparts are Kenyatta University, Maseno University, The University of Nairobi and The Kenya Institute of Special Education. There is limited information concerning the social interactions of students in these institutions. Nevertheless, Kochung (2010) notes that in Maseno University, it is mandatory for students pursuing a course in education to take an introductory unit in special needs education. To add on to that, students taking special needs education course are trained in inclusive education. These may be viewed as some of the efforts put forward by Maseno University to instill positive attitudes towards SWD in order to promote social interaction. The current study supplemented the findings of the foregoing studies on inter-student relationships in addition to backing or contradicting them.
2.3 Challenges Facing People with Disabilities in Social Interactions

Review of literature revealed various challenges that might face people with disabilities while interacting with peers without disabilities. These include attitudes, accessibility of environment, and aesthetic appearance of people with disabilities.

2.3.1 Attitudes

The social context has a significant influence on attitudes towards people with disabilities (Hergenrather & Rhodes, 2007). Riches and Green (2003) studied the extent to which 71 workers with disabilities in Australia were experiencing integration from the views of 65 supervisors, 63 co-workers and 67 employment specialists. The study established that workers with disabilities were equally valued members of the workforce. However, it was noted that although they were engaged in social life of the work place, co-workers were less positive of them. This resulted from perceived differences in task related social skills and the actual job performance. On the other hand, the resulting positive attitudes lead to a conclusion that having direct experiences with employees with disabilities in open employment situations could have a positive effect. The study called for further research into the formation of friendships by adults with disabilities.

In the education field, Hung (2005) studied attitudes of secondary school students and established that “the mere presence of SWD in the same school does not make a significant difference in changing” SWOD’ attitudes. Hung cited meaningful
interaction, close relationships or friendships, and breaking down the communication barrier as important elements that lead to positive attitudes thus leading to successful inclusion of people with disabilities. The finding supported Smith-D’Arezzo’s (2003) conclusion that in children, the presence of peers with disabilities does not necessarily guarantee change of perceptions towards them.

Hindes and Mather (2007) found out that SWOD favour the inclusion of students with sensory disabilities rather than those with psychiatric and attention disabilities. Sensory disabilities refer to visual and hearing impairments, while psychiatric and attention disabilities refer to conditions like autism spectrum disorder and attention deficit disorder, among others. Such negative attitudes towards persons with disabilities can adversely influence other students towards the same, and as a result diminish self-esteem and increase pessimism and feelings of despair in peers with disabilities (Paris, 1993; Tervo, Palmer, & Redinius, 2004).

Negative attitudes towards people with disabilities prohibit them from fully participating in the society, as well as procuring employment (Brodwin & Orange, 2002; Frank & Elliot, 2002; Hergenrather, Rhodes, & Mc-Daniel, 2005; Smart, 2002). Such attitudes have been significantly correlated with self-concept, personal issues related to one’s disability, utilization of skills and abilities, and public
vocational rehabilitation service outcomes (All, Fried, Ritcher, Shaw, & Roberto, 1997; Mullins, Roessler, Schriner, Brown, & Bellini, 1997).

Kimani (2012) established that SWD were comfortable with their inclusion at Kenyatta University. However, Kimani (2012) did not find out the views of SWOD towards the inclusion. The present study established the views of SWOD towards their social interactions with SWD at Kenyatta University.

2.3.2 Accessibility of the Environment

Physical inaccessibility of community environments is a major barrier to the participation of people with disabilities in community life (Restall, Leclair & Banks, 2005). A survey of 20 libraries in Argentina providing services for people with VI and PD found the libraries inadequate to provide services to them. The model of libraries in Argentina was considered as a contributor to the isolation and confinement of the people with VI and PD (Todaro, 2005).

Poria, Reichel and Brandt (2011) studied challenges arising from interactions between people with VI and PD within the hotel environment. The study involved 45 people with disabilities obtained through snowballing. It used semi-structured interviews and the data was analyzed thematically. The study found out that the challenges faced were from physical designs of the hotel environments in addition to staff discriminatory behaviors towards people with disabilities. It was also evident that hotel experiences differed depending on the type of disability. Thus,
the physical accessibility of the environment is very crucial to ensure people with disabilities participate on an equal basis in social activities. Kimani (2012) reported that lecture rooms, pedestrian paths to classrooms, as well as transport and accommodation services at Kenyatta University were generally accessible to SWD. However, he did not focus on avenues where most social interactions are likely to occur such as the students’ center, playground and dining halls, among others. The current study focused on the accessibility of these areas.

2.3.3 Aesthetic Appearance

Studies for people with disabilities in the hotel industry have reported physical appearance as important in explaining communication and attitudes towards people with disabilities (Gröschl, 2007; Ross, 2004). Gröschl illuminated the importance of a person’s aesthetic appearance during service encounter; an implication studied in hospitality and in the service industry too (Nickson, Warhurst & Dutton, 2005). Staff in hotels are reported to prefer talking to the companions rather than the people with disabilities. People with disabilities felt that because of their appearance, staff treated them as if they were cognitively disabled. This echoed Ross (2004) finding that the less physically attractive a person is, the more he/she is deemed to possess fewer desirable personal and social traits.
2.4 Gender as a Variable Influencing Interactions

Sexism is a prejudiced behavior towards a particular sex, especially by men towards women (Malim, 1998). There is a wide belief that men exhibit more competency and independency, while women exhibit more warmth and are expensive (Ogalloh, 2008). This has resulted to some occupations (like secretaries and nurses) being designated to women. Ogalloh (2008) argues that taking care of the handicapped is also viewed as a feminine duty as, generally, less valued occupations are designated to women.

Perry, Ivy, Conner, and Shelar (2008) established that gender and frequency of interaction with SWD significantly affected the attitudes of students towards disability. This is crucial, as attitude is a serious barrier to participation in recreation, leisure and other social activities by people with disabilities (Smith, Austin, Kennedy, Lee & Hutchinson, 2005). Besides, Mushoriwa (2001) studied the attitudes of primary school teachers towards including SWVI in regular classes. The study found out that female teachers had a higher attitude (50.3%) than their male counterparts (49.7%) did. However, the slight difference in percentage made it impossible to conclude that female teachers favored inclusion more than male teachers. Other studies have clearly established that female teachers have favorable attitudes towards SWD (Leyser & Tappendorf, 2001; Ogalloh, 2008) and have higher expectations of learners with disabilities than male teachers (Hodge & Jansma, 2000).
Furthermore, Staniland (2010) looked at the relationship between a respondent’s gender and his/her comfort with disability. This study was a large survey involving questionnaires and 1,290 respondents. Data analysis involved quantitative approaches where tests for significance were undertaken. It was revealed that women were more likely than men to say that they were comfortable being with people with disabilities in almost all scenarios and types of disabilities. This finding reveals the importance of gender in studying the challenges faced by SWD in inclusive settings.

Robillard and Fichten (1983) conducted a study on attributions of SWOD concerning sexuality and romantic involvement of SWPD and able-bodied peers. It was revealed that students with physical impairments were perceived to be “more socially anxious, less gender role stereotyped and less likely to be dating”. Besides, male students, unlike female, attributed “greater interest in sexual activities” to SWD than to able-bodied students. It was also evident that comfort with SWD was significantly lower than with those without disabilities. Another outstanding finding was that previous contact with SWPD neither reduced discomfort nor eliminated negative attitudes and stereotyping. These findings further highlighted the importance of gender in studying patterns of interaction between SWD and their non-disabled peers. Besides, most of the above studies looked at gender and disability from the perspective of SWOD. The current study also reported on the perspectives of SWD themselves.
2.5 Initiatives to Encourage Participation of People with Disabilities in Social Activities

People with disabilities are less likely to join clubs or associations, to talk to their neighbors most days, to meet friends most days or to participate in social afternoon or evenings out (Gannon & Nolan, 2005). This is despite the fact that people with disabilities who interact successfully with peers without disabilities “are more popular, have stronger friendships, and are included more often in classroom activities” than those who lack such skills (Bovey & Strain, 2011). As a result, there is need for inclusive institutions to come up with initiatives to encourage the participation of people with disabilities in social activities (Bovey & Strain, 2011).

Some initiatives made by universities to encourage SWD to indulge in social activities include introduction of sporting activities, music groups, disabled friends clubs, and structured social activities offered by Students Unions (UNESCO, 1999). Besides, UNESCO (1999) further notes that some universities offer special counseling services for learners with disabilities. For instance, new SWD in Addis Ababa University are given personal orientation to university life, which includes information on the help available to them in case of problems. Cairo University provides social welfare, student activities, and physical and psychological health care for SWD. In addition, removing communication, policy as well as attitudinal barriers is another way of supporting equal participation of students in institutions (UNESCO, 1994). Besides, UNESCO (1999) found out that 17 out of 35 sampled
universities offered some preparation to their staff to enable them to respond to the needs of people with disabilities prior to enrolling SWD.

Furthermore, Burugu (2005), in studying factors affecting implementation of inclusive education in primary schools, recommended that both non-disabled pupils and their peers with disabilities should be trained in order to develop prosocial behavior among them. He noted that children with disabilities should be taught specific skills, which could enhance social interactions with non-disabled peers. Such trainings and preparations serve to create appreciation about disability and might encourage the participation of SWD in social activities. Placing SWD together with non-disabled peers does not automatically result in their participation in social activities. The current study sought to find out the availability/ unavailability of initiatives to encourage participation of SWVI/SWPD in social activities at Kenyatta University.

2.6 Summary and Conclusion

The following is the summary of the literature review.

2.6.1 Social Interaction Patterns between SWOD and SWD

Studies have revealed that negative attitudes, a person's aesthetic appearance, as well as physical and communication barriers are some of the challenges that people with disabilities might face in their social interactions with non-disabled
peers. Though SWD might be catered for by educational and physical accessibility of the institutions of higher learning, they might lack meaningful interactions with nondisabled peers. However, there is limited information concerning the social interactions of students in institutions of higher learning in Kenya. The current study sought to examine the social interactions of SWD at Kenyatta University, and thus add a Kenyan perspective to the body of literature.

2.6.2 Gender as a Variable Influencing Interactions

Literature has shown that gender is an important variable in studying the way people with disabilities interact with nondisabled peers. This is because males might differ from females in the way they perceive disabilities. Most studies reported on the influence of gender on disability from the perspective of SWOD. The present study sought to build on the existing literature by establishing, from the perspectives of both SWOD and SWD, the way gender influences the social interaction patterns between students with different types of disabilities and their non-disabled counterparts at Kenyatta University.

2.6.3 Initiatives to Encourage Participation in Social Activities

Various studies have shown that the mere act of placing SWD together with nondisabled peers does not, by its own nature, result in their participation in social activities. The current study sought to find out the availability/unavailability of initiatives to encourage participation of SWD in social activities at Kenyatta University.
2.6.4 Conclusion

The review of literature indicated that SWD might face challenges while interacting with their nondisabled peers in institutions of higher learning. These challenges were increasingly becoming a great concern for researchers. Few studies had been carried out in Kenya regarding this topic. The current study sought not only to supplement research findings from other countries, but also to contribute a Kenyan perspective to the body of literature.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

The chapter presents the research design, research variables, location, population, sampling techniques and sample size, instrumentation, pilot study, validity and reliability, data collection techniques, data analysis procedures and logistical and ethical considerations.

3.1 Research Design

A case study of Kenyatta University was chosen to enable a detailed investigation of the problem at hand (Stake, 1995). This proposition was supported by Mugenda (2008) who posited that case studies allowed for in-depth exploration of a unit. Indeed, focusing on one university helped bring out in-depth insights and better comprehension of the social challenges that faced SWD.

3.1.1 Variables

The independent variables were inter-student social interaction patterns, initiatives to support social interaction between SWD and SWOD, and gender of the two groups of students. The researcher hypothesized that these variables influenced the social challenges faced by SWD in the university. As a result, the dependent variable was social challenges faced by SWD, as it was determined by a number of aspects operating within the target location.
3.2 Location of the Study

The study was carried out at the main campus of Kenyatta University. This is a public university located in Nairobi County, Kenya. The university is along Thika Road, 23 Kilometers from the city center of Nairobi. It is located at 1.181058°S and 36.927226°E. Kenyatta University became a fully-fledged university in 1985 after being a constituent college of the University of Nairobi from 1970.

Kenyatta University was chosen as it had the highest population of SWD when compared to other universities in Kenya (Kimani, 2012). Besides, it was an inclusive education institution and had been admitting SWD for more than 20 years (Kimani, 2012). Moreover, Singleton (1993) pointed out that, when choosing a study location, the ideal setting should be accessible to the researcher. For the current study, Kenyatta University was accessible to the researcher as he was pursuing his postgraduate degree in the same university.

3.3 Target Population

The study targeted undergraduate students in the regular study program (approximately 20,000 SWOD, 60 SWVI (75% of the SWD) and 20 SWPD (25% of the SWD) in the four years of study). These were purposively selected, as most SWD were undergraduates enrolled in the regular study program (C. Oggah, KUSA Special Needs Secretary, personal communication, July 22, 2011). Besides, the study targeted administrators of Kenyatta University, as they would provide
crucial insights into the kind of initiatives put in place to foster the participation of SWD in social activities.

3.4 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size
The following are the sampling techniques and sample size used for the study.

3.4.1 Sampling Techniques
Different sampling techniques were used for the respondents. These were convenience sampling, random sampling and snowballing.

3.4.1.1 Students with Disabilities
Convenience sampling and random sampling were used to get the sample of SWD. Convenience sampling involved selecting respondents based on availability. Students with visual impairments (SWVI) and students with physical disabilities (SWPD) were chosen as they were the most available in the regular study program (C. Oggah, KUSA Special Needs Secretary, personal communication, July 22, 2011). Random sampling involved selecting the respondents by chance using the lottery method. The method enabled the collection of unbiased data as all SWVI and SWPD had an equal chance of being selected.

3.4.1.2 Students without Disabilities
Snowball sampling was used to select the sample for SWOD. The researcher asked the sampled SWD to suggest SWOD who would be most resourceful. In the case
of a large population like the one at Kenyatta University, snowballing enabled locating the specific population that was most informative as regarded to the objectives of the study. Besides, it enabled the researcher to include respondents that he could not have known.

3.4.1.3 Administrators

Purposive sampling was used to select the Kenyatta University dean of students, the director of the directorate of sports and games of Kenyatta University and the director of Kenyatta University Directorate of Disability Services. Purposive sampling allowed the selection of informative cases that gave in-depth data as regarded to the initiatives put in place to foster the participation of SWVI/SWPD in social activities at Kenyatta University.

3.4.2 Sample Size

The sample sizes for students and administrators were as follows.

3.4.2.1 Sample Size for Students

The sample size for students was 60. It comprised of 30 SWD (7 female SWVI, 13 male SWVI, 6 female SWPD and 4 male SWPD) and 30 SWOD (19 female and 11 male). Barbour (2008) posits that, in qualitative studies, the goal of sampling is not to get a representative sample but to reflect diversity, and to provide a great potential for comparison. This proposition informed the selection of the sample size for the current study. In fact, the sample sizes for the two groups of students
were equal in order to enable the collection of adequate data for comparison. Besides, according to Hogg and Tanis (2005), a sample size that is greater than 25 or 30 is a large sample and can give representative data. Thus, the study assumed that the sample sizes for both groups of students yielded representative data, as they were greater than 25. Nevertheless, a sample size of 60 to represent over 20000 students might be considered a limitation of the study.

3.4.2.2 Sample Size for Administrators

As already indicated above (3.4.1.3), three administrators were selected, namely the Kenyatta University dean of students, the director of the directorate of sports and games of Kenyatta University and the director of Kenyatta University Directorate of Disability Services. The choice of the three was informed by the fact that they were directly involved in the issues under study in the university. The researcher assumed that the three administrators had in-depth information concerning the social challenges that faced SWVI/SWPD at Kenyatta University.

3.5 Research Instruments

The following instruments were used for data collection.

3.5.1 Questionnaires

For students, data was gathered using both close-ended and open-ended questionnaires. Some questions were adapted from a standard questionnaire, the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (Pace & Kuh, 1998). The
questionnaires for SWOD and SWVI/SWPD slightly differed as some questions applied to one category of students and not the other. Questionnaires were chosen because they were easy to administer in a large sample. Besides, the open-ended questions enabled respondents to include additional information concerning their feelings and understanding of the study subject. As also noted by Mugenda (2008), this allowed the researcher to have an insight on the respondents’ true feelings.

3.5.2 Interview Guide

For administrators, an interview guide was used to collect the data. The researcher used a list of questions based on the objectives of the study to probe the administrators. Interviews were favored as they are effective in small samples like the present one. Besides, interviews allowed for in-depth probing and clarification of the responses given.

3.6 Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted at Nairobi University on 12 randomly selected students and a dean of students. The University of Nairobi was purposively selected, being a public institution that admitted SWD just like Kenyatta University. Piloting was done by the researcher without using a research assistant and took three days. SWOD (6) and SWPD (3) filled in the questionnaires themselves. For SWVI (3), the researcher read the questions to each of them and wrote down the responses. Besides, a face-to-face interview was done with the dean of students guided by the interview guide. The items were then checked for
unanswered questions, inaccurate responses and inconsistencies, which were taken as indicators of lack of clarity. Following on this, some items in the questionnaires were modified in order to improve clarity. Other questions in the interview guide were also reframed as they had elicited ambiguous responses. Besides, the pilot established the estimated time needed to fill in the questionnaires (15 minutes for SWOD and 30 minutes for SWVI/SWPD) and conduct the interviews with the administrators (15 minutes). Piloting also served to validate the survey items by crosschecking their reliability as well as the proposed statistical procedures for analyzing data.

3.6.1 Validity

Construct and content validity were ascertained through expert validation by two university supervisors. Besides, some questions in the research instruments were adapted from the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (Pace & Kuh, 1998), which is a validated tool.

3.6.2 Reliability

Reliability was established using the test retest method. After the first phase of piloting, the researcher went back two weeks later to re-administer the same instrument to the same sample. The two sets of responses were then compared to determine consistency. A correlation coefficient of 0.73 was established. According to Mugenda (2008), a correlation coefficient of more than 0.7 is considered reliable.
3.7 Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected beginning with SWVI, followed by SWPD, then SWOD and, finally, the administrators. It took 30 days. The researcher self-administered the instruments for data collection to each respondent, which ensured a 100% return ratio.

The researcher obtained lists of SWVI and SWPD from the office of the Special Needs Secretary of KUSA, and did the sampling. The lists included the hostel rooms and phone numbers of the students. In the following 16 days, the researcher called and located the sample of SWVI and SWPD, and requested them to participate in the study. The researcher read the questions to the SWVI and wrote down the responses respectively. On the other hand, SWPD read and filled in the questionnaires themselves. At the end of each session, the researcher asked the respondent to propose SWOD who would be most resourceful to partake in the study. These identified SWOD formed the sample for SWOD.

After the SWVI/SWPD, the researcher used the next 11 days to call, locate and request the sampled SWOD to participate in the study. The SWOD read and filled in the questionnaires themselves.

Finally, the researcher booked appointments for interviews with the Kenyatta University dean of students, the director of the directorate of sports and games of
Kenyatta University, as well as the director of Kenyatta University Directorate of Disability Services. Each interview was done on a separate day as per the bookings. On the appointed times, the researcher conducted face to face interviews for 15 minutes with each of the three administrators using the interview guide and wrote down the responses.

3.8 Data Analysis

The questionnaires were numbered, coded, and checked for completeness. Data were analyzed quantitatively. They were entered in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), and then analyzed using descriptive statistics (percentages and frequencies), as well as correlation analysis (Spearman rank order). The data were presented using tables, pie charts and graphs.

Data from the interview guide were analyzed qualitatively using phenomenological analysis. This entailed the researcher attempting to make sense of the respondents' attempts to give meaning to their own experiences. The researcher coded the interview responses in considerable detail, while shifting the focus back and forth from the main claims of the respondents, to the researcher's understanding of the implication of the claims. The data were presented by narration.

3.9 Logistical and Ethical Considerations

Prior to the study, the researcher obtained a research permit from the Permanent Secretary, Higher Education and Science Council, through the Dean of Graduate
School, Kenyatta University, who gave a letter of introduction. Authorities at Kenyatta University were informed and permission sought to conduct the study. In addition, informed consent was obtained from the respondents. As the current study consisted of questions on social relationships and personal opinions, the researcher ensured protection of the privacy of the respondents and conveyed this protection to them.
4.0 Introduction

The chapter interprets and explains the findings with regard to the stated themes, objectives and research questions.

i) The social interaction patterns between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD

ii) The relationship between gender and the social interaction of SWVI/SWPD and SWOD.

iii) Availability of initiatives to encourage social participation of SWVI/SWPD

4.1 The Social Interaction Patterns between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD

The first objective of the study was to establish the social interaction patterns between students with SWVI/SWPD and students without disabilities (SWOD) at Kenyatta University. This was accomplished by analyzing the following features: patterns of sharing accommodation facilities, patterns of conversing, patterns of participating in games/sports, and patterns of friendship. Furthermore, the influence of aesthetic appearance on attitudes towards interaction with SWVI/SWPD was assessed.
4.1.1 SWOD’s Patterns of Sharing Accommodation Facilities with SWVI/SWPD

The study sought to establish patterns of sharing campus accommodation facilities between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD. This was done by assessing the frequencies of sharing accommodation facilities with SWVI/SWPD. Table 1 shows the frequencies of SWOD sharing campus accommodation facilities with SWVI/SWPD.

**Table 1: SWOD Sharing Accommodation Facilities with SWVI/SWPD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage of all respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents (excluding those living outside campus)</th>
<th>Disability category shared accommodation facility with (Frequency)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have never shared</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have shared</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live outside campus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 above shows that 16 (80%) of the SWOD who had used campus accommodation facilities had never shared such facilities with SWVI/SWPD. The remaining 4 (20%) had shared accommodation facilities with SWVI only. A study by Kimani (2012) noted that Kenyatta University provided separate accommodation facilities for SWD. However, the current study established that the practice was not absolute, as 4 (20%) of the SWOD had shared campus accommodation facilities with SWVI. It is significant to note that the four had shared accommodation facilities with SWVI only. This could be attributed to the
big population of SWVI 60 (75%) in the university when compared to SWPD 20 (25%). As a result, they could have had to share accommodation facilities with SWOD if the facilities were inadequate.

Besides, Hindes and Mather (2007) posited that SWOD favored the inclusion of students with sensory disabilities, like those with VI, to those with psychiatric and attention deficits. This suggestion could explain why the sampled SWOD had only shared campus accommodation facilities with SWVI. However, such an assumption is limited, as the research did not focus on students with psychiatric and attention deficits.

4.1.1.1 Attitudes of SWOD who had Shared Accommodation Facilities with SWVI/SWPD

The study also sought to compare the attitudes of SWOD who had shared accommodation facilities with SWVI/SWPD and those of SWOD who had not shared such facilities. Figure 2 (pg. 49) presents the results.
As shown in Figure 2 above, SWaD who had not shared the accommodation facilities with SWVI/SWPD indicated varied responses, ranging from uncertainty to enthusiasm. However, majority of them 12 (75%) “liked” the interaction, which was a scale down from being enthusiastic. On the contrary, all 4 (100%) SWaD who had shared campus accommodation facilities with SWVI/SWPD indicated enthusiasm towards interacting with SWVI/SWPD outside the classroom environment.

The findings imply that SWOD who shared accommodation facilities with SWVI/SWPD were more confident of positive interactions with SWVI/SWPD in social situations than those who did not share such facilities. This finding is
backed by Riches and Green (2003) position that having direct experiences with people with disabilities in open situations could have a positive effect on attitudes towards people with disabilities. It also echoed the finding by Perry, Ivy, Conner and Shelar (2008) that frequency of interaction with students with disabilities affects the attitudes of students towards disability.

4.1.1.2 Willingness of SWOD to Share Accommodation Facilities with SWVI/SWPD

The study sought to find out the willingness of SWOD (those that had not shared accommodation facilities with SWVI/SWPD) to share the same given a chance. The results are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: SWOD’s Willingness to Share Accommodation Facilities with SWVI/SWPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Willing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that 24 (92.3%) of the SWOD who had not shared campus accommodation facilities with SWVI/SWPD indicated willingness to do the same given a chance. Only 2 (7.7%) were not willing.
The findings implied that offering accommodation facilities to all students regardless of disability would increase the opportunity of SWOD sharing accommodation facilities with SWVI/SWPD since many are already willing, thus enhancing their social interactions. This is supported by Riches and Green (2003) who showed that more positive social interactions between people without disabilities and those with disabilities are enhanced when the two groups are provided with the same opportunities. Nevertheless, the findings in Table 2 above should be taken with a pinch of salt, as willingness to share accommodation facilities with SWVI/SWPD may not reflect actual doing.

4.1.1.3 SWVI/SWPD’s Patterns of Sharing Accommodation Facilities with SWOD

The study also assessed the frequencies of SWVI/SWPD sharing accommodation facilities with SWOD. Table 3 shows the results.

Table 3: SWVI/SWPD Sharing Accommodation Facilities with SWOD (N=30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have shared</td>
<td>Have not shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWVI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 above shows that 9 (45%) of the SWVI and 4 (40%) of the SWPD had shared campus accommodation facilities with SWOD. This further showed that Kenyatta University did not provide exclusive separate accommodation facilities
for SWD as suggested in a study on inclusive education at Kenyatta University carried out by Kimani (2012). Moreover, SWPD had also shared accommodation facilities with SWOD, an aspect not captured from the sample of SWOD. Thus, both categories of disabilities had shared accommodation facilities with SWOD.

4.1.2 Conversation Patterns between SWOD and SWVI/SWPD

The study sought to establish the conversation patterns between SWOD and SWVI/SWPD. This was done by assessing the frequencies of SWOD who talked to SWVI/SWPD. Figure 3 below shows the findings.

![Figure 3: SWOD Conversing with SWVI/SWPD (N=30)](image)

As illustrated in Figure 3, the majority had conversed with SWVI/SWPD very often 14 (47%), while 9 (30%) had occasionally done the same. 4 (13%) had often
engaged in the same. The remaining 3 (10%) of the SWOD had never conversed with SWVI/SWPD.

The many SWOD who had at least conversed with SWVI/SWPD (occasionally, often and very often) could be an indication of meaningful interaction between the two groups of students. Those who had ‘occasionally’ and ‘never’ conversed with SWVI/SWPD suggested the presence of a significant number of SWOD who did not indulge in regular conversations with SWVI/SWPD. A reason for the tendency could be the small population of SWVI/SWPD when compared to SWOD at Kenyatta University. As a result, it was natural that the majority of SWOD conversed more among themselves than with the SWVI/SWPD. Nickson, Warhurst and Dutton (2005) support the current observation by affirming that people without disabilities prefer to talk to their companions rather than to people with disabilities.

4.1.2.1 Category of SWD that SWOD preferred to Converse with

The study sought to identify the category of SWD that SWOD preffered to converse with. This was accomplished by establishing the correlation between frequencies of conversing with SWD and choice of the disability category conversed with. Table 4 (pg. 54) presents the findings.
Table 4: Correlation of Conversing with SWD and Disability category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>Converseing with students with disabilities</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Disability category conversed with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability category conversed with</td>
<td>-0.299</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 above shows that there was no significant relationship between conversing with SWD and the choice of disability category conversed with (SWVI or SWPD) at 0.05 level ($r_s = -0.299, p = 0.13$). The implication was that SWOD conversed with SWD regardless of the disabilities they had.

This was a positive finding as indulgence in conversations was an indicator of meaningful interactions between SWOD and SWVI, SWPD. Nevertheless, the finding that SWOD were not influenced by disability category in choosing the SWD to converse with contradicted Hindes and Mather’s (2007) position that SWOD favored particular categories of SWD for inclusion. All the same, the authors had looked at inclusion as a whole while the current research focused on a specific aspect of inclusion—indulgence in conversations. This could explain the difference in the findings.
4.1.2.2 SWVI/SWPD Conversation Patterns with SWOD

The study sought to establish SWVI/SWPD's patterns of conversing with SWOD. This was done by establishing SWVI/SWPD's frequencies of conversing with SWOD. The results are shown in Figure 4 below.

Figure 4: SWVI/SWPD Conversing with SWOD

Figure 4 shows that most SWVI/SWPD had conversed with SWOD very often (SWPD 8 (80%); SWVI 18 (90%)). This was a positive finding regarding the behavior of SWVI/SWPD as it showed that they were open to conversations with SWOD. The university could exploit this openness by encouraging more SWOD to engage in conversations with SWVI/SWPD, for instance through provision of additional social avenues where the two groups of students freely interact, like in clubs and games.
4.1.3 SWOD Participating in Games/sports with SWVI/SWPD

The study assessed the trends of SWOD participation in games/sports with SWVI and SWPD. This was done by establishing the frequencies of SWOD who participated in games/sports with SWVI and SWPD. Figure 5 below presents the results.

![Figure 5: Participation of SWOD in Games/sports with SWVI/SWPD (N=30)](image)

Figure 5 shows that 21 (70%) SWOD had never participated in games/sports with SWVI/SWPD, while 5 (17%) had often participated, and the remaining 4 (13%) occasionally participated.

Games/sports are a crucial component in removing social barriers and building meaningful interactions between SWOD and SWD (MOE, 2009). Thus, the small number of SWOD who participated in games/sports with SWVI/SWPD at Kenyatta University was worrying. In this regard, the study went further to
establish the willingness of SWOD who had not participated in games/sports with SWVI/SWPD to do the same given a chance. Table 5 below shows the results.

Table 5: SWOD Willingness to Participate in Games/sports with SWVI/SWPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not willing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that 15 (71%) of the SWOD who had not participated in games/sports with SWVI/SWPD were willing to do the same given a chance while 3 (14%) were not willing, and 1 (5%) was undecided.

These were positive findings as they implied that a majority of SWOD who had not participated in games/sports with SWVI/SWPD were most likely to participate in the same given an opportunity. However, the findings should be taken with reservations as willingness to participate in the games/sports with SWVI/SWPD may not reflect actual doing. In addition, it should be noted that games/sports for SWD were occasional events and thus the findings presented might not be conclusive.
On the other hand, the research further evaluated the reasons cited by the three SWOD (14%) who were not willing to participate in such games/sports. The reasons given were fear of disability and lack of awareness towards the availability of such opportunities. This was in line with the position of The Special Needs Education Taskforce Report (GOK, 2003) on the importance of removing social barriers to inclusion such as fear, anxiety, rejection by peers, or lack of awareness, among others. As noted by MOE (2009), there was need for “prior preparation and clear conceptualization of the philosophy of inclusive education” in order to avoid “emotional and social problems” to the students.

4.1.3.1 Disability Category Preferred by SWOD to Engage in Games/Sports with

The study sought to determine the disability category favored by SWOD to participate in games/sports with. To do this, the study analysed the correlation between frequencies of participating in games and the choice of the category of SWD engaged with in the games/sports. Table 6 (pg. 59) presents the findings.
Table 6: Correlation of Participating in Games/sports with SWD and Disability category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>Participating in games with SWD</th>
<th>Disability category engaged in games/sports with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 above reveals no significant association between participating in games with SWD and disability category ($r_s = 0.00, p = 1.00$) at 0.05 level. This meant that the SWOD who engaged in games/sports with SWD did not take into consideration the disability category. The implication was that SWOD would participate in games/sports with both SWVI and SWPD given opportunities. As a result, Kenyatta University could create more awareness and adapt existing facilities to make more SWOD participate in games with SWVI/SWPD. As already noted, this is crucial as games/sports boost meaningful interaction between students in inclusive settings (MOE, 2009).

4.1.3.2 SWVI/SWPD Participation in Games/Sports with SWOD

The study also established the SWVI/SWPD's frequencies of participation in games/sports with SWOD. The results are indicated in Figure 6 (pg. 60).
Figure 6: SWVI/SWPD Participation in Games/sports with SWOD

Figure 6 shows that 6 (60%) of the SWPD and 11 (55%) of the SWVI had at least engaged in games/sports with SWOD, whereas 9 (45%) of the SWVI and 4 (40%) of the SWPD had never participated in such activities.

Figure 6 above indicates a positive finding as it shows that a majority of SWVI/SWPD had participated in games/sports with SWOD. This could imply the readiness of SWVI/SWPD to engage in social interactions with SWOD. Kenyatta University needs to exploit this readiness by adapting the existing facilities to encourage more SWOD to engage in games/sports with SWVI/SWPD. Besides, there is need for additional games/sports opportunities so that more SWVI/SWPD can participate.
4.1.4 Friendship Patterns between SWOD and SWVI/SWPD

The study sought to establish friendship patterns between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD. This was done by identifying whom SWVI/SWPD engaged when they needed help with personal problems as well as whom they dated. Figure 7 below presents the findings of SWOD asking for help from SWVI/SWPD.

Figure 7 shows that majority 14 (47%) of the SWOD had never asked SWVI/SWPD for help with personal problems. A significant number 9 (30%) had occasionally asked for help, while those who often or very often asked for such help were minimal (4 (13%); and 3(10%) respectively).

Table 7 (pg. 62) shows the frequencies of SWOD dating SWVI/SWPD.
Table 7: SWOD Dating SWVI/SWPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not dated</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 above indicates that 22 (73.3%) of SWOD had not dated SWVI/SWPD, in comparison with 7 (23.3%) who had done the same.

Nevertheless, Figure 7 (pg. 61) and Table 7 above showed positive findings when the large size of SWOD at Kenyatta University was taken into account. As earlier on noted, it was natural for the majority SWOD to interact more amongst themselves rather than with the minority SWVI/SWPD. According to Ash, Bellow, Davies, Newman and Richardson (2005), there were concerns about absence of friendship networks between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD in colleges of higher education in Israel. This supports the present results as such concerns were also evident at Kenyatta University, though it was commendable that 16 (53%) of the SWOD had at least asked for help from SWVI/SWPD (Figure 7 pg. 61: 30% occasionally, 13% often and 10% very often), and seven (23.3%) had dated SWVI/SWPD (See Table 7 above).
4.1.4.1 SWVI/SWPD’s Friendship Patterns with SWOD

The study also established friendship patterns from the views of SWVI/SWPD themselves. Table 8 below shows SWVI/SWPD’s frequencies of asking for help from SWOD.

Table 8: SWVI/SWPD engaging SWOD for Help with Personal Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have asked</td>
<td>Have not asked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPD</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWVI</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows that 9 (90%) of the SWPD and 14 (70%) of the SWVI had asked SWOD for help with personal problems. This was a positive finding, as it implied that majority of SWVI/SWPD had engaged in friendships with SWOD.

Similarly, Table 9 below indicates SWVI/SWPD’s frequencies of dating SWOD.

Table 9: SWVI/SWPD Dating SWOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have dated</td>
<td>Have not dated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWVI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (pg. 63) shows that 5 (50%) SWPD and 8 (40%) SWVI had dated SWOD. This was in contrast with the findings for SWOD (See Table 7 pg. 62) where only 7 (23.3%) SWOD had dated SWVI/SWPD. The implication was that more SWVI/SWPD had friendships with SWOD than vice versa.

4.1.4.2 Disability Category preferred by SWOD to Engage for Help

In addition, the study sought to identify the disability category that SWOD preferred to engage for help. This was done by assessing the frequencies of whom SWOD asked for help with personal problems. Figure 8 below presents the findings.

Figure 8: Disability Category preferred by SWOD to Engage for Help (N=30)
Figure 8 (pg. 64) shows that 16 (56%) of the SWOD had asked for help from SWVI. Only 6 (19%) had gone to SWPD while the remaining 8 (25%) had gone to both SWVI and SWPD. The findings show that the disability category influenced the choice of SWD asked for help by SWOD. For instance, majority of SWOD preferred engaging SWVI when in need of help with personal problems. This could be because SWVI were the majority (60 (75%) see pg. 37, 3.3) among the SWD at Kenyatta University, and, as a result, they were the ones that SWOD met most regularly in the university.

The finding points to the need for Kenyatta University to encourage more SWOD to interact with SWVI/SWPD regardless of disability in order to foster friendships, a sign of meaningful interaction. This is supported by the UNESCO (1994) position that inclusive orientations are most effective in combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities and building an inclusive society.

4.1.5 Aesthetic Appearance of SWVI/SWPD

The study sought to establish the influence of aesthetic appearance on attitudes towards interactions with SWVI/SWPD. It was assumed that the use of assistive devices like wheelchairs, crutches and white canes compromised aesthetic appearance. Thus, the study established the frequencies of SWOD who preferred visiting social places with SWVI/SWPD that used assistive devices. Table 10 (pg. 66) gives the results.
Table 10 above shows that 24 (80%) of the SWOD were comfortable visiting social places with SWD who were using assistive devices. The remaining 6 (20%) did not respond to the question. Despite the 6 (20%) who did not respond to the question, the finding implied that the presence of assistive devices (which could compromise aesthetic appearance) played no significant role in the interactions between SWD and SWOD. The finding contradicted Gröschl (2007) and Ross (2004) who linked physical appearance with attitudes towards people with disabilities. However, this contradiction was not exhaustive, as other aspects of aesthetic appearance, such as actual body features, were not assessed.

4.2 The Relationship between Gender and the Social Interaction of SWVI/SWPD and SWOD

The second objective of the study was to establish the relationship between gender and the social interaction of SWVI/SWPD and SWOD. This was done by focusing on the following aspects: gender and conversing with SWVI/SWPD, gender and asking for help from SWVI/SWPD, as well as gender and dating SWVI/SWPD.
Data are presented by narration and graphs. In addition, Tables are used to show correlation analyses.

4.2.1 SWOD’s Gender and Conversing with SWVI/SWPD

The study sought to establish if gender of SWOD influenced conversations with SWVI/SWPD. This was done by analyzing the correlation between gender of SWOD and frequencies of conversing with SWVI/SWPD. The findings are presented in Table II below.

Table II: Correlation of SWOD’s Gender and Conversing with SWVI/SWPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Convering with SWVI/SWPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convering with SWVI/SWPD</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II shows that there was no significant relationship between the gender of SWOD and conversing with SWVI/SWPD at 0.05 level ($r_s = 0.013$, $p = 0.946$). It implied that conversing with SWVI/SWPD was not influenced by gender.
4.2.1.1 SWVI/SWPD’s Gender and Conversing with SWOD

The study used correlation analysis to assess the relationship between gender of SWVI/SWPD and the frequency of conversing with SWOD. Table 12 below shows the correlation analysis of SWPD’s gender and conversing with SWOD.

Table 12: Correlation of SWPD’s Gender and Conversing with SWOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman’s rho Gender</th>
<th>Correlation with SWOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>-.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 indicates no significant relationship between the gender of SWPD and conversing with SWOD at 0.05 level ($r_s = -0.609$, $p=0.062$). The findings imply that the gender of SWPD did not influence conversing with SWOD, a finding similar to that of SWOD (Table II, pg. 61). A study by Kimani (2012) on inclusive education noted that most SWPD are perceived to be without special needs. This position could explain why the findings of SWPD resembled that of SWOD.

On the same note, Table 13 (pg. 69) shows the correlation analysis between the gender of SWVI and conversing with SWOD.
Table 13: Correlation of SWVI's Gender and Conversing with SWOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Conversing with SWOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWOD</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 13 above indicates that there was a significant association between gender of SWVI and conversing with SWOD at 0.05 level ($r_s=-0.454$, $p=0.044$). The results meant that the gender of SWVI was related to the frequency of conversing with SWOD. This led the study to assess further the frequencies of SWVI and conversing with SWOD. Figure 9 below presents the results.

![Figure 9: SWVI Conversing with SWOD](image)
Figure 9 (pg. 69) reveals that all 13 (100%) male SWVI “very often” conversed with SWOD, unlike female SWVI whose responses varied from often 2 (28.57%) to very often 5 (71.43%). This is supported by Ogalloh (2008) who highlighted the socially induced expectation of males to be more aggressive and outgoing than females. However, there is need for further research to offer alternative explanations on why the tendency was present in SWVI and not SWPD.

4.2.2 SWOD’s Gender and Asking for Help from SWVI/SWPD

In addition, the study sought to examine how gender affected asking for help from SWVI/SWPD. Thus, it correlated gender of SWOD and the frequency of asking for help from SWVI/SWPD. Table 14 has the findings.

Table 14: Correlation of SWOD's Gender and Asking for Help from SWVI/SWPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Asked for help from SWVI/SWPD</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked for help from SWVI/SWPD</td>
<td></td>
<td>.304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.102</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 above shows that there was no significant association between the gender of SWOD and asking for help from SWVI/SWPD at 0.05 level ($r_s=0.304$).
p=0.102). It implies that the gender of SWOD did not influence the choice of SWVI/SWPD engaged for help with personal problems.

4.2.2.1 SWVI/SWPD's Gender and Asking for Help from SWOD

The study also sought to establish the effect of SWVI/SWPD' gender on asking for help with personal problems from SWOD. Table 15 below shows the results of correlation analysis between gender of SWVI and frequency of asking for help from SWOD.

Table 15: Correlation of SWVI's Gender and Asking for Help from SWOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Asked for help</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.245</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.245</td>
<td></td>
<td>.298</td>
<td></td>
<td>.245</td>
<td></td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 shows no significant association between the gender of SWVI and asking for help from SWOD at 0.05 level ($r_s = -0.245, p = 0.298$). The results imply that the gender of SWVI did not influence asking for help from SWOD.

On the other hand, Table 16 (pg. 72) shows the results of correlation analysis between gender of SWPD and frequency of asking for help from SWOD.
Table 16: Correlation of SWPD's Gender and Asking for Help from SWOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>Gender Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Asked for help from SWOD Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.708(*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 16 above indicates a significant relationship between gender of SWPD and asking for help from SWOD at 0.05 level ($r_s=-0.708$, $p = 0.022$). It implied that the gender of SWPD had an effect on asking for help from SWOD. This is supported by Ogalloh (2008) who noted the presence of a wide belief that men exhibit more competency and independency than females. As a result, the study analyzed further the influence of gender of SWPD on asking for help from SWOD. Figure 10 below shows the findings.

Figure 10: Gender of SWPD and Asking for Help from SWOD
As shown in Figure 10 (pg. 72), female SWPD had very often 4 (67%), often and occasionally 2 (16.5%) asked for help from SWOD. On the contrary, 1 (25%) of the male SWPD had never asked for help from SWOD. Besides, it was noted that 4 (67%) of the female SWPD asked for such help very often, but no male SWPD did the same very often. This implied that female SWPD were more probable to ask for help from SWOD than male. Ogalloh (2008) supports the findings by positing that males are considered as more independent than females.

### 4.2.3 Gender of SWOD and Dating SWVI/SWPD

The study sought to establish whether the gender of SWOD influenced dating of SWVI/SWPD. The correlation between gender of SWOD and frequency of dating SWVI/SWPD was examined. Table 17 below presents the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Gender SWVI/SWPD</th>
<th>Dating SWVI/SWPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.389(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dated students with disabilities</td>
<td>.389(*)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 17 shows that there was a significant association between the gender of SWOD and dating of SWVI/SWPD at 0.05 level ($r_s=0.389$, $p=0.037$). This implied that the gender of SWOD had an effect on dating SWVI/SWPD. The study
followed this up by using clustered percentages to examine the above effect. Figure 11 below gives the results.

Figure 11: Gender of SWOD and Dating SWVI/SWPD

Figure 11 reveals that 4 (71%) male SWOD had dated SWVI/SWPD, while only 2 (29%) female SWOD had done the same. This meant that more males than females had dated SWVI/SWPD. The proposition is supported by Robillard and Fichten’s (1983) finding that male SWOD, unlike female, had great interest in sexual activities with SWD.

4.2.3.1 SWVI/SWPD’s Gender and Dating SWOD

Moreover, the study sought to establish the influence of SWD’s gender on dating SWOD. This was done by analysing the correlation between SWVI/SWPD’s
gender and frequency of dating SWOD. Table 18 below shows the correlation analysis of SWPD’s gender and dating SWOD.

**Table 18: Correlation of SWPD’s Gender and Dating SWOD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman’s rho</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Dated SWOD</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 shows no significant relationship existed between gender of SWPD and dating SWOD at 0.05 level ($r_s = 0.408; p = 0.242$). The implication was that the gender of SWPD did not influence dating SWOD.

On the other hand, Table 19 below shows the correlation analysis between SWVI’s gender and dating SWOD.

**Table 19: Correlation of SWVI’s Gender and Dating SWOD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman’s rho</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Dated students with disabilities</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.570(*)</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>.570(*)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 19 (pg. 75) indicates that there was a significant relationship between gender of SWVI and dating of SWOD at 0.05 ($r_s = 0.570, p = 0.014$). It implied that the gender of SWVI had an effect on dating SWOD. Further analysis of the frequencies of SWVI and dating SWOD revealed the results shown in Figure 12 below.

Figure 12: SWVI's Gender and Dating SWOD

Figure 12 reveals that 8 (61.50%) male SWVI had dated SWOD while only 1 (16.70%) female SWVI had done the same. It shows that more male than female SWVI had dated SWOD. Probably, this arose from the traditional stereotype of females playing a passive role in initiating intimate relationships. On that note, the symbolic interaction theory (Blumer, 1969) supported the current finding as the roles prescribed by the society (symbols) had influenced how male and female SWVI acted towards SWOD.
4.3 Availability of Initiatives to Encourage Social Participation of SWVI/SWPD

The third objective was to determine the initiatives put in place to encourage SWVI/SWPD to participate in social activities at Kenyatta University. Data are presented mainly by narration. Besides, graphs are used to illustrate the data where necessary.

4.3.1 Administrators’ Views on Initiatives to Support Social Participation of SWVI/SWPD

The study revealed various support systems aimed at fostering participation of SWVI/SWPD in social activities at Kenyatta University. According to the administrators, the support systems included the Kenyatta University Disability Sports Association that targeted at empowering SWVI/SWPD to participate in sports at both recreational and competitive levels. The Kenyatta University Directorate of Disability Services Office was in charge of the welfare of staff and, most importantly, SWVI/SWPD, while the Kenyatta University Disability Day and Sports Day was a day for positively valuing and celebrating disability. In these once a year event, SWOD as well as staff were encouraged to participate in activities like simulation of disability, as well as playing sitting volleyball, amputee football, foot sole, wheel chair tennis, and racing. Among the activities of the Kenyatta University Disabled Association, a club for SWD, was creating awareness on disability and advocating for SWOD to help SWD on activities like
reading for SWVI. In addition, counseling services were present but not specifically for SWD.

The three administrators (Kenyatta University dean of students, the director of the directorate of sports and games of Kenyatta University and the director of Kenyatta University Directorate of Disability Services) felt that the initiatives put in place at Kenyatta University were adequate for the SWVI and SWPD. However, they cited inadequacy of support systems for students with hearing impairments, especially sign language interpreters. Additionally, there were cases of sexual harassment from SWOD directed to SWD. The Kenyatta University dean of students posited that prejudice against SWD could have existed in the university though it was not easy to document as, most of the time, it went without reporting.

Two of the administrators (the director of the Directorate of Sports and Games and the director of the Directorate of Disability Services) rated the social interaction between SWOD and SWVI/SWPD as good, while the dean of students rated it as excellent. However, all of them underlined the importance of more sensitization on disability to mitigate against the reported challenges, a fact also noted by Kimani (2012) in his study on inclusive education at Kenyatta University. The three administrators also pointed to the need for personal effort of the SWVI/SWPD in initiating interactions.
4.3.2 Students’ Participation in Initiatives for Supporting Social Participation of SWVI/SWPD

The initiatives cited by students were the Kenyatta University Disability Day, religious seminars, student clubs, International Day for People with Disabilities, Kenyatta University Sports Day, and other sponsored marathons. Figure 13 below shows the frequencies of students’ engagement in the initiatives.

![Chart showing the frequencies of students' engagement in initiatives](chart.png)

Figure 13: Students’ Engagement in Initiatives for Fostering Social Wellbeing of SWVI/SWPD (N=60)

Figure 13 shows that the Kenyatta University Disability Day and the Kenyatta University Sports Day had the most participants 19 (32%). The international day for people with disabilities had also significant participants 12 (20%). There was little participation in clubs 4(8%), religious seminars 2 (4%) and other sponsored
marathons like the Standard Chartered marathon 2 (4%). Bovey and Strain (2011) support the above finding by citing the need for inclusive institutions to come up with initiatives to encourage the participation of people with disabilities in social activities. In this regard, the effort made by Kenyatta University was commendable. In addition, UNESCO (1999) supports the study findings as the initiatives it established in other non-Kenyan universities echo the ones shown in Figure 13 above.

The study went further to establish the participation of SWOD, SWVI and SWPD in activities that promoted understanding of disability. Figure 14 below presents the results.

![Figure 14: Participation in Activities Promoting Understanding of Disability](image-url)
Figure 14 (pg. 80) reveals that 23 (78%) SWOD had not participated in activities that promoted appreciation of SWVI/SWPD, such as the Kenyatta University Disability Day, religious seminars, student clubs, International Day for People with Disabilities and Kenyatta University Sports Day. In contrast, the majority of SWVI/SWPD had participated in such activities (SWVI 15 (75%); SWPD 7 (70%)). The implication was that SWVI and SWPD were hindered by disability and, as a result, only engaged in the few social activities offered by the university. However, they turned up overwhelmingly in these activities, being the only ones available to them. The case was different for SWOD as they had a variety of alternatives to choose from, as they were not hindered by any disability.

The findings in Figure 14 (see pg. 80) point to the need for increased awareness and advocacy on disability so that more SWOD participate in activities that will promote their interaction with SWVI/SWPD. This is supported by Bovey and Strain (2011) who pointed to the need for more innovative activities to promote the appreciation of disability among the SWOD. It would mitigate against the challenges faced by SWVI/SWPD, like the sexual harassment reported by the administrators. On the same note, Burugu (2005), in her study on factors affecting the implementation of inclusive education, recommended that both SWOD and SWVI/SWPD should undergo training in order to develop pro-social behaviors amongst themselves. For instance, Maseno University provides a mandatory introductory unit on disability for all students pursuing a course in education in
order to create awareness (Kochung, 2010). This aspect was lacking at Kenyatta University.

4.3.3 Accessibility of Avenues for Social Interaction

The study assessed the accessibility of various avenues where social interactions between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD could occur. This was done by asking the students to rate the accessibility of the students’ center, amphitheater, playground, dining halls, gymnasium and swimming pool. Figure 15 below presents the findings.

![Accessibility of Avenues for Social Interactions](image)

**Figure 15: Accessibility of Avenues for Social Interactions (N=60)**
Figure 15 (pg. 82) shows that all the areas in question were accessible, though the degree of accessibility differed. The differences in rating accessibility could arise from the type of disability that the respondents had. For instance, students on wheelchairs could have ranked accessibility differently from students on crutches.

The students' business center was ranked as the most accessible by 48 (80%) of the students. This was a relatively new building in the University. As a result, it had been built with the consideration of the presence of SWD. The administrators expressed the same view that new buildings in the institution had designs that could be used by everybody. However, the administrators had also noted the need for old buildings to be made accessible. The position was backed by the findings in Figure 15 (pg. 75) as relatively old facilities like the swimming pool, playground, dining halls, and gymnasium had significant rankings of average accessibility (70%, 50%, 40%, and 30% respectively).

On the other hand, a considerable number of students 24 (40%) were not sure about the accessibility of the amphitheater. The amphitheatre is the newest building among the ones assessed, and the Kenyatta University Disability Day is usually held here. Hence, the significant number of respondents who are not sure about its accessibility might be explained by the large number of students who do not take part in the activities promoting appreciation of SWD (see Figure 14 pg. 80).
Generally, the study established that most of the facilities at Kenyatta University where social interactions between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD could occur were accessible. Restall, Leclair & Banks (2005) support the findings by noting the importance of barrier free environments in promoting social interactions between SWD and SWOD. Besides, a study by Kimani (2012) on implementation of inclusive education at Kenyatta University reported that lecture rooms, pedestrian paths to classrooms, as well as transport and accommodation services at Kenyatta University were, generally, accessible to SWD. Thus, inaccessibility of avenues of social interactions was an unlikely cause of the discrepancies in interactions between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD at Kenyatta University.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction
Presented in this chapter is the summary, implications and conclusions deduced from the research findings. In addition, general and further research recommendations are given.

5.1 Summary
The study aimed at analyzing the social challenges facing included SWVI and SWPD at Kenyatta University. This was because such social challenges could threaten the tenets of inclusive orientations as envisaged by UNESCO (1994), which are to combat discriminatory attitudes, create welcoming communities, build inclusive societies and achieve education for all. The study accomplished the aim by assessing the interaction patterns between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD, the relationship between gender and the social interactions of the students, as well as the initiatives put in place to foster the social participation of SWVI/SWPD.

5.1.1 The Social Interaction Patterns between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD
The interaction patterns were assessed by identifying whom SWD and SWOD shared accommodation facilities with, engaged in friendships, conversations, and sports/games.
It was realized that the majority of SWOD had not shared campus accommodation facilities with SWVI/SWPD, though they were willing to do the same given a chance. Conversely, a majority of SWVI/SWPD had shared accommodation facilities with SWOD. The SWOD who had shared accommodation facilities with SWVI/SWPD were more enthusiastic of their social interactions with SWVI/SWPD than those who had not.

The study observed that a majority of SWOD had engaged in conversations with SWVI/SWPD. It also noted that there was no significant relationship between conversing with SWVI/SWPD and the choice of category of disability conversed with. On the same note, most SWVI/SWPD had conversed with SWOD.

Majority of SWOD had never participated in games/sports with SWVI/SWPD despite various opportunities to do the same. Those who participated in such activities were not influenced by the disability category. Besides, majority of the SWOD who had not participated in games/sports with SWVI/SWPD were willing to do the same given a chance. On the other hand, the majority of the SWVI/SWPD had engaged in games/sports with SWOD.

Friendship networks existed between the SWVI/SWPD and SWOD, as indicated by the presence of patterns of dating and asking for help between the two groups. However, the majority of SWOD had asked for help from SWVI only. Moreover,
aesthetic appearance (defined by the use of assistive devices) did not influence the interactions between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD, though there was need for further research in the area.

5.1.2 The Relationship between Gender and the Social Interaction of SWVI/SWPD and SWOD

The relationship between gender and social interactions was assessed using correlation analyses. Gender of SWOD did not influence the choice of SWD they engaged in conversations with. Besides, the gender of SWPD did not influence conversing with SWOD. However, more male SWVI conversed with SWOD than their female counterparts did. In addition, gender of SWOD did not influence the choice of SWD engaged for help with personal problems. The gender of SWVI had no influence on asking for help from SWOD, while more female SWPD asked for help from SWOD than their male counterparts did. More male SWOD had dated SWVI/SWPD than their female counterparts did, while more male SWVI had dated SWOD than their female counterparts did. The gender of SWPD did not influence dating of SWOD.

5.1.3 The Initiatives put in place to Encourage SWVI and SWPD to Participate in Social Activities

The study established various initiatives put in place by Kenyatta University to foster the participation of students with disability in social activities. These
included the Kenyatta University Disability Sports Association and the Kenyatta University Directorate of Disability Services. Other activities included the Kenyatta University Disability Day, Kenyatta University Disability Sports Day, and other sponsored marathons. Other initiatives, though not specifically for SWVI/SWPD, were religious seminars and student clubs. In addition, SWVI/SWPD did not pay while entering the gymnasium or swimming pool. The university also participated in the celebration of the International Day for People with Disabilities. On the other hand, few SWOD had taken part in activities that fostered the understanding of disability. In contrast, the majority of SWVI/SWPD had engaged in such activities. Additionally, most avenues where social interactions were likely to occur were accessible to SWVI/SWPD, with the exception of old buildings. Nevertheless, it was evident that the initiatives to foster participation of SWVI/SWPD were not enough.

5.2 Implications of the Findings

The findings showed the need for Kenyatta University to encourage more interaction between SWOD and SWVI/SWPD. This could be done by offering additional opportunities for the two groups of students to interact, such as assigning accommodation facilities regardless of disability and creating awareness on the initiatives designed to foster interaction between the two groups of students, such as the games/sports. Besides, the SWVI/SWPD had a duty to initiate such interactions and not merely to wait on SWOD.
It was also implied that SWOD and SWVI/SWPD could interact with each other regardless of gender. This was because gender had no wholesome influence on social interactions between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD. However, there were exceptions, such as more male SWOD preferring to date SWVI/SWPD than their female counterparts did, and more female SWPD asking for help from SWOD than their male counterparts did. These suggested the influence of traditional gender stereotypes in social interactions, for instance males being more aggressive and independent than females.

Another implication was the need for sensitization of SWOD on the initiatives available to foster their social interactions with SWVI/SWPD. This arose from the finding that majority of SWOD did not participate in the existing initiatives. It pointed to the need for advocacy and awareness creation in order to encourage more SWOD to take advantage of the initiatives and, as a result, enable positive interactions between the two groups. There was also need for Kenyatta University to increase the accessibility of avenues where social interactions were likely to occur, especially on old buildings.

5.3 Conclusion

The research established that there existed some social challenges facing SWVI/SWPD at Kenyatta University. There were astounding discrepancies concerning interactions between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD. For instance, the
majority of SWOD did not participate in the initiatives to foster their positive social interaction with SWVI/SWPD. The study however established that these challenges could be abated. It was evident that Kenyatta University had acknowledged some of the challenges and attempted to put in place initiatives to achieve the UNESCO (1994) tenets of inclusive orientations, which are to combat discriminatory attitudes, create welcoming communities, build inclusive societies as well as achieve education for all.

Significant effort had been made by the university to foster the social participation of SWVI/SWPD and to remove the social barriers to inclusion. In fact, to some extent, there were noteworthy interactions between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD in the university attributable to some of the initiatives by the university. This partly settled the fear of lack of meaningful interactions between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD at Kenyatta University. It is against this backdrop, that there is need to foster and encourage positive interactions between the SWVI/SWPD and SWOD, address the impact of gender on such interactions and create initiatives to foster meaningful interactions. Therefore, this called for more awareness and advocacy regarding SWVI and SWPD at Kenyatta University.
5.4 Recommendations

The following are recommendations from the study:

- Kenyatta University should increase investment on disability related projects so as to provide more equipment for SWVI/SWPD and make their buildings and other social amenities accessible.

- There should be more sensitization on disability to foster appreciation of SWVI/SWPD.

- There is need to encourage the sharing of accommodation facilities between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD in order to foster meaningful interactions between the two groups. This could be realized through offering accommodation facilities to students without regarding disability. There should be no separate accommodation facilities for SWVI/SWPD, but, the institutions should strive at making all accommodation facilities barrier free so that more SWVI/SWPD live with SWOD.

- Kenyatta University should come up with additional innovative initiatives to foster the participation of SWVI/SWPD and meaningful interactions. These could be in games/sports, music and debate clubs, among others.

- Kenyatta University should provide SWVI/SWPD with personal orientation to university life, which includes information on the help available to them.
5.5 Further Research

Further research could be done in the following areas.

- Similar studies focusing on students with other disabilities like hearing impairment, psychiatric and attention deficits.

- Studies in other universities offering inclusive education to give comparative findings of the social challenges facing students with disabilities.

- Further assessment of the impact of aesthetic appearance on interactions between SWVI/SWPD and SWOD at Kenyatta University.

- Further analyses on the impact of gender on social interactions of SWVI.
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APPENDICES

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS WITHOUT DISABILITIES

The role of this questionnaire is to collect data to be used in a study to analyse social challenges facing students with disabilities at Kenyatta University. I will be very grateful if you could assist me by responding to all questions raised. The information you give will be treated confidentially and for purpose of the study only. You are not required to give your name. Thank you.

Sex: □ Female □ Male
Year of study: □ 1st □ 2nd □ 3rd □ 4th □ other (specify) □

1. Where do you now live during the university year?
□ Hostel or other campus housing □ Out of campus (Go to 1.2.1)
1.1 If in hostel or other campus housing, have you ever shared a hostel room with a student with disabilities. □ Yes □ No
If yes,
1.2 Category of disability of the student you shared a hostel room with
□ Visual impairment □ Physical disability □ Both
□ Other (Specify) □
1.2.1 If you live (i) outside campus or (ii) in hostel or other campus housing but have never shared a room with a student with disability, would you feel comfortable sharing a room with a student with disabilities? Please explain your answer

2. In your experience at this institution during the current year, about how often have you done each of the following? Indicate your response by filling in one of the boxes to the right of each statement.
2.1 Talked to a student(s) with disabilities. □ very often □ often □ occasionally □ Never (Go to 2.1.4)
If applicable:
2.1.1 Category of disability of the student you talked with □ Visual impairment □ Physical disability □ Both □ Other (Specify)
2.1.2 Sex of the student(s) with disability you talked with □ Male □ Female □ Both
2.1.3 Please explain your experience of talking with the student(s) with disabilities
2.1.4 If you have never talked to a student with disability, would you feel comfortable doing the same? Please explain your answer

2.2 Read print books or class notes to a student(s) with visual impairments.
2.2.1 If you have never read print books or class notes to a student(s) with visual impairments, would you feel comfortable doing the same? Please explain your answer

2.4 How often have you engaged in games/sports with a student with a disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never (Go to 2.4.4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If applicable:

2.4.1 Disability Category of the student you participated in games/sports with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual impairment</th>
<th>Physical disability</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Other (Specify)   |

2.4.2 Sex of the student(s) with disability you participated in games/sports with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.4.3 Please explain your experience with the student with disability

2.4.4 If you have never engaged in sports/games with student(s) with disabilities, would you feel comfortable doing the same? Please explain your answer

2.5 How often have you asked a student with disabilities for help with a personal problem?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never (Go to 2.5.3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If applicable:

2.5.1 Disability Category of the student you asked for help

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual impairment</th>
<th>Physical disability</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Other (Specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.5.2 Sex of the student(s) with disability you asked for help

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.5.3 If you have never asked a student(s) with disabilities for help with a personal problem, would you feel comfortable doing the same? Please explain your answer

2.6 Would you feel comfortable visiting social places with acquaintances with disabilities that are using assistive devices such as wheelchairs, crutches, white canes, etc? Please explain

2.7 Have you ever dated a student with a disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If applicable:

2.7.1 Disability Category of the student you dated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual impairment</th>
<th>Physical disability</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Other (Specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3. Thinking of your experience in this institution, to what extent is each of the following accessible for use by students with disabilities. Please tick where applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Accessible</th>
<th>Accessible</th>
<th>Least accessible</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining halls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Have you participated in any activity in the university that aimed at promoting appreciation for people with disabilities? (Like Kenyatta University Disability Day, Kenyatta University Sports Day for People with Disability, Clubs etc). □ Yes □ No

If Yes, please elaborate and give examples

5. Make other recommendations/suggestions concerning how you interact with students with disabilities outside the classroom.
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

The role of this questionnaire is to collect data to be used in a study to analyze social challenges facing students with disabilities at Kenyatta University. I will be very grateful if you could assist me by responding to all questions raised. The information you give will be treated confidentially and for purpose of the study only. You are not required to give your name. Thank you.

Sex: □ Female □ Male

Year of study: □ 1st □ 2nd □ 3rd □ 4th □ other (specify) □

Which kind of disability do you have? □ Physical disability □ Blind □ Low vision □ Other (Specify) □

1. Where do you now live during the university year?
□ Hostel or other campus housing □ Out of campus (go to 1.2.2)

1.1 If in hostel or other campus housing, have you ever shared a hostel room with a student without disabilities? □ Yes □ No (go to 1.2.2)

1.2.2 If you live (i) outside campus or (ii) in hostel or other campus housing but have never shared a room with a student without disability, would you feel comfortable sharing a room with a student without disabilities? Please explain your answer.

2. In your experience at this institution during the current year, about how often have you done each of the following? Indicate your response by filling in one of the boxes to the right of each statement.

2.1 Talked with a student(s) without disabilities. □ Very often □ often □ occasionally □ Never (Go to 2.1.3)

If applicable:
2.1.1 Sex of the student(s) without disability you talked with
□ Male □ Female □ Both

2.1.2 Please explain your experience of talking with the student(s) without disabilities.

2.1.3 If you have never talked with a student without disability, would you feel comfortable doing the same? Please explain your answer.

2.2 If visually impaired, how often has a student(s) without disabilities read print material or class notes for you?
□ Very often □ often □ occasionally □ Never

2.4 How often have you engaged in games/sports with a student(s) without disabilities? □ very often □ often □ occasionally □ Never (Go to 2.4.2)

If applicable:
2.4.1 Please explain your experience with the student without disability.
2.4.2 If you have never engaged in sports/games with student(s) without disabilities, would you feel comfortable doing the same? Please explain your answer.

2.5 How often have you asked a student without disabilities for help with a personal problem?
- □ Very often
- □ Often
- □ Occasionally
- □ Never (Go to 2.5.2)

If applicable:

2.5.1 Sex of the student(s) with disability you asked for help
- □ Male
- □ Female
- □ Both

2.5.1.1 If you have never asked a student(s) without disabilities for help with a personal problem, would you feel comfortable doing the same? Please explain your answer.

2.6 Have you ever dated a student without a disability
- □ Yes
- □ No

2.7.1 If No, would you feel comfortable doing the same? Please explain your answer.

3. Thinking of your experience in this institution, to what extent is each of the following accessible for use by students with disabilities. Please tick where applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Accessible</th>
<th>Accessible</th>
<th>Least accessible</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining halls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Have you participated in any activity in the university that aimed at promoting appreciation for people with disabilities? (For instance Kenyatta University Disability Day, Kenyatta University Sports Day for People with Disability, Clubs etc). □ Yes □ No

If Yes, please elaborate and give examples.

5. Please name the factors (if any) that hinder your participation on an equal basis with students without disabilities in extra-curricular activities at Kenyatta University?

6. How does the university encourage you (if it does) to participate on an equal basis with students without disabilities in extra-curricular activities? Please
elaborate and give examples. (For example in sporting activities, music groups, clubs, structured social activities, support systems, trainings, etc).

7. Make other recommendations/suggestions concerning how you interact with students without disabilities
ADMINISTRATORS' INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. What initiatives has Kenyatta University put in place to encourage students with disabilities to participate on an equal basis in social activities?

2. In your opinion, are these initiatives adequate to facilitate positive interaction between students with disabilities and those without?
   - Effective□
   - Not effective□
   - Average□

3. In your opinion, what challenges do students with disabilities face in their effort to interact with other students in the university?

4. What initiatives have been put in place by the university to promote appreciation of people with disabilities?
   4.1 Could you describe the initiatives?
   4.2 Please rank these initiatives in order of effectiveness.

5. How can you describe the extent of social interaction between students with disabilities and those without at Kenyatta University?
   - Very Good□
   - Good□
   - Bad□
   - Worst□

6. What recommendations would you give to promote the interactions between students with disabilities and those without at Kenyatta University?
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