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ABSTRACT

FACTORS HINDERING INTEGRATION OF STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS IN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF BORABU DIVISION: NYAMIRA DISTRICT, KENYA

International declarations such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948); the UN Convention of the Rights of the Child (1990), and the World Conference on Special Needs Education in Spain (1994), compelled nations to embrace integrated education. Literature reviewed reveal that developed countries such as, the US and Britain have established laws and acts which have streamlined the provision of service delivery for learners with special needs in regular school settings. In Kenya, the idea of integration of such learners was suggested more than 40 years ago, yet not much has been achieved. Although various education commissions such as the Ominde Commission (1964), the Gachathi Commission (1976), the Kamunge Commission (1988) and the Koech Report (1999) have for a long time advocated for integration of learners with special needs, very few schools are integrated. The Government of Kenya gazetted the “People with Disabilities Act, 2003” which became a law in 2004. It stipulates the need to provide education to people with disabilities. This study investigated what factors have impeded the integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division of Nyamira District, Kenya.

This study was guided by theories from: Okumbe (1998) “Educational Management Theory” adapted from Scientific (Classical) Management Theory by Taylor (1856-1917) and Fayol (1841-1925), Hobbes (1975), “The Future of Children” and Rogers (1969) “Unconditional Positive Regard”. The population of the study comprised the Kenya Ministry of Education staff, Headteachers and their deputies of both regular primary and secondary schools and teachers and headteachers of integrated programmes in Borabu Division of Nyamira District, Kenya. The study employed a descriptive research design where the dependent variables were those factors that impede integration and the
independent variables included age, gender, academic qualifications, teaching experience, type of institution and type of training. Cluster and simple random sampling techniques were used to select 20% of the population of all teachers and Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST) staff of Borabu Division to form a sample for the study. Questionnaires and interviews were used to collect data. Data were analysed using quantitative and qualitative methods. Descriptive statistics, that is, frequency distribution and percentages were used.

The findings indicated that major factors that hinder integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division include: lack of training in special education by most teachers; lack of and inadequate physical and learning facilities; lack of adequate plans and preparations for integration; absence of policy on special education and lack of awareness by parents about special needs education. Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made by the researcher: The Ministry of Education and Kenya Institute of Education (KIE) should consider starting and implementing a special education curriculum at all levels of teacher training colleges and teachers already in the field should be given comprehensive in-service training on special needs education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>American with Disabilities Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG</td>
<td>Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>Certificate of Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIDA</td>
<td>Danish International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAACE</td>
<td>East African Advanced Certificate of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EACE</td>
<td>East African Certificate of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARC</td>
<td>Educational Assessment and Resource Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARS</td>
<td>Educational Assessment and Resource Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Education for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPE</td>
<td>Free Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoK</td>
<td>Government of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSC</td>
<td>General School Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td>Individual with Disabilities Education Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>Individualized Educational Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KACE</td>
<td>Kenya Advanced Certificate of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPE</td>
<td>Kenya African Preliminary Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCPE</td>
<td>Kenya Certificate of Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCE</td>
<td>Kenya Certificate of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCSE</td>
<td>Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIE</td>
<td>Kenya Institute of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KISE</td>
<td>Kenya Institute of Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPE</td>
<td>Kenya Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSPh</td>
<td>Kenya Society for the Physically Handicapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAs</td>
<td>Local Education Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>Master of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEST</td>
<td>Ministry of Education Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Primary Teacher One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Public Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Parents Teachers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWDs</td>
<td>People With Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REI</td>
<td>Regular Education Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Secondary Teacher One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNE</td>
<td>Special Needs Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTC</td>
<td>Teachers Training College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Meeting children’s special needs in regular classes is one of the most important challenges facing teachers today. Children with special needs include those that experience conditions, barriers or factors that hinder normal learning and development of individuals. Such conditions include disabilities such as physical disability, mental handicap, visual handicap, speech and language problems and multiple handicaps. They also include social, emotional and health difficulties such as epilepsy, and schizophrenia. In Kenya, however, most school-aged children with special needs are not in any regular or special schools or classes.

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

According to WHO estimates, about 10 percent of any population have disabilities. Kenya, with a population of 30 million people (1999 GoK census), has therefore, about 3 million persons with disabilities. Since 44 percent of Kenya’s population is aged below 15 years, it is estimated that 1.3 million children between 0-15 years have disabilities. The National Development Plan 2002-2008 (Government of Kenya 2003) indicates that approximately 1.8 million people in Kenya, aged between 0-19 years have disabilities. A report by the Ministry of Education and UNICEF, *Situational Analysis of Children and Women in Kenya* (2001), shows that of the 90,000 children identified as
having special needs, only 6 per cent are in special schools (East African Standard, Aug. 25, 2001:16), a very low percentage.

In 2003, the Ministry of Education set up a Task Force to appraise Special Needs Education (SNE) in Kenya. One of the objectives for the Task Force was to establish the number of children with special needs in the schools. Before the appraisal exercise, available records at the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST Task Force, 2003) indicated that there were approximately 22,000 children with special needs in special schools and units. When the Task Force collected data from special schools, units, integrated programmes, DEO’s offices, MOEST headquarters and assessment centres, it was found that 26,885 learners with special needs were in schools – 15,129 boys and 11,756 girls (MOEST, 2003). Figures for the specific number of students in integrated programmes were not available. So out of a possible 1.3 million school-aged children with disabilities in Kenya, only 26,885 are attending school, again a very low percentage.

For long, children with disabilities have been confined to special schools under the assumption that such institutions offer safe and conducive havens for their rehabilitation and academic growth. Contrary to that view, a new rethinking is emerging that special schools serve to stigmatize the disabled and ultimately do not help them integrate and participate in society’s activities.

Against this background, experts are now arguing that the regular schools should be redesigned and equipped with teachers and facilities in order for them to enroll children with disabilities. Consequently, the current trend in education calls for educating every child within the community regardless of
the nature of handicap (Booth, Ainscow, Black, Vaughen & Shaw, 2000). It involves all students in the same schools in a community with no exceptions, irrespective of their intellectual, physical, sensory or other differences. They have equal rights to access the culturally valued curriculum of their society as full time members of their age appropriate mainstream classrooms (Booth et al, 2000).

Recently, the Kenya government created space for children with physical disabilities in ordinary schools, in order to give them opportunities to compete on an equal footing with their non-disabled agemates and therefore, stand an equal chance of exploiting their potentials to the maximum (Daily Nation, July 5, 2003: 6). Although the idea of regular class service delivery for learners with special educational needs is seen as a recent movement, it had been suggested in Kenya since independence. However, very minimal has been realized as far as the implementation of integration is concerned. The Ominde Report (1964), for instance noted that many children with mild handicaps were learning in regular schools. However, for quality education, the commission called for all certified teachers to be given skills which would enable them to teach such children in regular schools. It suggested that teacher training colleges (TTCs) should accept responsibility for acquainting prospective teachers with techniques for teaching children with special needs in regular schools. The recommendation of this commission suggested integration more than 40 years ago, which is in line with inclusive education today. If the contents of this commission report had been translated into action, Kenya would be way ahead in implementing integrated education.
Similarly, The Gachathi Report (1976): National Committee on Education Objectives and Policies which dealt with various education objectives and policies, put forward findings and recommendations on special needs education. It stressed the importance of improving education and other relevant services to persons with disabilities both in the school and community. The major recommendations of the report were that the government should:

i). Coordinate early identification and assessment of children with special needs.

ii). Create awareness on the part of the public on the causes of disabilities with a view of facilitating prevention.

iii). Collect existing data to establish the extent and nature of handicaps and the need for provision of special education.

iv). Follow a policy of integration for learners with special needs where special education facilities are catered for.

It was out of this commission that the need for coordinated assessment for learners with special needs education was determined. Consequently, Educational Assessment and Resource Services (EARS) was established in 1984 by the Kenya government through the assistance of the Royal Danish Government (DANIDA). Integration of learners with special needs education with regular learners was also needed according to this commission. The commission highlighted key factors in making integration a reality. However, these recommendations were not implemented.
Further, the Kamunge Commission (1988) was the first commission that went to special institutions and interviewed many stakeholders on special needs education. The commission investigated specific categories of learners with special needs in education. Some of the relevant recommendations made on special education included:

i). A national survey on data collection of various types of persons with disabilities;

ii). Appropriate curriculum developed for children with various special needs;

iii). Special units opened for children who are multiply handicapped and provided with appropriate and adequate staff;

iv). The regular teachers trained in teaching methodologies and guidance and counseling to enable them effectively teach children with emotional and behaviour problems;

v). Persons with various types of disabilities catered for in regular, vocational and technical institutions;

vi). Necessary facilities and equipment provided for learners with special needs in integrated programmes;

vii). Integration of learners with various handicaps into regular pre-primary and primary schools;

viii). The teaching and examination needs of learners with special needs such as visually impaired and physically handicapped catered for in adapted curricular and examinations; and
ix). Media and regular school and community programmes utilized to create awareness on persons with disabilities.

The latest commission of inquiry into the education system in Kenya, (Koech Report 1999), is the one that made the most positive recommendations in relation to education and training of persons with special needs. Although the Koech Report (1999) has not been fully implemented, partial reforms are taking place in the education sector. The report made one hundred and forty five recommendations on special needs education. A few of these include:

i). K.I.E should develop and standardize diagnostic assessment tools which have a local bias in promoting proper identification leading to accurate intervention.

ii). The government should abolish cost sharing for persons with disabilities and instead offer free and quality education.

iii). The government should establish a special education trust fund to give grants to support education of learners with special needs.

iv). The government should increase budgeting allocation to special needs education.

v). The examination papers for learners with handicaps should be adapted to suit the individual needs as dictated by the severity of handicapped and the ability of the child to manipulate examination instruments.

vi). An individually designed system should be used for learners with severe impairments following a functional curriculum geared towards independent living.
Research shows that children with disability are mainly from poor families. Many poor parents with children who are disabled opt to educate only their non-handicapped children using the limited financial resources they have (Daily Nation, May 6th, 2003:10). The government's recent introduction of free and compulsory primary education is laudable, however, it must put in place a mechanism to ensure that children with disability benefit too.

The above recommendations include many ways that could make more learners with special needs access quality education in regular school settings. Similarly, various commissions have for a long period highlighted the importance of special education needs being met in regular settings. However, little seems to have been accomplished. Currently, seminars are held in various regions of the country to sell the idea of inclusive education while again, little has been achieved as far as integrated education is concerned.

This study investigated factors hindering integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division of Nyamira District and its implication to the introduction of inclusive education.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Very few students with special educational needs are attending integrated programmes in Kenya. In Nyamira District, according to statistics available at Nyamira EARC, by September 2003, 707 children had been assessed between 1995 and 2003 and identified as having special educational needs. Of these, only 272 were enrolled in fifteen integrated programmes in the district. This is a further reflection that the district as well is doing poorly as far as integration
of students with special needs is concerned. The aim of advocating for the regular classroom setting as a service delivery system for learners with disabilities was conceived early enough in Kenya. This was recommended by the various education commissions; The Ominde Report (1964), Gachathi Report (1976), Kamunge Commission (1988) and Koech Report (1999). However, 40 years after the first recommendation, not much has been achieved.

According to the 2003 MOEST Task Force report on the SNE, Appraisal Exercise, there were only 26,885 learners with SNE in special schools, units and integrated programmes combined. The number of learners in integrated programmes alone would be much lower. It is a paradox that huge sums of money in Kenya have been spent on various commissions on education with good recommendations postulated about special education needs, yet Kenya is doing poorly in this area. Therefore, this study investigated factors hindering integration of students with special needs and its implications to the introduction of inclusive education in Borabu Division.

1.3 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to investigate factors that hinder integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division of Nyamira District.

1.4 OBJECTIVES

The major objectives of the study were to:

a) Identify major factors that hinder integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division.
b) Identify reasons for low enrolment in existing integrated settings in Borabu Division.

c) Establish the government’s role in providing integrated education in Borabu Division.

d) Compare enrolment populations of students with Special Educational Needs in Borabu Division during the years 1995 to 2004 so as to understand the trend of enrolment over the years.

e) Establish the number of students with disabilities enrolled in existing integrated primary and secondary schools in Borabu Division.

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study sought to answer the following questions:

i). What reasons are attributed to low enrolment of students with special needs in Borabu Division?

ii). What factors have hampered the progress of integrated education for students with special educational needs in the division?

iii). What is the Government doing to improve the implementation of integrated education?

iv). What reform measures can be introduced to expand the implementation of integration of students with special needs in the division?
1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

It is hoped that the results of this study was useful in the following ways:

i). Help the Government identify the planning and administrative issues affecting the integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division.

ii). Guide the Government in reforming and restructuring special education programmes so as to improve service delivery for students with special needs.

iii). Identify problems the teachers and the students are experiencing during the integration process.

iv). Identify areas for further research as regards integrated education.

v). Guide the Government in implementing the intended inclusive education for students with special educational needs.

vi). Bridge the existing gaps in literature and thus create new knowledge in the field of special education in Kenya.

1.7 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The major limitation of the study was: -

i). The study, being based in a rural set up, may have findings that cannot be generalized to urban areas.
1.8 ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

The basic assumptions of the study were:

i) Training of regular teachers in special education plays a major role in enhancing integration of learners with special needs.

ii) Both sociocultural and socioeconomic practices may play a major role in hindering integration of students with special needs.

iii) Teachers, MOEST staff and students were aware of the factors hindering integration of students with special needs.

iv) The suggested solutions could contribute to effective planning and implementation of the intended introduction of inclusive education.

v) Introduction of special education knowledge in pre-service training courses for regular teachers will significantly increase the number of personnel required for effective special education needs.

1.9 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This section deals with a theoretical framework based on three models: an educational management: theory and practice by Okumbe (1998) which he adapted from Scientific (Classical) Management Theory by Taylor (1856-1917) and Fayol (1841-1925), an effective programme theory by Hobbes (1975), in “The future of Children” and an “Unconditional Positive Regard” theory by Rogers (1969), in his classical work “Freedom to Learn”. The educational management model shows the type of management suitable to enhance integrated education in educational institutions or organisations, the effective programme theory concerns the appropriate
classification for students with special needs that can favour integrated education and the unconditional positive regard concerns the type of learning conditions apt for learners. The three aspects can be used as criteria for evaluating the performance of special needs education in regular schools.

According to UNESCO (1981), the teaching and education of the disabled must be planned and administered properly. Thus, efficient management of institutions that offer integrated education for students with special educational needs is a necessary component in integration. Okumbe (1998) defines educational management as a process of designing, developing and effecting educational objectives and resources so as to achieve pre-determined educational goals. This definition intimates that the educational manager is both a policy maker and a policy executor. He further defines educational administration as a process of acquiring and allocating resources for the achievement of pre-determined educational goals. Thus, the implementation of integrated education for students with special educational needs can be evaluated in terms of how it is managed or administered in various institutions and organisations.

According to Okumbe (1998), an educational organisation functions at three levels: technical, managerial and institutional. The technological level refers to those activities which enable the organisation to achieve its goals. The functions of the managerial level is to provide the technical level with an enabling environment for an efficient and effective achievement of the organisational goals. The institutional level, on the other hand, provides the organisation with both the legitimacy and overall direction. The essence here is
that those authorities concerned with administration of integrated education are also responsible for teaching and educating the rest of the population and making similar arrangements for the disabled (UNESCO, 1981).

This study intended to examine those factors that affect integrated education for students with special educational needs in light of management of special education as an educational organization.

Further, educational organization is characterized by division of labour. Due to their complex nature, the division of labour in educational organizations should be thoughtfully worked out for both efficiency and effectiveness (Okumbe 1998). The power centres in an educational organisation derive their authority from acts, statutes and laws. These power centres include school committees, Board of Governors (BOG), Parents Teachers Association (PTA) and local authorities. Okumbe (1998), suggests that these power centres may delegate their authority to such lower power centres as the teachers, head teachers, counsellors and principals.

Another uniqueness of educational organizations is that, although teachers are at the bottom of the administrative hierarchy, they are highly educated professionals and are supposed to be effectively involved in decision making in their institutions. He further asserts that for any educational organisation to achieve its set goals, effectiveness and efficiency in management of human and material resources is required. Thus, the functions of educational management are to assure that sound policies, goals and objectives are formulated for the achievement of these objectives. It is also incumbent upon the management to organise and co-ordinate the activities in
an educational organisation for better performance. Lastly, the management must evaluate the organisation’s performance in accordance to the laid down regulations.

In his contribution to special education in 1975, Hobbes, an eminent educational psychologist and clinician, headed a national commission in the USA charged with the responsibility of examining the problems of special education classification systems. In a work significantly titled “The Futures of Children”, Hobbes (1975) advanced the theory that a comprehensive educational plan is required to classify children according to the services they need rather than the capabilities they lack. He asserted that special education and regular education essentially need the same point of view, namely: to create and emphasize educational programmes that start where the learner is and then stimulate and nurture positive development. He recognized that for long, policies have been designed to exclude or segregate significant numbers of children not only from mainstream of schooling but from life as well. Hobbes further noted that when so called retarded children are placed in regular classrooms containing effective accommodative capacities, the pupils make as much educational progress as they would if they remained in separate classes and sometimes more. In addition to “academic” learning, socially, their self-concepts become more positive, less characterized by self-hatred and self-contempt (Gartner and Lipsky, 1987).

He, however, cautions that the practice will expose even the most vulnerable students to a polluted mainstream, making the task very difficult yet important. He continues to stress that we must create a responsive, humane
environment with positive regard for all children and with sets of manageable learning tasks providing an appropriate learning atmosphere for all children. In other words, we can either say that special education becomes less “special” or that all education becomes more special and significant for each child (Norman and Heller, 1994).

Another theory on which this study is based is one advanced by Rogers called “Unconditional Positive Regard”. Unconditional positive regard means accepting people for what they are, without exacting any condition for full acceptance. According to Rogers (1969), this is one of the three necessary and sufficient conditions for the promotion of learning, the other two being empathy and congruence (Norman and Heller, 1994). “Empathy allows us to communicate to our pupils that we really understand the emotions they are experiencing and permits us to accurately read their feelings”. Congruence or genuineness means being “real” honest.

If teachers provide these conditions, then according to Rogers (1969), the children will be free to learn. This model is concerned with human interaction. In other words, if human interaction is improved in regular education classrooms, even students with special learning needs will greatly benefit as classroom atmospheres play important roles. Thus, the quality of the interpersonal relationship between the teacher and pupil does have an impact on many facets of classroom interaction and on how the pupil actually learns, Meyen and Skritic (1995).

In summary, Rogers insisted that all persons have a natural tendency to grow in health, and that the role of the therapist is to provide conditions
whereby the patient or client can fulfill his or her destiny of self-actualization. The famous Rogerian triad of unconditional positive regard, empathy and congruence become the crucial ingredient in the helping process. Good teaching, like good counseling, is based on this same triad. Classroom interactions should be based on the development of equal and genuine relationships (Norman and Heller 1994).

Therefore, in investigating factors that hinder integration of students with special needs, three aspects are necessary. First, we have to include or consider the administration of special education programmes which should be enhanced by sound policies. Secondly, we should consider the suitability of programmes, government’s effort, parents or community support offered to these students. Finally, we should consider the student-teacher interaction process and attitudes of teachers towards these students.

Figure 1.1 A conceptual framework of the integration ideology based on the three theories by Hobbes, Rogers and Okumbe
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The above conceptual framework portrays that if integration of students with special needs is to be realized, then effective administrative structures must be put in place. According to Okumbe (1998), it is sound administrative structures that can provide authority from acts, statutes and laws, promote effective goals.
and objectives, allocate resources (both human and material) and provide legitimacy and overall direction. Besides that, it is effective administration that can offer efficient division of labour, involve stakeholders in special education in decision making and co-ordination of all other activities. And above all, evaluate performance to determine achievement levels.

Once administration is efficient and effective, then two aspects are likely to be achieved; appropriate programmes and adequate interaction processes for learners with special needs. Firstly, Hobbes (1975), states that these should be programmes that are inclusive and take into account the services the learners need rather than the capabilities they lack. Secondly, Rogers (1969), asserts that adequate interaction processes have to be provided. This entails a sound interpersonal relationship between teacher-pupil, parent-pupil and pupil-community. Once all these have been appropriately coordinated, the effective learning processes and outcomes are more often than not guaranteed.

1.10 DEFINITIONS OF SIGNIFICANT TERMS

The following terms in this study are defined as used in the study:

- **A resource room** – is a classroom with special material and equipment and a specially trained teacher. Students may come to the resource room each day for several minutes or several hours and receive instructions individually or in small groups. The rest of the day the students are in regular classes.

- **Act** – this refers to a law that has been passed by a parliament.
• **Disability** – is any restriction or lack of ability to perform an activity in the manner within the range considered normal for human beings. It is a functional limitation resulting from a condition.

• **Exceptional** - is an inclusive term that refers to any child whose performance deviates from the norm, either below or above, to such an extent that special education programming is required. Thus, the term exceptional children would include both intellectually gifted and severely retarded children.

• **Full inclusion** - the integration of all students, including those with severe disabilities, into regular classes.

• **Handicap** – is the consequence of a disability when it causes an individual to function measurably lower than individuals intellectually, emotionally or physically to an extent that special programmes or services are needed.

• **Inclusion** – This is where schools should accommodate all children regardless of their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic or other needs. This “school for all” ideology advocates for children with disabilities, as far as possible, attending the neighbourhood school that would be attended if the child did not have a disability. Hence inclusion can be seen as a further step towards the normalization of children with disabilities in the education system. This is to ensure that all persons regardless of their racial, economic, physical or any difference are not excluded from any of the society’s activities.
• **Individualized Educational Programme (IEP)** – is a teaching plan for a student with special education needs usually drawn by the assessment team in collaboration with the teacher. It is an annually revised programme for an exceptional student, detailing present achievement level, goals, and strategies, drawn up by teachers, parents, specialist and (if possible) the student.

• **Integration** – This involves the provision of educational services to children with special needs in the regular education by making curricular and environmental changes without demanding changes in the curricular provisions.

• **Least Restrictive Placement (LRP) or Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)** – placement of each child in as normal an educational setting as possible.

• **Mainstreaming** – Is where the learners with mild disabilities are included in general education classes to increase their social interaction opportunities without necessarily making curricular changes.

• **Policy** – is a comprehensive method and procedure designed for programme implementation.

• **Public Law 94-142** – Legislation passed by the US Congress in 1975 that formally recognizes the needs and the rights of exceptional children.

• **Regular Education Initiative** - an educational movement that advocates giving regular education teachers, not special education teachers,
responsibility for teaching mildly (and sometimes moderately) handicapped students.

- **Special needs** – Refers to conditions, barriers or factors that hinder normal learning and development of individuals. These conditions may include disabilities, social, emotional or health difficulties.

- **Special Needs Education** – this is a term which covers programmes and services for children who deviate physically, mentally or emotionally from the normal to an extend that they require unique learning experiences, techniques or materials in order to be maintained in the regular classroom, and specialized classes and programmes if the problems are more severe.

- **Special school** – this refers to a school that is organized to exclusively provide educational services to learners with disabilities.

- **Special unit** – is a classroom(s) that is attached to a regular school but set aside for educating learners with specific types of disabilities.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature in the area of studies pertaining to integration of students with special needs is reviewed in this section to provide some insights from which integration is based. The review begins with the concept of integration, followed by international declarations, then history of integration ideology and lastly, management of special education and integrated institutions.

2.1 CONCEPT OF INTEGRATION

The literal meaning of integration is making whole or combining into a whole. However, in special education settings it implies placing children with handicaps or special needs in ordinary schools where they can learn with other children Hegarty (1993). Children who are referred, assessed, and identified as having disabilities or special needs are entitled to free appropriate public education in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) possible, (Smith & Luckasson, 1995). Thus the provision of natural and least restrictive environment is guaranteed. In a way, this is a kind of socialization designed to eliminate individual variations or differences (Norman and Heller, 1994). The terms integration and mainstreaming are used interchangeably even though there may be slight grammatical differences. In special education, the terms mean the same thing in principle.

The concept of integration is derived from the principle of “normalization” which states that children with special needs should be treated as normally as possible within the limits of their capabilities (Norman and Heller, 1994;
Hegarty, et-al, 1982). Persons with disabilities should have opportunities to live as much as non-handicapped persons as possible and that this goal can be met by exposing them to the living conditions common to their culture (Woolfensberger, 1972). By integrating, it is hoped that social interactions and demands of the community environment would result in adaptive behaviour. The extent to which integration is attained is not restricted to academic matters alone. It is recognized that mixing of the disabled students with regular school pupils both within and outside the classroom contributes to “normal” standards of achievement and behaviour. From a social standpoint, as well as the various curriculum components which have a social and or emotional emphasis, integration serves as a focal point for social interaction. Essentially, the goal is to expand the boundaries and reduce the barriers that have segregated such children from the mainstream of society (Norman and Heller, 1994).

Principally, there are two main aspects of integration: Firstly, integration in terms of the nature of association between the special group and the ordinary school; secondly, integration in terms of organisational structure (Hegarty and Pocklington, 1984).

The nature of integration by association further takes three main phases. These are:

(i) Locational integration

(ii) Social integration

(iii) Functional or instructional integration

Locational integration relates to the physical location of special education provisions. It exists where special unit classes are set up in ordinary schools.
The Warnock Report (1978), states that units can exist where special school and ordinary school share the same site (Hegarty & Pocklington, 1984). The need for proper planning and organisation is paramount in achieving this kind of integration.

Social integration is a situation where children with special needs mix with children in regular school only during out-of-class activities such as, assembly, break time, lunch and games. The teachers may not be necessarily or directly connected to the socializing aspect of the children. This kind of integration will have different significance at different ages. According to the Warnock Report of 1978, young children are generally able to accept individual differences more readily and more naturally than older children. It is therefore, better to initiate such integration at the nursery or pre-school level.

Functional integration is the fullest form of integration where children with special needs join, part-time or full-time, the regular classes of the school and make full contributions to activities of the school (Hegarty, 1993). Functional integration makes the greatest demand upon the school since it requires the most careful planning of class and individual teaching programmes to ensure that all children benefit whether or not they require special needs education. It should also be noted that children with special needs will need provision of special equipment as well as individual teaching if such integration is to succeed.

The concept of integration in terms of organisational structure encompasses the following essential features:
(i) Regular classroom plus part time special class,
(ii) Regular classroom plus resource room for help,
(iii) Regular classroom with assistance by itinerant teacher,
(iv) Regular classroom with consultative assistance from specialist teacher, and
(v) Regular classroom.

2.2 INTERNATIONAL DECLARATIONS

The purpose of this section is to give an account of international declarations which compel nations to embrace integrated education.

According to Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) where Kenya is a signatory, Article 26 in part states that “Every one has a right to education and education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. This in essence commits the countries that are signatories to this declaration to promote the education of all children, disabled included.

The UN convention on the Rights of the Child (1990) Article 23, states that children with disabilities should enjoy a full and decent life, conditions which ensure dignity and promote self-reliance and facilitate the child’s active participation in the community. Article 23(3) further asserts that children with disabilities should be educated to their maximum potential, within their own communities. Thus regular school orientations are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building
on an inclusive society and achieving education for all; moreover, they provide an effective education to the majority of the children and improve the efficiency and ultimately the cost effectiveness of the entire educational system (Booth, et-al 2000).

Further, the world conference on Special Needs Education, Spain, 1994 (The Salamanca statement) proclaims that every child has a fundamental right to education, and those with special education needs must have access to regular schools which should accommodate them within a child centered pedagogy capable of meeting these needs. The conference called upon all governments and urged them to:

i). adopt as a matter of law or policy the principle of inclusive education, enrolling all the children in regular schools, unless there are compelling reasons to do otherwise.

ii). establish a centralized and participatory mechanism for planning, monitoring and evaluating educational provision for children and adults with special educational needs.

iii). ensure that in the context of a systematic change, teacher education programmes, both pre-service and in-service, address, the provision of special needs education in regular schools.

All the above three statements can propel various governments, Kenya included, to make strides towards providing education for students with special educational needs in a regular school setting. In the case of Kenya, little seems to be realized, although there is the will and concern of the government.
2.3 HISTORY OF THE INTEGRATION IDEOLOGY

2.3.1 INTRODUCTION

Children with special needs, especially the mentally handicapped, were viewed differently from other children before the 17th century and these perceived differences were based on unalterable conditions or characteristics which kept the children in juvenile status even when advanced in years. These views by educators and others necessitated the development of separate educational systems for such children (Hegarty and Pocklington, 1984). The practice went on for many years and is still in place in most parts of the world. However, integration has become a central focus of concern in recent years. Despite widespread advocacy, many educationists view the trend toward integration with some unease. Special school staff fear that the system of support they have built up will be dismantled and pupils' special needs may go unmet while many teachers working in ordinary schools feel that they lack the competence to educate these students (Seamus, 1984). What they fail to understand is that integration is a process whereby education offered in ordinary schools becomes more differentiated and geared towards meeting a wider range of students' needs (Karugu, 2001).

A few countries have been able to envisage plans of actions which have propelled them to accomplish integration goals at national and state level. Britain and USA, for example, have come up with legislation and judicial actions which serve as the basis for the implementation of integration of students with special needs in ordinary schools. However, Kenya still lags behind in legislation and implementation of this educational reform. Possibly
lack of policy on special education greatly contribute to its slow implementation.

2.3.2 Integration of students with special needs in Britain.

In Britain, the Education Act of 1921 gave provisions that children with special needs be educated in special schools or classes (Hegarty and Pocklington, 1984). However, later moves were made to discourage total separation but these had little impact (Hegarty & Pocklington, 1984).

The Wood Committee of 1929 which was charged with the responsibility of drawing up guidelines on how to give services to children with special needs in Britain felt that special schools be brought closer in line with ordinary schools legally, administratively and in all other common perceptions (Hegarty & Pocklington, 1984). However, it was the legislation framework for integrated education that can be said to have started with the Education Act (1944), which suggested that the most acceptable place to educate children with disability was in ordinary schools, but which in reality became the vehicle for establishing a massive range of segregated special schools (Campel & Oliver, 1996).

As public and parental pressure grew to reduce or end special school provision for children with disability and to design and organise ordinary school environments in such a way as to make it capable of including practically all children with disability (Topliss, 1982), parliament passed the Education (Children with Handicaps) Act in 1970, making education of the children with disability the responsibility of local education authorities. Consequently, they were called upon to facilitate adapted programmes for
students with special needs in open education practices in primary schools (Meisels, 1979).

In 1976, the British government passed the Education Act Section 10, which required education authorities to accommodate the students with disability in ordinary schools except in cases where it would be impracticable, would involve unreasonable expenses, or would be clearly against the best interest of the child concerned, (Topliss, 1982). The introduction of 1981 Education Act further gave improvement on special educational needs. New responsibilities were assigned to school governors in order to improve regular class service delivery for learners with special needs, (Wolfendale, 1993). These responsibilities included:

i). to use their best endeavours to ensure that children with special needs in the school are receiving an education that caters for them properly.

ii). to ensure that everyone teaching children with special needs knows about those needs and how they are to be met.

iii). to ensure that everyone in school understands the importance of identifying the children with special needs and providing for them.

The 1993 Act and the Code of Practice are the latest developments in Britain to move towards integrating children with special needs into regular schools which have been taking place gradually since the Warnock Report (1978) and the 1981 Education Act, both of which recommended a move toward integration. The code complements the Act on the identification and assessment of special educational needs which sets out how schools and Local Education Authorities (LEAs) should implement the Act (Dean, 1996). From
the code, a whole school approach is given prominence. According to Dean, a whole school approach is one which:

i). all members of the staff accept a commitment to work together to provide the best possible education for children with special needs including the exceptionally able.

ii). every teacher accepts the responsibility for assessing and providing for the learning needs of exceptional children including the exceptionally able and helping them to fulfill their potentials;

iii). all members of staff are committed to creating the fullest level of integration for students with special needs.

Dean in (Jean Gross 1993), suggests that schools using a whole school approach need:

a collective will amongst staff, born out of collaborative school development work in special needs, that their school will be a school for all, and that the factors that make for good practice and popularity with the schools prospective parent clientele - have the same rights across the ability range.

Dean 1996:9

The Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs further emphasizes the importance of establishing a partnership with parents (Garry, 1995). It suggests that this partnership has a crucial bearing on the child’s educational progress and the effectiveness of any school-based action.

Further, the code highlights the need for whole school acceptance of responsibility for special education. The provision for students with special needs has to be seen as an integral part of the planning for all students (Peter,
The code also emphasizes that schools can no longer afford to not work closely with the parents. Schools should involve parents including those who have children with special needs, in a variety of ways (Garry, 1995).

### 2.3.3 Integration of students with special needs in the USA

The development and establishment of special education programmes in the United States have been on an evolutionary process over several decades. Each incremental stage in the process has led to increased knowledge and implementation of the best practices known and available for the times and to the corresponding adjustments in the belief systems and attitudes held by the educational community (Smith & Luckasson, 1995).

The US constitution which guarantees equal opportunities for all citizens is the basis for the free public education system. Since their beginning in the common school movement in the mid-1800's, public schools have evolved into a system that provides educational opportunities for all students. In the early 1900's girls were the first class of citizens who secured public education opportunities, after first being denied them, followed by students from racial minorities in the 1950’s and finally students with disabilities in 1970s (Tom, Edward & James, 1998). Litigation and legislation played important roles as each group secured the right to participate in public educational programmes (Lipsky and Gartney, 1996). Consequently significant early advances on behalf of exceptional students occurred (Joseph 1983).

Prior to mid 1970s in some schools, students with disabilities were provided with self-contained or isolated classrooms. Students with disability
rarely interacted with non-disabled students, and their teachers did not routinely come into contact with other teachers in the school. In addition to isolating the students, the programmes that did exist were also very small. Therefore, very few students were served (Tom, Edward and James, 1998).

Since the mid-1970s services to students with disabilities have changed dramatically due to parental advocacy, legislation and litigation. Services for students with disabilities evolved in three distinct phases: relative isolation, integration or main streaming and inclusion. In the relative isolation phase, students were either denied access to public schools or permitted to attend in isolated settings. In the integration phase which began in the 1970s, students with disabilities were mainstreamed or integrated into general education programmes when it was deemed appropriate (Smith & Luckasson, 1995).

A combination of legislation, litigation and professional rethinking of the value of special and segregated programmes versus normalized programmes for exceptional students further made renewed interests in the problems of maintaining children with special needs in regular classes, (Meisels, 1979). As a consequence, a law was passed in 1975 that began revolutionary changes in the education of children with disabilities. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (Public Law 94-142) was passed and required states to provide “a free appropriate public education for every child between the ages 3 and 21 (unless if the state law provides free public education to children 3 to 5 or 18 to 21 years of age) regardless of how serious he may be handicapped”. In 1986, PL 99-457 extended the requirements for a free, appropriate education to all handicapped children ages 3 to 5, even in
states that do not have public schooling for children their age. Also in the mid-
1980s some special educators and educational policy makers suggested that
regular and special education should be merged so that regular teachers would
have to take even more responsibility for the education of exceptional students
(Woolfork, 1995). This movement was called the Regular Education Initiative
(REI).

While both integration and inclusion resulted in students with disabilities
being in general classrooms, in the inclusion phase it was assumed that these
students belong in general classrooms, whereas in the integration phase they
were considered to be special education students who were simply placed in
the general classroom part of the time (Tom, Edward, James & Carol, 1998).

In 1990, PL 94-142 was amended to the Individuals with Disabilities
Education Act (IDEA). This legislation replaced the word “handicapped” with
“disabled” and expanded the services for disabled students. Also in 1990, the
American with Disabilities Act (ADA) extended civil rights protection in
employment, transportation, public accommodations, state and local
government and telecommunications for people with disabilities (Woolfork,
1995).

There were three major points of interest to teachers as far as the
requirements for these laws were concerned:

(i) the least restrictive placement;

(ii) the individualized educational programme; and

(iii) the protection of the rights of the disabled students and their
    parents.
Least Restrictive Placement – the law requires states to develop procedures for educating each child in the least restrictive placement. This means a setting that is as normal and as much in the mainstream of education as possible. Some disabled students may spend most of the day in a special class, but attend one or two regular classes in physical education and art. In most schools, severely disabled students are not integrated into regular class. However, in some districts there is a movement toward full integration – integrating all students even those with severe disabilities into regular classes. Advocates of full inclusion believe that disabled students can benefit from involvement with their non-disabled peers and should be educated with them in their regular home district school, even if doing so calls for special aids, services, and training or consultation for the regular teaching staff (Woolfork, 1995).

Individual Education Programme – the laws recognized that each student is unique and may need a specifically tailored programme to make progress. The individualized education programme or IEP is written by a team that includes the students’ teachers, school psychologist or special education supervisors, the parent(s), or guardian(s), and (where possible) the student. The programme must be updated each year and must state in writing:

i). The students’ present level of achievement or performance;

ii). Goals for the year and short-term measurable instructional objectives leading to these goals;

iii). A list of specific services for students and details of when those services will be initiated;
iv). A description on how fully the students will participate in the regular school programme,

v). A schedule indicating the students progress towards the objectives and approximately how long the services described in the plan will be needed, and

vi). Beginning at age 16, a statement of needed transitional services to move the student toward further education or work in adult life.

The rights of students and parents – several stipulations in these laws protect the rights of parents and students. Schools must have procedures for maintaining the confidentiality of school records. Testing practices must not discriminate against students from different cultural backgrounds. Parents have a right to see all records relating to the testing, placement and teaching of their children. If they wish, parents may obtain an independent evaluation of their children. Parents may bring an advocate or representative to the meeting at which the IEP is developed. Students whose parents are unavailable must be assigned a surrogate parent to participate in the planning. Parents must receive written notice (in their native language) before any evaluation or change in placement is made. Finally, parents have the right to challenge the programme developed for their children, and are protected by due process of law (Woolfork, 1995).

The importance of empowerment and self-determination for students with disabilities has been a focus of inclusion efforts, to better prepare students for the highest degree of independence possible. Because all students are eligible for public education in the United States, teachers in today’s public schools
must provide instruction and other educational services to meet the needs of a very diverse student population. They must develop ways to serve as many students as possible in general education environments (Smith and Luckasson, 1995). Today’s teachers must be effectively prepared to teach all kinds of students. Diversity among students in public schools represents the norm rather than exception (Johnson, Pugach & Devlin, 1990). Most classroom teachers will be directly involved in educating students with disabilities. This means that collaboration among parents, special education teachers, and general classroom teachers is critical in order for students with disabilities to receive an appropriate education (Wood, 1998). Today all children have a right to attend school. In most states, in fact, it is their legal obligation to attend school until they reach age 16. Side by side, boys and girls, rich and poor, every race and ethnic group, and children of all skill levels and abilities arrive at school each morning. Such student diversity demands teachers and other professionals who are skilled to meet challenges, who eagerly meet students and pledge to help and guide the process of education (Smith & Luckasson, 1995). All children with disabilities now attend public schools and have a right to education.

According to federal regulations “special education means specially designed instruction at no cost to the parent, to meet the unique needs of a child with a disability, including instructions conducted in the classroom, in the home, in hospitals, in institutions, in physical education and other settings” (34 code of Federal 17[a], [1]) in (Smith & Luckasson, 1995). It also includes all related services, for example, speech pathology, physical therapy, occupational
therapy and orientation and mobility, required to meet the unique learning needs of the youngsters (Smith & Luckasson, 1995).

2.3.4 Integration of students with special needs in Kenya

In Kenya, special education existed long before independence in 1963. Special schools such as the Thika Primary School for the Blind were established in 1946 by the Salvation Army as a rehabilitation centre but there were no policies put in place to give guidelines to special education issues.

In 1964, the government of Kenya addressed the issue of education through the Ominde Commission (1964). The Commission recommended that there was need for special education in order for training of exceptional children - children with mild as well as severe and profound impairments. The children with mild impairments could receive instructions in regular schools, provided special considerations were given by the teachers.

Globally, special education is a dynamic and changing field. In Kenya, there has been a desire to integrate students with special educational needs in ordinary schools for some time. Although some strides have been made within the last 40 years to integrate learners with special educational needs in ordinary schools, still much more awaits to be done. The field needs more trained teachers and support personnel, improved collaboration, additional research and development of special education techniques, more sensitive communities and school environments, in addition to policies, in order for the students to achieve their fullest potential in integrated settings.
Currently, the regulations covering general education in Kenya apply to children and young people with special needs (UNESCO, 1995). Thus, there are no separate policies to provide a firm foundation for the development of special education. For example, once children with disabilities have been assessed at Educational Assessment and Resource Services (EARS) and the outcome referred to medical doctors for confirmation, it is the parents to decide whether they wish their children to attend a residential school, integrated programme or regular school. Choices are limited because demand is higher than existing facilities can meet (UNESCO, 1995). This further negates the idea of integrating students with special needs in ordinary schools.

Similarly, though there are no precise statistics on the number of people with disabilities in Kenya, it is clear there are not enough special schools to accommodate all the children with special educational needs (Daily Nation, July 5, 2003:8). Hence the majority of the students with special needs could attend ordinary schools. However, this is not the case. This is further aggravated by not having enough specially trained teachers in ordinary and special schools. For instance, while 96.6 per cent of teachers in regular schools are trained in regular education, only 20 per cent of the teachers in schools and units for the deaf are trained to teach the hearing impaired (East African Standard, January 7, 2003:8). Consequently, children with disabilities have had very limited access to formal education relative to their able bodied peers. Even when access is accorded, they have often been unable to reach their highest potential due to inadequate, inappropriate and ineffective educational services.
The special units attached to ordinary schools are haphazardly established and may lack teaching and learning materials. Most of the teachers in these units are not specially trained, therefore the services they provide to learners are not adequate. Although primary education is now free for all students in Kenya, the integration of students with special needs in the ordinary day schools has never been a priority. However, on 9th January 2004, the Kenya government gazetted Acts of 2003 approved by Parliament. The Persons with Disabilities Act 2003 was one of them. After 21 days of being gazetted, this Act became a law, providing for the rights and privileges of persons with disabilities. Specifically, paragraphs 18(1) and (2) and 19 refer to the rights of disabled people to “education”. They state thus:

Paragraph 18:

(1) No person or learning institution shall deny admission to a person with a disability to any course of study by reason only of such disability, if the person has the ability to acquire substantial learning in that course.

(2) Learning institutions shall take account the special needs of persons with disabilities with respect to the entry requirements, pass marks, curriculum, examinations, auxiliary services, use of school facilities, class schedules, physical education requirements and other similar considerations.

The government to make provisions in all districts for an integrated system of special and non-formal education for persons with all forms of disabilities.

How and to what extent this new law will help boost integrated education for students with disabilities will be revealed in time. Currently, the Ministry of Education is organizing for the implementation of the Act.
2.4 MANAGEMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND INTEGRATED INSTITUTIONS

Management of special education and integrated programmes is complex and many variables need to be considered when making decisions about specific situations. Nevertheless, several key questions come to mind about management and control of these programmes. These key issues interplay and are interwoven and generally fall within these spheres, namely, management to meet the existing laws and policies, management for instructions (efficiency), and management for quality assurance (quality education). What educators or proponents of special education therefore need to realize is that management can be, to meet current laws and policies, for service delivery and to make sound judgment. This therefore calls for all stakeholders in special education to put effort in streamlining management of special education in relation to the three issues.

Management and organisation of special education and integrated programmes in USA is based on the principle of equality (Lazerson & Block, 1985), which recognizes different capabilities and different interests. Equality in education requires that the school be committed to play some role in reducing the obstacles to learning that derive from parental or any other disadvantages. Thus overcoming the obstacles to learning is an appropriate and valid responsibility of schooling. Further, according to National Commission of Teaching and Americas’ Future, (1996) good schools, teachers and administrators are more essential now than ever before in the American history to cater for extreme diversity of nations’ student population. Added to this,
according to Kinsler and Gamble (2001), is mainstreamed students from detracked special education classes and the magnitude of these students-instructional needs. For all schools and students to achieve the ends laid out in national, state or local standards, a number of pieces must be put into place with the current restricting effort (Kinsler & Gamble, 2001). To facilitate change, new governance structures must be put in place. Greater ownership of schooling process must be shifted from state and local authority policy makers to school councils (Kinsler & Gamble, 2001). Thus, according to Stevens, 1993, if all students are to be judged against same standards, all students including those with special needs must have access to the full scope of what is tested or measured.

To achieve excellence and equality, as called by new standards, a systematic questioning of all current instructional practices and willingness to modify basic tenets should ensure (Liberman & Miller, 1990). However, Kinsler & Gamble 2001, state that, with the ever growing diversity of the nation’s student population, educators need to understand that there is no best practice that can optimally be used to educate all children, irrespective of the immediate goals of instruction and without consideration of the learners cognitive strengths and challenges. Adherence to any instructional ideology should not take priority over the learners practical needs. On the other hand, according to Kinsler & Gamble 2001, educators have a professional and moral obligation to prepare their students for examination in spite of their own personal beliefs. School personnel need to focus on diagnostic capacity and
thus ensure quality assurance which can be reflected in the kind of curriculum offered and the kind of staff.

While the education in the USA is based on the principle of equality and value (Lazerson & Block, 1985), education in British primary schools is founded on a set of prescriptive assumptions about children's learning referred to as 'good practice'. This good practice according to Alexander 1992, refers to organisational arrangements and teaching methods which include group work, curriculum integration, a learning environment strong on visual impact and exploratory pedagogy and thematic enquiry. Children's entitlement to participate in every area of curriculum implies that assessment of children with special needs does not only relate to detailed individual programmes but also address the kinds of arrangements needed to ensure that the child has opportunities to participate in all activities (Wolfendale, 1993).

Education in British schools has been run at local level, with relatively little direction from central government. The Local Education Authorities (LEAs) have a policy of making provision in the ordinary school (Hegarty, 1993). The LEAs employ staff in an advisory capacity. They are responsible for monitoring the authorities educational provisions and developing new initiatives within it. This is guided by the Education Act 1981 which amended key sections of the Education Act 1944 and became a central law governing special education in England and Wales. It was implemented in April 1983. The Act paid a great deal of attention to identifying children with special educational needs and assessing them in order to establish what their educational needs actually are (Hegarty, 1993). As Galloway (1985), further
states that the most effective way to help children with special needs is to review aspects of school organisation, teaching methods and resources. Thus, a child's special needs are more likely to be met if the child is seen primarily as a teaching problem, rather than as having a learning or behaviour problem. Seeing the child as a teaching problem implies that teachers see it as their responsibility to teach him. In contrast, when he is seen as a learning or behaviour problem the implication is that the problem resides 'in' the child, and is therefore not the teacher's responsibility.

The Act places an explicit responsibility on the governors of maintained and voluntary schools 'to use their best endeavours' to ensure that a child's special needs are made known to all his teachers and that the required special provision is provided (Galloway, 1985). The Act further introduces elaborate machinery for parental involvement in identifying their children's needs and deciding how they should be met. Further, governors can handle their responsibilities under the act in different ways. They can take an active interest, seeing the head as accountable to them for the school's policy towards children with special needs and for the implementation of this policy in practice. Alternatively, they can take a passive interest, relying on the head to tell them as much or as little, as they need to know. Headteachers can use a variety of tactics to stimulate or inhibit the governors' interests.

In Kenya, special education is administered as a separate section within the Ministry of Education. However, regulations covering general education are deemed to apply to children with special needs (UNESCO, 1995). Children are not excluded from public education system because of the severity of their
disability but many do not receive the education they require because of lack of educational facilities and because families tend to give priority to their other children in pursuing educational opportunities. Although it is the responsibility of the government and the communities to ensure that children with special needs go to school and remove all barriers that may hinder their access to quality education, there are obstacles including negative attitudes against children with special needs in Kenya (Ramani, 2004).

Despite the governments' policy to provide equal education opportunities and the recent introduction of free primary education, still more than 95 per cent of children with disabilities do not go to school (Ramani, 2004). This high percentage can be attributed to the Ministry of Education's continued support and development for regular schools at the expense of special schools and integrated programmes. The schools are characterized by poor management, leading to poor methods, poor attitudes on the side of teachers towards students with special needs and above all lack of proper teaching facilities (Kirimi, 1997).

2.5 SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW

From the literature reviewed, it emerges that there is an obvious commitment now by developed countries toward providing education for students with special needs. Major challenges which inhibited integration of students with special educational needs in Britain and USA have been considerably overcome by the introduction of public laws and education acts which streamline the provision of services for such students. These have been revised over time to accommodate the present rethinking of integration
ideologies and parental and public advocacy through litigation and legislation. The review also present us with a picture of the need to embrace the integration ideology as required by major international declarations such as Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), UN Convention of Rights of the Child (1990), World Conference on Special Needs Education (1994), all of which advocate education for children with special needs in regular school settings. It has also become apparent that school based planning and commitment play a major role in devising appropriate strategies for school-level and classroom-level interventions for students with special needs.

On Kenya, the literature available indicates that for a long time, there have been strides to integrate learners with special needs in ordinary schools but little has been accomplished so far. Failure by the government to implement various recommendations by various commissions is a major setback. It is also instructive to note that literature in Kenya points to the fact that the problem is aggravated by lack of specially trained teachers both in ordinary and special schools.

A clear challenge then emerges of the need to analyse factors that affect the integration of students with special needs and the implications that this can have on the intended introduction of inclusive education. So far, there hasn’t been any analysis or study related to these factors in Kenya. The commission reports, newspaper reports, regional seminars as well as speeches by prominent personalities have just been mentioning the setbacks in education for students with special needs. It is time to undertake a comprehensive analysis of these factors, document the extent to which they affect the implementation of
education of students with special needs, and propose reform measures to make the integration more effective. The results can be used as benchmarks for shaping and implementing the intended introduction of inclusive education for students with special needs in the education system.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a description of how this study investigated the problem. Specifically, it focused on, the research design, the study location, target population, population sample and sampling procedures. The chapter also deals with research instruments, pre-testing of questionnaires, reliability and validity of instruments, measurement of variables, data collection and analysis procedures.

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

This research adapted a descriptive research method utilizing both qualitative and quantitative techniques in gathering data. A descriptive research presents what is or what was, in a social system. This includes the conditions existing, relationships, opinions held, processes going on, trends developing among others (Best and Khan, 1993; Abagi, 1996). It aims at getting a true picture of a situation, behaviour or attitude of individuals and community at large (Onyango, 2000). In this study in Borabu division, it sought to investigate factors hindering integrated education. It sought to analyse factors associated with certain occurrences, outcomes or type of behaviour. It provides clues for subsequent research that is more specific and aims to uncover the nature of facts in a given situation. Similarly, Lovell (1973), adds that, a descriptive research describes what is in a phenomenon. It is concerned with conditions that exist, practices that prevail, beliefs and attitudes that are held, processes
that are on going and trends that are developing. Lokesh in 1984, further states that, descriptive research studies are designed to obtain pertinent and precise information concerning the current status of a phenomena and whenever possible to draw valid general conclusions from the facts discovered.

As stated earlier, this design combined both qualitative and quantitative approaches. This was deemed appropriate because, no single method is ever adequate in investigating a problem with rival causal factors (Patton, 1990). In addition, this combination allows flexibility while examining multiple factors in an attempt to obtain the pertinent information (Obonyo, 1994). This is further supported by (Kasante, 1996) that, triangular techniques are suitable when a more holistic view of educational outcome is sought. As explained by (Kane, 1995: 245):

Many studies take an exclusive quantitative or qualitative approach. Very few combine the two approaches. It is found that use of complimentary methods reveal discrepancies which a single method cannot. The information you get will be stronger if you use triangulation, that is, as many techniques, methods and possible explanations as you can.

Therefore, this research used questionnaires and interview schedules. The questionnaires catered for, quantitative aspects while interviews formed the main thrust of the qualitative aspects. Qualitative strategy enabled the researcher to collect data in the actual context in which the phenomena occurs. As a result, it gave a more holistic picture. This implies that, it provides a big description of societal dynamics including, values, systems and perspectives within a given cultural context (Abagi, 1996). The approach was appropriate because it has a high analytical content and it is the best way of getting in-
depth information including sensitive and personalized experiences which are unlikely to be obtained with other methods (Kane, 1995).

On the other hand, quantitative method has the advantage of getting responses of the same questions from a large number of people and these responses can be quantified for conclusions to be drawn from them. (Bell, 1993). Quantitative approach was applied in this case to get information from the relatively large number of teachers, Ministry of Education staff and students. The quantified information summarized the results while at the same time complemented the qualitative data. The above reasons form the basis for which the descriptive research design was used. As was anticipated, the design was the most appropriate for this study, that is, to obtain exhaustive and accurate accounts of various factors that affect integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division of Nyamira District, Kenya.

3.2 MEASUREMENT OF VARIABLES

Measurement is the process we use to assign numbers to variables of individual population unit (McClave, 2000). In research, a variable refers to the identity of that which is subject to change (Rosenberg, 1993). Also, according to Statt (1998) variable is a condition or factor that is capable of changing or being changed. On the other hand, Babbie (1999) states that, variables are logical groupings of attributes. Thus, for example, male and female are attributes, and gender or sex are variables composed of these two attributes. The relationship between attributes and variables lies at the heart of both description and explanation in science Babbie (1999). Similarly, McClave
(2000) states that a variable is a characteristic or property of an individual population unit.

Like in experimental research, we can also have independent and dependent variables in descriptive research. Independent variables are conditions that are manipulated and are under the control of the researcher. The dependent variable is a measure used to register the effect of independent variable. In this study, the independent variable comprised mostly subject variables such as age, gender, academic qualifications, teaching experiences, type of school or institution and type of training.

Dependent variables comprised various factors that affected the implementation of integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division. These included: lack of specific policy on special education, lack of or insufficient trained teachers in special education, lack of commitment by stakeholders, lack of proper assessment for identification and placement, ignorance, lack of parental awareness, lack of physical learning materials, poverty and financial constraints, stigmatization, unfriendly attitudes and preference for segregated special schools.

Measurements of these variables was based on determining what each of the attributes in independent variables scored on each of the dependent variables. The outcome or results were presumed to have emanated solely from the various independent variables. Various themes that emanated from respondents during interviews formed dependent variables on which scores were based. These themes were assigned arbitrary numerical values for ease of computer entry and analysis. These assigned numerals are simply codes, for
example, school based factors will be coded 1, socio-cultural factors 2, socio-economic factors 3.

3.3 THE STUDY LOCATION

This study was carried out in Borabu Division of Nyamira District, Kenya. The researcher chose the division because it is the largest division within the district in terms of size. The division has the highest number of teachers, integrated programmes and is easily accessible by road transport. Also, this division is mainly a settlement scheme where the people who have settled here originally migrated from the other remaining divisions and even the former larger Kisii District.

Borabu Division is one of the seven administrative divisions of Nyamira District. It shares boundaries with Ekerenyo, Nyamira and Rigoma divisions in the west, Transamra District to the south, Kericho District to the east, Kisii District to the west and Bomet District to the south east. The area of the division is approximately 252sq.km shared among three zones namely: Nyansiongo, Mekenene and Esise.

The topography of Borabu Division is mostly a highland dissected by several ridges and hills. Simbauti, Matierio and Mwongori Hills are the most prominent features. The drainage pattern in the division is such that the rivers and streams drain into Lake Victoria. The climate of the area is of highland equatorial type, which enables it to receive high and reliable rainfall that is well distributed throughout the year. The division is estimated to have had a population of 72,460 persons by the year 2001 (Republic of Kenya, 2002).
3.4 TARGET POPULATION

The study targeted teachers and headteachers and their deputies teaching at 55 primary and 15 secondary schools in Borabu Division, plus all Ministry of Education staff i.e. one divisional Assistant Education Officer (AEO), three Teachers Advisory Centre (TAC) tutors, three Zonal Inspectors of Schools and two education clerks in the division. The total population for the study was therefore 5,096 persons that is, 962 teachers, 9 MOEST staff and 4,125 students with a sample population of 200 teachers and staff which formed 20% and 413 students which formed 10% (See App.VIII).

The teachers were those involved in teaching the learners with special educational needs. The headteachers and their deputies were involved in assessing and admitting students with special educational needs in regular and integrated programmes (units), while the Ministry of Education staff oversees the integration of students with special educational needs in regular schools and integrated programmes (units). The students are the ones who receive services from the integration programmes.

3.5 POPULATION SAMPLE AND SAMPLING PROCEDURES

The study population consisted of Ministry of Education staff, headteachers and their deputies, teachers of regular primary and secondary schools, teachers and headteachers of integrated programmes and lastly class 8 and Form 4 students in Borabu Division of Nyamira District. It is estimated that the population was 5,096 people, with a sample population of 200 teachers, 9 Ministry of Education staff and 413 students.
Borabu Division has a total of 55 primary schools and 15 secondary schools with totals of 603 and 360 teachers and 2,200 Std.8 and 1,925 form 4 students respectively (District Education Office, 2004). The division comprises three zones, namely: Nyansiongo, Mekenene and Esise. The schools and teachers were distributed among the three zones as shown below.

Table 3.1 Distribution of schools, teachers and students in Borabu Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nyansiongo</th>
<th>Mekenene</th>
<th>Esise</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Primary schools</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of secondary schools</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of primary school teachers</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of secondary school teachers</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of standard 8 students</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of form 4 students</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (District Education Office, Nyamira 2004)

There were nine Ministry of Education staff in Borabu Division. So the total population for the study was $603 + 360 + 9 = 972$ persons i.e. Teachers and Ministry of Education staff and $2,200 + 1,925 = 4125$ students.

A total of 613 subjects were sampled for this study. This number represented 20% of the teachers and staff and 10% of students of the total number of the population which is adequate to constitute a sample in a study of this nature (Mugenda & Mugenda 1999; Gay, 1976). The overall goal of sampling was to select a subset of a population with a distribution of characteristics that matches the population. The result is representative sampling (Rosenberg, 1993). Kelinger (1973), also states, random sampling is that method of drawing a sample of the population of the universe so that all
possible samples of a fixed \( n \) have the same probability of being sampled. A sample drawn at random is unbiased in the sense that no member of the population has any more chance of being selected than any other member. For this study, various sampling methods were used to come up with a sample of 200 teachers and staff and 413 students. Thus, purposive or judgmental sampling, simple random sampling and cluster sampling methods were used.

Borabu Division was purposively selected from seven divisions in Nyamira District as it is the division with the highest number of integrated programmes in the district. It has four integrated programmes. This gives it an edge over the others when it comes to the subjects who were to give sufficient data for the purpose of the study. All the schools that hosted integrated programmes were purposively included in the study. As well, all students with special needs and were able to respond with the questionnaire and interview were automatic respondents. However, the majority of the students with special needs were intellectually incapable and therefore could not be included.

Secondly, the schools in the whole division were not homogenous. They varied in terms of the numbers of students per zone, disproportionate number of teachers per zone and disproportionate number of schools per zone. Therefore, cluster sampling was used with the zones designated as clusters, then, simple random sampling was used with replacement for selecting schools and teachers as samples for the study. Thus, all the names of either schools, teachers, and students were put in a hat at a time and shaken, then drawn out with replacement and a certain number of sample required was retrieved as indicated in table 3.2.
Headteachers and their deputies of the sampled schools were automatic respondents to the study. The table below shows how each group of respondents was sampled.

Table 3.2: Sampling procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zones</th>
<th>Nyansonko</th>
<th>Makenene</th>
<th>Esisi</th>
<th>Grand totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of primary schools n=55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of secondary schools n=15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of primary teachers n=603</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of secondary teachers n=360</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of standard 8 students n=2200</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of form 4 students n=1925</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampled schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample of primary schools n=11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample of secondary schools n=4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampled teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample of primary teachers n=119</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample of secondary teachers n=72</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampled students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample of standard 8 students n=220</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample of form 4 students n=193</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers and MOEST staff = 72 + 119 + 9 = 200

Students = 220 + 192 = 412

In addition, interviews were conducted with teachers and students in each of the sampled schools as well as 2 Ministry of Education staff. The headteachers participated in the interview as they are the executives of the schools. In the selection of students and teachers to be interviewed, gender and duration of stay in their respective schools served as the main criteria. Those who had served or stayed longer in the schools were considered to have knowledge about the pertinent issue under study. In establishing the number of teachers and students to be interviewed, 20% and 10% was assigned.
respectively to sampled teachers and students. Thus, only 20% of the sampled teachers and 10% of sampled students were interviewed as shown in table 3:2 above.

3.6 RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

The study was conducted using two data gathering instruments, namely: questionnaires and interview schedules. A questionnaire can be appropriate for a number of reasons. For instance, Kelinger (1973), observes that a questionnaire is widely used in research because it is possible to give similar or standardized questions to the subjects. This makes it possible to compare responses from different subjects on the same questions. Use of questionnaires enables the researcher to collect a relatively wider range of information from a relatively large sample in a short period of time and at reasonably low cost (Mwangi, 1999). Furthermore, it is also possible to reach distant subjects by either posting the questionnaire or delivering it to the respondents personally. By using a questionnaire a researcher can guarantee anonymity to the subjects and hence encourage them to give honest responses. This will consequently increase the reliability of the instrument.

On the other hand, interviews were conducted to MOEST staff, students and teachers in order to solicit detailed information. This was deemed appropriate as the interview method of data collection is flexible and can be adapted to a variety of situations. The flexibility of the method in the presence of the interviewer allows him to explore responses with the person being
interviewed, ask additional questions to clarify points, and in general, tailor the interview to the situation (Mason and Bramble, 1997).

There were four types of questionnaires for six categories of respondents, namely MOEST staff, headteacher and deputy headteacher of both primary and secondary schools, teachers of regular primary and secondary schools, teachers of integrated programmes and Std.8 and Form 4 students (See App. I,II,III,IV and IV). Each of the four questionnaires was divided into three parts. The first part sought general information about the teacher or student and the other related information (see App 1,II,III, IV Section A). The second part of each questionnaire elicited information about the extent to which the respondents thought the factors have hindered integrated education for learners with special educational needs in Borabu Division. (See App. I,II,III, and IV Section B). The third part sought statistical information and other issues related to integrated programmes in Borabu Division over the period of 1995 – 2004 (See App. I,II, III and IV Section C). Each questionnaire comprised ten items (questions). A four point Likert rating scale type of questionnaire was used to gauge each respondent’s response to each item.

The questionnaires generated data on the extent to which factors such as lack of policy, lack of adequate plans, poverty and financial constraints, stigmatization and unfriendly attitudes, preference for segregated schools, hinder integration of students with special needs.

The questionnaires were administered to the six types of respondents (i.e. regular teachers, headteachers and their deputy headteachers, MOEST
staff, teachers in integrated programmes, Standard 8 and Form 4 students) concurrently as the researcher and his assistants traversed the division.

As already stated, interviews were conducted to teachers, MOEST staff as well as students. The interview guide consisted of structured interview with specific questions to which responses are sought (See App. IV, V and VI). The headteachers and their deputies were automatic interviewees as they are executives of the school. At least four teachers were interviewed in each sampled school. In selecting the four, the length of stay in school and gender were considered. Those who had stayed longest were given the opportunity to be interviewed as they were more likely to be conversant with the issue under study. In each school at least four students were as well interviewed.

3.7 MODE OF RESPONSE

Participants from the Ministry of Education, teachers and students responded to each item by choosing one of the four alternatives; strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree depending on their level of agreement. Each item’s score is one point for strongly agree or agree or disagree or strongly disagree.

For interviews, the researcher gathered or identified all the factors or reasons from respondents affecting integration of students with special needs and transcribed them into themes. The themes formed the basis for scoring. Thus, every reason or factor scored against a theme, scored one point.
3.8 CODING

The response mode for the questionnaire was coded as follows; 1- strongly agree, 1- agree, 1- disagree and 1- strongly disagree. Each of the four responses had to score one point when selected by a respondent. Thus, points for each type of response was accumulated for easy tallying and comparison. For interviews, every reason or factor given by a respondent scored one point. Hence, the same reasons or factors were grouped together and translated as points.

3.9 PILOT STUDY

Piloting was carried out in three primary and two secondary schools randomly selected before the actual collection of data for the study. These schools were selected from the area of study but were not among those that took part in the actual study. This is because the members of these schools were likely to discuss the items in the questionnaire after the piloting exercise and would have had an added advantage if they were to participate during the research study. Therefore, giving them a second chance to fill the questionnaire could have triggered different responses from the same respondents due to the influence of discussions with other members, thus affecting reliability of the study.

The purpose of piloting was to discover any weaknesses in the instruments, check for clarity of the questions or items and also elicit comments from respondents that assisted in the improvement and modification of the instruments. Piloting also enabled the researcher to detect any flaws in
the administration of the research instruments. It is after the piloting that reliability and validity of the instruments was established. According to (Coolican, 1996), reliability refers to a measure's consistency in producing similar results on different but comparable occasions. Validity refers to whether an instrument is measuring what it was intended to measure. After piloting, the researcher re-evaluated the instruments and adjusted accordingly.

3.10 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE INSTRUMENTS

During the literature review, the researcher found no instruments which could be adapted for this study. The study therefore used instruments developed by the researcher. The statements were picked from various books, magazines, and newspapers concerning various factors that affect implementation of integration of students with special needs that the researcher read during the literature review. The statements were modified and revised for clarity while others were taken as they were. The questionnaires were also scrutinized by supervisors.

All the questionnaires were piloted to establish reliability and validity. There was need to determine whether there was any ambiguity in any of the items and to determine if the instruments would elicit the type of data anticipated. Finally, the data was meaningfully analysed in relation to research questions and purpose.

Content validity refers how much a measure covers the range of meanings included within a concept (Babbie, 1999). Given that content validity is determined by expert judgment (Franklin and Thrasher, 1976), the
questionnaires were scrutinized and approved by an expert lecturer in special education. The questionnaires were relied upon as they are a representative of all areas that are evaluated. To ascertain validity, test-retest method was employed. The duration between test and retest was three weeks.

3.11 DATA COLLECTION

Data was collected through questionnaires and interviews. The researcher prepared adequate questionnaires which were items on demographic information and factors which hinder integration of students with special educational needs. The questionnaires also provided statistical data and other related information on education for learners with special needs. The interviews as well focused on school factors and conditions that affect integration of learners with special needs.

Data collection was done by a research team which was composed of the researcher and two assistants. The research assistants were teachers trained in special education at Diploma level from Kenya Institute of Special Education (KISE). The research assistants were trained during the piloting period on how to administer the questionnaires and interview schedules.

The questionnaires were hand delivered and collected by the research team. The respondents were briefed on the importance of the study and the need to give candid responses, and suggestions on how to improve education for learners with special needs. The research team went over the questionnaire before asking the participants to fill it. After the questionnaires were completed a small sample group was asked to be interviewed. If there was enough time,
the groups were interviewed by the research team on the same day or the member of the research team made an appointment for the interview during an appropriate future time.

At least four teachers and four students were interviewed during the actual research in each of the sampled primary and secondary schools in each zone. Two Ministry of Education officials were interviewed by the researcher. During the interview the researcher or his assistant filled the schedules appropriately. The schedules were used to form themes out of the interviews.

3.12 DATA ANALYSIS

The two types of questionnaires (for teachers, Ministry of Education staff and students) yielded quantitative data and interview schedules yielded qualitative data. Quantitative data were analysed and tabulated using descriptive statistics including simple tables, frequencies and percentages. These were chosen because they easily communicate the findings to the majority of the readers (Gay, 1976). This mode of presentation gives a quick visual impression of the quantifiable variables affecting integration of students with special needs.

Therefore, once all the questionnaires were collected, they were checked through for completeness. Questionnaires with less than fifty (50%) percent responses to the items were considered incomplete and thus rejected. The next step was coding and presentation of findings in the form of tables, frequencies and graphs.
On the other hand, qualitative data from open ended items in the questionnaires and interview schedules were analysed quantitatively. Such data were organized or divided into categories or themes as school-based factors, socio-cultural factors, and socio-economic factors. Thus, recurring factors or reasons formed the basis of the main categories. This made it easier to determine the frequencies and then give adequate descriptions. This mode of presentation gave as vividly as possible the feelings and sentiments of the respondents.

Further analysis which was done based on the descriptive analysis that, depended on the outcome of the data, was correlational analysis. As Coolican (1996) states, any research conducted outside a laboratory, and, if non experimental, may well be called ‘correlational’ if it somehow compares groups and variables. In this case, we compared different groups such as teachers, headteachers and Ministry of Education staff and different dependent variables such as policy on special education, preference for segregated schools, unfriendly attitudes and stigmatization.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSES AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents data analyses and interpretations of the findings. The analyses are presented in the form of tables showing frequencies and percentages followed by interpretations. The results provide data on background information of participants, ratings of their level of agreement with each of the statements, narration from where the most outstanding responses were mentioned and lastly the results and interpretations of the interviews. The interviews highlight what hinders integration and provides insights on integration issues that make the state of things what they are. The chapter is basically organized according to ten major sub-themes which guided the study. These factors are as follows:

i) Education policy on special education

ii) Plans and preparations on integration

iii) Training of teachers in special education

iv) Implementation of recommendations on special education

v) Assessment tools and personnel for identification and placement

vi) Ignorance and lack of awareness

vii) Physical and learning materials

viii) Lack of financial provisions and general poverty

ix) Stigmatization by peers and general public

x) Preference for segregated special schools over integrated programmes
4.2 BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

The background information and characteristics of the respondents included their age brackets, gender, academic qualifications, professional qualifications and experience.

Age, gender, academic, professional and experience of respondents

Results from this study revealed that 58% of teachers are female and 42% are males in primary schools in Borabu. Most ages lie between 31-40 years (51.4%) and 41-50 years (39.3%). Only 4 female teachers had their ages between 20-30 years, while only 3 male and 3 female teachers were above 50 years. About 81.3% of the teachers had their academic qualifications as GSC/EACE/KCE. Most of their professional qualifications are P1 (72.9%) while there were 15% S1. There were only 4 graduate teachers. Finally, most of their experience in terms of years of teaching ranged between 11-20 years (49.5%) and 21-30 years (43.9%). (See table 4:1).
Table 4.1 Age group, gender, academic qualifications, professional qualifications and experience of primary school teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>20 – 30 Years</th>
<th>31 – 40 years</th>
<th>41 – 50 years</th>
<th>Above 50 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCPE / CPE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KJSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSC/EACE/KCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAACE / KACE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the side of secondary school teachers, 54.3% were male and 45.7% female respectively. Most of their ages were 31-40 (60%) and 41-50 (31%) years. The
majority (78.6%) had their academic qualifications as graduates and 80% had BED as their professional qualifications. However, their teaching experiences fairly varied between 1-10 years (15.7%), 11-20 years (48.6%), 21-30 years (27.1%) and above 30 years (8.6%). (See table 4.2).

Table 4.2 Age group, gender, academic qualifications and professional qualifications and experience of secondary school teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>20 – 30 years</th>
<th>31 – 40 years</th>
<th>41 – 50 years</th>
<th>Above 50 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCPE/CPE</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KJSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSC/EACE/KCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAACE/KACE</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIPLOMA</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.ED</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.ED</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 20 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 30 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the other hand, the MOEST staff had 5 male and 2 female staff members. Five of them were between 40-50 years while 2 were above 50 years. For their academic qualifications two had GSC/EACE/KCE and 5 had EAACE/KACE. Six of them had S1 as their professional qualifications and 1 had a Diploma. Their experiences as MOEST staff ranged between 1-10 years for all of them (See table 4.3). A close analysis shows that all of them were fairly advanced in their age bracket yet, their experiences as MOEST staff falls in the lowest experience bracket. This can be attributed to the fact that they had to work as teachers for a number of years before they were appointed as staff in the MOEST.
Table 4.3 Age group, gender, academic qualifications, professional qualifications and experience of MOEST staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 – 30 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 – 40 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 – 50 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 50 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCPE /CPE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KJSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSC/EACE/KCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAACE / KACE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Qualifications</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 10 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 20 years</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 30 years</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30 years</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, on class 8 and Form 4 students (Table 4.4) shows that class 8 had 102 males while 109 were females. Form 4 had 129 males and 60 females. A close analysis showed that only 9 (8.8%) boys and 5 (4.6%) girls had special needs in primary schools while only 3 (2.3%) boys had special needs in
secondary schools. Thus a greater majority 383 (95.15%) are students without special needs while only 17 (4.25%) are students with special needs.

Table 4.4 Number of Class 8 and Form 4 students, their gender, those with special needs, those without special needs and those with knowledge of learners with special needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Std 8 and Form 4 students</th>
<th>Students with special needs</th>
<th>Regular students</th>
<th>Students with knowledge of learners with special needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand totals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>95.75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results shown in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 indicated that there was no major gender imbalance among both primary and secondary teachers. However, the imbalance was shown in the MOEST staff (Table 4.3) where there were only 2 female staff out of 7. On the side of students, there was no gender imbalance in Std.8 but there was a big imbalance in Form 4 which can be attributed to more boys’ schools than girls’ in Borabu Division.

An observation on teachers and MOEST staff age groups revealed that most teachers in primary and secondary (male and female) are in their middle ages thus 31-40 and 41-50 years. In both cases there were few cases below 30 and above 50 years. Similarly, the majority of the MOEST staff are between 41-50 years while only two are above 51 years.
Further analysis showed that the highest academic qualifications that most primary teachers possessed is GSC/EACE/KCE (81.3%). However, there were a few with EACE/KACE and graduates. PI professional qualification emerged as most possessed by primary school teachers (72.9%). Also, there were a few S1, Diploma and graduates. As regards secondary teachers, the majority (78.6%) were graduates and the majority (80%) had B.ED as their professional qualification.

Finally, the majority of both primary and secondary teachers seem to have had the same experience in terms of years of teaching that is, for primary 11-20 and 21-30 years are 49.5% and 43.9% respectively while for secondary 11-20 and 21-30 years (48.6%) and (27.1%) respectively. But, the work experience of all MOEST staff is between 1-10 years. This can be attributed to the fact that most, if not all were once teachers and had to be appointed as MOEST staff after they had taught for a number of years in either primary or secondary schools.

4.3 RATINGS OF RESPONDENTS IN EACH OF THE FACTORS HINDERING INTEGRATION

This sub-section deals with ratings of respondents in each of the factors hindering integration. There are ten factors and each factor has been assigned its table (i.e. tables 4.3.1 to 4.3.10) which shows ratings (strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree) as perceived by respondents of different positions and sexes. Total number of respondents for each rating and its percentage has been calculated, followed by an interpretation or explanation.
Finally, at the end, figure 4.1 has been drawn to portray a visual picture of different factors showing ratings by combined respondents.

Table 4.3.1 Absence of policy on special education as perceived by respondents of different positions and sexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school teachers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEST staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school pupils</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school students</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand totals</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in table 4.3.1 shown indicate that 43.5% of the respondents agreed that the absence of a policy on special education is a hindrance to integration of students with special needs. The table also reveals that 18.7% strongly agreed, while 25.3% and 12.5% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. A combination of percentages for strongly agree and agree results to 62.2%. This therefore is a strong factor which hinders integration of students with special needs.
Table 4.3.2 Lack of adequate plans and preparations for integration as perceived by respondents of different positions and sexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEST staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand totals</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratings as shown in table 4.3.2 above indicate that the majority (25.9% strongly agree and 47.4% agree) of the respondents believe that lack of adequate plans and preparations for integration is a major hindrance to integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division. A small percentage, thus (17.6% and 9.1%) disagree and strongly disagree respectively with the statement. Looking closer at the results of this table, the requirements for adequate plans and preparations is more needed in secondary schools in comparison to all other respondents. The highest number of ratings for strongly agreed came from secondary school teachers and secondary school students, thus 20 and 30 respectively. This is further complicated by the MOEST staff, whereby all of them responded as either strongly agree or agree.
As shown in Table 4.3.3 above, a greater majority (59.8% and 29.8% strongly agreed and agreed respectively) believed that lack of training in special education for most teachers is a major hindrance in integration of students with special needs. A closer look into this analysis showed that the greatest number of all types of respondents of different positions and sexes strongly agreed that lack of training is a major hindrance to integration.

About only 10% of all the types of respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed. This percentage can be attributed to primary and secondary school students. However, the number for strongly disagree and disagree to teachers is negligible. Hence teachers can be relied on more than students when it comes to matters pertaining to training of teachers.

**Table 4.3.3 Lack of training in special education for most teachers as perceived by respondents of different positions and sexes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school teachers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school teachers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEST staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school pupils</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school students</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand totals</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3.4 Lack of commitment on the part of public in general as perceived by respondents of different positions and sexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEST staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEST staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school pupils</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand totals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the above results reveals that lack of commitment on the part of public in general is not a very serious issue in hindering integration as the majority (54.6% and 23.1%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. Those who either strongly agreed or agreed were only 2.1% and 20.3% respectively.

A peculiar situation on this analysis is that the majority of those who either disagreed or strongly disagreed were males, thus 180 and 78 respectively while females were 139 and 57 respectively. On the other hand, the majority of those who agreed were females (63) while males were (55). However, those who strongly agreed were half, thus 6 males and 6 females.
Table 4.3.5 Lack of adequate assessment for proper identification and placement as perceived by respondents of different positions and sexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEST staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school pupils</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis on table 4.3.5 above shows lack of adequate assessment for proper identification for placement as a hindrance to integration as perceived by various respondents. A majority (33.4% and 5.6%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively with the statement. Further analysis on the respondents showed that for those who disagreed with the statement who were a total of 195 (33.4%) there were 86 males and 109 females while those who strongly disagreed were 327 (56%) and there were 192 males and 135 females.

Out of the total of 584 respondents, 52 (8.9%) agreed to the statement while only 10 (1.7%) strongly agreed to the statement. A majority of those who either strongly agreed and agreed were primary and secondary school students thus, 51 out of 62 respondents. Only 11 professionals strongly agreed or agreed to the statement.
A look at the ratings of lack of awareness by parents about special needs education in table 4.3.6 showed that (9.1% and 54.1%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively. A closer look into the analysis showed that in both cases, strongly agree and agree, there were more males than females. Hence, strongly agree 53(9.1%) respondents comprised of 177 males and 129 females. On the side of disagreed and strongly disagreed, there were 164 (28.1%) and 51 (8.7%) respectively. However, on gender analysis, there was equal representation from both sexes on disagree, thus 82 males and 82 females, while strongly disagree, the males were 21 and females 30.

This clearly shows that the majority of the parents may be keeping their children with special needs at home because they are not aware of provisions offered for such children in the education system.
Table 4.3.7 Lack of and inadequate physical and learning facilities as perceived by respondents of different positions and sexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school teachers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEST staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school pupils</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school students</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand totals</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interpretations of the results in table 4.3.7 showed that lack of and inadequate physical and learning facilities is a major hindrance to integration. Evidently a greater majority (46.6% and 39.7%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively. Out of 107 primary teachers, it is only 10 who either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Thus a greater majority (97) of primary teachers either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Similarly, out of 70 secondary, school teachers, it is only 1 who strongly disagreed with the statement while all the 69 either strongly agreed or agreed. Surprisingly, all the 7 MOEST staff strongly agreed with the statement. On the side of students, out of 211 primary pupils 175 pupils either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement while only 35 either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Similarly, out of 189 secondary school students, 155 either strongly...
agreed or agreed while only 34 either disagreed or strongly disagreed for all the categories of respondents, a very small percentage (8.7% and 5%) disagreed or strongly disagreed respectively.

Table 4.3.8 Poverty and financial constraints as perceived by respondents of different positions and sexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEST staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school pupils</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school students</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand totals</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3.8 above showing the ratings of poverty and financial constraints as a factor hindering integration indicates that 20.2% strongly agreed to the statement, 36.5% agreed while 28.1% disagreed and 15.2% strongly disagreed. This is a fairly strong factor as 56.7% are in agreement.

It is therefore important to address the issue of poverty if integration of students with special needs is to be realized in regular schools.
Table 4.3.9 Parents and society ashamed of their children with special needs as perceived by respondents of different positions and sexes

N = 584

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEST staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school pupils</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school students</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand totals</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3.9 shows ratings of parents and society ashamed of their children with special needs as perceived by various respondents. The results indicated that 11.8% strongly agreed, 33.7% agreed, 38.4% disagreed and 16.1% strongly disagreed. Thus, the majority (54.6%) are in disagreement. However, a sizable group (45.4%) are in agreement. This shows that quite a number of parents and society in general are ashamed of their children with special needs and therefore may be refusing to enroll them in educational institutions.
Table 4.3.10 Preference for segregated schools to integrated programmes by parents as perceived by respondents of different positions sexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEST staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school pupils</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school students</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand totals</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of table 4.3.10, which shows the ratings of preference for segregated special schools to integrated programmes, indicated that 10.1% strongly disagreed, 19.4% agreed, 35.4% disagreed while 35.1% strongly disagreed to the statement.

This analysis shows that a greater majority (70.5%) felt that preference for special schools is not a big hindrance to integration. This means that whether or not special schools exist, integration can be realized as long as pertinent issues hindering it are addressed.
Figure 4.1 Factors that hinder integration and their corresponding ratings as perceived by various combined respondents

KEY:
1 – Lack of training in special education by most teachers
2 – Lack of or inadequate physical and learning facilities
3 – Lack of adequate plans and preparations for integration
4 – Absence of policy on special education
5 – Lack of awareness by parents about special needs education
6 – Poverty and financial constraints
7 – Parents ashamed of learners with special needs
8 – Preference for special schools
9 – Lack of commitment on the part of public in general
10 – Lack of proper identification and assessment for proper placement

Figure 4.1 shows how each factor hindering integration scored in each of the ratings (strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree) by the respondents.

Table 4.3.11 summarises Figure 4.1
Table 4.3.11 Summary of Ten factors hindering integration and their corresponding numbers of respondents and percentages for all the four ratings (strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of R</td>
<td>%</td>
<td># of R</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training in special education by most teachers</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack or inadequate physical and learning facilities</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate plans and preparations for integration</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of policy on special education</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of awareness by parents about special needs education</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty and financial constraints</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents ashamed of learners with special needs</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for special schools</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of commitment on the part of public in general</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of proper identification and assessment for proper placement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>1072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY
SA is Strongly Agree
SD is Strongly Disagree
A is Agree
D is Disagree
# of R is Number of Respondents
4.4 QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE RESPONSES REGARDING INTEGRATION

Introduction

This sub-section deals with both quantitative and qualitative responses from different groups of respondents on issues concerning integration in Borabu Division. The issues include enrolments of students with special needs, training of teachers, governments contributions to special needs provision and the recently introduced "Persons with Disabilities Act" and the respondents suggestions on how to improve the state of integration in Borabu Division and the whole country in general.

4.4.1 Enrolment of students with special needs

As part of the study, the enrolment figures of students with special needs were required. Of the 11 primary schools sampled, the total outcome of students with special needs enrolled was 15 (Table 4.4.2). For the secondary schools, there were only 3 students with special needs learning at the 4 sampled schools. The MOEST staff also stated that there were only three integrated programmes in the whole division. However, a close analysis of both primary and secondary responses on enrolment showed that there were only 8 students with special needs both in primary and secondary schools. This difference between the enrolment (Figure 4.3.1) and the actual number stated by respondents can be attributed to the fact that, 7 students with special needs might have already dropped out of school when the actual study was being carried out. This outcome clearly shows that the enrolment of students with
special needs is generally low in Borabu Division. To back up the enrolment issue, the head teachers and their deputies and MOEST staff were asked to state how they rate enrolment of students with special needs in their schools and division respectively. The ratings were between very low, low, average, high and very high. Out of twenty nine respondents in this category, twenty five stated 'low', while only four stated 'very low'. The other alternatives were not picked.

Finally on enrolment, the headteachers and MOEST staff were asked to give a breakdown on how the enrolment has been in schools and the division for the last decade. Tables 4.4.1 and 4.4.2 show the combined population for students with special needs in the sampled primary schools and division respectively. Statistics for the secondary schools were not available in schools or Borabu Divisional headquarters.
Table 4.4.1 Enrolment of students with special needs between 1995 – 2004 for 11 primary schools in Borabu Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of students with SN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of sexes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DEO’s Office

KEY: B - Boys  G - Girls  SN - Special Needs

Table 4.4.2 Enrolment of students with special needs between 1995 – 2004 for Borabu Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of students with SN</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of sexes</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Divisional records

KEY: B - Boys  G - Girls  SN - Special Needs
4.4.2 Reasons for low enrolment of students with special needs and how to improve it

In this study, opinions about what can be done to increase enrolment of students with special needs in classes was sought from teachers and MOEST staff. Altogether, opinions were expressed by 184 teachers and MOEST staff. The opinions varied and can be summarized into six types as shown in table 4.4.3 below.

Table 4.4.3 Opinions of teachers and MOEST staff on how to increase enrolment of students with Special Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinions</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training of teachers in special education</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of teaching and learning materials/implements</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in transport and communication</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of policy law on special education</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of grants and bursaries for students with special needs</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory use of provincial administration as a measure to increase enrolment</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the same issue, both the primary and secondary students were asked to state whether there were students with special needs in the communities within the immediate surrounding of their schools not attending classes and what were the reasons for not attending. Out of the total 400, 342 (85.5%) stated 'Yes' while only 58 (14.5%) stated 'No'. They gave a variety of reasons why those with special needs do not attend classes. The reasons can be hereby
summarized: lack of trained teachers in special education – 270 (67.5%), lack of transport facilities – 96 (24%), parents hide them – 200 (50%), lack of teaching/learning materials – 180 (45%), lack of awareness – 100 (25%), poverty – 144 (36%) and insecurity – 56 (14%). A noticeable feature was that a greater percentage of those who stated ‘No’ were secondary school students. Thus, of the 58 who stated ‘No’ only seven (1.75%) were from the primary group while 51 (12.8%) were from the secondary group.

4.4.3 Teachers preparedness on how to handle students with special needs

Another view which was seriously sought from the headteachers and MOEST staff was the teachers preparedness to handle students with special needs in schools in particular and the division in general. Out of 12 headteachers (80%) who responded 10 indicated that the regular teachers were not qualified to teach students with special needs. All the seven (100%) MOEST staff who responded stated that all the regular teachers except a few trained in special education, were not qualified to teach students with special needs.

On the same issue, regular primary and secondary school teachers were asked to state whether pre-service teacher training courses prepared them adequately to handle students with special needs. The majority of the teachers, thus 163 (92.1%) stated No. Only 16 teachers (9%) stated Yes. It is quite evident among teachers that training on special needs education is greatly desired. When, the teachers were asked to express what can be done to improve themselves on how to handle students with special needs, they offered two
suggestions; further pre-service training on special education and in-service training on the same. The headteachers and MOEST staff also recommended further training and in-service courses to their teachers if they have to handle students with special needs in the regular school system.

4.4.4 Government’s contribution towards special needs education

On the government’s contribution towards special needs education, both primary and secondary school teachers were asked in their opinion whether the Ministry of Education has provided adequate mechanisms so that they could teach students with special needs. Of the 176 (99.4%) teachers who responded to the statement, 174 (98.3%) stated ‘No’ while only two stated ‘Yes’. This is a clear indication that the government needs to do a lot in order to realize the integration issue. On the other hand, the Ministry of Education staff was asked to rate the Ministry’s contribution towards the implementation of programmes for students with special educational needs in their division and Kenya, in general. They were expected to select alternatives from very little, little, average, good to very good. In this case, 2 (25.6%) selected ‘very little’, 4 (57.1%) selected ‘little’, while only 1 (14.2%) selected ‘average’. The other two alternatives thus, good and not good were not selected. This is a clear indication that the MOEST staff felt, as the teachers, that the Ministry has done little as far as implementing programmes for students with special needs in Borabu Division and Kenya in general.
4.4.5 How the 'persons with disabilities act of 2003' will improve education for students with special needs

It is sometimes thought that an introduction of a law concerning a particular issue automatically solves problems related to it. The teachers were asked whether they thought the introduction of the 'Persons with Disabilities Act Of 2003' could improve education for students with special needs. Out of 177 teachers who responded, 112 (63.3%) stated 'Yes' while 65 (36.7%) said 'No'. Thus 36.7% of the teachers felt that just the introduction of the act does not automatically improve the state of integration. As a rejoinder to this statement, the teachers were also asked to state how they thought the act would improve special education. The teachers stated several opinions that can be summed up in seven types of comments as shown in table 4.4.4(a).

Table 4.4.4(a) Opinions of teachers on how the Disabilities Act would improve special education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinions</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Use of provincial administration to enforce the act</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Make education for those with special needs compulsory</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Train teachers on special education through in-service training</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Avail/supply teaching and learning materials for learners with special needs in schools.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Introduce special education policy</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improve transport and other infrastructural facilities</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sensitize parents and communities on the need for those with special needs to attend school.</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.6 Suggestions on how to improve integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division/ Kenya

Finally, on the side of questionnaires, all three types of respondents were asked to give suggestions on how to improve the integration of students with special needs in schools in Borabu Division. The opinions suggested were varied as they cut across all three types of respondents. In total, 584 respondents comprising 7 MOEST staff, 177 teachers and 400 class 8 and form 4 students gave the suggestions as shown in table 4.4.4(b).

Table 4.4.4(b) Suggestions on how to improve integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions</th>
<th>N=584</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase the number of trained teachers in special education</td>
<td></td>
<td>411</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide compulsory and free education of students with special needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>316</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Start an awareness campaign for education for students with special needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>246</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use provincial administration (use of chief and assistant chief) to realize or implement the Disabilities Act of 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improve general infrastructure (transport and communicators) facilities especially in rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Give special grants from government for schools that enroll a certain percentage of students with special needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Get sponsors from church organisations and charitable organisations to sponsor education of a number of students with special needs in their areas of jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provide loans for reduction of poverty among poor people</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Provide free education for students with special needs at university level</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Avail special incentives such as full bursaries to those students with special needs who excel in education</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Let schools organize public speeches for their students from people with disabilities who have excelled in life</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Use of media both national and local to sensitise communities on education for students with special needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Develop proper and standardized assessment tools to be used at all EARCs in every district for identification and placement

14. Start an integration model school in Borabu Division and every division in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12</th>
<th>2.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 RESPONSES ON INTERVIEWS

In order to probe into some of the factors that hinder integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division, it was decided to interview teachers, education officers and students. Interviews were carried out with 60 respondents sampled for this study. In each of the schools where questionnaires were delivered, interviews were conducted with at least two subjects. Interviews were held at convenient places chosen by the interviewees. Questions asked in these sessions were mostly structured and open ended so that interviewees would have a chance to think about the problem. From the interview, it was possible to identify major factors that hinder integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division. Their ideas, suggestions and feelings are discussed below.

The number of students with special needs in schools was investigated by interviewing 11 primary school teachers, seven secondary school teachers, 21 standard eight pupils and 19 form four students in all the schools that were visited. Two MOEST staff members were also interviewed. Responses are indicated as shown in Table 4.5.1.
Table 4.5.1 Responses on whether there are students with special needs in schools/division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents N=60</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class eight pupils</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form four students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEST staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>81.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the interviewees said Yes to whether their school(s) was or were suitable for learners with special needs. Thus, all of them indicated No. Those who said No gave the following reasons for their schools not being suitable for learners with special needs as shown in table 4.5.2.

Table 4.5.2 Reasons for schools not suitable for students with special needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>N=60</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of trained teachers</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of teaching and learning materials</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parents unwilling to enroll their learners with special needs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lack of government commitment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ignorance on part of parents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lack of policy on special education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Poverty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, almost all the respondents interviewed accepted that there are students with special needs within the immediate surroundings of their schools. Only three primary and four secondary school students indicated that they were
not aware of any. On being probed further, they said that they didn’t come from around their schools. All the teachers interviewed (18) said that their schools were not equipped enough to enroll students with special needs. They gave the following as major factors that need to be improved in their schools: training of teachers in special education (18 teachers); equipping schools with special teaching and learning materials (16 teachers); enlightening parents on the need to educate their children with special needs (12 teachers); improving infrastructure such as roads, classrooms, playgrounds, doors (seven teachers); supervision by MOEST (12 teachers), and implementing a policy on special education (three teachers).

Whether the regular teachers were suited to handle students with special needs was further investigated through the same interview. All the respondents except two teachers indicated that the regular teachers were not qualified to teach students with special needs. Some indicated that even if they were asked to, the big numbers in classes would inhibit their performance for these learners. They gave lack of training in special education as a major hindrance. The two teachers who indicated otherwise were found to have trained in special education at diploma level. The two MOEST staff interviewed indicated that there were not enough integrated programmes in the whole division to cater for students with special need. They said the programmes are only four and are concentrated along the tarmac road which traverses the division. Hence those schools away from the main road are left without any integrated programme. The two officers suggested that the government should send at least one teacher trained in special education to every school in the division. This further
complements what the teachers also said that the Ministry of Education should start offering special education curriculum for all teachers in teacher training colleges at all levels. Of the 18 teachers interviewed on how they rated the number of students with special needs within the immediate environment of their school to those ones already enrolled in school(s), fifteen said ‘high’ while the three said ‘average’. However, the two MOEST staff indicated the same number to be ‘very high’ in the division. This variation on the number, that is, ‘average’, ‘high’ to ‘very high’ may be attributed to the statistical knowledge about education issues in the division. Hence the MOEST staff can be more relied upon than teachers as they (MOEST staff) are the custodians of these statistics. But in any case the difference between high and very high can be a thin line.

All the forty students interviewed said their teachers are not qualified enough to teach students with special needs. On the other hand, out of 18 teachers interviewed, only two said they were competent enough to teach students with special needs. The rest, that is, 16 said they felt they were not competent enough to teach students with special needs. This is further supported by what the two MOEST staff said that the number of teachers trained in special education in the division is very low. However, all the 18 teachers expressed that to improve their competence they need further training on special education.

The Standard.8 and Form 4 students interviewed were asked whether the Ministry of Education has made good arrangements so that students with special needs can learn in their schools. All of them (40) said ‘No’ and none
said 'Yes'. They gave various reasons for saying 'No': Lack of qualified teachers in special education (31 students); unsuitable environment (26 students); and lack of suitable teaching and learning materials (28 students). The students were further asked to rate the regulation “Students with special needs should learn with those students without special needs as much as possible” as a way of improving education of students with special needs. Their responses are tabulated in table 4.5.2.

Table 4.5.3 Students’ ratings on the regulation “Students with special needs should learn with regular students as much as possible”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, “The Persons with Disabilities Act, 2003” paragraph 18(1) and (2) was read to the students by the researcher. They were asked to name any obstacles unique to their particular schools or communities that may be a hindrance to implementing this act. The following six responses were noted as obstacles as shown in table 4.5.4.
Table 4.5.4 Obstacles that may hinder implementing “The Persons with Disabilities Act, 2003”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>N = 40</th>
<th>No. of students who gave the responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of teachers in special education</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of teaching and learning materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parents unwilling to release their children with special needs to schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Poverty (most parents are poor)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Parents want to take their child to special schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hostile/unsuitable environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students were further asked to state problems students with special needs experience in their schools. They gave responses as shown in table 4.5.5.

Table 4.5.5 Kinds of problems faced by students with special needs in schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of problems</th>
<th>N = 40</th>
<th>No. of students who stated</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Neglect/isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of transport facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lack of school fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lack of suitable teaching and learning materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hunger</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly, the students were asked to give suggestions on how to improve the learning of students with special needs together with those without special needs in their schools. They stated three major suggestions, namely, the need for guidance and counseling for both students with special needs and those
without, teachers to be trained in special needs education, and to provide special teaching and learning materials for students with special needs.

On the other hand, the 18 teachers (both primary and secondary) who were interviewed were asked to state whether the Ministry of education has provided adequate mechanism to implement the education of students with special needs in their schools. All of them stated ‘No’ and gave the following suggestions on how to improve it as shown in table 4.5.5.

Table 4.5.6 Suggestions by teachers on how to improve education for students with special needs in schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions</th>
<th>N = 18</th>
<th>No. of teachers who gave suggestions</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Training of teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provision of special teaching and learning resources</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Introduce policy on special education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improved transport and communication</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Creating awareness among parents of children with special needs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provincial administration to be used</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teachers were also asked to rate the need for introduction of specific policy in relation to special education in our education system as a means of improving the integration of education for students with special needs. The ratings very low and low were not scored at all. Table 4.5.7 shows how the teachers responded.
Table 4.5.7 Teachers ratings on the need for specific policy on special education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>61.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 18

Thus most of the teachers, 61.1%, were of the opinion that there is great need to introduce a policy on special education.

The teachers were further introduced to the education section of “Persons with Disabilities Act, 2003”. Of the 18 teachers interviewed, only three teachers said they had read the Act. Two said they had read it in a newspaper. The majority, 13 teachers, said they were not aware of the Act. However, when they read excerpts, all of them stated that is was a good Act and that it should have even come earlier in our laws. The teachers were asked to state any obstacles which are unique in their individual schools or communities that may be a hindrance in implementing the Act. They stated various obstacles as summarized in table 4.5.8.
Table 4.5.8 Obstacles that may hinder the implementation of "Persons with Disabilities Act, 2003" as stated by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of obstacles</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. Sch</td>
<td>Pry. Sch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of qualified teachers in special education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of appropriate teaching and learning materials</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. General poverty in the communities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inadequate infrastructure: poor roads, poor classrooms</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. General unawareness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teachers' responses revealed that lack of qualified teachers is the greatest obstacle in implementing the Act. This was followed by lack of appropriate teaching and learning materials which was stated by 17 (94.4%) teachers. Similarly, general poverty in the communities was stated by 14 (77.8%) teachers. According to the teachers the three seem to be the major obstacles.

Another question that the teachers were asked was to state problems students with special needs experience in their schools. They expressed seven major problems as shown in table 4.5.9.
Table 4.5.9 Problems faced by students with special needs in schools as stated by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>No. of teachers who stated</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. Sch</td>
<td>Pry. Sch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Congestion in regular classes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social isolation by peers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Neglect by parents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Frequent absenteeism due to health problems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Neglect by regular teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Long/poor transport facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hunger due to lack of enough food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The seven problems faced by students with special needs in schools as stated by teachers cannot be over emphasized. As shown on table 4.5.9 the percentages of teachers who stated the seven problems range between 55.6% to 100%. This clearly shows that the stated problems are immense in the division and that there is dire need to address each of these problems.

Finally, the teachers were asked to give any suggestions they felt would improve the implementation of integrated education for students with special needs. The responses were varied as shown in table 4.5.10.
Table 4.5.10 Suggestions on how to improve integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of suggestion</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. Sch</td>
<td>Pry. Sch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. In-service all teachers in special education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Introduce special education curriculum in all teacher training institutions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Make education for learners with special needs free and compulsory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Government to supply special equipment for learners with special needs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Introduce a policy on special education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Start awareness campaigns on special education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Use provincial administration to implement “Persons with Disabilities Act, 2003”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Full government scholarships for learners with special needs at higher institutions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Government to start pilot programmes on integration starting from division, location and eventually to sub-location</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, the two MOEST staff members interviewed were asked to state problems unique to their division that hinder implementation of education for students with special needs. They stated the following problems:

i) Lack of qualified teachers in special education

ii) Lack of guiding policy on special education

iii) Poor infrastructure both in schools and within the community

iv) Lack of awareness about special education both by parents and community

v) Lack of teaching and learning materials for students with special needs.

vi) Minimal assessment of students with special needs and therefore improper placement.
vii) Stigmatization of students with special needs by society in general.

The two members also rated the number of trained teachers in special education in their division as very low. On the improvement of the number of teachers trained in special education, they suggested in-service training of teachers in special education and introduction of special education curriculum in Teacher Training Colleges (T.T.C). The two officers were of the view that the only thing the government has done to implement integrated education for students with special needs in the division was the introduction of a few special units in regular schools. However, they rated the introduction of “Persons with Disabilities Act, 2003” as a positive move towards the realization of education for students with special needs. For this to be realized, they suggested the need to use provincial administration among other avenues to implement the Act.

Lastly, the two MOEST officials were asked to recommend what the government can do to hasten or improve the implementation of integrated education for students with special needs in their division and generally in Kenya. First and foremost, they recommended the training of teachers in special education, introduce a clear policy on special education and implement commission reports that advocate for special education.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND
RECOMMENDATION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to investigate factors that hinder integration of students with special needs in primary and secondary schools of Borabu Division of Nyamira District, Kenya.

In particular, the study was to investigate the ratings by different stakeholders on various factors that hinder integration. These factors include: education policy on special education, plans and preparations on integration training of teachers in special education, assessment tools and personnel for identification and placement, ignorance and lack of awareness, physical and learning materials, lack of financial provisions and general poverty, stigmatization and preference for special schools.

The data for the study was collected through questionnaires that were administered by the researcher and his two assistants to students, teachers and MOEST staff who were all interviewed for further in-depth information. The findings were presented in percentages and tables of frequency distribution.

5.2 SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS:

The following are the summary of the findings:

i) The finding on the enrolment of students with special needs in schools revealed that there was very low enrolment of such students. There were only 14 students enrolled in the primary schools and only three were
enrolled in secondary schools. This was further supported by headteachers, their deputies and MOEST staff ratings on such enrolment. They mostly stated low enrolments in their ratings, when they were asked to rate the position of enrolment in their schools and division. This was further revealed by the analysis of the enrolment figures of students with special needs in the sampled schools and division for the period, from 1995 – 2004 (See Tables 4.4.1 and 4.4.2). Between those years, the highest total enrolment for the sampled schools was 19 boys and 4 girls, totaling 23 students. For the whole division, the highest number during the same period was 29 boys and 11 girls totaling 40. This is a clear indication that the number of students with special needs enrolled in this division was evidently low.

Similarly, in the interview side, 60 respondents were asked to state Yes or No for the presence of a student with special needs in the school/division. Surprisingly, 49 (81.7%) said 'No' while only 11 (18.3%) said 'Yes'. This is a further clear indication of low enrolment of students with special needs in the school/division.

Various reasons given for low enrolment include: lack of trained teachers in special education 158 (85.9%); lack of adequate teaching and learning materials 149 (81%); poor infrastructure such as poor roads, poor communication 120 (65.2%) and lack of a guiding policy on special education 101 (54.9%).

ii) The ratings on factors that hinder integration revealed that there are those which the respondents strongly felt hinder integration while there were
others that are least regarded as causes. It emerged that lack of training by most teachers in Borabu is the major cause hindering integration. Thus, 349 (59.8%) of the respondents strongly agreed while 174 (29.8%) agreed that lack of training in special education for most teachers is a major hindrance to integration. That translates to over 89 percent. This was followed by inadequate physical and learning facilities and thirdly lack of adequate plans and preparations for integration and lastly by absence of a guiding policy on special education. On the other hand, it was revealed that lack of proper identification and assessment for appropriate placement where only 10 (1.7%) respondents strongly agreed and lack of commitment on the part of public in general where only 12 (2.1%) respondents strongly agreed were regarded as least factors that hinder integration.

These factors were further complemented by the interviews. Sixty respondents were interviewed on reasons why they felt their schools were not suitable for students with special needs and 49 (81.7%) stated lack of training for teachers, followed by teaching and learning materials 36 (60%) respondents; and parents unwillingness to enrol learners with special needs in schools 35 (58.3%) respondents. Further, all the 40 students interviewed stated that their teachers were not qualified enough to handle students with special needs.

iii) It was also revealed that teachers’ preparedness on how to handle students with special needs was an important issue. A great majority of teachers, 163 (92.1%) felt that they were never prepared to handle students with special needs. This was further confirmed by the MOEST staff who stated
that teachers in their division were not competent enough to handle students with special needs. Those teachers who were interviewed 18 (100%) suggested further training in special education as a means of improving integration of students with special needs. They felt that the provision of specialized teaching and learning resources was one way of preparing teachers for integration. It was revealed that 12 (66.7%) teachers who were interviewed wanted provision of specialized teaching and learning resources stepped up in schools.

iv) An area that generated some interest was the government’s contribution towards special needs education. Over 99% of teachers felt the government has not provided adequate mechanisms for students with special needs to learn in regular schools. Further, it was revealed that the majority of the MOEST staff of 4 (57.1%) felt the Ministry has done little to provide such mechanisms. It was also revealed that all the 40 students who were interviewed said that the Ministry of Education has not made good arrangements so that students with special needs can learn together with those without special needs.

v) The introduction of “Persons with Disabilities Act, 2003” alone does not guarantee automatic integration of students with special needs in regular schools. Although the majority of teachers, 112 (63.3%), stated the Act could improve integration, quite a sizable group (36.7%) felt that there are other issues that need to be improved in order to support the Act. These include: training of teachers, provision of teaching and learning materials,
sensitizing parents, using of provincial administration to enforce the law and introducing a policy on special education.

vi) Finally, the respondents gave a variety of suggestions on how to improve integration of students with special needs in schools, the division and Kenya in general. Besides those given as factors in the ratings, new ones emerged. These include: starting integration model schools in every division in Kenya, compulsory and free education for students with special needs at all levels of the education ladder, special grants from the government for schools that enroll a certain percentage of students with special needs, using the provincial administration to realize the implementation of the Disabilities Act - 2003. Besides that, they also suggested stepping up awareness campaigns for education of students with special needs by the Ministry of Education, reducing poverty among people, availing incentives such as full bursaries to those students with special needs who excel in education, and other charitable organisations to sponsor education of a certain number of students with special needs in their areas of jurisdiction.

5.3 CONCLUSIONS

These research findings have identified five major factors which hinder integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division. These are:

i. lack of training in special education by most teachers,

ii. inadequate physical and learning facilities,

iii. lack of adequate plans and preparations for integration,
iv. poverty and financial constraints and

v. absence of policy on special education.

Due to lack of training in special education, regular teachers in both primary and secondary schools are more likely to ignore or unable to handle students with special needs in regular classes. Hence this leads to low enrolment in regular schools or high drop out rate among students with special needs.

Major factors that hinder integration are more of social economic than social cultural. The Ministry of Education has done little to provide mechanisms, funds and preparations for the education of learners with special needs in regular schools. This therefore means the headteachers and teachers have no reference to make when faced with a problem or issue that touches special education in regular schools. Provision of integrated programmes is not evenly distributed. This is as indicated in the background of the study. Most if not all programmes are concentrated along the main road. This is because of poor infrastructure in the interior.

For the last ten years or so, the number of boys with special needs enrolled in regular schools has always been higher than girls in any particular year. This has been so despite the fact that there is generally low enrolment of students with special needs in the division. A greater number of students with special needs are not enrolled in schools. This was confirmed by both standard Eight and Form four students as the majority (85.5%) indicated that there are students with special needs around their schools not attending classes. This further confirmed what the EARC had indicated in 2003.
The introduction of “Persons with Disabilities Act – 2003” does not necessarily guarantee full participation of students with special needs in regular school settings. More elaborate mechanisms need to be put in place to reinforce the Act. As stated by 36.7% of the teachers, issues such as provision of physical and teaching resources, training of teachers and use of provincial administration need to be organized and put in place to support the Act.

Finally, the government, through the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology needs to provide structured and applicable procedures on how to integrate students with special needs into regular schools.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

In this sub-section, a number of recommendations based on the findings of the study have been made. It is hoped that the Ministry of Education, Public and Private universities, the Teachers Service Commission, the Kenya Institute of Education, District Education Officers, headteachers, teachers and all other stakeholders in education, including NGOs and sponsors will find these recommendations helpful in implementing integrated education for students with special needs. More so, the recommendations can be used as a yardstick for determining an effective method of introducing the intended inclusive education in regular primary and secondary schools in Kenya.

i) The Ministry of Education together with K.I.E should consider starting and implementing a special education curriculum in all levels of teacher training colleges. Thus any teacher who graduates from any teacher
training college should be able to meet the needs of any student with special needs in a regular class setting.

ii) For those teachers who are already in the field, comprehensive in-service training on special needs education should be organized by MOEST, KIE and KISE. School, zonal, divisional or district based in-service training can also be used to do the same.

iii) The Ministry should start model integrated schools at divisional level, then move to zonal levels before extending to every school in every district. This should be accompanied with how provision of physical and learning resources can be distributed.

iv) The Ministry of Education should start a careful plan and introduce an appropriate mechanism on how physical resources can be improved in schools and how specialized resources for learners with special needs can be supplied to regular primary and secondary schools. The form of specialized resources should take account of the type of special need, for example, students with visual impairment should be provided with Braille writers, and the quality of provision. The quality should be reflected in the type of resources used to make and the level of supportive service it gives.

v) An integration policy on special education should be established and introduced to regular schools. This policy can be used as a yard stick for service provision for students with special needs in regular schools. More so this policy should touch on issues such as training of teachers, provision of physical and learning facilities, supervision in schools
where students with special needs are enrolled and what inputs can other stakeholders provide.

vi) Thorough sensitization and consultations with parents are required both within and around schools so that most parents who keep their children with special needs at home can release them to regular schools. Church organisations, Non-Governmental Organisations and the provincial administration can be used to implement this especially now that, the ‘Persons with Disabilities Act’ is in place.

vii) Compulsory education for learners with special needs should be introduced in Kenya. This will force parents who may be keeping their children with special needs at home to release them to schools without any excuse.

viii) The government should provide full bursaries for students with special needs who excel in education. This can act as an incentive for more students to join schools and work hard especially in institutions of higher learning.

ix) Before a decision to place a child with special needs in a regular school is taken, a thorough assessment of his needs, a clear understanding of what the benefits of such a placement are likely to be and where difficulties are likely to arise must be born in mind by stakeholders. Unless this is done, such students with special needs may not gain much and may even find themselves restricted in this regular setting.
5.6 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

i) The study covered only one division. There could be some benefit in replication of the study in other districts of the province or of other parts of the country. This could be done to compare findings. Research on a wider scale such as a larger sample or wider entity such as district or province could help widen the generalizations. It could also help improve the instruments for future or further research.

ii) This study covered all types of students with special needs. However, a study on specific special needs such as mental retardation, hearing impairment, speech and language difficulties amongst others could shed light on factors that may hinder integration of students with specific special needs.

iii) Attitudes play an important role in determining the kind of service provision extended towards clients. Training of teachers may not be enough. Hence, studying the regular teachers attitudes towards students with special needs in preparation for integration can be used to deal with problems which may arise due to negative attitudes before they become acute.
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APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire is about factors that hinder integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division

1. The purpose of this study is to analyse factors that hinder integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division.

2. You can greatly contribute towards the study by giving your individual responses without discussing with your colleagues.

3. The information you give will be exclusively confidential and for this study only.

4. Please, answer all the questions in all the sections by ticking or filling in the appropriate answers or responses.

5. In section A, tick what applies to you, in section B, tick the column which represents the level of your agreement to each of the statements and in section C fill the appropriate answers or responses.

6. Your co-operation is highly appreciated.

7. Thank you in advance.

Signature: ..............................................

J.B. OMURWA
SECTION A

SUBJECT DETAILS

Tick your appropriate response.

1. State your position.
   a) H/teacher in primary school [ ]
   b) H/teacher of secondary school [ ]
   c) H/teacher of integrated programmes [ ]
   d) Teacher of primary school [ ]
   e) Teacher of secondary school [ ]
   f) Teacher of integrated programme [ ]

2. State your gender
   a) Female [ ]
   b) Male [ ]

3. State your age bracket
   20 - 30 years [ ]
   31 - 40 years [ ]
   41 - 50 years [ ]
   51-and above [ ]

4. What is your highest academic qualification?
   a) KAPE / KPE / CPE / KCPE [ ]
   b) K.J.S.E [ ]
   c) GSC / FACE / KCE [ ]
   d) EAACE / KACE [ ]
   e) GRADUATE [ ]
   f) Others, specify ____________

5. What is your highest professional qualification?
   a) Untrained [ ]
   b) P4 [ ]
   c) P3 [ ]
   d) P2 [ ]
   e) P1 [ ]
   f) S1 [ ]
   g) Diploma [ ]
   h) B.ED [ ]
   i) M.ED [ ]
   j) Any other specify __________

6. State the number of years you have worked as a teacher.
   1- 10 years [ ]
   11- 20 years [ ]
   21 – 30 years [ ]
   31 and above [ ]

7. Have you ever been trained to teach students with special educational needs?
   a) Yes [ ]
   b) No [ ]
Section B

Please tick the column which most represents your views of the following statements.

NOTE: The phrase “students with special educational needs” is used here instead of “Students with handicaps” and it means any student(s) with physical, sensory, mental or behavioural conditions, which call for special provisions in order for them to achieve their maximum potential.

The following statements indicate factors which hinder or discourage integration of students with special needs in primary and secondary schools. Show the extent to which you agree with each statement by ticking the appropriate column on the right side of each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is the absence of a policy on special education that has hindered implementation of integrated education for students with special educational needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To my knowledge there are no adequate plans and preparations for integrated education for students with special educational needs in Kenya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is low integration of students with special educational needs in regular schools because the training of most teachers in these schools does not qualify them to teach such learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The lack of commitment on the part of the public, in general has contributed to slow integration of students with special needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lack of adequate assessment for proper identification and placement is a major drawback in placing students with special needs in integrated education programmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The lack of awareness on the part of parents about special educational needs and rights of their children has contributed to low enrolment of these students in regular schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lack of or inadequate physical and learning materials such as equipment, playground, classrooms and environment for learners with special needs contributes to low enrolment of such learners in regular schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Although now, the Kenya government has provided free primary education, poverty and financial constraints have been a limitation to parents and public in enrolling students with special needs in regular schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Most parents of learners with special needs are ashamed of them and therefore refuse to enroll them in regular schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Parents and learners still prefer segregated special schools to integrated programmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C

1. How many students with special educational needs are enrolled in your class? Number ______________

2. From your personal knowledge, do you know any students who would have been enrolled in your class, but for one reason or another they aren’t enrolled? Yes □ No □

3. If your answer to question 2 above is Yes, state reason(s) why they are not enrolled in your class?

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

5. Do you think pre-service training prepared you adequately to handle students with special needs? Yes □ No □

6. If No in question 5 above, state what can be done to you so that you can be adequately prepared.

7. If Yes to question 5 above, state what makes you think you are adequately prepared.

8. a) Do you think the introduction of Persons with Disabilities Act of 2003 will improve education for students with special needs in regular settings? Tick what you think is appropriate (See excerpts from Persons with Disabilities Act ‘App IX’ attached to the questionnaire)
   Yes □ No □

   b) How do you think this Act will improve special education?

9. In your opinion, do you think the Ministry of Education has provided you with adequate mechanism so that you can teach students with special needs? Yes □ No □

10. Please give other suggestions on how the implementation of integrated education for students with special needs can be improved in your class.
APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HEADTEACHERS AND DEPUTY HEADTEACHERS FOR BOTH PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

This questionnaire is about factors that hinder integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division of Nyamira District, Kenya.

1. The purpose of this study is to analyse factors that hinder integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division.
2. You can greatly contribute towards the study by giving your individual responses without discussing with your colleagues.
3. The information you give will be exclusively confidential and for this study only.
4. In section A, tick what applies to you, in section B, tick the column which represents the level of your agreement to each of the statements and in section C fill the appropriate answers or responses.
5. Your co-operation is highly appreciated.
6. Thank you in advance.

Signature: .............................................
J.B. OMURWA

Section A

7. State your position.
   a) H/teacher in primary school □
   b) H/teacher of secondary school □
   c) H/teacher of integrated programmes □
   d) Teacher of primary school □
   e) Teacher of secondary school □
   f) Teacher of integrated programme □

2. State your gender  a) Female □  b) Male □

3. State your age bracket
   20 – 30 years □  31 – 40 years □  41-50 years □  51 – and above □

4. What is your highest academic qualification?
   a) KAPE / KPE / CPE / KCPE □
   b) K.J.S.E □
   c) GSC / EACE / KCE □
   d) EAACE / KACE □
   e) GRADUATE □
   f) Others, specify □
b) What is your highest professional qualification?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Untrained</th>
<th>b) P4</th>
<th>c) P3</th>
<th>d) P2</th>
<th>e) P1</th>
<th>f) S1</th>
<th>g) Diploma</th>
<th>h) B.ED</th>
<th>i) M.ED</th>
<th>j) Any other specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. State the number of years you have worked as a teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) 1-10 years</th>
<th>b) 11-20 years</th>
<th>c) 21-30 years</th>
<th>d) 31 and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Have you ever been trained to teach students with special educational needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Yes</th>
<th>b) No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section B

Please tick the column which most represents your views of the following statements.

NOTE: The phrase “students with special educational needs” is used here instead of “Students with handicaps” and it means any student(s) with physical, sensory, mental or behavioural conditions, which call for special provisions in order for them to achieve their maximum potential.

The following statements indicate factors which hinder or discourage integration of students with special needs in primary and secondary schools. Show the extent to which you agree with each statement by ticking the appropriate column on the right side of each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is the absence of a policy on special education that has hindered implementation of integrated education for students with special educational needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To my knowledge there are no adequate plans and preparations for integrated education for students with special educational needs in Kenya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is low integration of students with special educational needs in regular schools because the training of most teachers in these schools does not qualify them to teach such learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The lack of commitment on the part of the public in general has contributed to slow integration of students with special needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lack of adequate assessment for proper identification and placement is a major drawback in placing students with special needs in integrated education programmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. The lack of awareness on the part of parents about special educational needs and rights of their children has contributed to low enrolment of these students in regular schools.

7. Lack of or inadequate physical and learning materials such as equipment, playground, classrooms and environment for learners with special needs contributes to low enrolment of such learners in regular schools.

8. Although now, the Kenya government has provided free primary education, poverty and financial constraints have been a limitation to parents and public in enrolling students with special needs in regular schools.

9. Most parents of learners with special needs are ashamed of them and therefore refuse to enroll them in regular schools.

10. Parents and learners still prefer segregated special schools to integrated programmes.

Section C

1. How many students with special educational needs are enrolled in your school? Number _______________

2. From your personal knowledge of the number of students with special needs from the geographical surrounding of your school, how do you compare the number of those enrolled in your school with those not yet enrolled?

   Tick the appropriate response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very low enrolment</th>
<th>Low enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average enrolment</td>
<td>High enrolment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high enrolment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. State reasons as to why the state of enrolment is what you have ticked in question 2 above.  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of students with special needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

6. How can you rate the government’s contribution towards improvement of service delivery for students with special needs in your school in particular and district in general?

Very little □    Little □    Average □    Good □    Very good □

7. What in your opinion can the government do to improve the education and service delivery for students with special educational needs in regular schools? ____________________________

8. a) Do you think the introduction of Persons with Disabilities Act of 2003 will greatly improve education for students with special educational needs in regular settings? Tick what you think is appropriate. (See excerpts from Persons with Disabilities Act ‘App. IX’ attached to the questionnaire).

   Yes □    No □

b) How do you think this Act will improve special education? ________

______________________________

______________________________
9. Do you think teachers in your schools are adequately prepared to handle students with special educational needs?

   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

b) If Yes, what skills and knowledge do the teachers have that qualify them to handle students with special educational needs? 

   

   

   

   


10. If No, in question 9 above, state what can be done so that teachers can adequately handle students with special educational needs. 

   

   

   

   

END
APPENDIX III

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MINISTRY OF EDUCATION STAFF.

This questionnaire is about factors that hinder integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division.

1. The purpose of this study is to analyse factors that hinder integrated education for students with special needs.

2. You can greatly contribute towards the study by being honest and giving your individual responses without discussing with your colleagues.

3. The information you give will be exclusively confidential and for this study only.

4. Please, answer all the questions in all the sections by ticking or filling in the appropriate answers or responses.

5. In section A, tick what applies to you, in section B, tick the column which represents the level of your agreement to each of the statements and in section C fill the appropriate answers or responses.

6. Your co-operation is highly appreciated.

7. Thank you in advance.

Signature: ..................................................

J.B. OMURWA
**Section A**

**Subject Details**
Tick your appropriate responses.

1. State your gender  
   a) Female □  
   b) Male □

2. State your age bracket
   a) 20 – 30 years □  
   b) 31 – 40 years □  
   c) 41 – 50 years □  
   d) 51 – and above □

3. What is your highest academic qualification?
   a) KAPE / KPE / CPE / KCPE □  
   b) K.J.S.E □  
   c) GSC / EACE / KCE □  
   d) EAACE / KACE □  
   e) GRADUATE □  
   f) Others, specify □

4. What is your highest professional qualification?
   a) Untrained □  
   b) P4 □  
   c) P3 □  
   d) P2 □  
   e) P1 □  
   f) S1 □  
   g) Diploma □  
   h) B.ED □  
   i) M.ED □  
   j) Any other specify □

5. State the number of years you have worked as a Ministry of Education staff.
   a) 1 – 10 years □  
   b) 11 – 20 years □  
   c) 21 – 30 years □  
   d) 31 and above □

6. Do you posses any special training on students with special educational needs?
   Yes □  
   No □
**Section B**

Please tick the column which most represents your views of the following statements.

**NOTE:** The phrase “students with special educational needs” is used here instead of “Students with handicaps” and it means any student(s) with physical, sensory, mental or behavioural conditions, which call for special provisions in order for them to achieve their maximum potential.

The following statements indicate factors which hinder or discourage integration of students with special needs in primary and secondary schools. Show the extent to which you agree with each statement by ticking the appropriate column on the right side of each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Absence of clear education policy specific to special education has greatly affected integrated education for students with special educational needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There are no plans and preparations in place to help in implementation of integrated education for students with special educational needs in Kenya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is low enrolment of students with special educational needs in regular schools because the proportion of teachers trained in special education is much smaller than those trained in regular education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is the government’s failure to implement recommendations on special educations by various commissions that has led to low integration of students with special needs in regular schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Absence of or insufficient specialized assessment tools and personnel for proper identification and placement of learners with special needs greatly contribute to low enrolment in regular schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ignorance and lack of awareness about special education on the part of parents and the public greatly contribute to low enrolment of students with special educational needs in regular schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. There is slow implementation of integrated education for students with special educational needs in regular schools because the Ministry of Education does not avail physical and learning materials for such students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Integration of learners with special educational needs is likely to remain low despite the government’s recent introduction of free and compulsory primary education because no financial provisions have been put in place in regular schools to cater for such learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. The stigma of students with special educational needs by society has greatly prevented them from joining integrated education programmes in regular schools.

10. There has been low enrolment of learners with special educational needs in integrated programmes because most stakeholders in special education still prefer segregated special schools to integrated programmes.

Section C

1. How many integrated programmes for students with special needs are found in your: Division [ ]

2. What can you say about the number of these programmes in your division or district as far as integrated programmes for students with special needs is concerned? Tick what applies to your division.
   - Very low
   - Low
   - Average
   - High
   - Very high

3. What do you think can be done to improve what you have stated in 2 above?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of students with special needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: B - Boys  G - Girls

5. How do you rate the government’s contribution towards the implementation of programmes for students with special educational needs in your division in particular and Kenya in general?
   - Very little
   - Little
   - Average
   - Good
   - Very good

6. Do you think the introduction of specific policy on special education can greatly improve education of students with special needs in your division? Tick what you think is appropriate.
   - Yes
   - No
7. Do you think teachers in regular schools in your division or district are adequately prepared to handle students with special educational needs?
   Yes □  No □

8. If Yes, in 7 above, state the knowledge and skills they possess to enable them handle students with special educational needs. ________________
   ______________________
   ______________________

9. If No, in 7 above, state what can be done to teachers so that they can adequately handle students with special educational needs. ____________
   ______________________
   ______________________

10. Please give your other suggestions on how the implementation of integrated education for students with special needs can be improved in your division.
    ______________________
    ______________________
    ______________________
APPENDIX IV

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STANDARD 8 AND FORM 4 STUDENTS

This questionnaire is about factors hindering integration of students with special needs in Borabu Division.

1) The purpose of this study is to investigate factors that hinder integration of students with special needs.

2) You can greatly contribute towards the study by being honest and giving your individual responses without discussing with your colleagues.

3) The information you give will be exclusively confidential and for this study only.

4) Please, answer all the questions in all the sections by ticking or filling in the appropriate answers or responses.

5) In section A, tick what applies to you, in section B, tick the column which represents the level of your agreement to each of the statements and in section C fill the appropriate answer or response.

6) Your co-operation is highly appreciated.

7) Thank you in advance.

Signature: ...........................................
J.B. OMURWA

Section A

Subject Details

Tick your appropriate response.

1. State the level of your school. Secondary □ Primary □
2. State the level of your class. Class 8 □ Form 4 □
3. State your gender. Girl □ Boy □
4. Are you a student with a special need (handicapped)? Yes □ No □
5. Do you know or have you ever come across a student(s) with a special need?

Yes □ No □
Section B
Please tick the column which most represents your views of the following statements.

NOTE: The phrase "students with special needs" is used here instead of "Students with handicaps" and it means any student(s) who experience conditions, barriers or factors that hinder their normal learning and development as individuals. Such conditions include disabilities such as physical disability, mental handicap, being blind or deaf, having speech and language problems, having health difficulties and even behavioural problems, which call for special provisions in order for them to achieve their maximum potential.

The following statements indicate factors which hinder or discourage integration of students with special needs in primary and secondary schools. Show the extent to which you agree with each statement by ticking the appropriate column on the right side of each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Absence of clear education policy specific to special education has greatly affected integrated education for students with special educational needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>There are no plans and preparations in place to help in implementation of integrated education for students with special educational needs in Kenya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>There is low enrolment of students with special educational needs in regular schools because the proportion of teachers trained in special education is much smaller than those trained in regular education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>It is the government’s failure to implement recommendations on special educations by various commissions that has led to low integration of students with special needs in regular schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Absence of or insufficient specialized assessment tools and personnel for proper identification and placement of learners with special needs greatly contribute to low enrolment in regular schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Ignorance and lack of awareness about special education on the part of parents and the public greatly contribute to low enrolment of students with special educational needs in regular schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>There is slow implementation of integrated education for students with special educational needs in regular schools because the Ministry of Education does not avail physical and learning materials for such students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Integration of learners with special educational needs is likely to remain low despite the government's recent introduction of free and compulsory primary education because no financial provisions have been put in place in regular schools to cater for such learners.

9. The stigma of students with special educational needs by society has greatly prevented them from joining integrated education programmes in regular schools.

10. There has been low enrolment of learners with special educational needs in integrated programmes because most stakeholders in special education still prefer segregated special schools to integrated programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Are there any students with special needs learning at your school?  
  Yes □       No □ |
| 2. If your answer to question 1 above is Yes, state how many they are in your school.  
  ____________________ |
| 3. From your personal knowledge, do you know any child or student(s) with special needs around your home who is not attending school?  
  Yes □       No □ |
| 4. If your answer to question 3 above is Yes, state reason(s) why you think they are not attending school.  
  ____________________  
  ____________________  
  ____________________ |
| 5. In your own opinion, do you think it is good that you learn together with students with special needs in the same school and class?  
  Yes □       No □ |
6. If your answer to question 5 above is No, state why you think it is not good.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

7. What can your school and community do to increase the number of students with special needs in your school? __________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

8. State what can the government do or provide in order to increase the number of students with special needs in your school. ________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

9. Now that primary education is free and compulsory, can this also apply to education for children with special needs? Yes [ ] No [ ]

10. Please give other suggestions or recommendations that can help in the improvement of education for students with special needs. ________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX V
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR STD. 8 AND FORM 4 STUDENTS IN
BORABU DIVISION

Section A
Demographic Information
1. Type of school
   Secondary □  Primary □
2. Respondent’s academic level.
   Std. 8 □  Form 4 □
   Male □  Female □
4. Respondent’s age. __________
5. State of respondent: With a special need □  Without a special need □
6. Type of special need. ________________________________

Section B
1. Are there students with special needs (handicapped) in your school?
   Yes □  No □
2. How many are they in your school? __________________________
3. Do you think your school is a suitable place where learners with special
   needs can learn? Yes □  No □
   a) If Yes, say why you think it is suitable.
      ____________________________________________________________________
   b) If No, say why you think it is not suitable.
      ____________________________________________________________________
4. Do you know of any students with special needs within the immediate
   surrounding of your school who are not attending your school?
   Yes □  No □
   If Yes, suggest reasons why they are not attending school.
   ____________________________________________________________________
5. Are your teachers suitable enough to teach students with special needs?
Yes [ ] No [ ]
Whether Yes or No, say why __________________________________________

6. Has the Ministry of Education made good arrangements so that students with special needs can learn in your school? Yes [ ] No [ ]
Whether Yes or No, state why you think so. __________________________________________

7. Suppose our government came up with this regulation: ‘STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS SHOULD LEARN WITH THOSE STUDENTS WITHOUT SPECIAL NEEDS AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE’. How will you rate this regulation as a way of improving education of students with special needs. Very high [ ] High [ ] Average [ ] Low [ ] Very low [ ]

8. I wish to read you ‘THE PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES ACT 2003’ Paragraph 18(1) and (2) (See App. IX).
Say any obstacles unique to your school or community which may be a hindrance to implementing this act. __________________________________________

9. What are some of the problems students with special needs experience in your school? __________________________________________

10. Please give suggestions how we can improve the learning together of students with special needs together with those without special needs in your school. __________________________________________

END
APPENDIX VI
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TEACHERS AND HEADTEACHERS

Section A: Demographic information

(a) Position in school
   Teacher of regular school □ H/teacher of regular school □
   H/teacher of integrated programme □ Teacher of integrated programme □

(b) Gender of respondents
   Female □ Male □

(c) Type of school
   Secondary □ Primary □

(d) Respondent’s age bracket
   20 – 30 years □ 31 – 40 years □ 41 – 50 years □ 51 – and above □

(e) Respondent’s highest academic qualification?
   KAPE / KPE / CPE / KCPE □ K.J.S.E □
   GSC / EACE / KCE □ EAACE / KACE □
   GRADUATE □ Others, specify __________

(f) Respondent’s highest professional qualification?
   Untrained □ P4 □ P3 □
   P2 □ P1 □ S1 □
   Diploma □ B.ED □ M.ED □
   Any other specify __________

(g) Number of years respondent has worked as a teacher.
   1-10 years □ 11-20 years □ 21-30 years □ 31 and above □
Section B

1. Are students with special educational needs enrolled in your school?
   No ☐       Yes ☐

2. If so, since which year has your school enrolled students with special educational needs? Year ________

3. In your view, do you think your school is equipped to enroll students with special educational needs? Yes ☐   No ☐
   a) If yes, what factors have placed your school in such a good position?
   _____________________________________________
   _____________________________________________
   b) If No, what factors need to be improved in order to enroll learners with special educational needs?
   _____________________________________________
   _____________________________________________

4. From your knowledge of the number of students with special educational needs within the immediate environment, how do you rate the enrolment of these students in your school?
   Very high? ☐   High? ☐   Average? ☐   Low? ☐   Very low? ☐
   Suggest reasons for the enrolment size of these students in (4) above.
   _____________________________________________
   _____________________________________________

5. As a teacher trained in regular education, do you think you are competent enough to teach students with special educational needs?
   Yes ☐       No ☐
   a) If Yes, state why you think so.
   _____________________________________________
   _____________________________________________
   _____________________________________________
b) If No, state what should be done to improve your competence. 

__________________________________________________________________________

c) Do you think the Ministry of Education has provided adequate mechanisms to implement the education of students with special needs in your school?

Yes □ No □

a) If Yes, state what the Ministry has done. 

__________________________________________________________________________

b) If No, state what the Ministry can do to improve it. 

__________________________________________________________________________

d) How do you rate the need for introduction of specific policy in relation to special education in our education system as a means of improving the integration of education for students with special needs?

Very high □ High □ Average □ Low □ Very low □

e) State any obstacles which are unique to your school or community that may be a hindrance in implementing the education section of Persons with Disabilities Act 2003. (See excerpts of the Act ‘App. IX’ attached to the questionnaire). 

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

f) What are some of the problems students with special educational needs experience in your school? 

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

g) Please give other suggestions on how the implementation of integrated education for students with special needs can be improved in your school. 

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

END
APPENDIX VII

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR MINISTRY OF EDUCATION STAFF
IN BORABU DIVISION

Section A

Demographic Information

a) Gender of respondent. Male □ Female □

a) Respondent’s age bracket
20 – 30 years □ 31 – 40 years □ 41 – 50 years □ 51-and above years □

b) Respondent’s highest academic qualification
KAPE/KPE/CPE/KCPE □ KJSE □
GSC/EACE/KCE □ EAACE/KACE □
GRADUATE □ Any other, specify

b) Respondent’s highest professional qualification.
Untrained □ P4 □ P3 □
P2 □ P1 □ S1 □
Diploma □ B.ED □ M.ED □
Any other specify

d) The number of years the respondent has worked as a Ministry of Education staff


e) Do you possess any training on how to handle students with special educational needs?
Yes □ No □
Section B

a) How many integrated programmes for students with special educational needs are found in your division __________

(a) In your view, do you think this number of integrated programmes are enough to cater for students with special educational needs in your division?

Yes □ No □

(i) If Yes, state why you think these programmes are enough. __________

(ii) If No, state why you feel these programmes are not enough. __________

(b) What do you think the Kenya government should do to improve the integration of students with special needs in regular schools? __________

(c) What are some of the problems unique to your division that hinder the implementation of education for students with special needs? __________

(d) How do you rate the number of teachers trained in special education in your division who can help you implement integrated education for students with special needs?

Very low □ Low □ Average □ High □ Very high □

(e) What do you think should be done to improve on what you have chosen in (e) above? __________

(f) What in your view, has the government done to implement integrated education for students with special needs in your division? __________
(g) How do you rate the just introduced ‘Persons with Disabilities Act 2003’ (See attached excerpt from the Act ‘App. IX’) in relation to special education in our educational system as a means of improving the implementation of education for students with special needs?

Very high □    High □    Average □    Low □    Very low □

(h) What can the government do to hasten or improve the implementation of integrated education for students with special needs in your division and generally in Kenya? _________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________

END
APPENDIX VIII

EXCERPTS FROM: "THE PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES ACT 2003"

Education.

Paragraph 18 (1) No persons or learning institution shall deny admission to a person with a disability to any course of study by reason only of such disability, if the person has the ability to acquire substantial learning in that course.

(2) Learning institutions shall take into account the special needs of persons with disabilities with respect to the entry requirements, pass marks, curriculum, examinations, auxiliary services, use of school facilities, class schedules, physical education requirements and other similar considerations.

(3) Special schools and institutions, especially for the deaf, the blind and the mentally retarded, shall be established to cater for formal education, skills development and self-reliance.

Special and non-formal education.

The Council shall work in consultation with the relevant agencies of Government to make provisions in all districts for an integrated system of special and non-formal education for persons with all forms of disabilities and the establishment where possible of Braille and recorded libraries for persons with visual disabilities.
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

When replying please quote

Johnson Buddy Omurwa
Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844
NAIROBI

Dear Sir:

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to conduct research on “Factors hindering integration of students with special needs in Primary and Secondary Schools in Kenya”. I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to conduct research in Nyamira District for a period ending 30th May, 2005.

You are advised to report to the District Commissioner and the District Education Officer, Nyamira District before embarking on your research project.

Upon completion of your research you are expected to submit two copies of your research report to this Office.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

FOR: PERMANENT SECRETARY

Co

The District Commissioner
Nyamira District

The District Education Officer
Nyamira District
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