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<th>Abbreviation</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADL</td>
<td>Activities of Daily Living also known as Daily living skills (DLS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARC</td>
<td>Educational Assessment Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Educational for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>Education for Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEM</td>
<td>Global Economic Meltdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Hearing Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Intellectually Challenged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>Individualized Educational Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCPE</td>
<td>Kenya Certificate of Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCSE</td>
<td>Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Mentally handicapped, also sometimes called intellectually challenged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC</td>
<td>Most vulnerable child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>Occupational Therapist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>Physically Handicapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public Private Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Physiotherapist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REI</td>
<td>Regular Education Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNE</td>
<td>Special Needs Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO</td>
<td>United Nations Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VH</td>
<td>Visually Handicapped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate constraints to the implementation of reverse integration in special primary and secondary schools in Mombasa County, Kenya. It was guided by a set of objectives which were followed up with a corresponding set of research questions. A theoretical framework based on Albert Bandura’s Social Learning Theory was adopted. The study adopted a descriptive survey design that used an exploratory approach to investigate the problem at hand. The target population comprised of 1019 students, 88 teachers as well as 46 non teaching staff, totaling to 1163 respondents. Purposive sampling technique was used to select three schools (42%) out of the seven special schools in the study locale. Stratified random sampling technique was used to select 36 students (5%) from the various strata of student’s population. Ultimately, the sample was 71 respondents, representing approximately 10% of the population in the sampled schools. Data was collected using two types of questionnaires one for teaching/non-teaching staff and the other for students. Tools reliability was ascertained through the test re-test method, while content validity was confirmed by the researcher’s supervisors. Analysis of quantitative data was done using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 17.0, while qualitative data was analyzed descriptively. Descriptive statistics (measure of central tendency) was used to analyze the data from the respondents. Quantitative variables were cross tabulated with the dependent variable of reverse integration including administrative factors; school staffs qualifications, experience and training, status of educational materials in terms of relevance, adequacy and effective use and non academic issues such as policy shifts. The study found out that the reverse integration was a laudable policy that would enhance mutual co-existence between children with special needs and those without special needs. The study also found out that administrative factors greatly influenced the implementation of the reverse integration education policy. The level of experience and professional qualifications of the teaching staff also affected implementation of the policy. Results of the study on the influence of educational materials and facilities showed that most schools lack the resources especially libraries and laboratories. It found out that most of the schools were in dire need of support from all the stakeholders in order to provide emotional, financial and material support to the students. The study recommends that the reverse integration policy’s implementation should be enhanced in order to provide an equal opportunity to all the children. In addition, schools should redouble, their efforts in the provision of a conducive learning experiences for children joining the programme. The study also recommends that a nationwide study be launched in order to find out the current level of pressure and available resources in the schools.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction
In this chapter, the researcher discussed the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose and objectives of the study as well as research questions. The researcher also examined significance of the study, limitations and delimitations, assumptions of the study, conceptual framework, theoretical underpinnings as well as operational definitions of central terms and concepts used in this research undertaking.

1.2 Background to the Study
Reverse integration is a special education practice in which non-handicapped learners are deliberately admitted into a special school, contrary to what the case would be in traditional or convectional integration, whereby the learners with special needs would be the ones to be admitted into regular schools, so that the two diverse categories of children can learn side by side, (Ryan, 2004). Special education has undergone tremendous transformation over the last two or so decades. It has changed from categorical institutionalized special provision for children with special needs in education (SNE) given on the basis of the nature of disability. It has been transformed to deinstitutionalization, and normalization in the past to reverse integration and finally inclusive socialization (popularly known as inclusion) in recent years (Corbett, 2001).

Special needs education targets children with developmental disabilities on one end of the spectrum and those who are intellectually gifted on the other end. So they are
atypical, meaning that they differ from average or normal children in mental characteristics, sensory abilities, communication abilities, physical attributes and behavioural and emotional development. These differences must occur to such an extent that the child requires some modification of school practices, that is, special education and related services to develop their unique capabilities (Kirk and Gallagher, 2005).

Traditional special education has been categorical in nature, where schools are specifically mandated to admit learners on the basis of the nature of disability. This practice perpetuates internal dichotomy among the various categories of learners with disabilities themselves, not to mention their segregation from their non-handicapped contemporaries. This is in contradiction to the “noble” goal of integrating persons with disabilities into the mainstream of society as espoused by UN declaration for persons with disabilities (1981) and World Congress on Rehabilitation (1992), cited in (UNO, 1999). Instead, it promotes educational separateness or apart- hood a kin to apartheid, a heinous policy of racial segregation as it used to be practiced in South Africa, where it has since been discarded.

As a means of reducing segregated learning, attempts have been made to integrate learners with SNE into regular classes through a range of provision that is integration. The other approach which is inclusion focuses on improvement of the capacity of mainstream schools to accommodate diversity amongst learners so that all learners those with SNE included can attend the neighbourhood mainstream school (Tilstone, Florian and Rose, 20005). This is because there has been increasing rhetoric about the immorality of segregated educational provision. In some cases, non-handicapped
learners have been admitted into special schools within their neighbourhood so as to enable severely handicapped learners who may not be easy to integrate into mainstream schools, due to unavailability of commensurate specialized facilities and services to meet their unique needs. There has over a long period of time, been several attempts at bringing the learners with SNE and their non-SNE contemporaries to learn together or at close proximity. Therefore, terms such as integration, inclusion, mainstreaming, and de-institutionalization in this study may at times be used interchangeably, to generally mean any special education model that tries to bring the learners with SNE close to their non-SNE peers.

In support of the integrative educational paradigm of special education provision, Hallahan and Kauffman (2003), argue that individuals with SNE share similar needs and aspirations with their non-exceptional counterparts, suggesting further that they are more alike than they are different hence the need for them to integrate. Where neither traditional integration, nor inclusion does seem to work, some form of modified inclusivity, such as reverse integration then becomes imperative. Reverse integration according to Smith (2004), is a procedure that involves introducing non-handicapped students into special classrooms to work with severely handicapped students. The purpose is to maximize integration of severely handicapped and the non-handicapped students without denying the latter, specialist support.

Mainstreaming, a more familiar concept refers to the integration of the handicapped into the non-handicapped classes to enable each individual to participate in patterns of everyday life that are close to the mainstream. It has its origin in the mid-1960s in Europe, as a result of the change in conceptualization of disability occasioned by the
broader rights movement in society towards normalization (Bickel and Bickel, 2004). Efforts have been made by governments, non-governmental organizations as well as school administrators at effective implementation of reverse integration cases in point being Port Reitz special and Mombasa secondary school for the physically handicapped in Mombasa and Bishop Muhor special school in Central Kenya, with gaps having been noted in the areas of enrolment, whereby non-handicapped learners had far outnumbered their SNE counterparts. Florian Rose and Tilstone (2005) posit that recent research in the area of special education has focused more on inclusive education. The current study intends to establish constraints to the implementation of reverse integration in Secondary and Primary special schools in Mombasa County.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Reverse integration entails bringing the non-disabled learner into the special class or school (Gross, 2002), Reynolds and Jansen (2002), see it as a first step in the normalization process which will eventually make the learners with disabilities learn how to interact with their non-handicapped peers. In Kenya, this education model has been tried in a number of schools such as Bishop Muhor special school for learners with hearing impairment in Central Kenya which by 1998 had over 75% of its school enrolment comprising of non-SNE (Koech, 1999) and Mombasa secondary school for the physically handicapped where the ratio of non-SNE to SNE for five consecutive years was 157:43 in 2002, 161:39 in 2003, 176:35 in 2004, 187:23 in 2005 and 194:14 in 2006 as well as Port Reitz Special School for the Physically Handicapped at the Mombasa County which started reverse integration in 2005 with a non-SNE-SNE enrollment pattern of 180:120 in 2005, 187:113 in 2006, 211:89 in 2007 and 113:87 in
This is indeed a worrying trend as the majority has always been the non handicapped.

All these schools registered an increase of learners most of whom were non-SNE, thereby defeating the whole purpose of this initiative’s endeavour of enhancing mutual socialization and tolerance in the two diverse groups preferably with a 50% representation of each, (Ainscow, 1999) cited in Bigge (2005). Koech (1999) observes that special school administrators are keen on improving their school’s financial positions through fees as well as enhancement of academic performance mean scores in national examinations. This state of affairs has worked at cross purposes with the goal of reverse integration, that of mutual socialization and tolerance between the diverse types of learners.

Since the start of implementation of reverse integration in 1998 at Bishop Muhoro special school in central Kenya and over the years; continuing up to date in Coast province, there are still gaps in the effectiveness of reverse integration education model which is meant to serve learners with SNE. Many recent studies in the area of education for learners with SNE have tended to focus more on inclusion yet the model of reverse integration remains largely un-researched. The current study therefore sought to investigate the constraints facing the effective implementation of reverse integration in special primary and secondary schools in Mombasa County.
1.4 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the constraints facing the effective implementation of reverse integration in special primary and secondary schools in Mombasa County in Kenya.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The study was guided by the following objectives:

i. Identify school administrative factors affecting the implementation of reverse integration.

ii. Distinguish the extent to which facilities and materials are adequate for the implementation of reverse integration in the study schools.

iii. Examine teachers’ opinions on the practice of reverse integration in the selected schools.

iv. Establish the learners’ opinions on the practice of reverse integration in the study schools.

v. Find out the extent to which teachers' professional training affects the implementation of reverse integration.

1.6 Research Questions

The study sought to address itself to the following research questions.-

i. What school administrative factors affected reverse integration in the study schools?

ii. Were facilities and materials adequate for effective implementation of reverse integration in study schools?
iii. What were teachers’ opinions on the practice of reverse integration in the selected schools?

iv. What were the students’ opinions on the practice of reverse integration in the study schools?

v. To what extent did teachers’ professional training affect the instruction of learners with SNE?

1.6 Significance of the Study

It was hoped that findings of this study may help the government through the Ministry of Education, (MoE) in the formulation of policy guidelines for effective implementation of reverse integration in situations where such a practice is required to care for multitudes of children with SNE. It was further hoped that findings of this study may help the government to be responsive to appropriate staffing needs and provision of other relevant resources in integrated schools.

Findings of this study may also help administrators in special institutions that practise inclusive or integrated education to anticipate what administrative challenges they are likely to come across and how to deal with the same appropriately. Also, findings of this study may help unearth any non-academic factors affecting reverse, integration and any related issues which may arise and how to address the same in the integrated schools. Furthermore, findings of this study would contribute knowledge to other researchers by providing data which can act as a basis for related research on inclusion or integration of SNE learners with their non-exceptional counterparts whether regular or reverse in nature.
1.8 Limitation of the Study

i. The study limited itself to Mombasa County, Coast Province. For a more conclusive and comprehensive result, it would have been more fitting if a provincial or national study were to be conducted. Due to cost implications, time factor and logistical constraints, it was not possible to cover the entire province or country.

ii. The concept of “reverse integration” was fairly an uncommon phenomenon in Kenya, let alone its practice during the time of the study. This was in sharp contrast with inclusion, which was the new orthodoxy in the realm of special education. As such, there was a shortage of literature relevant on the local scene for review and this was a limiting factor no doubt as review of related literature largely relied on external sources.

iii. Most special schools in Kenya were residential in nature, and some, especially secondary ones had students from far away, therefore getting their parents’ views regarding this educational model, though imperative, became an uphill task as they were not easily available. Hence, this study limited itself to the views of students and teachers who were on session during the material time of the study and exclude their parents.

1.9 Delimitations of the Study

i. The study was confined to students and staff in seven public special schools practicing reverse integration in Mombasa County. This excluded private special institutions and public special institutions that did not integrate exceptional and non-exception learners together.
ii. The study delimited itself further to administrators of the same schools. This excluded other stakeholders like education officers, school inspectors within the study locale, who might have had useful information regarding the subject at hand.

iii. Staff and students who for one reason or the other were absent during the material time of the study were excluded so as to remove unnecessary delays.

iv. The study further delimited itself to learners who are not candidates, i.e. classes 1-7 in primary and forms 1-3 in secondary schools.

1.10 Assumptions of the Study

The researcher conducted the study with the following assumptions in mind:

i. That all respondents would be co-operative and provide sincere and gave reliable answers to all questions addressed to them.

ii. That the respondents were not biased while giving feedback to the questions presented to them.

iii. That the tools for collecting data were valid, accurate reliable and sufficient to provide appropriate and reliable information.

1.11 Theoretical Framework

The study was guided by the following theory:

1.11.1 Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory (1997, 1990 and 1999)

The main assumptions of this theory are that learning comes from the surroundings and the environment and that experiences shape the person's behaviour, attitudes and beliefs, and hence his/her personality. Eysenck (1999) as cited in Wamocho (2003)
points out that personality research is suggestive of the fact that we human beings have a certain sort of personality, that is stable and an enduring condition. He further suggests that our personality is part of our nature and hence there is a biological basis for it, that is, it is innate. However, others suggest that nature also affects personality for example, we learn through reinforcement: - thus we tend to repeat behaviour for which we have been rewarded and tend not to repeat behaviour for which we have been punished. We use others around us as a reference point and learn from them. Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory thus suggests that we develop as individuals, through learning and socialization. This is a sharp contrast to the idea that we have an innate personality, which might or might not lead us to be, say well in academics or sport.

This in turn means that even the exceptional learners can be helped to achieve their full potentials so long as an enabling environment which allows them to move about and intermingle with the wider society is provided. They have to be helped to “socialize” and in the process learn from the wider society, a prototype of which is the integrated school setting. The learners with SNE are usually empowered through the creation of enabling environment in special schools or creation of barrier-free environment through construction of ramps for wheel chair users, rough floor (non-skid) for crutches and wheel chair users, acoustic walls to aid learners with hearing impairments among other prosthetic devices in special schools.

But it would be more empowering and enabling for them to benefit from socializing with others in an integrated setting. Bandura's social learning theory is adopted as an element of this study’s theoretical framework because of its advocacy on socialization
as an important medium of learning. It is hoped that if learners with SNE can be placed in an integrated setting whether through reverse integration or inclusion, then socialization which facilitates learning, will take place. Consequently, inclusion or integration whether regular or reverse is, therefore, imperative as opposed to categorical placement in special schools which in turn promotes exclusion and by extension discrimination of the child with SNE.

Socialization refers to passing of cultural norms and values of society to the people. Primary socialization takes place in the family while secondary socialization occurs within other areas of society such as education, work, sport and media. In the integrated setting, the learner with SNE will be exposed to role models in more areas of social endeavours in “competitive real settings” and not sheltered or over protected special school settings. The learners with SNE in an integrated setting will learn from others and others will in turn learn from them and hence mutual understanding; as opposed to what the case would be in segregative special schools.

According to Allyort's Contact Hypothesis, lack of contact or segregation breeds ignorance and autistic hostility, reinforces negative stereotypes, breeds belief in greater dissimilarity and ultimately greater dislike for them that are different from you. Direct inter-group contact on the other hand leads to familiarity, opportunity to modify negative stereotypes, perception of similarity and greater liking ultimately.

Bandura (1987, 1990, 1999) suggests that we learn through imitation, modeling as well as through reinforcement. He concludes that as well as learning through direct reinforcement like praise, we learn through vicarious reinforcements from observing
others and imitating them. We learn in a social setting with others around us and these others affect what we learn. It is the researcher’s strong view that integrated school setting and indeed inclusion, provides a better socialization forum for both the learners with SNE and their non-exceptional peers.
1.12 Conceptual Framework

Figure 1.1: Correlation of Integrated Learning

Figure 1.1: Shows a conceptual framework of the interrelations between human and physical variables affecting reverse integration in special secondary and primary schools in Mombasa County.

The dependent variables in this scheme included well-adjusted learners in reversely integrated schools, tolerance between the learners with disabilities and those without disabilities and possibilities of learners to achieve their potentials. According to the conceptual framework, the independent variables such as physical resources (school
buildings barrier-free environment, adaptive devices, school dispensary and physical and occupational therapy facilities) have a motivating effect on the learner with SNE. Therefore, providing for adequate school buildings that are barrier-free, adequate adaptive devices such as walkers, wheelchairs, calipers and braces, wheelchairs, dispensary, good labs and libraries as well as physical and occupational therapy services, the learners with SNE will be motivated and well adjusted, and possibly achieve their potentials.

Similarly, the other independent variable which was human resources could be measured in terms of (teachers professional training, teachers’ administrative styles, staff motivation, teaching methods, effective handling of curriculum as well as auxiliary services by school nurse and physical and occupational therapists) had a direct impact on the dependent variable.

In the context of teachers trained in Special Needs Education using specialised teaching methodology and input by the occupational and physical therapist was instrumental in motivating the learners with SNE to adjust positively in the integrated school.
1.13 Operational Definition of Terms:

**Attitudes:** Refer to organized reactions of an individual towards something or another individual (Hornby, 2012).

**Disabled:** Is a state of being incapable and deviating from the normal standards of the majority's way of life (Gross, 2002).

**Exceptional Children:** Children who differ from the norm to such an extent that modification of school practices (i.e. special education) become necessary for them as learners with SNE (Bigge, 2005).

**Inclusion:** A new special education model which requires that every learner with SNE goes to the school nearest to his/her home, where adjustments to cater for his/her unique needs can be effected rather than go to special school (Tilstone, C., Florian, L. and Rose, R., 20005).

**Integration:** Some form of interactions of children with disabilities and those without these disabilities (Thomas and Taylor, J.M, 2003).

**Integrated schools:** These are schools that admit learners with special needs in education as well as those without those needs (Bigge, J, 2005).

**Main streaming:** Situations where handicapped students are educated with their non handicapped peers for certain periods of time (Bigge, J, 2005).

**Reverse integration:** It is a special education service delivery procedure where learners without special needs in education are admitted in special schools to learn alongside their counterparts with special needs in education (Kaufman, J.M, 1989).

**Special Institution:** Refers to special school or vocational training centers for the handicapped learners (Benett, T, S, 2003).
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction
In this chapter, the researcher gave a general overview of the development of special education followed by a review of related literature from a broad or global perspective to a specific or local perspective as well as historical to present development of special education guided by the research objective as follows:

2.2 A General Overview of the Development of Special Education
A former president of the United States of America (USA); Thomas Jefferson once said, “There is nothing more unequal than equal treatment for unequals.” Koech (1999), agrees that one of the goals of education as stated in the national goals of education in Kenya is to provide equal opportunities for all children including those children with Special Needs in Education (SNE). The Kamunge Report (1988) , asserts that the goals of education were essentially similar for all children, but that special techniques were required to help children with Special Needs Education. Article 26 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 (UNO, 2000) states that every person has a right to education. Basic education should be free and compulsory. The Kenya government’s current policy on education (GoK, 2007), has been greatly influenced by the millennium development goals (MDGs). More recently, emphasis has been laid on the plight, of the most vulnerable child regarding provision of their educational and other basic necessities, (GoK, 2008). The government introduced free primary education (FPE) in 2003 (GoK, 2003) pursuant to the UNO inspired, Education For All (EFA) initiative. UNESCO, Nairobi office
UNESCO, 2007) reports of a meeting of 9th May 2006 whose theme was education for sustainable development (ESD) with a view to assessing progress made by the network of existing formal non-formal and informal organizations as well as initiatives such as the public-private partnerships (PPP) with SNE having been a key component of the overall strategy of ESD. ESD itself is a sub-sector in the UNOs multi-sectored approach to educational, scientific and social development as enshrined in the MDGs.

Furthermore, there is Kenya government’s economic blue print, vision 2030 (GoK, 2008), which advocates the enhancement of education as a flagship for faster and sustainable economic development as well as the economic stimulus package designed to combat the adverse effects of the Global Economic Melt-down (GEM). Devolution of resources to the grass roots, with a particularly positive bias on the education sector, such as the allocation of Kenya shillings 30 million per each of the 210 electoral constituencies in Kenya for the improvement of educational facilities is noteworthy. Tax exemption of a significant section of people with disabilities in formal employment and free interest loans for individuals with disabilities, further affirms the Kenya government’s consistent attempt at affirmative action in favour of learners with special needs.

Paradoxically, Koech (1999) observes, that the rapid growth in education since independence (1963) has not been reflected in the special education sub-sector. For instance, by 1999, there were only 479 special education institutions and programmes which comprised 385 units and 94 special schools including vocational and technical
institutions for the handicapped. The number of children enrolled in these institutions stood at 14,600 with 1,962 teachers and 1,449 classrooms.

Yet out of the 90,452 estimated physically handicapped children then, only 3,003 were in special education programmes. As for learners with visual impairment, 2,208 children out of an estimated 220,000 were enrolled in special education programmes to cite but a few examples. The Kochung Report (2003), casts an even grimmer picture when it reported that there were 26,885 learners with SNE, that is, 15,129 boys and 11,756 girls in special schools, units and integrated programmes in Kenya as of August 2003, out of an estimated 1.8 million learners with special needs countrywide. This meant that an estimated 1.75 million learners with SNE were not receiving any SNE related services. The Kochung taskforce also found that 10-15% of children in regular classes were SNE type yet they were not receiving special education treatment. With the enrolment in primary schools, having shot up to 7.5 million children, since the NARC (National Rainbow Coalition) government introduced Free Primary Education (FPE), it is estimated that there are between 800,000 and 1.9 million SNE children in Kenya who attend regular schools without commensurate specialist support.

In the realm of education for the exceptional children particularly, there has ensued numerous paradigm shifts ranging from special (categorical) schools, de-institutionalization, normalization, mainstreaming, or integration, reverse integration, and currently the trend is inclusion. This chapter intends to undertake a review of related literature as regards the theory and practice relating to the entire broad spectrum of education and care for learners with SNE over the years.
2.3 Professional Training, Management of SNE and Reverse Integration

Kochung report (2003), notes that any successful implementation of any SNE educational programme will largely depend on a multi sectoral approach in its management. However, there is lack of a coordinating board for the diverse SNE services and programmes by various departments of Ministry of Education charged with provision of SNE services and other service providers from other ministries. This situation has resulted in un-coordinated provision of SBE services by MoE organs, ministries of health, social services, home affairs, local government, NGOs and other stakeholders (Kochung, 2003).

Learners with SNE whether in the most restrictive environment or least restrictive environment may require specialist services time to time. Gross (2002), posits that these services may conveniently be provided on itinerant basis. Consequently, speech therapists (or convectionists), social workers, school psychologists, remedial reading teachers, learning disability specialists among other special education personnel may deal with the SNE children on itinerant basis, whereby a particular specialist may serve several schools, and travel over a considerable area visiting children with SNE and their teachers at regular intervals or whenever necessary.

With the availability of itinerant services to learners with SNE, implicitly, the child can be reached, whether in most restrictive or least restrictive environment, including the regular classroom, closer home possibly in an inclusive setting. Beside the itinerant or peripatetic personnel, there are various special education support services. According to the Kochung report (2003), there is a serious shortage of trained SNE teachers in Kenya. About 80% of teachers working with learners with SNE are not
trained. Consequently, some special needs educational programmes, special units, special schools, Educational Assessment and Resource Centers (EARCS) and small homes are manned by personnel who have no qualification in SNE, further disadvantaging the learners with SNE.

Moreover, Beveridge (2001), stress that specialist personnel are a critical requirement in the management of learners with special needs. These include physiotherapists, speech therapists occupational therapists, Braille transcribers, orthopedic surgeons and nutritionists among others. Besides these human resources are modifications like use of prosthetic devices and making the environment barrier free which helps in maximizing the functional potentials of learners with SNE. Likewise, Corbett (2001) and Tilstone, Florian and Rose (2005), cite methodology in handling the learners with SNE as another critical consideration. Use of individualized educational programmes (IEP), task analysis, peer tutoring, team teaching, and computer assisted instruction, teacher aides, collaboration and reverse integration are among other methods that come in handy. Notably, these intervention measures were not being applied in the sampled schools.

2.4 Facilities, Materials and Adaptations in Reversely Integrated Schools

Educational facilities and materials are key to the success of any educational undertaking. These include the very basic ones such as books, seats; classrooms and play grounds among others. In the case of reversely integrated special schools specially adapted devices and prosthetics that enhance the functioning of individuals with SNE become imperative. Where these facilities and materials are unavailable, improvisation may become necessary. Smith(2004), talks of accommodations or
instructional adaptations being either typical/routine, that is, strategies directed towards the whole class, or relatively minor adaptations that a teacher makes for any student, or substantial/specialized instructional adaptations, which are individually tailored adjustments to suit the needs of an individual with SNE. According to Tilstone, Florian and Rose (2005), skilled support is very important especially in ensuring that there is balancing of the structured intervention to facilitate broader interaction within the integrated class/group. Reiterating the fact that training and professional supervision are increasingly important for both the teaching as well as the non-teaching staff, Tilstone et al (2005) argue that pupils in integrated settings must be provided with skilled support so that interactions can be promoted and facilitated throughout the range of activities. For example, support staff should not sit next to a pupil with learning difficulties all the time as this approach has been shown to be a barrier to interactions and integration eventually. Rather, children should be equipped with relevant materials and an enabling environment coupled with necessary prompting for them to chart their way to independent functioning, (Bigge, 2005). Schools practicing reverse integration in Mombasa were found not to be applying these teaching methodologies.

2.5 De-Institutionalization, Normalization and Anti-Labeling Movement

The first part of the 20th century witnessed growth in numbers of large residential institutions for learners with SNE (Hallahan and Kaufman, 2003: 485). Starting from the late 1960s however, the trend gradually changed to de-institutionalization, through which method, the learners with SNE were placed in closer contact with the community.
More and more individuals with SNE were raised by their families as a result. Smaller facilities near local neighbourhoods were common as the isolation identified with institutionalization of exceptional individuals gradually gave way to de-institutionalization. Close on the heels of de-institutionalization was the concept of normalization. Booth and Ports (2000), state that normalization was first espoused in Scandinavia but later popularized in USA. Wolfensberger (1999) cited in Booth and Ports (2000), postulates that normalization is a philosophical belief that every person with a disability should have an education and a living environment as close to normal as possible. No matter what the type or level of the individual's disability, normalization dictates that he/she should be “integrated” as much as possible into the larger society PL 94-142 (Hallahan and Kaufman, 2003) insistence on least restrictive environment was as a direct result of lobbying by advocates for people with disabilities, to get the principle of normalization legally mandated. As a consequence of the normalization movement, non-labeling movement and integration as a special education service provision model emerged.

This development came about due to the fact that most labels used to designate students with special needs carry negative connotations. Retarded, disturbed and other labels that designate disabilities associated with learners with SNE are not kind words. Being so described may lower a person's self-esteem or cause others to behave differently towards the labeled individual,( Booth and Ports 2000). Consequently, advocates for persons with disabilities suggest use of better labels or to the extent possible, avoid the use of labels altogether. Booth and Ports (2000) further argue that anti labeling is based on the theory that disabilities are a matter of social perceptions
and value, not ‘inherent characteristics. Therefore, labels can reflect biases or prejudices that are damaging to the labelled person.

Labeling can also change the way persons are perceived, changing what is noticed about them. Damaging labels may be applied more frequently to members of certain ethnic groups, compounding society’s discrimination against them. Hughes (2005), notes that overrepresentation of ethnic minorities in the special education institutions in USA has been a pressing and volatile issue during the 1970s and 1980s.

Furthermore, Bogdan (2001) as cited in Hallahan and Kaufman (2003) suggests that disability is a socially created construct, whose existence depends on social integration. Only to a very narrow sense according to him does a person have a disability. For example, the fact that a person cannot see sets the stage for his/her being labeled blind. Once labeled so, there is a variety of undesirable consequences that follow, such as our interactions with him or her are different because of the label and we view the blind person primarily in terms of the blindness, tending to interpret everything he/she can or cannot do in terms of the blindness.

Effectively, his disability takes precedence over all other things we may know about the individual. Thus, labeling opens the door for viewing the labeled in a stereotypical and prejudicial manner, because once labeled blind, we tend to think of all blind people as being similar to each other but different from the rest of society. Prior to the publication of the Warnock Report in the United Kingdom (UK) argues Fuchs and Fuchs (2003), special education models emphasized deficits within the child from a medical or psychological perspective. The deficit model as it would appear was a
subtle acknowledgment of the child's sub-normality or mal-adjustment, socially or educationally.

It is not easy to determine the cut-off point between ‘normal’ and ‘abnormal’ level of individual variation in learning, social and emotional development in the implied value judgment exercise, without falling victim of using unkind words (or labels) such as disabled infirm, in educable among others. The Warnock Report further points out concerns that labels tended to be associated with certain ethnic and social class variables, hence discriminatory which is undesirable. It is strongly believed that inclusion or indeed any form of integrated learning such as reverse integration, that can facilitate the interaction between non-handicapped and learners with SNE may probably play an important role in minimizing labeling of the latter category of learners, which in most cases leads to stigmatization.

2.6 Main Streaming or Integration: A Departure from Segregation

Integration can be defined as a form of normalization in terms of where and with whom people with disabilities live, work go to school and play, (Bleck and Nagel /2004). Like other aspects of normalization, integration as a broadly social issue began in the 1960s. Jordan and Goodley (2000), state that integration involves the movement of people with disabilities from institutions to community living; from special schools to regular schools; and from special classes to regular classes.

Ultimately, in the opinion of the most radical advocates of integration; it entails the dissolution of special education. Special education and regular education to some should merge into a single educational system in which all students are perceived as
special. Proponents of less radical views of integration suggest that, exceptional persons should be integrated into communities and general education as much as possible, but that special education is maintained including the full range of placement options from special schools and classes to fulltime placement in regular classes with help from special teachers.

Booth and Ports (2004), identify three levels of integration, namely:

a. Locational integration, where exceptional children learn in the same locality as their non-handicapped peers, but in different classes. They share the compound or location only.

b. Social integration is where the two categories of learners as in (a) above share some social activities, such as playing together, going for field trips among others.

c. Functional integration - it is the highest form of integration, which allows exceptional children to share classes with their non-exceptional peers, besides social activities and same location. They access same curriculum but the learners with SNE get specialist support.

Bickel and Bickel (2004), Hallahan and Kaufman (2003), view mainstreaming as integration of handicapped students into general education classes as a primary method by which schools can help exceptional children achieve normalization. Moves to reverse the segregation of children with handicaps gathered momentum from the mid 1960s in Europe. This was as a result of a change in the conceptualization of disability occasioned by the broader rights movement in society towards normalization. In tandem with this view, people with disabilities were supposed to access the same opportunities and options as other members of society. At the same
time, concerns were raised by researches such as Dunn (1968) cited by Hallahan and Kaufman (2003), who alluded to the lack of evidence to suggest that exceptional children who were educated in special schools did any better than those who were being educated in mainstream schools by default due to lack of provision. It was argued that mainstreaming or integration of learners with SNE into ‘ordinary schools’ would facilitate their access to and participation in society both as children and adults and that continued segregation could no longer be justified from either ‘research’ or ‘rights’ perspective.

Even though the concept of mainstreaming has been around for many years, special educators have changed their approach to the topic quite a number of times. For example, from 1950s - 1980s, emphasis was on research on the effectiveness of special classes (efficacy studies) for students with mild disabilities. During the late 1980s however, the argument was about mainstreaming on ethical grounds, and special education stakeholders have all along tried to devise ways of making it more apt to work.

In the United Kingdom, the education for handicapped children Act of 1970 removed the legal distinction between those who were and those who were not 'educable' in school thereby opening school doors to all children. In USA similarly, PL 94-142 (Education for all Handicapped Act) of 1978, later transforming to IDEA (Individuals with Disability Education Act) of 2003, established the principle of 'zero reject' which entitled all children to join any public school. Normalization in that country focused on commonalities between children with disabilities and other children, rather than differences between them. It was according to Frederickson and Cline (2004), who
argued that the aims of education for all children and young people with disabilities were the same as those for all children and young people without disabilities. Disabilities and significant difficulties do not diminish the right to and equal access to and participation in society. Frederickson and Cline (2004) drew attention to the way in which integration movement, which started as a rallying cry for those who had a vision of change in education and within 10 years, it became the new ‘orthodoxy’.

In the Kenyan context, Koech (1999) and Kochung (2003), point out that integration has taken the form of special units and integrated programmes in regular schools. Studies on efficacy of special classes, have found that students with mild disabilities learned as much or more academically in regular classes compared to special classes but that regular class placement tended to result in lower acceptance of those students by their non-SNE peers (Frederickson and Cline, 2004). Research on efficacy of special classes, has tended to focus on physical placement of students to the exclusion of what goes on in the class, how the teacher manages and instructs or what actually happens in the peer group.

Consequently, research on efficacy of special classes has tended to overestimate the extent to which the settings per se and their possible attendant barriers affect students learning and social development. In spite of the serious flaws in many efficacy studies and the inconclusive findings of researches, many now view these studies as an indictment of special classes. Special classes even those that students may attend for only part of the school day segregate exceptional children from their non-SNE peers (Bickel and Bickel, 2004).
Because segregation is unethical, Wang, Reynolds and Walberg (2002), argue that unless its benefits are clearly demonstrated and because it is widely believed that no benefits of special classes have been demonstrated, the case is thus closed: special classes are indefensible.

Others, who are more cautious, like Vergasen and Andereg (2000), point out that “we have not resolved all the problems so as to make it possible for the special class to be effective.” Since about 1930, those advocating for mainstreaming have used two general arguments, namely:

i. Emphasis on ethical issues: mainstreaming is the right thing to do because unlike the special class and resource class programming, it does not require segregating handicapped students from their peers (Vergasen and Andereg, 2000).

ii. Some in general agreement with the arguments concerning over emphasis on physical setting in most efficacy studies, have begun to look at the educational process with the goal of finding ways of facilitating the principle of mainstreaming(Vergasen and Andereg, 2000).

They have investigated different ways of structuring what goes on in the classroom as well as different ways in which educational personnel can be used to enhance the chances of successful mainstreaming. In the American context, integration or mainstreaming (as they are used interchangeably), was however in actual practice as common as the rhetoric that endorsed it. It was to move a notch higher through the Regular Education Initiative (REI) of the Reagan and Bush administrations that proposed the restructuring of American schools education into a single system for the
delivery of services to all children. However, REI faced its own challenges when for example in 1987 a group of special education specialists met to assess implications of the REI proposal, coming up with a caution that, It is important to acknowledge that special education cannot seek institutional solutions to individual problems without changing the nature of the institutions...school organization is what fundamentally must change (Heller and Schilit, 1987 - cited in Smith 2003).

Hallahan and Kaufman (2003), on the other hand express fear that the special services needed by children with disabilities might be diluted or eliminated if REI or integration becomes the order of the day to the detriment of severely disabled children. They further argue that most regular classroom teachers do not have the training and or inclination to work with the children who are served by special education especially the severely disabled ones. Hallahan and Kaufman re-affirmed their strong feelings thus:

_The belief systems represented by the REI proponents are a peculiar case in which both the conservative ideology (for example focus on excellence, federal disengagement) and liberal rhetoric (for example non labeling, integration) are combined in a suspect agenda of supporting the diminution or dissolution of a support system for handicapped students” (Hallahan and Kaufman 2003 p 273)._

### 2.7 Inclusive Education

This is the new orthodoxy in the development of special education. Baker and Zigmond (2004), in their study of inclusion models in five USA states found that while the term inclusion had different meanings for different people, what was
common was the view of it as being a ‘place’ or a seat in an age appropriate mainstream classroom where a child could have access to and participate fully in the curriculum. It also meant bringing the SNE teacher or his/her assistant into that place to help make it work.

In a national study conducted in 1995, the national centre on education restructuring and inclusion in USA further defined inclusion thus "it's the provision of services to students with disabilities including those with severe impairments in the neighbourhood schools in age appropriate general education classes with the necessary support services and supplementary aids for both the child and the teacher so as to ensure the child's success academically behaviorally and socially and also prepare the child to participate as a full and contributing member of his/her society.

Bleck and Nigel (2004), view it as a journey or movement away from the kind of segregation which separates the learners with SNE from the rest of the school. Traditionally, children in schools have been grouped mostly according to their abilities, but with regard to learners with SNE, their grouping criteria has been their disabilities, ostensibly so that special facilities and specially trained staff can be made available to those who need them.

According to Sheba and Sacher (2003), this kind of grouping results in the learners with SNE being segregated from other pupils of their age. This cannot only be stigmatizing but also restricts access to important educational opportunities. The metaphor of a journey, as per the views of McLaughlin and Warren (2003), was to be supported by Smith (2004), who further stated that it is a process of change. Inclusion is best regarded as a progressive trend for taking increasing responsibility for
educating groups previously excluded from the mainstream of society (Reynolds, 2002). He sees social values about race, ethnicity, language or disability as key influences on exclusion. From this perspective, the current debate that hinges on integration and inclusion vis-à-vis the best way of educating learners with SNE, would seem to cast some doubts on special education per se. The view that special education utilizes unique teaching materials, techniques and methods has been challenged, for example by Lewis and Norwich (2000), who failed to find evidence for distinctive SNE teaching strategies. They concluded that it was probably more useful to think of a continuum of adaptations to generally effective teaching approaches that were successful for all learners. In recent years, questions have been raised about the necessity of and desirability of systems of special education and language support which are segregated from mainstream schooling. In particular, it has been suggested that this segregation may be instrumental in contributing to prejudice and bias in schools and later in society, (Lewis and Norwich, 2000).

This is embodied in the Salamanca statement issued by United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2000:11) on principles, policy and practice in SNE which held that inclusion and participation were essential to human dignity and the enjoyment and exercise of human rights. Within the field of education, this is reflected in the development of strategies that seek to bring about genuine equalization of opportunities. The statement was signed by representatives of 92 governments including that of Kenya, and 25 international organizations. It calls on governments to adopt the principle of inclusive education, enrolling all children in regular schools unless there are compelling reasons for doing otherwise (UNESCO, 2000:44).
In the Kenyan situation, universal primary school education as a policy was started by the government in the year 2003. This was in perfect agreement with EFA as contained in the United Nations declaration for human rights of 1998 and reinforced by the Dakar Conference (UNO, 2000) on EFA, initiatives in which Kenya is an active participant and signatory. Education for all is coincidentally, the second of eight millennium development goals (MDGs) which Kenya also subscribes to. This shift in emphasis from an inclusive focus on the needs of the individual pupils to an approach which focuses centrally on the skills and resources available in mainstream schools is an important difference between the earlier concept of integration and the more recent concept of inclusion.

2.8 Summary

The misgivings and reservations by proponents of less radical views on integration, who were opposed to the abolition of special education, vis-à-vis the mixed results that came out of the efficacy studies were indicative of knowledge and research gaps that still begged for answers., hence the need for further research.

Furthermore, the apparent clash between the views expressed by Wang, Reynolds and Walberg (2002), and the line taken by Hallahan and Kaufman (2003), regarding whether special classes were of any benefit at all or REI could be an option, clearly demonstrated the 'fluidity of the situation, hence the need for further research. Although the rationale for inclusion was well-articulated, further research was needed to answer certain questions. So far, there is little data on its effectiveness. It was not clear how widespread integration was, its optimum length of time and the blend of pupils (handicapped and non-handicapped alike) and other characteristics such as age,
sex and types of disabilities. One fear raised is that non-handicapped children will be harmed by reverse integration because it might expose them to inappropriate models. This was symptomatic of the fluidity in special education provision hence the need for further research, to establish a more reliable position.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the research design, variables, study locale, target population, sampling procedures, research tools, pilot study, data collection techniques, data analysis procedure, logistical and ethical considerations among others.

3.2 Research Design

The study adopted a descriptive survey design using an exploratory approach, to investigate constraints to the implementation of reverse integration in public special primary and secondary schools in Mombasa County. Descriptive survey designs are used in preliminary and exploratory studies (Luck and Ruben, 1992), cited by (Orodho, 2009a), to allow researchers to gather information, summarize, present and interpret it for the purpose of clarification (Orodho, 2012). Borg and Gall (1989), and Orodho (2009a), note that descriptive survey research is usually intended to produce statistical information about aspects of education that interest policy-makers and educators. The area of reverse integration is largely unresearched. Consequently, a descriptive survey design was settled on so as to help explore the constraints in the implementation reverse integration.

3.3 Variables

Creswell (2009) opines that research variables constitute the most critical centre piece of any research undertaking as it is through the deliberate manipulation of the independent variable or spontaneous interplay between independent and dependent variables that, research consummates.
In the current study, the main independent variables were teachers’ professional training, physical facilities and, instructional materials in sampled schools. Positive attitudes of teachers and those learners without SNE towards their SNE peers was a manipulatable variable too. The dependent variable was reverse integration involving learners with disabilities and those without disabilities.

3.4 Study Locale
The location of the study was Mombasa County, in Mombasa County. This study area is situated on a stretch bordering the Indian Ocean on the Kenyan coast mainly comprising the island of Mombasa and the adjacent mainland regions of Mtwapa to the north, Mazeras on the mainland west and extending southwards to Shika Adabu. This area was selected because some schools in the area practise reverse integration and more importantly due to the cosmopolitan nature of its inhabitants.

3.5 Target Population
According to the Educational Assessment and Resource Centre (EARC), Mombasa County had seven Special Schools. However, target population, which (Mugenda and Mugenda 1999), refers to as universe comprised all staff members, (teaching and non-teaching) and all learners in three public special schools that practiced reverse integration in the study locale which were purposively selected namely Port Reitz Special School for the Physically Handicapped (PH), Tom Mboya Special School for Learners with Cerebral Palsy (CP) and Mombasa Secondary School for the Physically Handicapped which was a boys only secondary school whereas the other two were mixed gender primary schools. The total enrolment in the selected special schools was as contained in the table below:
Table 3.1: Target population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>NonTeach-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Port Reitz PH</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Mboya CP</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mombasa SecPH</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>597</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EARC Mombasa District 2011

3.6 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

3.6.1 Sampling Techniques

In the current study, purposive sampling procedure was employed to select at least three special schools that specifically practice reverse integration in both primary and secondary sections, so as to deliberately narrow down the number of institutions to be dealt with to a manageable size (Orodho, 2012).

The target population had sub-groups or strata which were mutually exclusive to each other, such as students, teachers, non-teaching staff, secondary school students and their primary school counterparts, learners with SNE versus, their non-exceptional peers. Therefore, purposive sampling procedure, stratified random sampling as well as simple random sampling techniques were used, to isolate a reasonably representative and manageable sample from each group. Specifically, purposive sampling was used to select 3 head teachers of the selected three schools that practiced reverse integration. Then simple random sampling of the lottery category was used to select 7 non-teaching staff members out of the total of 29. The same procedure was used to select 8 out of the 12 teachers at Tom Mboya CP Special School, 10 out of the 14
teachers at Port Reitz Special School and finally 10 out of the 18 at Mombasa Secondary School for the Physically Handicapped. Stratified random sampling procedure which involves the use of a predetermined sampling was employed to pick 6 students out of the 89 at Tom Mboya Special School, 14 out of 300 at Port Reitz Special School and 12 out of 208 at Mombasa Secondary School for the Physically Handicapped to give a student sample size of 32. The use of these particular sampling techniques was intended to ensure that every segment of the various prospective respondents had an equal opportunity of being selected to take part in the study.

Orodho (2009a), as well as Creswell (2009), argue that, whenever stratified random sampling technique is used, it should be done in such a manner that sub-groups in a population will be represented in the resultant sample in proportion to their actual numbers in the population itself. Orodho (2009 a), further states that stratified random sampling provides greater sampling efficiency.

### 3.6.2 Sample Size

Heiman (2008), as well as Berg (2004), argue that in some situations, its not practical or realistic to deal with the entire targeted population and hence sampling becomes imperative. This leads to the selection of a sample size, which is basically a figure that is fairly representative of the targeted population and is used in a study on behalf of the entire universe. In the current study, the sample size comprised of 70 subjects inclusive of students, teachers and non-teaching staff. Of these, 11 were non-handicapped secondary students and 5 were students with disabilities (all boys) while in the primary schools, there were 10 pupils per each of the gender. Teachers and non-teaching staff in both primary and secondary schools were 35.
Table 3.2: Summary of sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Non Teach-Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Mboya CP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Reitz PH</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mombasa Sec PH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These various sample sizes were arrived at using purposive, simple random and stratified random sampling procedures as explained earlier in 3.6.1 above. The total sample was therefore 70 out of a total population of teachers, non-teaching staff and students from the three sampled schools that practised reverse integration, of 670 individuals which was roughly 10% of possible respondents in the three schools.

3.7 Research Instruments

The researcher used focused group discussions for students, while a self developed questionnaire targeted teachers and non-teaching staff. For head teachers one on one interviews were used.

3.7.1 Teachers and non teaching staff’s Questionnaire

It had a mixture of items, some of which were open ended, while others were closed ended contingency questions as well as matrix questions. The respondents who were involved in the provision of data through this tool included teachers and other staff members such as laboratory technicians, occupational and physiotherapists among others. The main reason for settling on the questionnaires as tools for these respondents was the fact that the population was made up of subjects who were
Questions which were used were unstructured open-ended, structured closed-ended, contingency (partly open partly closed) and matrix type of questions. Open-ended questions were of essay type and gave respondents wider latitude in their responses. They were easy to set but posed challenges in interpretation and analysis of resultant data. This was easily overcome through expert help from the researcher’s supervisors. Close-ended questions also called multiple choice questions, had several suggested answers provided. They were difficult to set but easy to analyze. Contingency questions were both open and closed, while matrix questions were those that shared same response options.

### 3.7.2 Focused Group Interview for Students

This was slightly modified version of an interview through which the researcher used to seek more or less the same information as that sought by the questionnaire, as the tool items largely were driven from the study objectives.

This tool used the researchers’ intent on extracting information through group discussion about psychological or socio-cultural issues among others, in informal settings thus enabled the subjects to freely express their behaviours, feelings, attitudes, opinions where the interviewer served as a facilitator or moderator. This tool was used with students deliberately in cognizance of the functional limitations among those learners with SNE as well as the literacy levels of those in lower primary classes who were not able to deal with questionnaires.
3.7.3 Interview Schedule for Head teachers

This basically, was a set of questions which the researcher orally administered to the school head teachers. Interview as a research tool was used to extract vital information from the head teachers in a greater detail than would have been the case with a questionnaire. Some of the information sometimes required clarification through follow up items and this was the main reason that this tool was selected for use with school-heads.

3.8 Pilot Study

A pilot study was carried out prior to the actual study and was done at Port Reitz Special School with a smaller population that had similar characteristics to that targeted for in the main study. Pilot study involved a small sample of 10 subjects comprising one subject from each sub group of the target population. All respondents for the pilot study were purposively selected so as to ensure that every sub group of the target population was taken care of. The pilot study was conducted as a matter of necessity so as to establish the validity and reliability of the instruments, as well as determine the clarity and relevance of tool items. The few respondents who participated in the pilot study were from Port Reitz Special School and were excluded from the actual study.

3.9 Validity of Research Instruments

Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) argue that validity of a test is concerned with what the test measures and how well it does so. Orodho (2012), states that "it is the degree to which a test measures what it purports to measure. In short, it is the accuracy and meaningfulness of inference based on research results. In other words, to what extent
do results from the analysis of data actually represent the phenomenon under investigation?" To determine the validity of the research tools, the researcher consulted with his supervisors and other lecturers at Kenyatta University, who went through the entire proposal and then advised on the suitability or otherwise of the research instruments, in terms of whether the items of the research tools adequately addressed the objectives of the study. Validity was further established through piloting using both tools.

3.9.1 Reliability of Measurement

Orodho (2009 a), defines reliability as a test to determine the consistency of an instrument in giving consistent responses- In other words; it's the consistency of an instrument in producing a reliable result. To determine the reliability of the current study's instruments, the researcher used the test retest method with each of the tools, during piloting stage, in the following order: interviews were conducted as well as developed questionnaires were given to the pilot sample of 10 respondents, not included in the main study sample, responses from interviews and completed questionnaires were analyzed manually, the same tools were administered to the same respondents after a period of two weeks, then responses from the tools were once again analyzed manually then a comparison of answers of the two tests was made in respect of ‘b’ and ‘d’ above and then analyzed. From the two responses, 'b' and‘d’, Spearman Rank order correlation was employed to compute the correlation co-efficient in order to establish the extent to which the items of the questionnaires were consistent in eliciting the same responses every time the instrument was administered. A correlation coefficient (r) of 0.75 was established and considered high enough to judge the reliability of the instrument.
3.10 Data Collection Techniques

Data collection was done through the use of three sets of tools, questionnaires, for teachers and non-teaching staff both in secondary and primary special schools while focused group interviews targeted small groups of students (not more than seven each) both SNE and non-SNE in the study schools. One on one standardised interviews were used to extract information in great detail from head teachers. Questionnaires were considered ideal for collecting data from teachers and non-teaching staff in this study because these were people who could individually and independently read and respond to these instruments since they were literate.

The questionnaires were used to collect information on administrative factors affecting reverse integration, relevance of teachers' training to learners in study schools, status of educational resource materials, views of teachers and learners on integration and any non-academic factors affecting the same. Questionnaires were personally taken to the study schools by the researcher in the morning during which time, a polite request was made to the school administrators on expeditious working on them by those who constituted the sample population in their respective schools so that they could be picked preferably before the end of the day. Meanwhile, as the teachers and non-teaching staff were filling the questionnaires, the researcher sought permission from the school administration to conduct the focused group interview with the students sampled. As for the head teachers’ interviews, the researcher booked appointments with the interviewees for person to person interviews when the head teachers in the study schools would be free. Their responses were recorded through the use of field note books or recorded on tape recorders if the interviewees had no objections to the later method.
3.11 Data Analysis

Raw data from the field was coded by the researcher, and then with the help of a computer programme, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 17.0., entry and initial analysis was done (Orodho, 2009 b). According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), the choice of statistical procedure used in analyzing data depends on the proposed hypothesis and or objectives, research design and the type of instruments used in the measurement of variables. Orodho (2009 b), asserts that the method of data analysis is the 'backbone and conduction wire' which should guide the researcher and enlighten his/her approach. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data from teachers and students in the study schools, and helped in addressing the research objectives earlier stated.

3.12 Logistical, Ethical, Legal and Human Relations Considerations

The execution of the proposed study took cognizance of the fact that logistical, ethical, human relations and legal issues were perceived as all processes, activities or actions that a researcher must address to ensure a successful completion of a research project (Orodho, 2009 a:193). Consequently, logistical considerations from pre-field to post-field levels were observed. Specifically, at pre-field level, a permit was sought from the National Commission of Science and Technology and innovation (NACOSTI) in the Ministry of Higher Education, so as to authenticate the study findings. A budget, as well as a timetable was put in place to take care of financial and time –lines requirements respectively, ensuring that all people involved were doing their parts. Equally, ethical, issues such as respondents’ informed consent, confidentiality, and honesty was observed with the view to protecting the integrity of the researcher besides guaranteeing honest results. Also, human relations
considerations such as observing chain of command, mien and decorum and last but not least, legal issues like avoidance of plagiarism, fraud and breach of terms of engagement, were strictly if not clinically observed so as to expedite and enhance the process of data collection.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The study sought to investigate the constraints to the implementation of reverse integration in Mombasa County. This chapter presents the findings discussions and interpretation of the study along the objectives of the study namely;

To identify school administrative factors affecting the implementation of reverse integration distinguish the extent to which facilities and materials were adequate for the implementation of reverse integration in the study schools. Other objectives were to examine teachers’ opinions on the practice of reverse integration in the sampled schools, establish the learners’ opinions on the practice of reverse integration in the study schools and finally find out the extent to which teachers' professional training affected the implementation of reverse integration.

In order to appropriately address the factors that influenced implementation of the reverse integration policy for learners with special needs, the discussions and interpretations of the findings of the study were discussed according to the various research schemes. The presentation was arranged into two main sections. Section one dealt with general and demographic data about teachers, non-teaching staff and students from the sampled schools for the purpose of sample description. The second section dealt with results of the research questions which were thematically discussed according to the themes which were directly driven from the study objectives:
4.2 General and Demographic Data for Respondents in the Study Sample

This section discussed general and demographic information from the respondents that constituted the study sample. General and demographic data was presented and analysed alongside variables such as sex and age of respondents, school level, practice of sample schools, and influence of integration and finally nature of schools’ mean-score since the integration of reverse integration.

4.2.1 General and Demographic Information

Although, the background information does not constitute any research question, it was imperative that an assessment be carried out to ascertain the number of teachers, support staff and students with special needs. A tabulation of the number of teachers in the sampled schools was done against the number of the schools in the study locale. Table 1 presents the gender composition of the teaching and non teaching staff in the three study schools.

Table 4.1: General and Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the School</th>
<th>Port Reitz Special School</th>
<th>Mombasa Secondary School for PH</th>
<th>Tom Mboya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study findings indicate that female respondents constituted two thirds of the sampled respondents. However, one school, Mombasa Secondary School for the physically handicapped had an equal number of male and female teachers who
participated in the study. For the focus group discussion, it involved 3 boys and 3 girls aged between 9-13 years of age.
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**Figure 4.1: Gender of the Teaching and Non Teaching Staff**

The study showed that, overall, there were 63% female and 37% male teaching and non teaching staff as indicated in the pie chart above.

The information in the table and pie chart above was an indication that there were more female than male respondents in the sampled schools.
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**Figure 4.2: Age Bracket of the Teachers and Non Teaching Staff**
Findings of the study showed that most of the teaching and non teaching staff belonged to different age groups, but were all mature. However there were a few teachers and non teaching staff who were below the 25 years of age. The implication being diversity in age, maturity and level of thought was a possibility.

Over half of the respondents 21(57.7%) were in the age bracket of between 41 years to over 60 years, an indication that they could be highly experienced hence able to deal with integration of the various activities and programmes as the policy under study did require. The study further found out that 2 of the head teachers were 53 and 58 years respectively with only one in the 46-50 year age bracket at 49 years.

The age of both the teachers and head teachers was a necessary pre-requisite in developing an understanding of the level of experience exhibited by the administrators in ensuring effective implementation of the reverse integration policy in the respective schools. The head teachers were instrumental in seeking and implementing suitable strategies that could help improve on inclusion and integrating of challenged children into relevant school programmes. The general conclusion was that majority of the teaching and non teaching staff were mature and therefore better placed to handle reverse integration.

4.2.3 School Level

It was important for the study to find out what level of schools the learners were in and also find out how best each of these schools was implementing the policy of reverse integration. The data in bar graph posit that the practicing of integration in schools did improve mutual understanding of the two categories of learners and
created confidence among them on how to live without fear of each other. The interviews researcher conducted with heads of schools did express the same opinion given by other respondents. This argument was supported by Hallahan and Kauffman (2003) who said that the two categories shared similar needs and aspirations than differences and hence being together would add value of mutual understanding.

![Figure 4.3: School Level](image)

The study found out that approximately three quarters of the teaching and non-teaching staff belonged to the secondary school level, 74.3%. This can be attributed to the fact that most parents release their children to pursue the secondary school education in the special schools that offer education that is suitable for their children with special needs. Therefore, efforts must be made to ensure that the secondary level of education is enhanced in order to give an opportunity to children with special needs to access and enroll in the regular school programmes.
The head teachers of the two primary schools and one secondary school pointed out that the schools had a mixture of students with special needs and those that were non-SNE students. It was noteworthy that the sampled schools had embraced reverse integration policy, thereby providing equal opportunities to all the learners, irrespective of their gender and physical state or needs.

4.2.4 Practice of the Policy of Reverse Integration by schools

This was in line with Bandura in his Social Learning Theory that it would be more empowering and enabling for learners with special needs to learn in the same schools with the non-special education children as they would benefit from socializing with others in an integrated setting. All the head teachers were in agreement that if the schools practiced the reverse integration system of education things would be better for all children regardless of their status. The head teachers pointed out that reverse integration enabled the co-existence of children despite their physical differences.

Findings from the focus group discussions indicated that all the study schools had implemented reverse integration. Additionally, one head teacher pointed out that this
practice provided an opportunity for the learners especially those with SNE to be prepared for future roles in the society. A view which was in agreement with Kochung (2003), who had argued that reverse integration platform provided a platform for children with special needs to interact with their non handicapped counterparts.

**Table 4.2: Influence of Reverse integration Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion on integration</th>
<th>Influence of mixed pattern of integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of job opportunities</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help schools improve finances</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was the opinion of majority of the teachers and non teaching staff 85.7% that reverse integration created opportunities for the two groups of children, while ensuring that these opportunities were equitably distributed among the children. This provided an opportunity for the students with SNE to compete with normal children improving their level of self esteem in an all inclusive environment. Findings of the focus group discussion showed that reverse integration made it possible for all learners despite their differences in physical conditions to learn side by side with one another. On the contrary a few respondents felt that integration was used as opportunity for helping schools raise their financial bases.
The findings were in line with Shebba and Sacher (2003), Maclaughlin and Warren (2003) and also supported by Smith (2004), who concurred with Bleck and Nigel (2004), who argued that reverse integration was a journey or movement away from the kind of segregation which separates the learners with SNE from the rest of the school. Thus, reverse integration prepared the child to participate and contribute fully in learning and day to day activities as any other member of the society.

4.2.6 Nature of the School’s Means Score

Table 4.3: Nature of school mean score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>f.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.1 demonstrates that schools improved mean score. The data did indicate that 47% of respondents said the mean score was good, while 28% said the school’s mean score after integration has remained poor, yet 25% said school mean-score did not change. It’s clear that after integration some improvement was noticed in all schools. This was noticed too with the interview researcher conducted with all heads of schools all of whom agreed that some improvement was noticeable in school mean-scores since introduction of reverse integration policy.

The study findings from the teachers and non teaching staff from the sampled schools indicated that reverse integration was good, as pointed out by nearly half of the respondents. Some 31.4% were of the view that the schools’ performance had not changed much due to reverse integration. On the contrary, 28.6% felt that the
performance of the students had not improved even with the introduction of reverse integration policy. This was associated with the earlier finding that some schools were “suspected” of misusing the policy for purposes of improving financial bases of their schools.

Kochung (2003), pointed out that the serious shortage of teachers in the special schools was a major hindrance to favourable school performance.

Except for one head teacher who argued that there was great improvement, the rest concurred with the views held by some teachers, that there was no significant improvement in the school’s mean scores. This was attributed to the small population of the students attending the reverse integration system besides inadequate specialized personnel and facilities. Results of the focus group discussions indicated that the schools’ mean scores were generally good.

However, it should be appreciated that integration would help in provision of an all inclusive education to all children irrespective of their ability, age, race, religious or political affiliations were it to be effectively implemented without tying it to improvement of schools’ mean scores.

4.3 Section Two: Results of the Study Based on Themes

This section presented study results based on themes which were directly driven from the objectives using variables such as schools’ administration and implementation of reverse integration, adequacy of facilities and materials for implementation of reverse integration. Other items were teacher attitudes and implementation of reverse integration as well as teachers’ professional training and experience.
4.3.1 Administrative Factors and Schools Overall Academic Performance

The first objective sought to find out the contribution of administrative factors, such as school management style, staff supervision, departmental collaboration and delegation of authority on average academic performance of the schools that were implementing the reverse integration policy.

Table 4.4: Administrative Factors and Schools Overall Academic Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative factors</th>
<th>School management style</th>
<th>Supervision of staff</th>
<th>Departmental collaboration</th>
<th>Delegation of Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a lot of effect</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not affect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has some effect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has little effect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study findings showed that the administrative factors had a lot of effect on the overall academic performance of the sampled schools. This statement was corroborated by 91.4% of the teachers and non teaching staff, while only 5.7% of the respondents were of the opinion that administrative style had little effect in the contribution to the overall performance of the schools where reverse integration policy was being implemented. One respondent felt that the contribution of the administrative style did not count in relation to the schools performance.
Over three quarters of the respondents were in agreement that the administrative factors greatly and positively contributed to the overall academic performance; with 77.1% saying that departmental organization, collaboration and coordination had a lot of effect on the overall performance. The view that was overwhelmingly, supported by 74.3% of the teachers and non teaching staff was that, supervision of the staff had a lot of effect on a school’s performance, In agreement with this were (65.7% respondents who pointed out that delegation of duty had a lot of effect on a school’s academic performance. All the head teachers said that despite the differences in the school management styles, this administrative strategy had profound effect on the schools academic performance.

There was a general consensus among the students who participated in the focused group discussion that the schools were managed well. Thus, with proper management styles, the schools were able to achieve high levels of success and meet the school goals. This was echoed by Tilstone et al.(2005), who had earlier argued that pupils in integrated settings must be provided with skilled support so that interactions can be promoted and facilitated throughout the range of activities. This could be provided for, if only the school administration was more focused and willing to put the interests of the learners on the forefront.

However, 7(20.0%) teachers and non teaching staff were of the opinion that delegation of duty did not have any effect on the level of academic performance, while 8.6% on the other hand felt that administrative style, departmental coordination and supervision of the staff had little effect on the overall school performance. On the
contrary, all the head teachers were of the opinion that delegation of duty provided an opportunity for the deputies and other teachers to effectively participate in the management of the schools.

Tilstone, Florien and Rose (2005), concur with the findings of the study that good administrators and skilled support are very important factors that ensure there is balancing of the structured interventions to facilitate broader interaction within the integrated class/group. They reiterated the fact that training and professional supervision were increasingly important for both the teaching as well as the non-teaching staff. Head teachers also pointed out that delegation of duty eased the head teacher’s work.

Smith (2004), and Beveridge (2001), support the view that proper supervision of the staff ensures that the organizational goals are achieved and that all in the institution are kept on their toes. This implies that personnel management is a critical requirement in the management of integrated schools as the level of productivity, effectiveness and efficiency increases with proper supervision of the school staff.

All the head teachers were of the opinion that effective departmental management, collaboration and coordination promoted mutual co-existence of the workers for improved performance. Corbett (2001), confirms that departmental collaboration and coordination promotes co-existence among the employees and work is done in a better way. Moreover, it helped to maximize the functional potentials of the learners.
The general view therefore was that administrative factors influenced and affected schools’ overall academic performance. Schools with proper leadership were more likely to achieve their goals than those with no proper leadership.

4.3.2 Other Administrative Factors that affect Implementation of Reverse Integration Policy

The first objective, further sought to find out if there were any other administrative factors that influenced implementation of the reverse integration policy. The study found out that there were other factors that influenced implementation of the reversely integrated education policy. These factors included workers’ motivation, order of reporting, perceptions and attitudes of head teachers and issues related to management of finances in the schools.

Table 4.5: Other Administrative Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Administrative Factors</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of academic performance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of reporting in schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker motivation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions and attitudes of head teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of the study generally indicate that majority of the teachers and non teaching staff were of the opinion that there were no other administrative factors that influenced performance as reported by 65.7% respondents. However, diverse opinions were received from both teachers and non teaching staff that lack of teachers 1(2.9%), order of reporting 5.7%, integration of academic performance 3(8.6%), worker motivation 2(5.7%) and financial management 3(8.6%) were the possible factors that
could contribute to academic performance of the schools. Unlike the teachers, all the three head teachers concurred, that head teacher’s personal commitment, leadership style and attitude influenced the academic performance of their schools. This indicated that schools performance was a collective responsibility that was not dependent on a few administrative aspects but a wide range of factors that could influence decision making and overall performance. For instance, 2.9% of the respondents pointed out that, the perception and attitude of the head teacher, could influence the performance of a school. According to the Kochung Report (2003), proper leadership and management of the institutions were key when dealing with learners with special needs.

4.3.3 Factors that influenced learning of learners in sampled Schools

The first objective also sought to establish other factors that influenced learning in sampled schools, such as socio-religious aspects, discipline, recreation and guidance and counseling all of which could have different levels of influence on the overall learning and well being of the learners. These factors were rated based on a five point likert’s scale below.
Table 4.6: Factors influencing fostering of learning and well being of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect on learning and wellbeing</th>
<th>Religious/social aspects</th>
<th>Disciplinary procedures</th>
<th>Recreational aspects</th>
<th>Guidance and counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally positive</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a very positive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information on effectiveness of the factors fostering learning and well being of the learners shows that they were generally positive but not very positive. Effectiveness of the disciplinary procedures was rated highest at 60.0% as being effective in fostering learning and wellbeing of the learners. Disciplinary measures ensured that students did not misbehave or develop deviant behaviour including 'ruddiness' to teachers. The study was informed by the students that discipline and hard work were the key elements in implementation of the reverse integration education policy. Therefore, students who made mistakes were properly guided and advised on the need for proper discipline. Those who deviated from the norms were punished as a way of preventing indiscipline.

Religious/social aspects and guidance and counseling were each rated near averagely effective in fostering learning and wellbeing of the learners. However, recreational aspects were comparatively more effective in fostering learning and wellbeing of learners.
Most 42.9% of the respondents felt that the social or religious aspects were insignificant in fostering learning and well being of the learners in school. The socio cultural aspects, though, were quite effective as they helped foster spiritual health of the learners, as pointed out by the head teachers. This concurred with the Kochung report of 2003, which had pointed out that learning environment, should be conducive and non restrictive including issues dealing with social constructs like religion. Guidance and counseling was not an effective tool in fostering learning and well being of the learners as pointed out by 34.3% of respondents, a view that received support from 28.6% and 22.9% teachers and non teaching staff who felt that recreational and disciplinary procedures were not effective measures in fostering learning and wellbeing of the learners. Effective guidance and counseling ensured that the learners were able to deal or cope with challenges that adversely influence their academic performance.

The head teachers were in total agreement that recreational facilities enabled the learners to relax and work better after relaxing. According to the students, schools provided television sets and music systems that were used by the students for entertainment. The differences in opinion among teachers and head teachers indicated that each factor had a limited effect on learning and wellbeing of the learners. It also implied that no single factor could foster learning and learners’ wellbeing independently.
4.3.4 Impact of the Policy of Reverse Integration

The first objective, finally, addressed itself to administrative issues of school finances, socialisation, peer guidance and reduction of stigma towards learners with SNE as captured in the table below.

Table 4.7: Impact of policy of Reverse Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of policy of reverse integration</th>
<th>Financial position</th>
<th>Socialization</th>
<th>Peer guidance</th>
<th>Reduction of stigma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a very positive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally positive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No significant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average most respondents reported that the policy of reverse integration had a positive impact on schools’ financial position 42.9%, socialization 57.1%, guidance and counseling 54.3% and helped reduce stigma as pointed out by 51.4%. The study also found out that 42.9% of the teachers and non teaching staff said that the policy had a generally positive effect.

According to the three head teachers, the reverse integration policy had a very positive effect on the schools finances. Increased enrolment is attributed to the increase in the financial base of the schools that implement the policy. This policy
also helped the students in sorting out their differences without necessarily involving the teachers.

At least 3(8.6%) in each case was in agreement that the policy of reverse integration helped to promote financial position, socialization policy and reduction of stigma respectively. The views of the head teachers were that the policy had positively impacted on the socialization of students with special needs and those without, as they co-existed and were exposed to similar opportunities. On peer guidance the head teachers confirmed that the policy had led to improved discipline due to the increased peer guidance among the learners. Some of the students were also able to open up and share their problems and challenges they were going through. Additionally, this led to tolerance amongst the students.

As pointed out by one head teacher, reduction of stigma had been the greatest benefit from the integration process. Except for reduction of stigma rated by 14.3% respondents as very badly, all the other issues of impact had negligible effect. Although, a few contradictory opinions existed among the teachers and non teaching staff in relation to the relevance and impact of the reverse integration, the policy had enormous impact on the lives of children with special needs. As pointed out in the Kochung Report (2003), there is need for support and proper coordination of the diverse services and programmes that were offered to institutions dealing with learners with SNE.
### 4.3.5 Adequacy and relevance of educational materials and facilities

The second objective sought to distinguish the adequacy of facilities and materials in the implementation of reverse integration. Respondents’ views were summarised in the table below.

#### Table 4.8: Adequacy Relevance and Effectiveness of Educational Materials Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational materials and facilities</th>
<th>Adequacy relevance and effectiveness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Used effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching aids</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistive devices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation of educational equipment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra curricular</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support programmes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field trips</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource persons</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study found out that the textbooks were not very adequate as only 37.1% said they were adequate and relevant as reported by 40.0% of the teaching and non-teaching staff. Only a few teaching and non-teaching staff reported that the available textbooks were used effectively. The finding indicated that the few textbooks available in the schools were not well utilized.

According to the head teachers and the students, textbooks were relevant but inadequate in most schools. Similarly two of the head teachers said that libraries were relevant but inadequate. The head teacher of one of the schools reported that the library facility was not available in her school. The students agreed with the head teacher that they lacked a library. In all the schools, the teaching aids and assistive devices were reported by the students and head teachers to be available and relevant but inadequate. This finding indicates the inadequacy of the facilities was impacting negatively on learning within the schools that were implementing the reverse integration policy. The available health facilities were relevant but inadequate too, as expressed by the head teachers.

According to the teachers, non-teaching staff and the head teachers, use of field trips as educational materials was relevant but inadequate. The general opinion among the students was that field trips were sometimes organised and that there was need for more field trips to be organised in the schools. A similar scenario was pointed out by all the head teachers and students with respect to the use of resource persons. However, the students felt that the use of resource persons was good but rare.
Tilstone, Florian and Rose (2005), concur that skilled support was very important especially in ensuring that there was balancing of the structured intervention to facilitate broader interaction within the integrated class/group. The learners needed exposure to expert help and support materials that are relevant for their functionality in schools.

The level of adequacy of library was below average as 37.1% said they were adequate with 28.6% reporting that they were relevant. In response to whether the library was used effectively only 20.0% agreed that it was used effectively.

Teaching aids were not adequate in the schools where the reverse integration was being implemented. This was evident from the fact that fewer 28.6% individuals said that teaching aids were adequate and used effectively as expressed by the teaching and non teaching staff.

The adequacy, relevance and effective use of assistive devices for SNE was rated as follows; 40.0% said they are adequate and 17.1% noted that they were relevant, and were used effectively as reported by 37.1%. Similarly, 34.3% said the equipment was adequate, 28.6% argued that they were relevant with 22.9% saying they were effectively used to improve learners’ performance. This could be attributed to the fact that the learners with SNE’s lacked adaptive devices and prosthetics that enhanced their functioning. Although Smith (2004), talks of accommodations or instructional adaptations being either typical/routine, it is difficult for these schools to function effectively without these facilities.

The results of the study indicated that although most of the materials and facilities were available in schools, they were not adequate and effectively utilised. The
available educational equipment was adequate as expressed by 34.3% of the teaching and non teaching staff. A slightly lower figure of 28.6% respondents noted that the equipment was relevant and put to effective use in schools.

The study found out that the extracurricular activities in the school played an important role in the promotion of the reverse integration policy. An equal number of 31.4% respondents respectively pointed out that the extracurricular activities were adequate and relevant; however, the level of effectiveness was rated lowly by 14.0%. Extracurricular activities in school were of great significance in promotion of learning in schools.

There was a general feeling among the teaching and non teaching staff that the laboratories were adequate, relevant and effectively used to deliver the reverse integration policy in schools. The balance was a clear indication that the available laboratory facilities were put to effective use in the schools. It’s important also to point out that more 31.4% respondents said that the laboratories were not available in schools.

The health facilities had a 37.1% level of adequacy, 17.1% relevancy and 31.4% effectiveness that influenced the implementation of reverse integration policy in schools. The support programmes in the school in terms of their adequacy, relevance and effectives were also found to be wanting, with only 40.0% reporting they were adequate, with a very low percentage of relevance as reported by 14.3% of the respondents. However the level of effectiveness was fairly high, with at least, 31.4% saying that the programmes were effective.
An equal number of 31.4% felt that the field trips were not adequate, with another 31.4% reporting they were not available in the schools. However, those available were rare and therefore inadequate. The use of resource persons was inadequate as none of the respondents said that they were adequate. However, 31.4% felt that the resource persons were relevant and were effectively used as reported by 31.4% of the teaching and non teaching staff who took part in the study.

Summatively, Tilstone et al (2005), argue that pupils in integrated settings must be provided with all the necessary materials and facilities including skilled manpower and support so that interactions can be promoted and facilitated throughout the range of activities. More so, schools should seek to provide learners with professionally trained experts in the various categories of special needs. On the other hand, the government was urged through the Koech report (1999), Kochung report (2003), and its investment programme (Vision 2030), to make SNE’s more relevant.

4.3.7 Level of Commitment to Service Delivery

The third objective sought to address itself to the question of staff attitudes and opinions. Effectively, the level of commitment to service delivery was approached from the perspective of teachers and non teaching staff’s attitude to the implementation of reverse integration and was determined on the basis of a four point likert’s scale. In order to carefully understand the levels of commitment, the staff were classified into four major groups as academic/teaching, technical, non teaching and administrative staff as seen in the table below.
Table 4.9: Table Level of commitment by the staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of commitment</th>
<th>Teaching staff</th>
<th>Technical staff</th>
<th>Non teaching staff</th>
<th>School administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very necessary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relevance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study found out that, the academic staff were the most committed as rated by 68.6% of the respondents who reported that they were very committed; the administrative staff were also rated as very committed by 62.9%, while 54.3% of the respondents were of the opinion that technical staff were very committed. The least committed were the non teaching staff as pointed by 48.6% respondents, who said they were very committed.

All the head teachers who took part in the study expressed the view that the academic staff, technical staff, non teaching and administrative staff were all very committed and devoted to performance of their duties in the study schools. The general feeling was that all the staff members were committed with the overall ratings of more than 80% in each case.

Despite the high levels of commitment reported by most teachers and all the head teachers, it was reported by a few teaching and non teaching staff that a few technical
and non teaching staff were not committed, which can be attributed to the fact that, in any group there are diverse of feelings about any given scenario.

4.3.8 Attitude of the Students and Staff Towards Reverse Integration Policy

Whereas the third objective concerned itself with teachers’ opinion on reverse integration, the fourth objective addressed itself to the opinion of learners to the practice of the same policy. Staff and learners’ views were handled together with the view of making a comparison between the students and staff attitude towards the reverse integration policy.

![Student and Staff Attitude towards Reverse integration](image)

**Figure 4.5: Student and Staff Attitude towards Reverse integration**

Most of the students 71.4% and staff 68.6% were positive towards reverse integration policy as it fostered proper learning and enhanced academic performance of the learners in the respective schools. An equal number of 20.0% students and staff felt that it was not easy to tell the attitude of the students and staff in the schools that
practiced the reverse integration policy. On the contrary, 11.4% felt that the attitude of the staff was negative. Similar sentiments were echoed by 3(8.6%) respondents who noted that some students had a negative attitude towards reverse integration.

The negative attitude could be attributed to the fact that there was lack of a coordinating board for the diverse SNE services and programmes by various departments of Ministry of Education charged with provision of SNE services and other service providers from other ministries a situation that had resulted in uncoordinated provision of SNE services by MoE organs, Ministries of Health, Social Services, Home Affairs, Local Government, NGOs and other stakeholders (Kochung, 2003).

It was the opinion of all the head teachers that the attitude of the staff and students was positive. This was in agreement with the views of most teachers that the staff and students were positive about the practice of reverse integration in schools. The attitudes and perceptions of the teachers, support staff and students had an influence on the implementation of the reverse integration policy in schools. The patterns of influence or attitudes that influenced implementation of reverse integration were numerous and impacted upon the process in different ways.

The attitude influenced mutual understanding of the students in the schools ensuring that there was mutual co-existence among the students as reported by 45.7% civic education should be enhanced among the students and staff in implementing the reverse integration policy. There was a general feeling that school leadership and need for a friendly environment were critical determinants of staff and students attitudes
towards the policy. Just like the teachers, support staff, and head teachers, the students expressed the view, that student attitude was good and it stimulated interest in learning and cohesive existence. However, it was clear that the positive attitude of the staff and students was due to willingness to accommodate and co-exist with one another. This also provided an opportunity for the teaching, non teaching, technical and administrative staff to co-exist with one another. Although, the teachers, non teaching staff and head teachers had a positive attitude towards reverse integration, so many children with special needs were still out of school as pointed out in the Kochung report (2003). The Koech report (1999), pointed out that the rapid growth in education had not been reflected in the special education sector since 1963.

4.3.9 Level of Training of Teaching and Non teaching Staff

The final objective sought to find out the extent to which teachers’ and non teaching staff’s professional training affected implementation of reverse integration and findings were captured in the table below.

Table 4.10: Level of Training of Teaching and Non teaching Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of training of staff</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely necessary</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its hard to tell</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much as long as one is devoted to duty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Most of the respondents affirmed that training for the teaching and non teaching staff was absolutely necessary as reported by 74.3% teaching and non teaching staff. A few teachers 20.0% were of the view that the level of training was not a necessary requirement as long as they remained committed to duty.

However, 5.7% of the respondents felt that it was not easy to tell the effectiveness of the reverse integration implementation in relation to level of training of the officers. The head teachers felt that the level of training in special needs education was extremely important in ensuring that the programme succeeded. This can be attributed to the fact that individuals who were trained in SNE were able to effectively implement the reverse integration policy in schools, as handling children who are challenged required more than training. The Kochung report (2003), pointed out that there was a serious shortage of trained SNE teachers in Kenya. This implied that effective implementation of the reverse integration policy was bound to collapse if stringent measures are not taken to enhance educational and professional training of those handling children with special needs. Beveridge (2001), argues that specialist personnel are a critical requirement in the management of exceptional learners, yet highly inadequate in most institutions.

4.3.10 Effect of professional aspects on level of performance

The final objective further sought to find out the influence of professional aspects on level of performance. This included training in special needs education, academic qualification, length of experience and commitment and devotion to duty.
Table 4.11: Effect of Professional Aspects on Work Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence of professional aspects</th>
<th>Training in SNE</th>
<th>Academic Qualification</th>
<th>Length of experience</th>
<th>Commitment and devotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very necessary</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relevance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study found out that professional aspects had an influence on the levels of performance as was reported by both teachers and non teaching staff. Majority of the teachers 77.1% were of the opinion that the level of training in special needs education and level of devotion and commitment had influence on the level of performance among the teaching and non teaching staff. Similar sentiments were echoed by 74.3% respondents who pointed out that the level of academic qualification and length of experience 68.6% affected performance and effectiveness of the implementation of the reverse integration policy.

The academic qualifications and level of experience were very important in ensuring effective implementation of the reverse integration policy in schools as pointed out by all the head teachers. The head teachers also pointed out that the level of commitment and devotion to duty was very important in ensuring effective implementation of the policy.
Although, few teaching and non teaching staff felt that training in SNE and level of commitment did not necessarily determine performance as reported by 5.7%, in concurrence were 2.9% who said that level of academic qualification and experience respectively did not influence performance in schools. Only 5.7% said that educational qualifications were not relevant. Although, there were diverse views on professional training levels of the staff, Corbett (2001), points out that methodology used in handling the learners with SNE as another critical consideration. The overall implication was that reverse integration policy, or indeed, the demand of this type of education was likely to go down if creation of awareness was not given priority.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
The study sought to investigate the constraints to the implementation of reverse integration in Mombasa County. This chapter presents a summary of the research findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study based on the research themes. The findings are arranged as per the research objectives on the reverse integration policy implementation in special primary and secondary schools in Mombasa County.

5.2 Summary
The summary findings are presented as per the five objectives of the study.

5.2.1 Administrative Factors and Implementation of Reverse Integration
The study found out from the all students, teaching, non teaching staff and head teachers that administrative factors had a lot of effect on the schools overall academic performance. Majority 91.4% of the teaching and non teaching staff said administrative style, departmental organization 77.1% and staff supervision 65.7% had a lot of effect on the overall academic performance of the schools.

The study also found out that there were other administrative factors that influenced implementation of the reverse integration policy including staff inadequacy, order of reporting, head teacher attitude and financial management as having minimal effect on the overall academic performance.
The study findings from the teaching and non teaching staff indicated that disciplinary procedures 60.0%, recreational aspects 57.1% and guidance and counseling 45.7% had a positive effect on fostering learning and general wellbeing of the learners in school. However, the religious aspects according to study findings were not significant in fostering learning and wellbeing of learners.

5.2.2 Adequacy, Relevance and Effectiveness of Educational Materials and Facilities

There was a general feeling among the respondents that educational materials and facilities were most critical in the effective implementation of reverse integration. Specifically, things like text books, teaching aids were available in all the sampled schools and were relevant as well, a view which was expressed by 40% and 31% of the teachers and non teaching staff respectively. In respect of their adequacy, the same group of respondents registered responses at 37.1% and 28.6% respectively. Assistive devices were available but again inadequate. Laboratory and library were available at Mombasa Secondary School for the Physically handicapped while the two primary schools did not have these facilities. Health facilities were available in all the sampled schools with a 37.1% of adequacy 17.1% relevancy and 31.4% effectiveness. This was very important as learners with SNE require medical attention most of the times. Field trips, resource persons and extracurricular activities were other critical areas most respondents generally expressed strong views about with majority of the respondents among the students through the focused group discussion saying these areas were quite relevant but inadequate. All the head teachers were in concurrence that all the educational materials and facilities were relevant but inadequate.
5.2.3 Staff’s Opinions on the Implementation of Reverse Integration

Most of the respondents affirmed that training for the teaching and non teaching staff was absolutely necessary as reported by 74.3% teaching and non teaching staff. Majority of the teachers 77.1% were of the opinion that the level of training in special needs education and level of devotion and commitment had important influence on the level of performance among the teaching and non teaching staff. This finding confirmed the view that the skill set and level of training of the teaching staff and support staff was inadequate.

All head teachers concurred with the teachers and non teaching staff that the attitude of the staff and the non teaching staff was positive. It important to note that, the attitudes of the teachers, was invaluable in the event the study were to endeavour to find out the level of ownership and or commitment to the entire reverse integration process in study schools.

5.2.4 Adequacy of educational facilities for implementation of Reverse Integration

The study found out that most of the educational materials were relevant but inadequate. Most teachers, students and the head teachers noted that the schools lacked laboratories and had inadequate libraries. Reports from all the respondents indicated that most of the facilities and materials including field trips and resource persons each represented by 31.4% were very useful and relevant but not readily used.

Relevance of the support programmes was rated lowly, although adequate in the schools 40.0.% and effectiveness. The study observed that 31.4% teaching and non
teaching staff pointed out that the extracurricular activities were adequate and relevant; however, the level of effectiveness was rated lowly by 14.0%. The study also found out that teaching aids were equally relevant as pointed out by the teaching and non teaching staff as well as the head teachers. The teaching aids were however, found to be inadequate. Provision of learning resources and materials was not inadequate though relevant for the effective implementation of the reverse integration policy.

5.2.5 Professional Training and Implementation of Reverse Integration

The report by 74.3% teaching and non teaching staff on the level of academic qualification and length of experience 68.6% showed that they affected performance and effectiveness of implementing the reverse integration policy.

All the head teachers reports indicated that all their academic, technical and support staff as well administrative staff were very committed and devoted to the implementation of the policy.

The academic staff were the most committed as rated by 68.6% of the teaching and non teaching staff; the administrative staff were also very committed as pointed out by 62.9%, with 54.3% of saying that technical staff were very committed.

Most students 71.4% and staff 68.6% were positive towards reverse integration policy as it fostered proper learning and enhanced academic performance of the learners in the respective schools. The head teachers concurred with the teaching and non teaching staff that the students and staff were positive.
The patterns or attitudes towards the integrated system of education indicated that there is mutual co-existence among the students as reported by 45.7%, civic education should enhance among the students and staff in implementation of the reverse integration policy in schools. The study found out that there was a great deal of influence from the type of leadership.

Results of the study further showed that the reverse integration policy had a positive impact on schools’ financial position 42.9%, socialization (57.1%), guidance and counseling 54.3% and reduced stigma 51.4% as reported by the teaching and non teaching staff.

5.3 Conclusions

Implementation of the reverse integration policy of education can promote and enhance acquisition of skills that make the learners effectively compete with regular students. It was also found that the policy impacted positively on the learning and well being of the learners in the schools.

The attitudes and perceptions of the teachers, support staff and students had an influence on the implementation of the reverse integration policy in schools. The practice of integrating students with special needs and those without special needs promotes co-existence and enhanced interactions among the students in the schools.

Conclusions of the study are based on the findings that revealed that majority of the teaching and non teaching staff, were in agreement that administrative factors, coordination, and devotion influenced implementation of the reverse integration policy of education.
Learning materials in the schools that practice reverse integration policy were in adequate or unavailable yet relevant. The schools lacked laboratories, equipped libraries as well as textbooks. Therefore, there was need for the schools to seek alternative sources of funds so as to acquire the relevant facilities, teaching learning materials for functional use by the learners in the schools. Support from donor organizations was also limited if not lacking all together, thus slowing down progress towards effective implementation of reverse integration system of education.

5.4 Recommendations for Policy and Further Research

5.4.1 Policy Recommendations

The study recommends that more effort should be geared towards promotion of SNE in the entire county through integration of the programme into normal school programmes. This should be done in consultations with the national government. Schools that practice reverse integration should be accorded the much needed support to enable the learners to develop skills that would make them more functional in the society.

There is need for a county board of management on SNE to oversee all the projects and programmes under special education. The various and diverse bodies dealing with SNE should be amalgamated together for improved service delivery.

There is need for more teachers to be trained in special education and that the current crop of teachers is retrained in order to incorporate the critical aspect of how to handle learners with non special needs. Regular schools should continue providing opportunities for children with special needs, and that the classrooms, school
buildings, abolition blocks and other facilities be modified (made barrier free), to suit both learners with special needs and those without.

5.4.2 Recommendations for Further Research

i. A nationwide research study to be carried out in order to determine the status of special needs education in Kenya.

ii. A study to be carried out to find out the level of adequacy of educational facilities and materials for learners with special needs.

iii. A study to be carried out to determine how best learners with special needs can be integrated in the regular schools in Kenya.

iv. An assessment of the current support services available in the institutions that are implementing the reverse integration policy be carried out.
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APPENDIX 1: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Kenyatta University
Department of Special Education
P.O Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI.

Dear Respondent,

This questionnaire is about the study on the constraints to the effective implementation of the special education practice of reverse integration in primary and secondary schools in Mombasa County. Your institution has been randomly selected to take part in the study and you have been identified to participate in this study, in a bid to improve interaction of learners with diverse educational needs in inclusive cum integrated settings, more so those with SNE.

Be assured that all information you will give shall be handled with STRICT CONFIDENCE and shall be used for research purposes only. Therefore, feel free and give information to the best of your knowledge. Please do not write your name anywhere in this questionnaire.

Best regards.

NEVILLE M. C. YERI
P. O. BOX 1893-80100
MOMBASA.
APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW FOR HEADTEACHERS

A. **Background Information**
1. What is the name of your school?
2. Would you please mind to indicate your age?
3. What is the category of your school?

B. **Other Information**
4. Does your school practise the policy of integrating learners with disabilities to learn with those who have no disabilities?
5. If your answer to above question is yes, what in your view might have influenced this mixed or integrated admission pattern? Please, specify.
6. What is the nature of your school’s mean score since the introduction of the integration policy?
7. Can you briefly explain the contribution of each of the following administrative factors to the school’s overall performance?
   a) School’s management style.
   b) Supervision of staff.
   c) Coordination and collaboration of various school departments.
   d) Delegation of authority.
8. What other administrative factors do you think have an effect on the implementation of reverse integration? Please explain.
9. How effective is each of the following factors in fostering learning and general wellbeing of your students in your school?
   a) Religious and social factors.
   b) Disciplinary procedures.
   c) Recreational facilities.
   d) Guidance and counseling services.
10. Please kindly give your views on how the policy of reverse integration impacts on the following areas?
    a) School’s financial position.
    b) Socialization between learners with SNE and non-SNE.
c) Peer guidance.
d) Reduction of stigma towards learners with SNE.

11. How do you rate your teaching staff and non-teaching staff’s professional training on effective implementation of reverse integration? Use the following scale
1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Satisfactory, 4=Good and 5=Best

12. In your own opinion, please briefly justify the level of importance for each of the following professional/academic factors with regard to your members of staff’s effectiveness in service delivery: Use the following scale to guide you;
1=Not important, 2=Slightly important, 3=Moderately important, 4=Very important, 5=Extremely important

a) Training in special education.
b) Academic qualifications.
c) Length of experience in one’s work.
d) Level of devotion and commitment to one’s work.
a) Teaching staff.
b) Non-teaching staff such as OT/s PT/S and Lab technicians.
c) Other staff members such as clerks, bursar and school nurse.
d) Other members of school administration.

13. In your own assessment, how would you rate the commitment to service delivery and success of reverse integration among the following staff members? Use this scale for ease of rating; 1=Not committed, 2=Moderately committed, 3=Committed, 4=Very Committed

14. Indicate the adequacy, relevance and effective use of each of the following educational materials and facilities, using the scale thus; 1= Inadequate/not relevant, 2=Relevant but not adequate, 3= Adequate and relevant.

a) Textbooks.
b) Library equipped with relevant materials such as computers.
c) Teaching/learning aids.
d) Assistive/adaptive devices and equipment...
e) Extracurricular activities like APE and sports.
f) Well equipped laboratory.
g) Health facilities and services such as physiotherapy and occupational therapy.
h) Use of field trips.
i) Use of resource persons.

15. What is the attitude of teaching and non-teaching personnel towards the practice of reverse integration?

16. What is the attitude of students towards the practice of reserves integration?

17. Briefly explain what you think influences the patterns of attitude(s) in the above two questions.
APPENDIX 3: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS AND NON-TEACHING STAFF

A. Instructions.
Please tick in one of the boxes given in every question to indicate your preferred answer or briefly write your answer in the space provided. Thank you.

B. Background Information
1. What is your sex?
a) Female □  b) Male □
2. What is the name of your school?
a) Port Reitz special school □  b) Mombasa Secondary School for PH □
c) Tom Mboya special school for CP □
3. Please indicate your age ..........................
4. What are the level/ category of your school?
a) Primary □  b) Secondary □

C. Other Information
5. Does your school practice the policy of integrating learners with disabilities to learn with those who have no disabilities?
a) Yes □  b) No □
6. If your answer to above question is yes, what in your view might have influenced this mixed or integrated admission pattern?
a) To help special schools improve their finances through fees □
b) To create opportunities for the two categories of learners to learn to live with each other □
c) Others, please specify .................................
7. What is the nature of your school’s mean score since the introduction of the integration policy?
   a) Very good
   b) Good
   c) No change
   d) Poor
   e) Very poor

8. What is the contribution of the following administrative factors to the school’s overall academic performance?
   (Use these codes in answering this question: 4 = Has a lot of effect; 3 = Has negligible effect; 2 = It is not a relevant factor, 1 = Does not count/or not there).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative factors</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools m/gt style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental, coordination collaboration in schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What other administrative factors do you think have an effect on the implementation of reverse integration?

...........................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................
10. How effective are the following factors in fostering learning and general wellbeing of your students in your schools?

(Use codes to answer, this questions (4 = Very effective; 3 = Effective; 2 = Ineffective; 1 = Very ineffective).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other relevant Factors</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious / social aspects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational aspects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How does the policy of reverse integration impact on the following areas?

(Use the following codes to answer this question: 5 = In a very positive way; 4 = Generally positively; 3 = No significant impact; 2 = Badly; 1= Very badly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas affected by Rev. Integration</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Financial position of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Socialization of various types of learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Peer guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Reduction of stigma towards SNE learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What is your rating of teaching staff and non-teachings staff’s professional training on effective implementation of reverse integration? Please choose one answer.

a) Absolutely necessary
b) Not a must so long as one is devoted to his/her duty
c) It is hard to tell
13. In your opinion, indicate the level of importance the following professional / academics aspects. (Use the following codes to answer: 4 = Very necessary; 3 = Necessary; 2 = Unnecessary; 1 = Is of no relevance).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro and Ac factors</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Training in SNE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Academic qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Length of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Level of devotion and commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How would you rate the commitment to service delivery and success of reverse integration among the following staff categories?

(Use the following codes to answer this question: 4 = Very committed; 3 = Committed; 2 = Indifferent; 1 = Not committed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of staff</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Teaching (Academic) staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Technical staff (OT, DT, Lab Technician).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Non-Teaching staff (Clerks, Bursars, Nurse).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) School Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Indicate the adequacy, relevance and effective use of the following educational materials and facilities. (Use the following codes to answer questions: 4 = Adequate; 3 = Relevant; 2 = Used effectively; 1 = Not available in school).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational materials/ facilities</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Textbooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Teaching aids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Assistive devices for SNE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Adaptation of educational equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Extra-curricular activities e.g. APE 7 Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Health facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Support programmes e.g. occupational and physical therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Field trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Use of resource persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. What is the attitude of teaching and non-teaching personal towards the practice of reverse integration? Please tick one.
   a) Positive    b) Negative    c) I can’t tell

17. What is the attitude of students towards the practice of reserves integration? Please tick one.
   a) Positive    b) Negative    c) Not easy to tell

18. Briefly explain what you think influences the patterns or attitude(s) in the above question (question 16).

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
APPENDIX 4: MODERATION GUIDE FOR STUDENTS’ FOCUSED GROUP INTERVIEW

A. Introduction
Moderator, in every school among those targeted, will introduce himself to the learners and explain the purpose of his visit to the learners and politely request for their co-operation. He will also explain his role and that of the learners and engage the learners in a rapport building exercises before embarking on the interview questions.

B. Background Information
1. Moderator establishes each participant’s gender.
2. Indicates the name of the school.
3. Moderator asks learners to indicate their ages
4. Moderator establishes the level of school, whether secondary or primary.

C. Other Information (Short questions and discussions)
5. Does your school practise the policy of integrating learners with disabilities to learn with those who have no disabilities?
6. If your answer to above question is yes, what in your view might have influenced this mixed or integrated admission pattern? Discuss.
7. Do you find this system of integrating learners with SNE and those without good or bad? Discuss.
8. What is your opinion about how the school is being managed? Let us discuss.
9. Are you as students free to practice your religion in the school? Discuss.
10. How are discipline issues handled in your opinion, fairly or unfairly? Discuss.
11. a) Now tells me about recreation, how often are you entertained in your school?
   d) What do you feel about the kind of entertainment you get in your school?
12. How effective is guidance and counseling in fostering learning and general wellbeing of your students in your school according to you as students?
13. Now that you learn in these integrated settings, let us discuss how you socialize and interact with each other between your different categories?
14. a) In your everyday interaction with each other as students, do you sometimes advise or guide each other as peers?

b) In your opinion, how helpful is the peer guidance or advice to your general well-being? Let us discuss.

15. How would you rate the way learners with SNE are treated generally, is it fair or not fair?

16. Now let us discuss one after the other, the adequacy of the following items in your school and whether they are relevant and effectively used for your educational benefit;

- Text books
- Library facilities
- Teaching aids
- Assistive devices
- Extra curricula activities such as APE and sports
- Laboratory
- Health facilities
- Support programmes such as occupational and physical therapy
- Field trips
- Use of resource persons

17. What is the attitude of teaching and non-teaching personnel towards the practice of reverse integration?

18. Finally, let us discuss your feelings as students towards the practice of reverse integration in your school, is it good or bad?

Thank you.
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