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ABSTRACT

This study focused on implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary schools with the main objective of establishing determinants of teachers’ preparedness. In reference to policy of inclusive education, it is critical that teachers are knowledgeable and skilled on inclusive education. In view of this, the study therefore purposed to establish the determinants of teachers’ preparedness to implement inclusive education in lower primary schools in Awendo, Migori County, Kenya. The study would be useful to teachers dealing with learners living with special needs in education. The study was premised on Vygosky’s Social Development Theory as the theoretical underpinning with a concept of Zone of Proximal Development which maintains that students can learn abstract ideas through the help of informed others. Descriptive survey design was adopted for the study. The study was carried out in Awendo, Migori County, Kenya. The study targeted all lower grade primary teachers in the mainstream schools with special units. Multi-case sampling technique was used to come up with 9 (30%) of 30 targeted schools. Stratified, simple random sampling and Purposive sampling techniques were used to sample the respondents to come up with 37 subjects comprising an education officer, school heads and lower primary teachers. Questionnaires for teachers and school heads, interview schedules for teachers, heads of schools and education officers as well as Observation checklists were used to collect data. A pilot study was carried out in two schools which did not form part of study size. Validity was attained by analyzing content and instruments accepted as reliable after test re-test. The statistical package for social sciences was used to prepare and organize data for analysis. Quantitative data from questionnaires was analyzed through descriptive statistics while qualitative data from interviews and checklists was analyzed thematically by coding of the responses in the coding frame, interpreted then inferential statistics employed. Hypothesis was tested using Pearson’s correlation at a significant level of alpha 0.05. Findings revealed that there is only a small number of teachers trained in special needs education at (4%) degree and (26%) diploma as compared with the number of schools with special units and as a result most of the schools still lack a single teacher trained in special needs education. There is no policy guiding the implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary and therefore teachers found it difficult controlling classes full of many learners with different types of disability In a single class in addition to other learners without special needs in education and majority of teachers are still in denial concerning the inclusion education rolled down to regular schools. In conclusion, the ministry of education has done very little towards preparing teachers for inclusive education at the lower grade primary school. The main recommendation is that the ministry of education to ensure inclusive disability type specialization by participating schools and conduct mass training to get enough teachers for all schools with special units.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

1.0 Introduction
The chapter covers background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research hypothesis, significance of the study, scope of the study, limitations of the study, delimitations of the study, assumptions of the study, theoretical framework, conceptual framework and the operational definitions of key terms.

1.1. Background of the Study
Inclusive education is the process of educating all students in general education classes in their neighborhood schools with quality instructions, intervention and support by providing equitable and quality education to all children without any form of discrimination (Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education (MCIE), 2012; UNESCO, 2016). Yeri (2016) posited that inclusive education involves all learners living with and without disability getting education together and achieve more. It is where learners living with disability access normal curriculum, increased concentration span, improved literacy and communication skills and develop more friendship resulting to low rates of suspension, low rates of school drop-out hence improved academic achievement and higher rates of employment (National Dissemination Centre for Children with Disability (NDCCD), 2016).

Special needs education mainly focuses on children with developmental disabilities and those who are gifted and talented. These children typically differ from those who are average in mental, sensory, communication, physical, behavioral or emotional developments. Due to their unique disabilities and characteristics, there is need for
modification of school routine, collaborative and respectful school culture for this category of learners to become competent, develop social relationship with their age mates and to be participating members of the school community (Kirk and Gallagher, 2005).

In Spain, the Salamanka conference had one main objective which was achieving access and quality education for all (UNESCO, 1994). Similarly, EFA (2000) summit held in Dakar, Senegal echoed the results of UNESCO conference which formed the main objective of discussion during the forum ‘achieving universal education goal for all’. The outcome of the forum formed the foundation of education inclusion. The EFA made reference and priority to groups of children who are vulnerable and disadvantaged by emphasizing on the need for equity of education services and practices for all.

In reference to millennium development and EFA goals of education, UN (2012) formulated Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs 4) which contend the need for vocational training for the vulnerable including persons with disability for full realization of vision 2030. The strategy of achieving the goal was through careful upgrading of education facilities that are disability sensitive and providing safe non-violent inclusive as well as effective learning environment for all. However, a study conducted in India by Reddy (2006) pointed out that teachers lacked training in SNE hence less competent to give vocational training to learners living with disability.

Similarly, other studies have unveiled challenges to Inclusive Education (IE) such as national governments lack technical strategies to put into practice the six Dakar goals of education, education systems still lack guiding policies resulting to challenging of implementation of inclusive education (Calderbank, 2009; Kamundia, 2012). Thurman, Vollmer and Pieper (2010) studied British and American systems of education and
discovered that teachers were negative and hate teaching children with Special Needs Education (SNE) as these children were perceived as extra work load for them.

Tesemma (2011) carried out a survey and revealed that African countries still lacked laws and policy framework and strategies for the education of children living with disability in reference to the current trends of millennium development and EFA goals in perspective of education. Gwala (2006) revealed consistent findings as those of (Tesema, 2011) that challenges facing implementation of inclusive education in South African primary schools were that the educators did not understand the aspect of inclusive education and were uncertain of their roles, inadequately trained in SNE as well as holding negative attitude towards learners with special needs.

Krohn-Nydal (2008) conducted a study in Tanzania and found out that the absence of clear policy regarding IE was government’s irresponsibility. The researcher challenged the Government to give the document the first priority as well as show more commitment to the task of finalizing the document since absence of IE policy is a precursor of teacher lack of knowledge of the later.

Republic of Kenya (2008 and 2009) points that provision of special education services during the past mainly focused on the huge four traditional categories- hearing impairments, visual impairments, mental retardation and physical handicap but areas left out include: learners with Autism, Gifted and Talented, Emotional and behavioral difficulties and special learning difficulties. Introduction and implementation of inclusive education in the mainstream schools target to benefit these categories of learners just like other children in regular schools (Republic of Kenya, 2009; Government of Kenya, 2013).
However, there are challenges realized at the National Level in line with access and equity in the provision of special needs education caused by cultural prejudices, negative attitudes and lack of implementation of acts on inclusivity. In referenced to the policy framework on education, the Government of Kenya would adopt inclusive education in all public learning and training institutions and ensure the institutions are responsive to the education of learners with special needs placed there, initiate intervention Strategies at the National Level and roll it down to schools. Additionally, other strategies in place towards implementation of IE policies included design programmes that enhance inclusive education in all institutions and restructuring Kenya Institute of Special Education (KISE) and enhance its capacity to enable it play a role of training of teachers of Special Needs Education Learners (SNEL) including tailored courses for the head-teachers and educational managers to support inclusive education (Republic of Kenya, 2009; Government of Kenya, 2013).

Ministry of Education (MoE) and KISE (2018) has revealed a joint report of national Survey on Children with Disabilities and Special Needs in Education conducted between 2016 and 2017. The report contends that the government has not yet achieved its goal of provision of inclusive education according to 2009 inclusive education policy. The report maintained that the education system in Kenya is still ill equipped to support learners with disability and special needs. It shows that 11 per cent of all learners in Kenya have one or another form of disability and the most common disabilities among learners were found to include: Visual impairment (3.1 per cent), physical disability (3 per cent), intellectual disability (2.5 per cent), hearing impairment (1.2 per cent), speech and language (0.9 per cent), deaf-blind (0.2 per cent). While a significant number of these children are enrolled
in schools, there is no policy of inclusive education in the primary schools and the rate of school dropout remains high due to lack of support services in most learning institutions.

Republic of Kenya (2001 and 2009) pointed that all children are entitled to equity basic education. Similarly Republic of Kenya (2010); Government of Kenya (2013) maintained that all children have right of admission in any public school without restriction. However, even with these efforts of disability mainstreaming, reports by Kenya Society for the Blind (KSB, 2011) revealed that SNE learners still perform poorly in their examinations. Similarly, Kimondiu (2012) revealed consistent poor performance by the special schools in KCPE over the years. Onywany, Odongo, and Makori (2014) similarly conducted a study on challenges facing implementation of inclusive education in Homabay and revealed that teachers were untrained in special needs education and had negative attitude towards implementation of inclusive education.

The literature reviewed revealed that inclusive education is teaching and supporting SNL through an education system within their neighbouring regular schools. It is therefore critical that teachers’ are prepared towards provision of expanded and improved special needs education rolled to mainstream schools. This study therefore sort to establish determinants of teachers’ preparedness to implement the new inclusive education rolled down in the lower grade primary schools which was not an area of focus by the earlier studies.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

As highlighted earlier in the background to the study, the international protocols including UNESCO (1994); Education For All (2000) ratified the idea of inclusive education in an effort to ensure equity in education for ‘all’ including persons with disabilities. Although,
there is significant increase in the provision of expanded and improved early childhood education that has been realized, its achievement has not been marked with special consideration to SNEL in regular schools (Calderbank, 2009). Reddy (2006) pointed out that teachers lacked training in SNE and are less competent teaching learners with special needs in education. Gwala (2006) pointed out that implementation of inclusive education in South Africa faced constrains because the educators did not understand the aspect of inclusive education and were uncertain of their roles.

In Kenya, introduction of inclusive education policy resulted to the mushrooming of special units in mainstream schools. However, studies have revealed that teachers were uncertain of their role concerning inclusive education and are not ready to implement it (Republic of Kenya, 2009; Muthoni, 2013). Onywany et al. (2014) conducted a study on challenges facing implementation of inclusive education in Homabay and pointed out that inclusive education faced myriads of challenges.

While a significant number of children with special abilities are enrolled in schools, lack of support services in most learning institutions has been identified as the main challenge of inclusion education. The report points out at glaring inadequacies in teachers trained to handle special needs education in the assessment centre and schools in Kenya hence the education system is still ill equipped to support SNEL. Additionally, the majority of head teachers in primary integrated schools and special units (78.28 per cent) do not have any mastery in special needs education.

In consideration to lower grade primary, the situation may be considerably more challenging because children at this stage are undergoing critical development. Handling of SNEL with developmental disability of this stage of development in classrooms and
outdoor environment require that teachers are adequately prepared through knowledge. In view of this dimension of the problem, it precipitated and prompted the undertaking of the study reported in this document entitled ‘determinants of teachers’ preparedness towards implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary’ which was timely for study.

1.2.1 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study was to establish the determinants of teachers’ preparedness to implement inclusive education in the lower grade primary schools.

1.2.2 Objectives
The study sought to:

i. Establish whether training in special needs education influence implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary school.

ii. Determine whether existence of policy on inclusive education influence implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary schools.

iii. Explore the status of inclusive environment in relation to implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary schools.

iv. Determine whether teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education influence implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary schools.

1.2.3 Research Hypothesis
The study was guided by the following hypothesis as listed below.

i). H0: There is a relationship between training in special needs education and implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary schools.
ii). H0: There is a relationship between existence of policy on inclusive education and implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary schools.

iii). H0: There is a relationship between status of inclusive environment and implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary schools.

iv). H0: There is a relationship between teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education and their implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary schools.

1.3. Significance of the Study

The results of this study may be of significant to the following stakeholders:

The Ministry of Education and policy formulators may opt to use the findings of this study to review policy on implementation of IE that require SNE placed in the mainstream schools. Teachers both in inclusive schools and special schools conducting reverse integration and regular schools with such special needs in education pupils may also use the findings of this research to improve the service delivery to SNEL. The results of this research has baseline information for researchers interested in opened window for identifying gaps of knowledge of concern in laying a firm education foundation for pupils with special needs in education and with disabilities. The findings may also elicit areas of focus to improve on academic benefits for pupils with special needs in education and with disabilities that may eventually open life-long opportunities as a result of quality education provision. The results of this study can fill the gap of knowledge in Awendo Constituency and the entire Migori County.
1.4 Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

In the section limitation and delimitations of the study was discussed.

1.4.1 Limitations of the Study

The main challenge emanated from the respondents unwilling to participate. The challenge was managed by conducting special meeting with the individual schools administration as well as the teaching staff of the participating schools. Additional participants were also enrolled so that any unwilling to respond were easily substituted to get the information required for the study.

1.4.2 Delimitations of the Study

This study was carried out only in public primary schools where special units had been introduced. Reason for this delimitation was that learners with disabilities could easily be found admitted in such schools and also teachers of the learners could as well be found. Secondly, the study was only focused on four variables in order to determine teachers’ preparedness towards the implementation of inclusive education. The reason was that the time could not allow the researcher to investigate all the possible factors that could determine teachers’ preparation to implement inclusive education. The findings of the study may not be generalized as the situation countrywide. The reason for this is because some schools have special units which are well operational and serve learners with disabilities.

1.5 Assumptions of the Study

The study assumed that there were teachers who were present in the schools that had special units. Additionally, the researcher assumed that there were learners with special needs included in the mainstream schools that had special units programme. Finally, the
study assumed that teachers would cooperate and give all information required for the success of the study.

1.6 Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

In this section, theoretical and conceptual framework was discussed as in the sub sections below.

1.6.1 Theoretical Framework

Social Constructivism Learning Theory and Allport’s Theory of Contact Hypothesis

This study was guided by Vygosky (1978) theory which underscored the critical importance of culture as well as the importance of the social contexts for cognitive development. His concept of Zone of Proximal Development maintained that learners are able to conceptualize/master concepts and ideas that they cannot understand on their own with the help of an adult or informed other.

In the context of the current study, a pupil-teacher relationship formed the zone of proximal development and came out to be imperative. Teachers’ preparedness therefore, according to Vygosky is combination of determinants forming zone of proximal development. Through social interaction between the teacher and the pupil the teacher influence the learner to understand even the concepts which appeared abstract. The theory assumes that the teacher help a learner “socialize” and in the process learn from the wider society, a prototype of which is the inclusive school setting. Nevertheless, it would be more empowering and enabling for teachers to acquire relevant skills to help special needs learners in education benefit in an inclusive setting. Socialization is an important medium of learning and if learners with SNE are placed in an integrated setting whether through
reverse integration or inclusion, then they will socialize with their teachers, ‘normal’ peers which facilitate learning (Yeri, 2016).

Allport (1954) in his Contact Hypothesis underscored the importance of Vygosky’s social context for cognitive development in that ‘lack of contact or segregation give birth to 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. Allport’s theory of Contact hypothesis in essence supported Lev Vygosky’s theory of social development which argues that in a social and cultural set ups such like school, teachers help pupils learn abstract ideas (Vygosky, 1978). Vygosky’s social learning theory was therefore, appropriately employed as an element of this study’s theoretical framework because of its background of advocacy on culture as well as the importance of the social contexts for cognitive development.

1.6.2 Conceptual Framework

Looking at the figure 1.1 it presents the problem as it was conceptualized. The conceptualization which was sought was the relationship between the independent variable ‘determinants of Teachers’ preparedness’ which includes training in special needs education, existence of policy on inclusive education, status of inclusive environment and teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education and the dependent variable ‘implementation of Inclusive education’. The influence of the variables on the expected outcome has also been illustrated as the figure presents.
Figure 1.1: Relationship between determinants of Teachers’ Preparedness and Implementation of Inclusive Education in the Lower Grade Primary Schools
1.7 Operational Definition of Terms

**Early Childhood Education:** This is formal teaching of lower grade primary school comprising classes 1, 2 and 3.

**Existence of policy on inclusive education:** This is teachers’ guidelines concerning inclusive education in the mainstream schools.

**Inclusive education:** This is giving quality instructions and support to learners with special needs in education in regular schools.

**Status of inclusive environment:** reality on the Condition of operation of inclusive education in regular schools.

**Teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education:** This is teachers take on inclusive education in regular schools.

**Teachers’ preparedness:** This is professional skills acquired by teachers to implement inclusive education in the regular schools.

**Training in SNE:** This is the acquisition of ability by the teacher to serve SNEL in regular schools.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

In this section related literature was reviewed on inclusive education, training in SNE, existence of policy on inclusive education, status of inclusive environment and teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education. Finally a general summary of the reviewed literature was discussed.

2.2 Inclusive Education

Inclusive education is a process of educating pupils with and without disabilities in classes in their neighborhood schools where they receive high quality instruction, intervention and support, collaborate and enjoy respectful school culture that facilitates pupil’s competency through social relationship with their peers and full participation in community developments (Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education(MCIE), 2012; National Dissemination Center for Children With Disability(NDCCWD), 2016; UNESCO, 2016; Kirk and Gallagher, 2005).

New Zealand government (2014) points that inclusive schools were necessary because, SNEL attended a school of their choice together with their siblings and friends, participate and involved in class and out of class activities together, performed together while learning and achieving, experienced success and challenged, had the opportunity of learning within the curriculum and enjoy its activities, felt a sense of belonging hence enjoy school and had the urge to go to school and make new friends.
New Zealand government (2014) contend that in relation to policy, schools are obliged to foster the identity of language and culture of all learners, expected to have high expectations of all their learners and teachers obliged to be strongly values-driven and foster these values in learners and adults, should be innovative and flexible to adapt to the learners, should have strong leaders who communicate and model clear values and expectations, should have good systems and processes in place for enrolling and welcoming learners with special education needs and identifying their needs and strengths, should work effectively with wider community and should have self-review processes in place to ensure ongoing improvement of policies and practices that support the learning and professional development of their teachers to apply the curriculum to meet the needs of all learners.

According to EFA (2000) achieving universal goal in education is the organization’s overriding objective. Outcome of the forum formed the foundation of education inclusion to groups of children who are vulnerable and disadvantaged by emphasizing on the need for equity of education services and practices for all. In reference to the government’s adoption of EFA inclusion policy, Teachers need adequate support for proper implementation of inclusive education (UNESCO, 2016). Similarly, UN (2012) in their Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs 4) emphasized on vocational training for the vulnerable including persons with disability for full realization of vision 2030, careful upgrading of education facilities that are disability sensitive and providing safe non-violent inclusive as well as effective learning environment for all.

UNESCO (2006) revealed that a number of learners with Special Needs in Education still fail to attain minimum education standards as a result of rampant drop outs from schools
during the early years leading to life handicapped after failing to access quality education. Nevertheless, Rouse-hill (2009) argued that inclusive school’s environment should have modified curriculum content, teachers should be competent in identifying learners with SNE and design an Individualized Educational Program (IEP) and the content should be presented in simple terms that do not scare any learner. A researcher argued that a competent teacher can modify the content and use strategies like poems, songs, stories and mnemonic devices to effect learning (Sailor, 1991).

More categorically, Sailor (1991) revealed that use of oral questions, teaching from known to unknown, coding the text, retesting the vocabularies, taping and use of audio-visual aids as well as tactile aids, appreciating the children’s attempts and augmenting writing abilities are qualities of a prepared teacher. Other methods include the learner can cycle or underline the responses, type or record answers, give time to organize his thoughts and avoid textbook or board coping as much as possible as additional qualities of a good teacher competent in their area of specialization.

Knokey (2006) points in National Longitudinal Transition (NLTs- 2) that the courses learners with disabilities pursued in their classes is intimately correlated to both their academic performance and their social adjustment at school thus influencing the contribution of the pupil with disability to the society. This assertion requires competent teachers who advice on the courses that they choose in schools where they get encouragement from what their equals do.

In Uganda, Kamuga (2016) conducted a study on primary inclusive teachers’ about their competency needs and revealed teachers acceptance of inclusion introduced in their schools that it reduced stigmatization and promoted equality. On the same note,
Ndyabawe, (2016) advised the government of Uganda to address critical issues affecting PWDs including the following: improve the inclusion environment, train teachers in special needs, put in place policies that safeguard the needs of PWDs placed in the mainstream schools and both the teachers and the community to get educated on inclusion.

Republic of Kenya (2010) points in chapter 4 Article 54, section b of the constitution that all persons living with disability are entitled to access any school of their choice and be integrated in the society. The government of Kenya enshrined disability policy in relation to the international protocols (Republic of Kenya, 2001, 2009 and 2010; Government of Kenya, 2013). Contradictory reports indicate that County governments have done very little towards supporting Educational Assessment Resource Service centers, with only three institutions (6 per cent) have received support in terms of personnel space and equipment from their counties (MOE and KISE, 2018).

Onywany et al. (2014) conducted a study on challenges facing implementation of inclusive education in Homabay and pointed out that implementation of inclusive education faced challenges including lack of teaching resources, teachers lack training on special needs education, negative attitude by teachers towards inclusive education was quite high and parents could not cooperate with the teachers.

According to the studies reviewed, inclusive education is an internationally driven agenda and obligation. In Kenya, the data does not clearly show results on examinations of determinants of teachers’ preparedness towards implementation of IE in lower grade primary hence a big question. As a result this study aimed to establish determinants of teachers’ preparedness to include SNEL in regular schools.
2.3 Training in Special Needs Education

In Bangladesh, Mullick (2013) argued that effective inclusion education required that a teacher become confident. Similarly, Sharma, MacQueen, and McIntyre (2013) identified that limited professional qualifications of the teachers were a major barrier for the countries from the Asia-Pacific region to implement an inclusive approach in regular schools. The researchers added that improvement in the quality and content of pre-service and in-service teacher education programme was necessary. In addition, Opertti, Brady and Duncomb (2009) contend that teachers have a professional role to take into account their ethical and societal mission and that Teachers’ education programmes needed to change from that of a deviance discourse (establishing a hierarchy of cognitive skills to place each student in a rather closed system) to one of inclusion. The researcher highlighted that learners have open-learning potential that a teacher should discover and stimulate.

In Zimbabwe, a study was carried out by Phinias, Jerishanos & Kudakwashe (2013) to investigate the challenges facing children with severe intellectual disability placed in the mainstream schools, Mavingo province, Zimbabwe. The study targeted twelve pupils with severe intellectual disability. These were placed accordingly in these schools after having been diagnosed by the school’s psychological services board. Thirty-five teachers were randomly selected from the three schools and it was established that most schools lack specialist teachers and school administrators which has greatly exacerbated the plight of the pupils with special needs in education placed in regular schools.

According to MoE and KISE (2018), the education system in Kenya is still ill equipped to support learners with disability and special needs. The report points out at glaring
inadequacies in teachers trained to handle special needs education in assessment centre and schools in Kenya. The majority of head teachers in primary integrated schools and special units (78.28 per cent) do not have any training in special needs education for instance. Only 2.24 per cent of teachers have mastery degree in special needs education (SNE).

A study conducted in Mathioya district in Kenya by Muthoni (2013) established that regular teachers are not properly prepared to teach learners with special needs in education placed in the mainstream schools. The study further revealed that the current curriculum does not cater for learners with special needs in education that are placed there coupled with inadequate materials for learning.

The study conducted in Homabay County by Onywany et al. (2014) pointed out the necessity of basic training of teachers to enable them to cope with differentiated education by redesigning the curriculum of teacher training institutions. Teachers should demonstrate ability to cope with challenges of meeting the needs of learners with special needs within the inclusive setting. More categorically, on top of the training there should be some well-structured and coordinated ongoing trainings through in-service to enable teachers to keep abreast with new developments in education (Onywany et al., 2014; Wanderi, 2015). These findings imply that only untrained teachers in SNE who embrace in service trainings develop skills and become competent to implement IE.

With regard to inclusive education, studies have failed to investigate training of lower grade teachers in special needs education as a determinant of teachers’ preparedness to implement inclusive education hence formed the main focus of this objective.
2.4 Existence of Policy on Inclusive Education

State of Victoria (2016) outlined the SPECIAL NEEDS PLAN FOR Victorian SCHOOLS as part of the Education programme in reference to millennium development and EFA Goals in education. The Government made commitments to inclusive education through putting in place the Special Needs Plan for Victorian Schools. The plan included nine initiatives to give every child and young person a safe, positive and supportive environment in which to learn and which suited their individual needs. It was reported that the initiatives aimed to improve students’ long term achievements and wellbeing by creating fairer, safer and more inclusive school environment for students with special needs.

According to State of Victoria (2016) some initiatives under the government annual plan towards IE included a new $10 million Inclusive Schools Fund for funding schools to build inclusive facilities for students with disabilities as well as strengthening the capability of teachers through in-service training to help students with disabilities. Secondly, ensuring that teachers undertook relevant professional development in special needs education and only teachers who succeeded in these capacity development courses are allowed to renew their contracts as enshrined in the vision 2017 policy.

Further, the policy contend that from 2016, all initial teacher education programs would include specific learning activities about teaching students with disabilities before accreditation by the Victorian Institute of Teaching. In addition, new principal practitioner which is special needs Leader education have been appointed to work exclusively with schools overseeing the use of restraint and seclusion and build best practice in the management of challenging behaviors of the SNEL (State of Victoria, 2016).
A study, conducted in Tanzania by Krohn-Nydal (2008) claimed that a great deal of responsibility regarding the development of inclusive education in Tanzania rested on the shoulders of the government. The researcher contends that even though the policy is a key of inclusion education, until then no policy on inclusive education existed. Anyhow, the researcher advised that the Government should give the document the first priority as well as show more commitment to the task of finalizing the document. Also other existing relevant policy documents should be re-addressed in order to declare inclusive education as a government obligation for achieving the Education for All added the researcher. The research therefore concluded that from the research Tanzanian teachers are unaware of policy on inclusive education and the later is not operational since the government has not shown commitment towards millennium development and EFA goals in education.

Kamuga (2016) in Uganda pointed restructuring of national curriculum system and school policy on inclusive education, support and collaboration with the relevant stakeholders and teacher competency in special needs education. These aspects alleviate teachers’ work and yield good teachers’ work performance. Competent teachers by way of team spirit, facilitate inexperienced teachers and carry a research on the school related factors about the inclusion maintained the researcher. Lack of trained teachers’ in special needs, lack of community health personnel and educational psychologists to help identify SNE children are major challenges to teaching added the researcher. Large class sizes, wider inaccessibility issues, funding of special schools at the expense of mainstream schools, lack of assistive devices impeded the implementation of UPE (Ndyabawe, 2016).

In Kenya, In referenced to the millennium development and EFA goals in education, Government enacted the following policies: Adopt and implement inclusive education,
Integrate special educational institutions in all public learning and training institutions and ensure the institutions are responsive to the education of learners with special needs and disability placed there, initiate intervention Strategies at the National Level and roll it down to schools (Republic of Kenya, 2009; Government of Kenya, 2013).

Republic of Kenya (2009); Government of Kenya (2013) revealed strategies put in place to oversee the implementation of IE policy including: Design programmes that would enhance its implementation, implement affirmative action to enable gifted and talented, learners to access secondary, tertiary and university education as a special category, restructure Kenya Institute of Education (KISE) and enhance its capacity to enable it play its role of training of teachers and other personnel working with learners with special needs and disabilities more effectively, including tailored courses for the head-teachers and educational managers (Republic of Kenya, 2009; Government of Kenya, 2013). The other strategy is to establish pilot special schools and integrated programmers as well as inclusive education as centers of excellence at county level to counter challenges Facing Inclusive Education in the country (Unice and Orodho, 2014).

However, according to MOE and KISE (2018) there is no policy on inclusive education in Kenyan primary schools and education system is still ill equipped to support the learners with disability and SNE. According to the report, the country lacks a policy framework to guide the implementation of inclusive education, curriculum does not favour the SNEL in the regular school as well as capitation for children with disabilities is not disaggregated according to type and severity of disabilities.
Muthoni (2013) carried a study on primary school readiness in Mathioya district to provide inclusive education and found out that the persons with disabilities who were successful in life were still judged as lesser beings instead of being considered as role models. The researcher insisted that teachers’ should identify, recognize and collaborate with those successful PWDs in life to motivate them and become their role models. Further it should be school’s obligation to sensitize both the teachers and the community on disability issues pointed the researcher. This way all the stakeholders would indeed realize the potentiality of the learners living with special needs.

Unice and Orodho (2014) conducted a study on Effective Provision of Inclusive Education: Coping with Constraints in Public Secondary Schools in Rongo, Migori County Kenya and revealed that secondary schools that had embraced inclusive education and implementing the policy were experiencing untold interrelated constraints ranging from lack of qualified teachers to handle the inclusive education, lack of physical and instructional facilities suitable for inclusive education, and negative attitudes by parents regarding learners living with disability. The researchers further contend that successful inclusive education requires practical copying strategies introduced forthwith.

A number of related studies have investigated implementation of inclusive education and revealed misunderstanding which come as a result of inclusion education policy. Encountering the challenge, it is paramount that existence of policy on inclusive education was investigated as a determinant of teachers’ preparedness towards implementation of IE. This parameter as a result informed this objective’s focus
2.5 Status of Inclusive Environment

New Zealand Government (2014) revealed that at inclusive schools, SNEL attend their chosen school with their siblings and friends, participate and engaged in class and out of class with their peers doing what their peers do, successfully learn and become challenged together with others, learning under the all inclusive curriculum and enjoy their area of interest. Learners feel a sense of belonging hence enjoy school. The policy contends that schools are charged with fostering language identity and culture, inscribe expectations of all their learners and fostering in learners and adults values, be innovative and flexible to adapt to learner, have processes for identifying and supporting the needs and aspirations of special needs learners and have strong leaders who communicate and model values and expectations, should have good system and process in place for enrolling and welcoming learners with special needs (New Zealand Government, 2014).

Kirk and Gallagher (2005) held that the main focus of special needs education is a child living with developmental disabilities and the gifted and talented. Such a child differs from their peers who are average in mental, sensory, communication, physical, behavioral or emotional developments. Due to this unique disabilities and characteristic, there is need for modification of school routine and respectful school culture for SNEL to improve their competency, develop social relationship with their age mates and to be participating members of the school community.

A study in Kwa-Zulu Natal South Africa by Gwala (2016) about inclusive education and its implementation in schools revealed the various variables that have impact on the successful implementation of inclusive education. The variables include the rights of learners with learning disability and developmental disability violated, have not achieved
equality of opportunity and access to regular education in inclusive education, learners who are placed in regular schools or classrooms were physically present but with no proper services offered to them which were implications of non conducive school learning environment which undermines inclusion education.

In Tanzania, Krohn-Nydal (2008) found out that there is need to emphasize better feedback procedures and follow up seminars if inclusion is to be successful. In addition, the researcher pointed out that the Government must consider the tools (resource pack) used in the program and preferably develop tools which are more relevant in a Tanzanian context. The researcher speculated that the move could help improve the inclusive learning environment.

In Kenya, MoE and KISE (2018) pointed out that 11 per cent of all learners in Kenya have one or another form of disability and the most common disabilities among learners were found to include: Visual impairment (3.1 per cent), physical disability (3 per cent), intellectual disability (2.5 per cent), hearing impairment (1.2 per cent), speech and language (0.9 per cent), deaf-blind (0.2 per cent). Curriculum used in schools does not meet needs of children with disabilities and special needs in education and capitation is not disaggregated according to type and severity of disability. County governments have not supported Educational Assessment Resource Service centre, with only three institutions (6 per cent) reporting having received support in terms of personnel, office space and equipment from their counties. Additional challenges are understaffing, inadequate material, lack of appropriate tools and inadequate funding that most education assessment resource service centre face. Advocacy, sensitization and mobilization for education for children with disabilities at the grassroots are also poor.
Ndiwa (2013) conducted a study in Nairobi County on social and academic experiences of students with low vision in integrated primary schools in Nairobi county Kenya and identified that the level of peer-teacher interaction at school greatly influenced the academic performance of learners with low vision. Further the study established that the support given by the school for example the provision of teaching resources as well as friendly environment like easy access to the physical space resources within the school did influence academic performance the least. The study posited that interaction between the learners as well as with the teachers should be given number one priority as it is the critical determinant of academic performance hence teachers’ preparedness.

Onywany et al. (2014) in Homabay revealed an inclusive environment as being faced with many challenges which include learning facilities (63.3%), teachers had little knowledge as well as guidelines about inclusive education; SNEL are indiscipline and teachers held negative attitudes towards the learners living with special needs. It was also revealed that inclusion was time consuming; made class control difficult and that SNEL have low self-esteem, syllabus coverage was difficult, heavy work load on the teachers. Further, it was pointed that pupils with severe intellectual disability were still being shunned and labeled in schools (Onywany et al., 2014).

The data indicated that inclusive education lack equipment. Early childhood stage of development requires special equipment paramount for child’s holistic development for implementation of IE. Therefore it is objective to investigate how status of inclusive environment determines teachers’ preparedness to implement IE in the lower grade primary schools.
2.6 Teachers’ Attitude towards Inclusive Education

UNESCO (2011) revealed difficulties faced by teachers implementing inclusive education. The difficulties include negative attitudes towards working with learners living with disability, less accommodative curriculum to SNEL, language and communication problems, teachers’ incompetency to handle SNEL, lack of funds to support IE, organization of syllabus which does not cater for the needs of SNEL and lack of policy guiding IE. These difficulties have negatively influence the perception of teachers towards implementation of IE.

Mullick (2014) conducted a survey in Bangladesh and the first study revealed that pre-service teachers had moderately high attitude, relatively high levels of teaching-efficacy but low level of concern about IE. However, the researcher’s second study contend that the level of in-service teachers’ attitude was close to neutral, fairly high levels of perceived teaching-efficacy and the degree and intention to include students with disabilities was found close to positive’. Further, findings revealed that in-service teachers were skeptical about the success of full inclusion under existing conditions in regular schools, but were obliged to include students with disabilities in regular classrooms based on notions of social responsibility and profession. IEP was considered as an effective approach to achieve education for all but their main concern was lack of support from key stakeholders including head-teachers, school management committees, social group and parents of students with disabilities which bred their development of negative attitude towards IE.

Kamuga (2016) conducted a survey in Kampala City, Uganda on the primary teachers’ about their competence on inclusion and pointed out that teachers showed positive attitude and beliefs, limited ability, limited understanding which were the main elements within the
teachers’ competency area that the researcher identified to greatly affect the inclusive education core values but the main challenge faced by teachers was negative attitude from the community.

Muthoni (2013) conducted a research in Mathioya, Murang’a County and revealed that primary school teachers in regular schools were not adequately ready to teach SNEL in their schools because they were not sensitized and equipped before it was rolled down. The researcher pointed that there is dire need for both teachers and the communities be sensitized about the issues disability so that they may discredit the notion that SNEL are burden.

Wanderi (2015) held that the teachers’ attitude influences both positive and significant affective relationship between teachers and learners which should be enhanced to improve their commitment. The research further contends that teachers’ attitude is an important aspect in determining teachers’ affective commitment in inclusive schools. These findings imply that teachers who develop negative attitude towards IE cannot implement the same while teachers who develop positive attitude towards IE effectively implement it.

In a nut shell, studies reviewed reveal that teachers’ view IE negatively. In reference to this assertion, it is viable to conduct a study that investigate teachers’ attitude towards IE as a determinant of teachers’ preparedness towards implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary schools which formed the key focus of the current objective.

2.7 Summary

Inclusive education in the lower grade primary schools has not yet been achieved with consideration to learners with disability and with special needs. This study aimed to
establish determinants of teachers’ preparedness to include SNEL in regular grade primary schools and found the following gaps of knowledge with respect to objectives.

In training in SNE, a gap in respect to knowledge was found as lack of study focused on training of lower grade teachers in special needs education as a determinant of teachers’ preparedness to implement inclusive education in lower grade primary schools.

In existence of policy on inclusive education, a gap in reference to knowledge was exposed as lack of data focusing on existence of policy on inclusive education as a determinant of teachers’ preparedness towards implementation of IE in the lower grade primary schools.

In status of inclusive environment, a gap with respect to knowledge was identified as lack of scientific data focusing on status of inclusive environment as a determinant of teacher” preparedness towards implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary schools.

In teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education, a gap with respect to knowledge was indicated as inadequacy of research that focus on teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education as determinant of teachers’ preparedness towards implementation of IE in lower grade primary schools.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter focuses on the methodological procedures that were employed in the study. These include research design, variables, and location of the study, target population and sampling techniques. Sample size, research instruments, data collection techniques, as well as data analysis are also described.

3.1.1 Research Design
The study adopted descriptive research design where survey technique was particularly used to gather data because it was found appropriate to collect facts, knowledge, attitudes and opinions of the population of study, procedures and events (Gay, 2007; Orodho, 2004). The design was also found appropriate for collecting data with large population size because of its ability to gather data regarding the characteristics of a population (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). The study therefore used the descriptive survey design to collect data regarding the assessment of the teachers’ preparedness and the influence it had on the implementation of inclusive education in lower primary schools in Awendo, Migori Kenya.

3.1.2 Variables
The independent and the dependent variables considered in this study are described in this section.

The independent variables for this study were:

(i) Training in special needs education which was measured by highest level of training in SNE and application of specific method of teaching.
(ii) Existence of policy on inclusive education which was measured using status of national policy on IE, mode of application of national policy on IE, challenge encountered when applying the policy and mitigation of challenge as a result of policy.

(iii) Status of inclusive environment which was measured using presence of SNEL and their categories of disability, disaggregation of capitation for children with disabilities and environment of inclusion in regular schools

(iv) Teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education which was measured by teachers’ take on IE, knowledge of emotional and Behavior Characteristics of the SNEL, Performance of SNEL, teachers’ Interest to Train in SNE and steps of mainstreaming IE.

The dependent variable for this study was implementation of inclusive education in lower primary schools. The indicators the study focused on here include assessments and admission of SNEL, and level of government involvement towards inclusive education. The implementation of inclusive education was measured using a four point liker scale where involvement and aspects of each of the modes of the aggregates occurring 1 highest were given, 2 high 3 low and 4 lowest respectively.

3.1.3 Research Methodology and Data Collection Procedures

The methodological approach employed was survey since the situation was assessed as it was. Questionnaires, interview guides and observation checklists were administered to gather data. See appendices II, III and IV.
3.2 Location of the Study

This study was located in Awendo sub-county, Migori County, Kenya. The sub-county has approximate coverage of thirty-four square kilometres. The area is bordered by Uriri sub-county to the north, Rongo sub-county to the west and Maasai Mara sub-county, Narok County to the south (see appendix V). Awendo was purposively chosen for study because the fact that learners living with disability need to access and participate in lower grade primary mainstream schools have not been documented in the study locale and positively embraced as noble attribute and strategy to enable all get prepared for inclusion education have not been embraced in the study locale, public primary schools here have consistently recorded poor performance in the national examinations when compared to private schools which have secured the top performance in the last five years, yet it is the public schools which are hosting special units, the area has large number of public primary schools implementing IE that is 30 integrated primary schools out of a total of 73 public primary schools (DEO, 2017) which prompted the choice of the study area.

3.3 Target Population

Awendo area had a total of 73 public primary schools. Out of this number, 30 schools had special units (DEO, 2017). The target population for this research was 30 public primary schools with special units from which a sample size of 30% was obtained. In each school sampled, the study targeted all teachers of the lower grade classes.

3.4 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

Described below is the sampling techniques and sample size.
3.4.1 Sampling Techniques

The research adopted stratified sampling technique to select 12 schools out of which nine schools formed the study sample. The reason for the use of the technique was because the area has four wards (Central Sakwa, West Sakwa, North Sakwa and South Sakwa) and to get each ward represented and get evenly distributed information, the use of the technique sufficed. North Sakwa ward had only one school included in the study sample to make a total of nine schools. The other two schools from North Sakwa ward were used during piloting study. Simple random sampling technique thereafter was employed to select 27 teachers of lower primary schools to participate in the exercise after allowing all the population equal chance to take part in the study. The reason for using simple random technique was to give all the target population equal chance for selection. All the targeted schools were classified into strata of 4 wards. Each ward had their schools given a numerical tag on piece of paper. The numbers were written on small pieces of paper which were folded and placed in a container representing each ward where the researcher picked 3 pieces of papers at random from the container representing each ward at a time. The first nine schools corresponding to the numbers picked were included in the study sample.

Simple random sampling technique was adopted to select three teachers per school representing grease 1, 2 and 3 from the nine schools sampled, making a total of 27 teachers. Purposive sampling technique was used to select 9 heads of the sampled schools and 1 director of education in charge of special education in the sub-county because of their outstanding special characteristics. According to Mugenda & Mugenda (2003) when using descriptive survey design, at least 30% of the target population is appropriate for the entire study for it is good enough to serve as adequate representation of the whole population of what needs to be generalized through research. All names of schools were
listed. 9 schools, 9 heads of schools, 27 lower primary school teachers and 1 director of education in charge of special units were selected for study that were administered to questionnaires and interview guides by the researcher.

### 3.4.2 Sample Size

Looking at the table 3.1 it presents sample size. The sample size which was sought was the procedure used to come up with the number sampled against target population which formed 30% of the target population which the table presents.

**Table 3.1: Sample Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of respondents</th>
<th>Target population(T)</th>
<th>Number sampled(t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of schools</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of schools</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers of lower primary</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education officers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>151</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 Research Instruments

Questionnaires, interview schedules and observation checklists were used to collect data. The instruments were necessary to gather the detailed information required for the study and to avoid any bias.

#### 3.5.1 Questionnaires

Research questionnaire with Likert scale was used to collect quantitative data. Questionnaires helped to gather large information within the shortest time possible and also to collect information which seemed embarrassing to ask one on one (Mugenda &
Mugenda, 2003). It further allowed for more than one respondent to respond to the same question of investigation making it appropriate for education studies to investigate the status quo of the phenomena. Questionnaires to various respondents, namely Head-teachers and teachers were different. Both open and closed ended questionnaires were used. The questionnaires had two sections that comprised of demographic data and that of general information (see appendix ii).

3.5.2 Interview Schedule

Interview schedules were administered to education officer, school heads and lower primary teachers of the sampled schools. The schedule probed in-depth information that could not be obtained using questionnaires (McLeod & Clarke, 2014). All the head-teachers and teachers who had filled the questionnaires were interviewed because the questions of the interviews were different from the ones on the questionnaires to probe for further information (see appendix iii).

3.5.3 Observation Checklist

The observation checklist was used because it helped to collect first hand information and it also presented the reality as it was on the ground. It was used for gathering information on how inclusive education operates and collecting general data on expected inclusive features within the school. It was administered before the interview schedules in order to avoid any bias that might have sprang from the researcher (see appendix IV).

3.6 Piloting Study

A pilot study was conducted in two schools from North Sakwa Ward which did not form part of actual study size. The reason was to avoid the biasness emanating from pre-test since Pilot study results only had objective of assisting in finding out the instruments’
appropriateness for data collection. This was done by checking for unclear and poorly structured data collection tools such as common flaws which emanated from administration of the instrument. It was done after two weeks of administration. A sample of six teachers and two head teachers were selected for the study. Questionnaires were administered to both the teachers and head teachers. Each teacher who participated in filling questionnaire was interviewed individually upon the completion of filling of their questionnaire. After analysis, the results of pilot study was used to improve the instruments where R>70 was accepted as valid and reliable.

3.6.1 Validity

The research instrument’s validity was attained by checking the content of the instruments after re-testing to make sure that they contain all possible items measuring the content of the objectives. The researcher also consulted and discussed with the experts in consideration to the objectives of the study. The findings of pilot study was interpreted and analyzed. The vague questions found were some eliminated while others rephrased. Ambiguities, misunderstanding and inadequacies were eliminated (Amin, 2005). With regard to face validity, the words that were used in the instruments were simplified, clarity ensured and related to the research problem.

Complicated terminology was eliminated after advice of the experts from the questionnaire and interview schedules. With regard to content validity, the researcher ensured that the items on the main variables (independent) conformed to the study’s conceptual framework. The opinion of the experts on the relevancy, wording and clarity of the items in the instruments was sought hence validation of the instruments. The content validity
index was measured using the formula: Content validity index (CVI) = Number of items declared valid/Total number of items. The results are presented in the table below.

**Table 3.2: Content Validity Index (CVI) of Instruments from Pilot Data Source**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Questionnaire for teachers</th>
<th>Questionnaire for head-teachers</th>
<th>Interview schedule for teachers</th>
<th>Interview schedule for head-teachers</th>
<th>Interview schedule for DEO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor no. 1</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor no. 2</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pilot data source had the averages of validity index from the evaluators as discussed. Questionnaire administered to teachers (0.765), questionnaire administered to head-teachers (0.75), interview schedule administered to teachers (0.77), interview schedule administered to head-teachers (0.70) and interview schedule administered to district education officer (0.74). These findings are consistent with findings by Arya et al. (2002, p. 63) and Amin (2005, p. 78), which contends that the instruments are valid for research if the instruments test results were above 0.7. These findings imply that the instruments were recommended for research and that CVIs apply to all instruments.
3.6.2 Reliability of the Instruments

The instruments’ reliabilities assured by developing the instruments under the guidance of the experts. The transcripts were also checked and petty errors deleted, Alertness towards recording exactly what the respondent meant was a priority. Codes used were ensured that they were consistent throughout the coding process by cross checking the results with the help of research assistant. The pilot data from the questionnaires were fed in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and In the case of the questionnaire, data from the pilot study was entered in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and Cronbach’s alpha coefficient

Reliability test was calculated using the formula:

Where is the variance of the observed total item scores, and is the variance of component i for the pilot sample.

Cronbach’s alpha coefficient results were analysed and all the sections on training in SNE (α=0.742), existence of policy on inclusive education (α=.803), status of inclusive environment (α=.798) and teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education (α=.813), were found above Cronbach’s alpha value .700 as contended by Cortina (1993). The instruments were therefore, considered satisfactory (see Table 3.3).
Table 3.3: Reliability Coefficients (Cronbach’s Alphas) of the Variables from Pilot Data Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. Items</th>
<th>Alpha’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training in SNE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of policy on inclusive education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of inclusive environment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Data Collection Techniques

Data collection was conducted in three phases namely:

i. Questionnaire administration where the instrument was administered to teachers first before being administered to the head-teacher.

ii. Interview schedule which was administered to teachers before being administered to the head-teachers. The tool was also administered to sub county education officer after completing the exercise with the schools to avoid any bias and leading questions.

iii. Observation checklist in which both participatory and non-participatory observation guides was applied where necessary. Ticks were used to mark the behaviors which had been defined earlier.

The data collection interview was carried out after explaining the purpose of the research to the respondents. Signed consent was obtained at the on-set of data collection interview. Confidentiality of the individual respondent was assured.
3.8 Data Analysis

The gathered information was analyzed by using both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Quantitative data was collected using closed ended questionnaires of four point Likert scale.

Qualitative data was collected through interview guides, observation and open ended questionnaires. The data was cleaned and the responses tallied first as sub themes and used a coding frame to code the data. The most relevant qualitative responses were presented in narratives and direct quotes and linked to common themes derived from each objective.

Inferential statistics was also used to further analyze the data through the use of Pearson correlation analysis. The reason for the choice of Pearson’s correlation analysis was because the study sought to establish the relationship between determinant of teachers’ preparedness (Independent variable) and implementation of inclusive education (Dependent variable). The use of Pearson’s correlation paid attention to significance where the null hypothesis was observed and accepted as significance above 0.05 (5% margin of error) and with regard to reliability of data and accepted as significant only at R=>70 (Campbell and Machin, 1999). The results were presented through frequency distribution tables, charts and graphs.

3.9 Logistical and Ethical Considerations

In this section the researcher discussed the logistical requirements

3.9.1 Logistical Considerations

The researcher received a letter of introduction from the Dean Graduate School of Kenyatta University that facilitated the acquisition of a research permit from National
Commission for Science Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) before embarking on the collection of data. The permit was presented to Awendo Sub-County Director of Education for a letter authorizing the collection of the data. The researcher also explained to the officers the long term objectives of the study for purposes of coordination during the study. The letter authorizing data collection was presented to the head-teachers of the sampled schools to seek permission to collect data. The researcher provided each teacher a consent form to read through and sign just before collection of data kicked off.

3.9.2 Ethical Considerations

The copies of research findings are destined to be availed to all the participating institutions. Prior visit to book appointments with the sampled school heads for data collection was pre-arranged at a convenient time to them. Assurance of confidentiality to the respondents by the researcher by not unsealing information from one respondent to another or publicizing it without permission from relevant individuals or authority was practiced. Participation only took place after proper consultation and their signed informed consent. However, as an ethical consideration, the researcher concealed the identity of individual respondent whose voices were taped and used for the purpose of the research study.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS, INTERPRETATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents results of the study. The purpose of the study was to establish the determinants of teachers’ preparedness towards implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary schools. The Data was collected from teachers, head teachers and officials of the ministry of education from Awendo Sub County using instruments including questionnaires, interview schedules and observation checklist.

The chapter first presents the general information regarding data collection tools response rate. Secondly, the chapter presents demographic information of the respondents. Thirdly, the findings are presented in four sections according to objectives that were the focus of the study. These include:

i. Establish whether training in special needs education influence implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary school.

ii. Determine whether existence of policy on inclusive education influence implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary schools.

iii. Explore the status of inclusive environment in relation to implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary schools.

iv. Determine whether teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education influence implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary schools.
The findings are presented using frequency percentages, charts and graphs followed by discussion of findings.

4.2 General Information

Table 4.1 presents data collection tools response rate. The general information which was sought was whether the data collecting process was successful, valid and reliable for analysis which the table presents. A total of 82 tools were administered to 37 respondents from 9 public primary schools and 1 education officer.

Table 4.1: Return Rate of Data Collection Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Actual No. Distributed (100%)</th>
<th>Actual No. returned (%)</th>
<th>Unreturned (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ questionnaires</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
<td>25 (93%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Interview</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
<td>24 (89%)</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Checklist</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head-teachers questionnaires</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>8 (89%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head-teachers Interview</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational officer’s questionnaire</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 82 (100%)  74 (93%)  8 (7%)

Table 4.1 indicates that out of 27 (100%) primary school teachers, 25 (93%) of them participated in filling questionnaires and out of 27 (100%) of the teachers, 24 (89%) participated during the interviews. The table also shows that out of 9 (100%) questionnaires distributed to head-teachers, 8 (89%) of them participated in filling questionnaires and also 9 (100%) head-teachers participated during the interviews. One 1
(100%) education officer in charge of SNE participated during the interviews. While 8 (7%) of the questionnaires distributed were not filled. This indicates that majority 74 (93%) of the sampled respondents which is above average participated in the study.

4.2.1 Demographic Information

Table 4.2 presents demographic information. The demographic information which was sought was whether age and gender participation influence the implementation of IE in the mainstream schools which the table presents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (Years) Distribution</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 indicate that majority of the teachers were female (83%) while males were only (17%). These findings imply that even though female teachers dominate the lower grade primary, the male teachers are also represented. From the research, it was revealed that age of the teachers varied from 30- 64 years with the majority of the teachers had a range of 30-34 years (29.6%). The number reduces consistently with the teachers who have taught for long (60-64) recording the lowest (7.4%) hence participation inversely reduces with the higher the experience. These findings are consistent to findings by UNESCO (2016). The reason for consistency would be the report also reveals losing of teachers to special
schools from IE programme because government introduced stipend for teachers working in special schools but the financial enticement do not apply to teachers in inclusive programme. This has led to loosing of teachers who further their studies and instead move to those segregated special schools to enjoy the offer. These findings imply that implementation of inclusive education faces inadequacy of staffing.

4.3 Training in Special Needs Education

The first objective sought to establish whether training in special needs education influence implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary school. The kind of information analyzed concerning this objective includes highest level of training in SNE and application of specific method of teaching.

4.3.1 Highest Level of Training in Special Needs Education

Figure 4.1 shows that the highest training which was sought was whether a teacher implementing inclusive education were trained in special needs. A total of 25 teachers participated in filling questionnaires.
Figure 4.1: Highest Level of Training in SNE

Figure 4.1 indicates that majority of the teachers (56.5%) which correspond to 14 teachers are O-level (Untrained teachers), 26.1%) which corresponds to 6 teachers are diploma holders in special needs education, (4.3%) which corresponds to 1 teacher degree holders in special needs education and workshops/seminars in special needs education at (4.3%) which correspond to between 1 to 2 teachers. The figure also indicates that 8.7(%) trained P1 teachers but not in SNE are also slotted to teach the inclusive classes. These findings imply that special needs in education regular schools is still faced with inadequate trained teachers because up to (56.5%) are secondary school leavers employed by board of management and (8.7%) are P1 teachers and are incompetent. These findings are consistent with findings by Muthoni (2013); Unice and Orodho (2014); Onywany et al. (2013). The reason for consistency would be their research revealed that teachers are not trained in SNE which hinders effective implementation of inclusive education. These findings indicate that inadequate training of teachers in SNE characterizes the teachers’ unpreparedness to implement IE
Figure 4.2 presents findings on highest training in SNE. The highest training in SNE which was sought was distribution of trained teachers in SNE with knowledge of individual needs of a learner in the regular schools.

Figure 4.2: Distribution of Trained Teachers in Special Needs Education in Regular Schools

Figure 4.2 shows that out of the nine schools sampled, four schools (44.4%) have their teachers trained in SNE. Two schools have one teacher respectively one school has three trained teachers while another school has two trained teachers. The data also reveal that the majority five schools do not have a single teacher trained in special needs education. These findings imply that most of the teachers attend further training in SNE, it also imply that the ministry has not put up a way of identifying the teachers who have gone for further training and post them in the relevant schools that is why there are many trained teachers in some schools while other have none at all yet the learners are present. These findings
are consistent with the findings by MOE and KISE (2018) which revealed that the Kenyan schools are still ill equipped to support the learners with special needs and with disability.

Data from the interview had the following. ‘This programme really challenge us because teachers were not even given time to train in special needs education since the programme came so fast, the ministry did not consider the facilities and resources that would be used and we also lack a clear syllabus that we should use in the same’, said one of the teachers interviewed. Another teacher pointed out, there is even transferring of those teachers trained in SNE to other schools without the inclusion programme, like we had a madam here who was transferred last year to another school without the programme and now we have no single teacher trained in special needs. This statement implies that there is need for proper sensitization through mass training to prepare many teachers for inclusive programmes. In addition there is no clear policy on training, posting and transferring.

Figure 4.3 presents level of training. The level of training which was sought was whether teachers attend capacity building causes through seminars and workshops in SNE as sponsored by different stakeholders.
Figure 4.3 shows that (60%) of the teachers attended SNE seminar/workshop sponsored by school administration, (20%) attended seminar sponsored by EARC and (20%) attended workshop/seminar sponsored by SNE grant. All who happened to attend the in service training indicated that level of training improve their teaching skills as shown in table 4.4. These findings indicate that at least teachers are improving their skills towards implementation of IE. These findings are inconsistent with findings by Unice and Orodho (2014). The reason for inconsistency would be their research pointed out that stakeholders have left the constrains of implementation of inclusive education to the government alone instead of being everyone’s concern. These findings imply that all stakeholders discredit the idea that implementation of IE is government’s responsibility and instead joint effort towards empowering teachers to improve their SNE skills. In addition, when teachers are supported to attend training in special needs they effectively implement inclusion education.
Table 4.3 presents level of training in SNE. The training in SNE which was sought was whether capacity building trainings through seminars and workshops in SNE improves their implementation of inclusive education.

### Table 4.3: Rate of Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate of Improvement</th>
<th>Teachers N=25</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below average (39 and below)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (40-50)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average (51 onwards)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 indicates that attendance of the seminar/workshop improved teachers skills of teaching the SNEL as follows: (16.7%) below average, (66.6%) average and (16.7%) above average. The teachers who underwent these trainings indicated that they were able to apply some specific methods to make learning effective in their class as shown in the figure 4.3. These findings imply that training of teachers improves their inclusive skills and only when trained, the teacher applies specific methods to serve learner with special needs. These findings are consistent to findings by Onywany et al. (2014); Wanderi (2015) which maintain that teachers implementing inclusive education should demonstrate ability to cope with challenges of meeting the needs of learners with special needs within the inclusive setting and categorically on top of the training there should be some well-structured and coordinated ongoing trainings through in-service enabling teachers to keep abreast with new developments in education.
According to data from the interview, whenever a seminar or workshop is organized, normally the number of teachers who should attend per school are limited. The teachers maintained that all teachers in the schools with inclusive programmes should be allowed to attend because all of them are affected by the presence of the SNEL in their schools. These findings imply that inclusive programme in regular schools is run by untrained teachers in SNE and is the main cause of problem to inclusion. These findings are consistent to findings by Onywany et al. (2014); Wanderi (2015) which maintain that teachers implementing inclusive education only demonstrate ability to cope with challenges of meeting the needs of learners with special needs within the inclusive setting when they categorically attend some well-structured and coordinated ongoing trainings through workshops/seminars.

4.3.2 Application of Specific Method of Teaching

Figure 4.4 shows that application of specific methods of teaching which was sought was to establish whether teachers who underwent training in SNE are able to use different methodology in implementing inclusive education which the figure presents.

![Method Applied](image)

**Figure 4.4: Methodology Applied in Inclusive Class**
Figure 4.4 shows that (43%) would adapt lesson, (25%) use individualized education programme IEP (10%) and pairing (22%) grouping. These findings imply that when teachers are trained in SNE they are able to apply specific method of teaching in implementing inclusive education while untrained teachers are unable. These findings are consistent to findings by Rouse-hill (2009); Sailor (1991). The reason for consistency would be the researchers also maintained that a competent teacher make proper preparation before the lesson and use materials and apply different methodology to deliver content to make sure that the individual learner benefit.

Table 4.4 presents findings on application of specific method of teaching. The application of specific method of teaching which sought to establish whether teachers implementing inclusive education found it appropriate to use ‘specific methodology’, the table presents.

Table 4.4: Appropriateness of Methods Applied in Inclusive Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriateness</th>
<th>Pairing</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th></th>
<th>IEP</th>
<th></th>
<th>Adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=25</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=25</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=25</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 indicates that appropriateness of adopting specific methods to teach the inclusive class include: making groups (22%) and peer paring of learners (10%). The teachers who use pairing agreed that the method sometimes works with only (10%) pointed that the method work always. Teachers who use grouping method pointed that the method sometimes work and only (30.8%) maintain that the method is always appropriate. Majority (63.6%) pointed that the use of IEP method is sometimes appropriate while
revealed that the method is appropriate always. Both the groups tied at (50%) that the adapting a programme sometimes/always appropriate respectively. These findings imply that when trained in SNE, teachers become competent and are skilled to apply the most appropriate methodology that suite the category of the learner. These findings are consistent with findings by (Mullick, 2013). The reason for consistency would be the researcher revealed that teachers attain confidence through training and become competent to teach learners with special needs.

Table 4.5 presents findings on application of specific methods of teaching. The application of specific methods of teaching sought to establish whether teachers trained in SNE use materials in implementing inclusive education which the table presents.

**Table 4.5: Influence of Teaching Learning Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence of training on use of materials</th>
<th>Teachers N=27</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support use of materials</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support the use of materials</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 show that (44.4%) of the teachers pointed out that use of materials in inclusive class is necessary and (55.6%) revealed that it has no influence. These finding imply that the level of training does not influence the use of materials in inclusive class. Hence materials are less important tool in inclusive class. These findings disagrees with the findings by Rouse-hill (2009); Sailor (1991). The reason for disagreement is that their findings maintained that competent teacher make proper preparation before the class
commences and use materials and different methods in delivering content to make sure that the learning is successful. These findings imply that training in SNE does not influence on the choice of materials in teaching SNEL.

Data from the interview revealed majority of the teachers (91.7%) would advise parents against allowing their children get admitted in inclusive schools because there are no trained teachers to serve learners, facilities and resources to be used by teachers and learners are lacking when compared to special schools. One of the teachers interviewed said, ‘You know teachers are not even motivated by supporting them to go for the special training’. The findings imply that training in special needs education is still an issue that needs to be considered if implementation of IE should be successful.

Table 4.6 presents findings of the first hypothesis test. The hypothesis tested sought to establish whether there is a relationship between teachers’ training in special needs and the implementation of inclusive education. Hypothesis was tested using Pearson’s correlation at $\alpha<=0.05$: $H_0$: There is no relationship between the teacher’s training in SNE and the implementation of inclusive education in the lower primary.
Table 4.6: Hypothesis Test on Teacher’s Training in SNE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Application of specific teaching method in SNE</th>
<th>Attendance of training in SNE</th>
<th>Highest level of training in SNE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application of specific methods of teaching in SNE</td>
<td>r-value</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of in service training in SNE</td>
<td>r-value</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of training in SNE</td>
<td>r-value</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at .05 level (2-tailed)**

Table 4.6 reveal a significant relationship between the training in SNE and the implementation of inclusive education. According to training in SNE attended (r=1.000, P=0.000). Correlation analysis further shows that there was a significant correlation at the .05 level (2-tailed). This implied that training in SNE determined the preparation to implement inclusive education in lower grade primary school.

As a result of the analysis it is established that training in SNE affect implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary schools. This led to statistical hypothesis being rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted which stated: “there is a relationship between the training in SNE and the implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary”. This means the objective is achieved.
There are fewer number of teachers who are trained in special needs education as compared to the number of schools implementing IE and as a result, all teachers without considering their special training teach the SNEL across the schools with majority (65.2%) untrained in special needs education, 26.1% diploma in SNE, (4.3%) degree in SNE and (4.3%) capacity development causes through workshops/seminars. All schools identified for inclusion programme are not operational because of no trained teachers in SNE posted and some schools have none of their teachers trained in SNE while some schools have more than one teacher but all the schools have SNEL. Secondly, the data revealed that untrained teachers in SNE were the majority and lack the knowledge to properly include SNE learners and also had issue with use of teaching aids. Third, teachers were not given time to attend training in SNE before its advent but instead they struggle with training as the programme is already running. Fourth, the number of teachers attending seminars and workshops in special needs is limited per school and as a result only a few teachers mostly those who are already trained in special needs attend such forum yet the presence of SNEL affects every teacher in school. Lastly, the trained teachers are still transferred to schools without inclusive programme without considering their special training. This leave these schools without a single teacher to guide the programme hence teachers are unprepared through training to include SNEL in regular schools

4.4 Existence of Policy on Inclusive Education

The second objective sought to determine whether availability of policy on inclusive education influences implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary schools. Existence of policy on inclusive education in this case was measured by asking the teachers their knowledge of: status of national policy on IE, mode of application of
national policy on IE, challenge encountered when applying the policies and mitigation of challenge as a result of policy.

4.4.1 Status of National Policy on Inclusive Education

According to Republic of Kenya (2008 and 2009); Government of Kenya (2013); UN (2012); whatever policies put in place in schools are in reference to government of Kenya policy references to inclusive education which include the following. National Survey for PWDS Preliminary Report (2008), Final draft: The national special needs education policy (2009), The Basic Education Act (2013) and sustainable development goals and disability (2012). Both policy references point the need for inclusion through education. The policies reveal national challenges encountered in relation to access and equity in the provision of special needs education to SNEL. The challenges are caused mainly by lack of implementation of children’s education acts which guide implementation of IE, cultural prejudices as well as negative attitudes towards their learning and inclusivity, the data on the number of children with special needs in the schools lacking, resources for assessing and identifying learners with special needs missing.

In referenced to the policy framework on education, to address the said challenges, the Government of Kenya would adopt the following policies: Adopt and implement inclusive education and integrate special educational institutions in all public learning and training institutions and ensure the institutions are responsive to the education of learners with special needs and disability placed there, initiate intervention Strategies at the National Level and roll it down to schools. However, research conducted by MOE and KISE (2018) which contend that there is no policy found in Kenya on inclusive education and as a result
schools are ill equipped to support learners with disability and with special needs therefore reveal a contradictory findings.

Figure 4.5 presents findings on status of national policy on IE. The policy status sought to establish whether teachers’ had knowledge of special needs policy in reference to the government’s policy on implementation of inclusive education in the mainstream schools.
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**Figure 4.5: Knowledge of Policy on Inclusive Education**

Figure 4.5 reveal the status of knowledge of policy on implementation of inclusive education. (28.6%) have idea of Physical structure policy, (14.3%) would cite sign language and braille manual as a policy reference, (14.3%) cited teacher’s guide book as a policy reference and About (42.9%) of the teachers did notcite in oblivion. These findings imply that up to (71.4%) have not heard of the policy on IE and therefore do not use it. The policy was also enacted at the national level but is not effective among the intended audience. These findings are inconsistent with Republic of Kenya (2008); Republic of Kenya (2009); Government of Kenya (2013) which point on policy references that guide the implementation of IE. These findings on the other hand conforms with findings by
MOE and KISE (2018). The reason for conformity is because their findings also revealed that there is no policy on special education in primary schools hence the schools are still ill equipped.

Data from the interview revealed that teachers had idea of inclusive education even though most of the teachers who were interviewed (65.2%) do not have training in SNE. One of the teachers described inclusive education as ‘education system where SNEL learn with other ‘’normal’’ pupils in the same environment’. Another teacher had the following to say ‘It should be a policy that all head-teachers get trained in SNE as part of qualification for the promotion to headship in inclusive schools as well as more teachers to get training in SNE.’ Still another said, ‘let the government be responsible and implement the programme she started’. One of the Head-teachers pointed out that inclusive education is the most beneficial program to pupils with disability however noted that there is no guideline on how the programme should be run and indicated that they are not trained in SNE. These findings indicate that there is no policy existing in regular schools on inclusive education and policy that guide on qualifications of the kind of administrator posted in inclusive schools as well is missing.

These findings are consistent with findings by Phinias, Jerishanos & Kudakwashe (2013). The reason for consistency would be their findings similarly revealed that out of Thirty-five teachers who were randomly selected from the three schools, it was established that most schools lack specialist teachers and school administrators which has greatly exacerbated the plight of the pupils with special needs in education placed in regular schools. These findings on the other hand contradict the (State of Victoria, 2016) policy guideline on inclusive education which presents the government’s commitment to
inclusive education by putting in place plans that would improve the student’s long term life achievements. The finding on the other hand conforms to findings of Krohn-Nydal (2008); Calderbank (2009) both which maintained that there was no clear policy guideline that guide implementation of inclusive education in schools.

4.4.2 Mode of Application of National Policy on Inclusive Education

Figure 4.6 indicates that mode of application of national policy on IE sought to establish assessments prior to admissions with regard to inclusive education which the figure presents.
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**Figure 4.6: Assessment Carried out Prior to Admission**

Figure 4.6 revealed that Performance is the assessment tool frequently used during admission at (19%). Family background information and physical disabilities follow at (16%) each. Other methods used which cannot give the true picture of the child include time taken to answer question (6%), mannerism o the learner (3%). Some schools likewise do not conduct any assessment (3%). These findings indicate that the modality of assessment of SNEL is misguided and lacks a standard procedure. These findings are inconsistent with findings by Phinias et al. (2013); State of Victoria (2016) which maintain
that assessments before admissions and Improving early years screening for learning
difficulties and disorders should be a priority of any school before admissions.

Table 4.7 presents findings on mode of applications of national policy on IE. The mode of
application sought to establish whether there is source of information used by the teachers
to assist in continuous assessments.

Table 4.7: Continuous Assessments in respective Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Teachers N=27</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent/guardian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs officer from sub-county</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation by administration office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Assessment and Resource Center (EARC)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist from hospital</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission records</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KESRAT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 shows that only (6.7%) of the school administrations carry out the continuous
assessment. From 6% conducting assessment, it was revealed that assessment done in class
(44.4%) seek further information from the child’s guardian, only (13.3%) of the schools
use the information from education, assessment and resource center. These findings imply
that there is laxity on the application of policy on inclusive education and it lack guideline
on how continuous assessments should be conducted. The SNEL in regular schools are not
planned for because it is only through assessment that needs of SNEL can be identified
and attended. These findings conform to findings by (Krohn-Nydal (2008)) which reveal
no clear policy documents on inclusive education. Also other existing relevant policy documents are not re-addressed in order to declare inclusive education as a government obligation for achieving the Education for all.

4.4.3 Challenges Encountered When Applying Policies

Figure 4.7 presents findings on challenges encountered when applying policies. The challenges of application sought to establish whether the experts trained in special needs education are involved in the team conducting admissions.
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**Figure 4.7: Involvement of Experts**

Figure 4.7 indicates that there is no involvement of expert scoring highest at (45%), information from hospital (22%), observing the physical characteristics (11%) and involvement of EARC office at (11%). The data fail to present the involvement of the trained teacher who is with the learner most of the time, there is no also the involvement of a psychological teacher and there is no involvement of a social worker who can link the child’s home and the school. These findings further imply that the school administrators make some of the critical decision about the SNEL without involving the child’s teacher in
the plan. These findings are consistent with findings by Phinias et al. (2013) which reveal that most administrators do not give the teachers in the area of special needs opportunity to assess the learner before admissions.

4.4.4 Ways of Mitigating the Challenges of Inclusion

Table 4.8 presents findings on ways of mitigating the challenges as a result of inclusive education. The ways of mitigating challenges sought to establish whether there was a standard guide regarding handling emotional-behavior characteristics of PWDs in regular schools.
Table 4.8: Challenges faced and how they are addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges Faced</th>
<th>Addressing Challenges</th>
<th>Number of respondents in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stigmatization</td>
<td>Be friendly</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading difficulty</td>
<td>Involving parent</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow learning rate</td>
<td>Motivating them</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of cooperation from administration</td>
<td>Communication with relevant authority</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate time to give pupil special attention</td>
<td>Frequent follow up</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities</td>
<td>Provision of learning facilities</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are very emotional</td>
<td>Giving them simpler tasks</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiscipline i.e. living class anytime, lack to do homework</td>
<td>Report to administrative</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to socialize</td>
<td>Providing mass education to the parents</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing difficulty</td>
<td>Monitor them closely</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in solving mathematical problems</td>
<td>Employment of trained SNE teachers</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to carry out physical activities</td>
<td>Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>Individual coaching</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of experienced teachers on SNE</td>
<td>Talk to parents</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of sign language and Braille</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always lonely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short concentration span</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of some assistive devices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow pace of doing work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of acceptance from their fellow pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time for IEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner stubborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor hygiene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of awareness of SNE by other teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8 revealed the different methods used by teachers to address some of the challenges. These findings indicate that teachers only express their own individual opinions on how they would handle the issue if in any case there arise but there is no element of consistency on the standard mitigation measures to challenges. These findings conforms to what was found by (Krohn-Nydal, 2008) which held that teachers are unaware of what to do with SNE learners as they lack policy guideline for their retention which is a setback to implementation of inclusive education. This imply that schools implementing inclusive education lack standard guide on handling challenges

Data from the interviews and observation checklist revealed that some schools have put effort towards mainstreaming disability in their schools. ‘’We give the mentally impaired learner an animal mostly a sheep as a token of appreciation on disability day to motivate them and make them feel part of school since they do very little in class’ work’, said one head teacher. Another said ‘’most of the intellectually challenged do not take an examination since some of them do not settle, keeps chanting and walks out of class at their pleasure and on the same not it really challenge us to either grade or promote to the next class’. These findings reveal schools lack solutions to challenges associated with SNEL because there lack a policy that guide their inclusion. These findings are similar to findings by MOE and KISE (2018)) which revealed that schools in Kenya lack policy on special needs education and as a result the schools are still ill equipped to support learners with disability and special needs. Further the curriculum and syllabus used in the special schools emphasize on academic performance rather than competence.
Data from the interviews indicates the ratio of teacher-SNEL per class across the schools range between (1:5 and 1:7) of different types of disability. In addition, the ‘normal other pupils range between forty and eighty which are very large class sizes. Further it was revealed that inclusive education program in mainstream school suffers from transferring SNE teachers in the inclusive school to schools which were not marked for inclusive programme. These findings indicate that teachers are still not prepared to mitigate challenges associated with inclusion because of large class sizes comprising of SNEL and other non SNEL making individual attention to a learner reduced, and lack of training especially for the programme. These findings are consistent with findings by Ndyabawe (2016) which revealed that large class sizes hinder the effective learning as the teachers move with the ‘normal’ majority.

Table 4.9 presents findings on hypothesis test. The hypothesis tested sought to establish whether there is relationship between existence of policy on inclusive education and implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary school. The following hypothesis was tested H0: There is no relationship between existence of policy on inclusive education and the implementation of inclusive education in lower primary.
Table 4.9: Hypothesis Test on Existence of Policy on inclusive education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Knowledge of national policy on IE</th>
<th>Application of national policy on IE</th>
<th>Challenges encountered when applying policy on IE</th>
<th>Mitigation of the challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers N=24</td>
<td>Knowledge of existence of policy on IE r-value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.346</td>
<td>-.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application of national policy on IE r-value</td>
<td>-.346</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges encountered when applying policy on IE r-value</td>
<td>-.442</td>
<td>-.334</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation of the challenge r-value</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td>-.473</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at .05 level (2-tailed)

Table 4.9 revealed a significant relationship between policy reference on inclusive education and implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary. According to challenge encountered when applying policy on IE (r=1.000, P=0.000). The study findings also show that there was a significant relationship in the mitigation of challenge (r=.432, P=0.000). As a result of the analysis existence of policy on IE affects implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary schools. This led to statistical hypothesis being rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted which stated:

“There is a relationship between the existence of policy on inclusive education and the implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary” hence the objective is achieved.
According to existence of policy as determinant of preparedness towards implementation of IE, teachers are not yet prepared because of the following: The IE policy enacted in 2009 is not used by primary schools and some schools are not even aware of its existence. There is no standard procedure used during admissions, assessments and instead the teachers only do what they think is right. Only 6.7% of the schools have carried out continuous assessment (one school) and the information they rely on for the assessment is from the family which is not reliable in most cases.

No policy guide on the qualification of kind of administrators of primary schools conducting IE. Majority of the administrators in inclusive programmes do not involve class teachers who are with the child most of the time. Further other important sources of information like the psychological teacher and social worker who link the school and the child’s family are not involved by the administrators. The different types of disability have different characteristics and cannot all be served together in the same class by a single teacher during a lesson so a policy on Inclusive Disability Type Specialization (IDTS) by schools lack.

4.5 Status of Inclusive Environment

The third objective sought to Explore whether the status of inclusive environment influence implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary schools. In this case the objective was measured by asking the teachers’ knowledge of presence of SNEL and their categories of disability, disaggregation of capitation for learners living with disabilities and environment of inclusion in regular schools
4.5.1 Presence of Special Needs Learner and their Category of Disability

Whatever the status of inclusive environment in the mainstream schools, are in reference to the government survey report of (Republic of Kenya, 2008: 9). The report revealed that Provision of special education in the past focused mainly the major four traditional categories. They include hearing impairments, visual impairments, mental retardation and physical handicap. Areas left out include learners with Autism, Gifted and Talented, Emotional and behavioral difficulties and special learning difficulties. However, a joint report by MOE and KISE (2018) revealed that 11 per cent of all learners in Kenya have one or another form of disability and the most common disabilities among learners were found to include: Visual impairment (3.1 per cent), physical disability (3 per cent), intellectual disability (2.5 per cent), hearing impairment (1.2 per cent), speech and language (0.9 per cent), deaf-blind (0.2 per cent).

According to data from the interviews and observation checklist SNEL are present in all the schools identified to conduct the inclusion programme. However, all schools earlier identified to implement IE policy are not operational because of lack of provision of teachers, facilities and resources that would realize the same has not been realized. Teachers were not trained to oversee the implementation of IE prior to commencement of the programme. These findings imply that there is a total mess going on in our primary schools with inclusive programme and the environment needs to be salvaged as it is a mixture of all types of learners of different types of disability and yet they lack instructors. These findings are consistent with findings by Onywany et al. (2014). The reason for consistency would be that their research revealed that teachers lack knowledge of IE to enable them handle the SNEL.
Figure 4.8 indicates that SNEL and their type of disability sought to establish the different types of learners with different types of disability contained in a single class which the figure presents.

**Figure 4.8: Other Common Categories of SNEL**

Figure 4.8 shows learners with various types of disability found in the regular classes as vision impairment at (17.8%), mathematics disability at (12.5%), reading disability at (12.1%), spoken language problem (10.6%), physical disability (9.7%), multiple disability (8.1%) oral language disorder (7.9%, hearing impairment (7.9%), emotional behavioral disorder (6%), mental challenge (3.9%), poor motor ability (3.8% and attention deficit disorder (0.6%)). These findings imply that the kind of environment of inclusion witnessed in regular schools is full of learners with various types of disability and requires that there
are enough teachers trained in different specific areas of SN to handle this mixture of these learners in the unit.

These findings are consistent with findings by MOE and KISE (2018) which shows that 11 per cent of all learners in Kenya have one or another form of disability. The most common disabilities among learners include visual impairment (3.1 per cent), physical disability (3 per cent), intellectual disability (2.5 per cent), hearing impairment (1.2 per cent), speech and language (0.9 per cent), deaf-blind (0.2 per cent). While a significant number of these children are enrolled in schools, the rate of school dropout remains high due to lack of support services in most learning institutions. Similarly they are consistent to findings by Republic of Kenya (2008); Republic of Kenya (2009); Government of Kenya (2013) both findings which maintained that Provision of special education services in Kenya had been tilted towards the big four traditional categories. These categories include hearing impairments, visual impairments, mental retardation and physical handicap. The report further reveal that areas left out include learners with Autism, Gifted and Talented, Emotional and behavioral difficulties and special learning difficulties who would benefit from introduction and implementation of inclusive education in the mainstream schools.

4.5.2 Disaggregation of Capitation for Learners Living with Disability

Table 4.10 presents findings on disaggregation of capitation for learners living with disability. The disaggregation of capitation was sought as government’s commitment towards improving the environment of inclusion by providing funds according to the type and severity of disability which the table presents.
Table 4.10: Number of Times Receive Special Needs Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times Funded</th>
<th>School N=9</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 indicates that about 5 schools out of 9 have been funded by the government through the policy of inclusivity while the other 4 out of 9 have not yet received funds. There is no special allocation of fund according to type and severity of disability in addition to the fact that some schools have not received a single fund. These findings indicate that the government has not yet achieved the full inclusion requirement but efforts are made towards implementation of the inclusive policy. These findings are inconsistent with findings by (Republic of Kenya, 2009; GOK, 2013). The reason for inconsistency would be, according to these researches the government is committed to overcoming the challenges that come as a result of special education in referenced to the policy framework on IE. The challenges would be addressed by adopting policies and implement inclusive education and integrate special educational institutions in all public learning and training institutions and ensure the institutions are responsive to the education of learners with special needs and disability placed there, initiate intervention Strategies at the National Level and roll it down to schools. Similarly, the findings are inconsistent with findings by (New Zealand government, 2014). The reason for inconsistency would be New Zealand Government maintained that it is the schools that have the obligation to foster the identity, language and culture of all learners.
Table 4.11 indicate that disaggregation of capitation for children with disability sought to establish whether there are facilities and resources realized from the use of SNE funds which the table presents.

**Table 4.11: Special Needs Resources and Facilities in Mainstream schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Schools N=9</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Schools N=9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books with large prints</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pavement assessable to the SNE learners</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety pampers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adapted toilets</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braille materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spacious classrooms</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding programme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Play materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate readers/study assistants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adapted furniture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 shows that only one school has pavements, four schools have put up toilets that are disability friendly, only one school has large print books, and two schools have feeding programme and play materials (0%). These findings imply that all the five schools that have received funding have not used the funds to the maximum towards improving IE environment for the benefit of SNEL. Further, schools lack strong innovative management for implementing IE hence poor environment of inclusion.

These findings however, contradicts with the data from the observation checklist which pointed out that apart from ramps in front of the classes there is no other significant resources and facilities in reference to special needs education in regular schools. These findings further, contradict findings by New Zeeland Government (2014). The reason for contradiction would be according to their research, environment of inclusion should be
characterized by schools that foster the identity of language and culture of all learners, schools that have high expectations of all their learners, schools that are strongly value-driven and foster the values in learners and adults, schools that are innovative and flexible to adapt to the child or young person rather than making them adapt to fit the school, schools that have processes for identifying and supporting the needs and aspirations of special needs learners requiring special education needs and schools that have strong leaders who communicate and model clear values and expectations, schools that have good systems and processes in place for enrolling and welcoming learners with special education needs and identifying their needs and strengths.

The data from the interviews revealed one of the head-teachers point that ‘we have few facilities but not adequate and in good condition’. These findings indicate that the environment of inclusion lack the very necessary equipment that will support teachers in delivering services too SNEL. These findings are consistent with findings by Unice and Orodho (2014). The reason for consistency would be they also found out that the facilities including toilet were inadequate and in dilapidated condition. These findings has an implication that the schools implementing inclusive education have their SNE funds misused and environment of inclusion is poor and lack important facilities and resources.

Additional data from the interviews with head-teachers on whether they appropriately use the SNE funds had the following responses. ‘I think I am appropriately using the funds well because we have introduced feeding programme for them, provide spectacles to low vision pupils and building facilities like we have ramps in front of all our classes). Another head teacher maintained ‘according to me am not sure whether whatever I am doing with it is what it is intended for since I lack guideline’. Still another mentioned ‘fund is not
appropriately used’ because according to us we budget for the whole school’. Another head teacher mentioned that ‘Am not aware of the funding’. These findings imply that mainstream schools implementing inclusive education lack administrators with training in special needs education and upon the receipt of SNE fund they lack the knowledge of assistive devices that they should give priority in their budgets.

4.5.4 Inclusion Environment in Regular Schools

Table 4.12 presents the findings on inclusion environments. The inclusion environments focused on comparison between physical and social environment which one best favor IE which the table presents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favorable environment for SNEL</th>
<th>Teachers N=27</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involving them in school activities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((Creating awareness of each of the condition and disability and encouraging interaction among them)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building facilities that accommodate their conditions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing books and desks together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treating them equally</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12 indicates that physical and social environments are both very key in the implementation of IE. These findings indicate that teachers require both social and cultural context to serve learners effectively. This kind of environment is improved by the help of a teacher knowledgeable to include the learner requiring special needs since both the
environment work hand in hand. These findings are inconsistent with findings by (Ndiwa, 2013) which revealed that social interaction between the teacher and the pupil better influence inclusion when compared with physical environment in regular school.

Data from the observation reveal that most schools had very rough terrain with stones and stumps littered all over, schools lack assistive devices such as computers with screen readers and acoustic walls, lack of resources like Braille materials, toilets in dilapidated conditions and the floor of classes earthen and those cemented had big pot-holes. Finally classes are congested with many pupils ranging between 40-80 regular pupils. I asked one of the pupils with mild intellectual challenge in one of the classes in a school to identify sound ‘a’ from letters of the alphabets and the ‘normal others’ broke into laughter. More categorically, it was observed that each class had more than one category of disabilities ranging from visual, hearing, mental, physical, speech, mathematics disorders and gifted and talented among others all in one class. In addition, some intellectually challenged learners were not under the control of teachers and remained outside while learning continued in classes. These findings imply that teachers are not well prepared to manage the inclusive environment, SNEL of different types of disability are camped together making their control difficult especially in the absence of trained teachers in the area of special needs. These findings are in line with findings by Unice and Orodho (2014); Onywany et al. (2013) which also revealed poor school environment ranging from classes to toilets, lack of trained teachers as well as resources. Stigma exist among the learners which is similar with environment revealed by Onywany et al (2013); Gwala (2016) both which pointed that rights of the SNEL are fringed as they are physically in schools but not served according to their needs, stigma witnessed among both the learners and teachers and there are no trained teachers.
Table 4.13 presents findings on the third hypothesis test. The hypothesis tested sought to establish whether there is a relationship between the status of inclusive environment and the implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary. The following hypothesis was tested. H0: There is no relationship between status of inclusive environment and implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary.

**Table 4.13: Hypothesis Test for Learning Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Presence of SNEL and category of disability</th>
<th>Disaggregation of capitation</th>
<th>Environment of inclusion in regular schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers N=24</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment of inclusion in regular school</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 4.13 presents a significant relationship between status of inclusive environment and the implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary schools, according to presence of SNEL and category of disability $p=.000$). The study findings also show that there was a significant relationship in the environment of inclusion in regular school $p=.000$). As a result of the analysis status of inclusive environment for inclusive education influence implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary schools. This led to statistical hypothesis being rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted which stated: "There is a relationship between status of inclusive environment and
implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary schools”, hence the objective is achieved.

The classes were found congested not only with ‘normal’ learners but also SNEL with different types of disability. Teachers found it difficult controlling classes because there are many types of disability and they were trained only in one area and situation was worse in schools where there were no trained teachers at all. The report adds that fund allocated by government towards IE was used for general development in regular schools. The ministry of education has not identified the teachers who further their training in SNE and get posted in schools lacking teachers to run the programme. This is why in some schools whose many teachers have gone for training had more teachers while others had none at all (see figure 4.1.)

4.6 Teacher’s Attitude towards Inclusive Education

The fourth objective sought to determine whether teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education influence implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary schools. The kind of information analyzed concerning this objective include: teachers’ take on IE, knowledge of emotional and Behavior Characteristics of the SNEL, Performance of SNEL, teachers’ Interest to Train in SNE and steps of mainstreaming IE.

4.6.1 Teachers’ Take on Inclusive Education

Figure 4.9 presents findings on teachers’ take on IE. The teachers take on IE which was sought was the appropriateness for rolling IE programme down to regular schools which the figure presents.
Figure 4.9: Inclusive Education or Special Needs Education

Figure 4.9 indicates that (57%) of teachers pointed out that special education is better than inclusive education, (29%) maintained that inclusive education suffice and (14%) have no clue of special or inclusive education. These findings imply that majority of teachers still view special needs education in regular schools negatively and will not support it. These findings are inconsistent with findings by NDCCWD (2016); New Zealand Government (2014). The reason for inconsistency would be according to their research, in inclusive school SNE learners attend their chosen school with their siblings and achieve learning, feel challenged and involve in what their peers do, feel a sense of belonging and esteemed to learn.

4.6.2 Knowledge of Emotional and Behavioral Characteristics of Special Needs in Education Learner

According to data from the interviews and observation checklist teachers used different approaches to handle the behaviors portrayed by the SNEL. These action reflect the teachers attitude towards the presence of IE including: Talking to the learner , give
responsibilities like appointed to be in charge of sports as a way of motivation, refer to guidance and counseling office, involving them in community work like they will be instructed to pick all the litters in the compound, giving them simpler tasks and allow them participate more, assign them a group, provide incentives by allow them participate more, praising them and even buy them uniforms, refer to school policies, give more exercise to keep them busy, ignore some of the shortcomings they portray, create special units, punish like any other student, talk to their parents, conduct home visits and pray for them.

These data indicate different actions taken while handling emotions and behaviors of SNEL. The action taken reflects individual teacher’s perception of IE. Some teachers would punish, some would consider a special unit, while others would assign a group among others. These findings imply that teachers have moderate attitude towards IE and that there is need for more sensitization through training to improve their attitude further. These findings are consistent with findings by (Mullick 2014) which revealed teachers have moderate attitude towards IE.

4.6.3 Performance of Special Needs Learner

Table 4.14 presents findings on performance of SNEL. The performance of SNEL sought to establish whether teacher’s attitude towards IE influences learner’s academic performance.
Table 4.14: Reason for academic performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Teachers N=27</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Teachers N=27</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>Their attention span is short</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No discrimination hence equal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>Lack of enough assistive facilities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop very high self esteem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>They are less attended too</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No special classes and units for</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Untrained teachers on SNE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low self esteem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6(22.2%)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>18(77.8%)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 reveals that SNEL are underperformers (77.8%) because they have low attention span (11.1%), lack of facilities and trained teachers in mainstream schools (16.1%), lack of assistive devices in implementing schools (44.4%) and SNEL have low self-esteem (5.6%). These findings imply that teachers emphasize majorly on the weakness of the SNEL more than they would emphasize on their strength and as a result would not identify what the learner can do best and support them while in regular schools. Similarly, these findings are an implication of gross negative attitude associated with misconception of underperformance of learners with disabilities which is a setback to implementation of IE.

These findings are inconsistent with findings by (Yeri, 2016; NDCCwD, 2016). The reason for inconsistency would be they posited that when learners living with disabilities are included, all learn and achieve more. Through inclusion learners with disabilities greatly access curriculum, increased concentration span, improved literacy and communication skills and develop more friendship resulting to low rates of suspension,
low rates of school drop-out hence improved academic achievement and higher rates of employment. These findings imply teachers implementing IE are incompetent. As a result judge the SNEL based on their attitude which spring from low academic performance. Further, these findings are inconsistent with findings by (Mullick, 2014; Kamuga, 2016). The reason for inconsistency would be their research established that teachers generally have moderate attitude towards IE and have high teaching efficacy and trained in SNE.

### 4.6.4 Teachers Interest in Special Needs Education

Table 4.15 presents findings on teachers’ interest in SNE. The teachers’ interest in SNE sought to establish whether their attitude towards IE influenced their positions about the placement of SNEL which the table presents.

#### Table 4.15: Position on the Placement of Special Needs in Education Learner in Regular School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ positions</th>
<th>N=27</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go to special units with equipment’s</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child should go for assessment before placement is done</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at the type of disability if severe to be taken to special unit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take children to inclusive education to enhance interaction with other children</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not costly like the special school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15 indicates that majority of the teachers (34.8%) have position that they would ensure the child is admitted in special schools instead of IE unit because of provision of trained teachers, facilities and resources. (8.8%) would advise the parents to attend
assessment first before the child is placed while (4.8%) would consider the severity of disability. These findings are an implication of low levels of concern about IE by majority of teachers. On the other hand, some teachers have shown moderate attitude towards learners with special needs in education. These findings are in line with the findings by (Mullick, 2014) which revealed that pre-service teachers in Bangladesh had moderately positive attitudes, relatively high levels of teaching-efficacy and low levels of concern about IE. The findings are an implication of moderate attitude towards special needs education.

4.6.5 Steps of Mainstreaming Inclusive Education

Table 4.16 presents findings on steps towards mainstreaming IE. The step towards mainstreaming IE sought to establish whether schools implementing IE apply policy reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Teachers N=27</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not discriminating any of the students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing them with Uniforms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building friendly structures like ramps in front of classes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving them extra time while handling them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging them in sports activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing feeding program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising teachers to closely observe and supervise pupils with disabilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering family background of the child</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.16 shows low percentage of teachers who have shown interest and commitment towards the policy. This is a positive move towards achieving the inclusive education policy in regular schools. These findings are consistent with government’s policy on inclusive education Republic of Kenya (2009); GOK (2013). The reason for consistency would be it maintained that the Government of Kenya adopted and implemented the inclusive education by Integrating special educational institutions in all public learning and training institutions and ensure the institutions are responsive to the education of learners with special needs and disability placed there, initiate intervention Strategies at the National Level and roll it down to schools. These findings on the other hand are inconsistent with findings by (UNESCO, 2011). The reason for inconsistency would be UNESCO presented a contrary report that government lack commitment towards IE resulting to difficulties faced by teachers already in inclusive education resulting to negative attitude towards working with learners who have disability because of the following reasons: Curriculum that is less accommodative, problem with language and communication, teachers’ inability to handle learners, poor funding, organization of education system and inclusive policies.

Data from the observation checklist reveals that SNE learners were given some responsibility in their school in the capacity of prefects. Findings also revealed that some of the learners with intellectual disabilities were out of the teachers’ control and they were totally unaware of what role they should play towards their learning. This is what one of the head-teachers interviewed had to say ‘The student has been here for a long time but can only scribble and not write’. This is an implication that the teachers lack knowledge and are not prepared to serve. They have negative attitude towards the presence of learners with disability especially intellectually challenged. These findings are in line with findings
by (Muthoni, 2013) which remarked that the teachers in inclusive programme are unprepared for the IE.

Table 4.17 presents findings on the fourth hypothesis test. The hypothesis tested sought to establish whether there is relationship between the teacher’s attitude towards inclusive education and implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary. H0: There is no relationship between the teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education and the implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary.

Table 4.17: Test Hypothesis for Teachers Attitude towards Inclusive Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ take on IE</th>
<th>Teacher’s take on IE</th>
<th>Knowledge of EBD of SNEL</th>
<th>Knowledge of emotional and behavior characteristic of SNEL</th>
<th>Performance of SNEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r-value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn Knowledge of emotional and behavior characteristic of SNEL</td>
<td>r-value</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>-.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance of SNEL</td>
<td>r-value</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 4.17 shows a significant relationship between the teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education and the implementation of inclusive education, according to performance of SNEL (r=0.866; p=0.026). The study findings also shows that there was a significant relationship in knowledge of EBD of SNEL (r=0.447, P=0.042). As a result of the analysis teacher’s attitudes towards inclusive education affects implementation of inclusive education in lower primary school. This led to statistical hypothesis being
rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted which stated that: “There is a relationship between the teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education and the implementation of inclusive education” hence the objective was achieved.

A big number of teachers are still less concerned with IE and find it difficult in the application of IE policy especially challenge posed by individual disability. Majority of the teachers (71%) in the mainstream schools have not accepted the IE rolled down to regular schools and are still in denial of IE causing their development of negative attitude towards implementation of IE in regular schools and hold a view that special needs education needs special school. This is because only (29%) have accepted that there is need for the SNEL to be included with the ‘normal other’ learners.
5.1 Introduction

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

5.2 Summary of the Findings

The study explored the determinants of teachers’ preparedness towards the implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary school. The study specifically ventured on the factors that if met, they determine the teachers’ ability to include the learners requiring special needs in education in regular school hence preparedness. The factors were examined guided by Lev Vygosky’s theory of Social Constructivism Learning Theory how training in special needs education, existence of policy on inclusive education, status of inclusive environment and teachers’ attitude towards inclusive education influences the implementation of inclusive education in lower grade primary schools. The study employed descriptive survey method where questionnaires, interviews schedules and observation checklists were used to collect data.

Findings revealed that there was small number of teachers who are trained in special needs education at (4% degree, 26% diploma) as compared to the number of schools implementing IE. Teachers were not trained in SNE before the advent of IE and some struggle with training as the programme is already running. The number of teachers attending seminars and workshops in special needs is limited per school and as a result only a few teachers mostly those who are already trained in special needs attend such
forum yet the presence of SNEL affects every teacher in regular school. The trained teachers are still transferred to schools without inclusive programme without considering their special training leaving the IE regular schools without a teacher to guide the programme, and in these schools where there are these teachers with special trainings in SNE, they are allocated the same number of subjects just like other teachers.

Teachers are not aware of existence of any policy that guides the services in inclusive schools. Only 6.7% of the schools carried out continuous assessment and the information they rely upon was from the family which do not suffice. There was no policy that guide on the qualification of administrators of primary schools conducting IE. Further other important sources of information like the psychological teacher and social worker who link the school and the child’s family were not involved by the administrators.

Classes were congested with many pupils ranging between 40-80 pupils without disability in a class and also SNEL with different types of disability were all served together in the same class by a single teacher during a lesson resulting to high ratio of teacher and learner. The teachers found it difficult controlling class because they were trained only in one area and situation was worse in schools where there were no trained teachers at all. The government’s fund towards IE was used for general development in regular schools and not to upgrade the inclusion environment. The ministry of education has not identified the teachers who further training in SNE and get posted in schools without teachers to run the programme. This is why in some schools whose many teachers have gone for training had more teachers while others had none at all.

A big number of teachers are still less concerned with IE and find it difficult fitting in a programme of IE especially handling challenge posed by individual needs. Majority of the
teachers (71%) in the mainstream schools have not accepted the IE rolled down to regular schools and are still in denial and developed negative attitude.

5.3 Conclusions

The study aimed to establish the influences of determinants of teachers’ preparedness towards the implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary schools in Awendo, Migori Kenya. Findings of the study revealed that the ministry of education has done very little towards preparing the teachers to implement inclusive education. Enough teachers have not been trained so that every school implementing IE get a teacher to guide the IE programme. The few trained teachers in SNE were slotted extra lessons without special consideration of the IE programme. Only 6.7% of the schools had conducted assessment but the information they rely upon was from the family which do not suffice. There was no policy that guides IDTS, qualification of administrators of primary schools hosting IE programme and transfer of teachers trained in special needs education.

The teachers found it difficult controlling classes because they were trained only in one area of special needs yet there were many pupils with different types of disability and situation was worse in schools where there were no trained teachers at all. The government’s fund towards IE was used for general development in regular schools and not to upgrade the inclusion environment. The ministry of education has not identified the teachers who train further in SNE and post in schools without trained teachers. A big number of teachers are still less concerned with IE and find it difficult fitting in a programme of IE especially handling challenge posed by individual needs. Majority of the teachers (71%) in the mainstream schools have not accepted the IE rolled down to regular schools and are still in denial and developed negative attitude.
5.4 Recommendations

Teachers’ preparedness is a key for successful inclusive education. This is because teachers are the primary implementers who work with the learners and spend more time with the learner who have special needs in education compared with other stakeholders of the inclusion education. In reference to the findings, the following recommendations were suggested as probable steps to enhance the teachers’ preparedness to implement inclusive education.

Special attention can be given to determinants of teachers’ preparedness to implement inclusion education. These special determinants include: A special mass training can be conducted to get enough teachers so that every school implementing IE get a teacher posted to guide the IE programme. Trained teachers in SNE managing IE in their schools should not be slotted extra lessons so that they give IE implementation all their energy. The government should constitute assessment team in primary schools to assess learners before admission. In this team the trained SNE teacher, psychological teacher and social worker must be included. There is need to constitute a policy that would guide qualification of administrators of primary schools hosting IE programme and transfer of teachers trained in special needs education.

There is need to come up with a policy that will ensure a programme I denoted as ‘Inclusion disability type specialization (IDTS)’ where a single primary school will include only learners with a given type of disability say ‘intellectually challenged’ and another of the schools ‘visually impaired’ and teachers trained in the same area posted together, a resource person employed so that through team spirit the competent teachers effectively include the learners and ensure they benefit fully. The Ministry of education to
identify the teachers who have trained further in SNE and post them in schools without trained teachers. On the same note the ministry can constitute a team of experts who will be in charge of the special education funds released by the government for inclusion education. There is need for sensitization programme to all the stakeholders of IE. This can be done in phases where phase one will be teachers and phase two is peers and the last phase is the child’s community.

5.4.1 Recommendations for Further Research

The current study was conducted in Awendo, Migori County and can be replicated in other counties in order to verify if similar or different trends exist in other counties. The study’s focus was mainly ‘Determinants of teacher’s preparedness towards implementation of inclusive education in the lower grade primary schools in Awendo, Migori County in relation to training in SNE, existence of policy on inclusive education, status of inclusive environment and teacher’s attitude towards inclusive education. However, similar research could be done in the upper grade primary. Another research could be done on effects of teacher’s preparedness towards competency of SNE learners. The study particularly focused on young disabled learners of between classes 1-3 school years, but attention could be directed to pre-school years. Further research need to be done to assess the implementation of the intervention strategies used to address labeling against children with disabilities in regular schools implementing IE. Finally, there need a research on the appropriate teaching methodology of a specific subject in inclusive schools for a given type of disability.
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APPENDIX I

INFORMED CONSENT

I am Clifford OWINO, a student at Kenyatta University pursuing Master’s degree in Early Childhood Studies. My research is entitled Teachers preparedness for implementation of inclusive education in lower primary schools in Awendo, Migori County, Kenya. Inclusive education refers to having children with disabilities learning together with the normal ones in the same environment i.e. sharing the same resources and facilities. Results from previous research show that the performance of a number of disabled pupils is negatively affected in secluded environment. The main objective of this research is to determine how prepared are our teachers in implementing inclusive education in the regular schools focusing in Awendo sub county. The information from this research may be of use to teachers who may gain an understanding on how to implement inclusive education policy in the mainstream schools. The information will also help the teaching fraternity to identify learners with disability and better able provide for their learning needs.

This research has been approved by Kenyatta University Graduate School Research Committee vide ref. letterE55/37375/2016…………dated23rd January 2018and permitted by NARCOSTI vide ref letter NARCOSTI/P/18/43865/21152 Dated 8th February 2018

Procedures to be followed:

Participation in this study is voluntary and will involve responding to questionnaires, taped oral interviews and observation checklist. You will sign a consent form to confirm participation. You will respond to the questions by marking with an X or a tick in the spaces provided. The information you give will be confidential. The interview will be conducted in a private setting within the school compound. Your name will not be
recorded on the observation checklist or interview guide. The identification tools and checklists will be kept locked for safe custody under a password accessible only to the researcher. The participant is free to withdraw from the study at any stage so long as he/she signs a withdrawal form to be provided.

**Benefits of the Respondent**

Respondent will benefit from the results the study will generate.

**Contact information:**

If you have any questions you may contact Dr, Rachel W. Kamau Kang’ethe on 0718722747 or Dr. Teresa B. Mwoma on 0726392781 or the Kenyatta University ethical review committee secretariat on kuerc@ku.ac.ke.

Clifford Otieno Owino, Student,

Department of Early Childhood and Special Needs Education

Kenyatta University

Box 43844 – 00100, Nairobi.

**Consenting Form**

1. I …………………………………………………………………confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I will be free to withdraw at any time, without giving reasons.

3. I agree to take part in the interview.

4. I agree to the interview being audio recorded.
5. I understand that the information I will give will be confidential.

Sign---------------------------------------- Date------------------------

Name of Researcher----------------------------------------

Sign---------------------------------- Date. ------------------------
APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER A: TEACHERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

Section 1: BIODATA OF RESPONDENT

1. School

2. Sex

3. Age in years

4. Highest level of training in SNE
   (i) Untrained
   (ii) P1
   (iii) Diploma
   (iv) B.ED
   (v) Others; specify

5. For how long have you taught as a SNE teacher?

6. For how long have you taught in this school as a SNE teacher?

Section 2: Rating of Preparedness

Teacher’s training in SNE

7. In your opinion, do you think the special unit in this school is operational? YES/NO. If No, proceed to Q9

8. If yes, what shows? Answer by circling the number/s
   (i) Presence of SNE pupils
   (ii) Presence of relevant facilities
   (iii) Presence of SNE teacher/s
   (iv) Availability of adequate funding
   (v) Administrative support

9. Have you attended any training in SNE? YES/NO. If no, proceed to Q14

10. If Yes, at what level

11. In which year did you attend the last training in SNE?

12. Has the level of your training helped improve the teaching learning process in your class? Yes/No. If no, proceed to Q14

13. If yes, rate the improvement
   (i) Below average
   (ii) Average
   (iii) Above average

14. In the inclusive class, do you apply specific methods? Yes/No. If no proceed to Q17
15. If yes, which ones?
   (i) Pairing
   (ii) grouping
   (iii) IEP
   (iv) Adaptation
   (v) Others; specify-------------------------------

16. How appropriate is the specific method/s you have circled in Q15
   (i) Pairing: Always--------. Sometimes………. Never---------
   (ii) Grouping: Always---------Sometimes-------Never--------
   (iii) IEP: Always---------Sometimes-------Never--------
   (iv) Adaptation: Always---------Sometimes-------Never--------
   (v) Others: Always---------Sometimes-------Never--------

17. Do you make relevant preparations for this special class? Yes/No

18. Is the use of teaching learning materials part of your preparations? Yes/No If no, proceed to Q20

19. If yes, how, in your opinion, does it influence the teaching learning process?
   (i) High influence
   (ii) Moderate influence
   (iii) Low influence
   (iv) No influence

20. From your own experience, how would you rate the competency of SNE learners placed in mainstream schools?
   (i) Above average
   (ii) Average
   (iii) Below average

21. Comment on your response to Q 20-----------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------

22. Is teacher training also a contributing factor to your response in Q 20? Yes/No. If No, proceed to Q24

23. If yes, how would you rate your response?
   (i) Strongly agree
   (ii) Agree
   (iii) Disagree
   (iv) Strongly disagree

Existence of policy on inclusive education
24. What reference of inclusive education in Kenya do you know?------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Since your arrival in this school as an SNE teacher, how many disabled children have been admitted? -----------------------------
25. Have you ever been involved in the admission of disabled pupils? Yes/No. If No proceed to Q30
26. If yes, which of the following procedure do you use during admission?
   (i) Assessment
   (ii) No assessment
   (iii) Pupils walk into school un-introduced.
27. If assessment is carried out, what do you look at?
   (i) __________________________________________
   (ii) __________________________________________
   (iii) __________________________________________
28. A part from the school’s assessment during admission how often do you assess the SNE pupils in class?
   (i) Always
   (ii) Sometimes
   (iii) Not at all
29. If any assessment is done in class, where from would you get information to assist in further identification?
30. Since you became SNE teacher has/have any SNE pupil/s repeated a class? Yes/No. If No, proceed to Q33
31. If YES, what was the cause?
   (i) School policy
   (ii) Decision by parent
   (iii) The pupil/s decided to
32. In your experience with the SNE pupils, have you ever faced challenges? Yes/No If No, proceed to Q36
33. If YES, name 4 of the challenges?
   (i) __________________________________________
   (ii) __________________________________________
   (iii) __________________________________________
   (iv) __________________________________________
34. How do you address the challenges listed________________________________________
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Status of Inclusive environment

35. The following are common characteristics/types of disability of SNE pupils, which ones have you encountered in the school/class?

(i) Learning disability
(ii) Attention deficit disorder
(iii) Poor motor ability
(iv) Physical disability
(v) Processing problem
(vi) Oral language disorder
(vii) Reading disability
(viii) Written language problem
(ix) Mathematics disability
(x) Blindness/Low vision
(xi) Spoken language disorder.

36. How often do learners with and without disabilities interact in school/class?

(i) Always
(ii) Rarely
(iii) Not at all

37. If there is interaction, what is the possible cause?

(i) External influence e.g. teacher/s, resource persons etc
(ii) Pupils self initiated interaction.

38. If there is no relationship, what reason/s would you give? -----------------------------

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

39. In your opinion, do you think the Government is funding the inclusive education program in this school? Yes/No. If No, proceed to Q44

40. If yes, are the relevant facilities/resources for teaching and learning in place?

Yes/No. If No, proceed to Q44

41. If yes, which resources?

(i) Braille materials
(ii) Books with large prints
(iii) Acoustic aids and walls for use by deaf learners
(iv) Hearing morphs
(v) Audio books
(vi) Computers with assistive devises
(vii) Adequate SNE trained teachers
(viii) Adequate readers/study assistants
(ix) Safety pampers
42. If yes, which facilities?
   (i) Pavement assessable to the SNE learners
   (ii) Adapted toilets
   (iii) Suitable transport System
   (iv) Spacious classrooms.

43. If yes, is the number of the ones you have listed adequate? Yes/No

44. Indicate the method/s you usually apply in teaching the inclusive class
   (i) Whole class
   (ii) Grouping
   (iii) Individual education program.
   (iv) Peer tutoring
   (v) Assignment.
   (vi) Others, specify

45. From the answer/s given in Q 45, how effective is/are the method/s
   (i) Most effective
   (ii) More effective
   (iii) Less effective
   (iv) Not effective

46. How do you create an all inclusive environment

47. Does the environment created support learning in the inclusive class? Yes/No. *If No, proceed to Q49

48. If yes, how do you usually assess your success?  

49. In your opinion express your take on inclusive education, is it relevant in regular schools? Yes/No. *If No, proceed to Q51

50. If yes, why?

51. It is said that learners with disabilities usually have emotional and behavior disorder. Do you agree with this statement?
   (i) Strongly agree
   (ii) Agree
   (iii) Disagree
52. If agree, give at least 4 different actions you take to counteract the behavior.
   (i) __________________________
   (ii) __________________________
   (iii) __________________________
   (iv) __________________________

53. How would you rate the ability of learners with disabilities in inclusive schools?
   (i) Very high.
   (ii) High
   (iii) Low
   (iv) Very low

54. If at least high, what in your opinion, is/are the reason/s?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

55. If low, what in your opinion is/are the reason/s?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

56. What disciplinary action do you usually take on disabled learners when found in mistake/s?
   (i) Suspended for a period
   (ii) Sent out of class for a period
   (iii) Given work to do
   (iv) Mistake ignored
   (v) Others, specify______________________________

57. How effective is the disciplinary action usually taken?
   (i) Very effective
   (ii) Effective
   (iii) Little effective.
   (iv) Not effective

58. Are there teachers in this school who have developed interest in training in special needs education? Yes/No/Don’t know

59. If yes, how many? ____________________________

Any Comment_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________

Date Response was obtained. ____________________________
QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER B: HEAD-TEACHER’S QUESTIONNAIRE

Bio data of the respondents

1. For how many years have you been in teaching profession?  

2. For how many years have you been a head teacher?  

3. For how long have you been in this school as a head teacher?  

4. There is SNE program in this school, when was it started?  

Training in SNE

5. When was the first trained SNE teacher posted to this school?  

6. How many trained SNE teachers are currently in this school?  

7. Did yourself trained as SNE teacher? Yes/No. If No, proceed to Q9  

8. If yes to what level of qualification were you trained?  
   (i) Certificate  
   (ii) Diploma  
   (iii) Degree  
   (iv) Any other, specify  

9. Have you attended any seminar/workshop on SNE in the last one year? Yes/NO. If No, proceed to Q11.  

10. If yes, have you ever had a chance to implement the knowledge acquired in the seminar/workshop you attended?. Yes/No. If No, proceed to Q18  

11. If answer to Q9 is No, why?  

---------------------------------------------  

---------------------------------------------  

---------------------------------------------
12. Has any teacher/s form this school attended an SNE seminar/workshop in the last one year? Yes/No. *If No, proceed to Q18*

13. If yes, was the knowledge acquired implemented? Yes/No. *If No, proceed to Q18*

14. If yes, was the knowledge implemented effective? Yes/No

15. If the answer to Q14 is no, why? -------------------------------------

16. If the answers to Q10 and Q14 are yes, how effective were the results?
   (i) Very effective
   (ii) Effective
   (iii) Less effective
   (iv) Not effective

17. If the answers to Q9 and Q12 are yes, who sponsored both you and the teacher to the seminar/workshop? -------------------------------------

   **Existence of policy on inclusive education**

17. Does the school have inclusive education open day. The disabled in the institution?
   Yes/No. *If No, proceed to Q20*

18. If yes how effective is it to the implementation of inclusive education in the school?
   (i) Highly effective
   (ii) Effective
   (iii) Less effective
   (iv) Not effective.
19. Before the advent of SNE program in this school, was there a training to prepare teachers on how the program would be implemented? Yes/No

20. Does the school have a copy of the policy guidelines relevant to the implementation of inclusive education in the country? Yes/No

21. Are teachers of SNE, including the headship, involved in formulation of policy governing inclusive education in this school? Yes/No. If No proceed to Q24

22. If yes, do you face challenges in the implementation of the policies you happen to formulate on inclusive education? Yes/No

23. How do you manage inclusive education in this school?

24. How do you appreciate members of the team assisting you in implementing inclusive education in this school?

25. The National government usually funds inclusive education program in schools with special units like this one, how many times has the school received the funding during your tenure as head teacher here?

26. What developments relevant to inclusive education have you realized in this school using the funding?
27. Do the SNE teachers in this school directly or indirectly benefit from the funding? Yes/No. If No, proceed to Q30

28. If yes, what benefit---------------------------------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------------------------

29. If the answer to Q28 is no, why not?--------------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Teacher’s attitude towards inclusive education

30. How would you describe the willingness of your SNE teachers to teach the pupils of inclusive education class?

   (i) Highly willing
   (ii) Willing
   (iii) Not willing

31. If not willing, what is the possible reason? --------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------------------------------------

32. How would you gauge the competency of learners with disabilities in this school?

   (i) High
   (ii) Average
   (iii) Low
33. It is said that inclusive program negatively affect the normal running of the schools. How do you agree with this argument?

(I) Strongly agree

(II) Agree

(III) Disagree

(IV) Strongly disagree

34. If at least you agree how does the inclusive program negatively affect the normal running of the implementing schools?---------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Any further comment -----------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Date response was obtained -----------------------------------
APPENDIX III
INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

NUMBER A: TEACHERS’ INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1 (A) What is inclusive education?

(B) Do you think training in special needs education has any relevance to inclusive education in your school?

2. In your opinion is the funding to support SNE in this school adequate and appropriately used? Yes/No

3. How does this environment influence the learning of pupils with special needs?

4. In this school, are the facilities required for the provision of services to persons with disability available? Yes/No. If No proceed to Q7

5. If yes, are they adequate and in good condition? Yes/No

6. What support do you expect from the stake holders mainly government and school administration to enable you perform more effectively?
7. Please comment on teacher-pupil or pupil-pupil relationship as far as inclusive education is concerned in your school—-----------------------------------------------

8. In your opinion what are some of the ways your school applies to ensure persons with disability interact with the community? -----------------------------------------------

9. What is your area of specialization as far as special needs education is concerned? ------

10. List the various types of disabilities that you have encountered during your practice as a SNE teacher? -----------------------------------------------

11. What comment would you give on the government’s decision to incorporate inclusive education in the regular schools -----------------------------------------------

12. From your experience what would be your advice to parents who wish to take their disabled children to schools with inclusive education program? -----------------------------------------------

Date response was obtained -----------------------------------------------
NUMBER B: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SCHOOL HEADS

1. What are some of the steps that are put in place to ensure that disability is mainstreamed in your school?

2. What is the procedure of admission in this school for the learners with disabilities?

3. Have your teachers who are not trained on SNE approached you requesting to be considered for training in the same? Yes/No

4. Do you usually hold in house meeting to bring none SNE teachers on disability development issues? Yes /No

5. In your opinion, which program benefits pupils with disability more than the other, inclusive education or special school?

6. How would you asses to identify special needs in a learner?

7. What strategies has the school put in place to ensure teacher-child relationship and child-child relationship is strengthened?

8. Do you have stipend for teachers who implement inclusive education in your school? ---

9. What is the teacher-disabled learner ratio per class in your school?

10. With reference to the ratio, how effective is the learning?

11. Please give your opinion on the future of inclusive education program in your school---

Date response was obtained
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NUMBER C: INTERVIEW SCHEDULES FOR EDUCATION OFFICER.

1. In your view as an educationist, what was the main aim of introducing special units in regular schools? ____________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

2. Were all schools in the sub county earlier earmarked for introduction of inclusive education implementing the program? Yes/No

3. Please comment on the functionality of the special units within the sub county. ------
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

4. What preparations did this office make before the introduction of inclusive education program in the schools? ________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

5. Does the office of the sub county Director of education organize seminars/workshops for SNE teachers? Yes /No If No proceed to Q8

6. If yes, how often? _________________________________________________________

7. If yes who sponsors the activity? ____________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

8. If No, why not? _____________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
9. Do you face challenges related to the management of inclusive education programs in regular schools? 

10. Are you satisfied with the implementation of inclusive education program in the schools? Yes/No

11. Do you think there is a conducive environment in schools providing inclusive education program? Yes/No

12. In your view are there some areas that need to be improved for proper implementation of inclusive education? Yes/No *If No proceed to Q15*

13. If yes, which ones?

14. If it is yes for question 12, who is responsible for the improvements?

15. What would you comment about your head-teachers’ readiness to implement inclusive education? 

16. Any other comment

Thank you for participating in this study.

*Date response was obtained*
# APPENDIX IV

## OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of learners with disabilities in the class</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of responsibility</td>
<td>Full delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Head prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most common forms of punishment</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of reward system</td>
<td>Large extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Disabilities in a single class</strong></td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectually challenged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical space resources</strong></td>
<td>Present and in good working condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braille materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadgets for use by deaf students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers with assistive devices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks-----------------------------------
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APPENDIX V: THE MAP OF AWENDO CONSTITUENCY SHOWING ITS DIVISIONS IN WARDS
## APPENDIX VI: WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing the proposal</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>February-July, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting the proposal at the department</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>September, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>October, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to graduate school and the application for research permit</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>November, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting and revision of instruments</td>
<td>2 Weeks</td>
<td>February, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>March-April, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing of thesis</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>May-August, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis presentation</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>September, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defending the thesis</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>February, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final correction of the thesis</td>
<td>3-5 months</td>
<td>February-July, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>August, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX VII: PROPOSED BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Unit of supply</th>
<th>Units required</th>
<th>Cost per Unit (ksh)</th>
<th>Total Cost (ksh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Lap top</td>
<td>Pc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Talk back phone</td>
<td>Pc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td>Pc</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Lunch Allowances for 2 field Assistants</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Travel Allowance for 2 F/Assistants</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Travelling Allowance for researcher</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Lunch Allowance for researcher</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Typing</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Photocopy</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Pc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Copies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>20000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pens</td>
<td>Dozen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Field note books</td>
<td>Pieces</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lunch Allowance for guide</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Travel Allowance for Guide</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>203670</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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You may now proceed with your Data collection, subject to clearance with the Director Ethics Office and the Director General, National Commission for Science, Technology & Innovation.
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Dear Sir/Madam,


I write to introduce Mr. Clifford Otieno Owino who is a Postgraduate Student of this University. He is registered for M.Ed degree programme in the Department of Early Childhood Education.

Mr. Owino intends to conduct research for a M.Ed Proposal entitled, "Assessment of Teachers' Preparedness on the Implementation of Inclusive Education in Lower Primary Schools in Awendo, Migori, Kenya".
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Clifford Otieno Owino
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Following your application for authority to carry out research on “Assessment of teachers’ preparedness on the implementation of inclusive education in lower primary schools in Awendo, Migori Kenya,” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Migori County for the period ending 8th February, 2019.

You are advised to report to the County Commissioner and the County Director of Education, Migori County before embarking on the research project.

Kindly note that, as an applicant who has been licensed under the Science, Technology and Innovation Act, 2013 to conduct research in Kenya, you shall deposit a copy of the final research report to the Commission within one year of completion. The soft copy of the same should be submitted through the Online Research Information System.
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