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ABSTRACT

An estimated 10% of the World’s population is disabled and children form a big fraction of this number. Approximately 80% of persons with disabilities reside in isolated areas in developing countries especially in slum and informal settlements in cities and in poor households in rural areas. While some of these countries have made progress towards achieving universal primary education (UPE) by 2015, children with disabilities have not achieved optimal access to education; their enrollment rate is still low. The few that enroll in primary schools are not able to move to secondary schools after primary education due to such hindrances as high cost and entry criteria among other factors. The purpose of this study was to investigate what hinders learners with disabilities from accessing secondary education and how these hindrances can be addressed so that optimal access to secondary education for these learners will be achieved. The objectives of the study were to investigate whether children with disabilities from the primary cycle in Kisii District are able to move to secondary schools or not and what hinders those who do not access secondary education with the aim of suggesting strategies that may be employed to enhance their access to secondary education. A survey research design was used to find out the level of access to secondary education and the hindrances to access. The target population was 21327 learners and 764 teachers drawn from 3 special schools, 17 special units, and 60 public secondary schools in the district. 32 Ministry of Education officials from the district were also studied. Questionnaires, interview schedules and observation check lists were used as instruments to collect data. Data was analysed using descriptive statistics like frequencies and percentages by use of the SPSS computer package. The collected data was presented inform of tables and pie charts. The study established that enrollment of learners with disabilities was still low in the district with most secondary schools recording less than three learners and the total district enrollment standing at below 1500 learners both in primary and secondary schools. The major hindrances of access were said to be: limited number of accommodative schools, inadequate special education teachers in existing schools, poverty and financial hardships and discrimination arising from retrogressive culture. The suggested strategies to enhance access were identified as: modification of existing schools to make them accessible and accommodative to learners with disabilities, training and in- servicing teachers on special education and community sensitization to eliminate the stigma attached to persons with disabilities.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction
This chapter contains the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose and objectives of the study and research questions. It also contains limitations and delimitations of the study, theoretical and conceptual framework as well as definition of central terms as used in the study.

1.1 Background to the Study
According to the World Health Organization (W.H.O) about 10% of the world’s population is disabled (Grol, 2000). An estimated 80% of this, with 150 million of them children, lives in developing countries. While some of these countries have made progress towards achieving Universal Primary Education (UPE) by 2013, about 47 million still remain out of school. One –third of this is estimated to be disabled (Munoz, 2007), an indication that exclusion of Children with Disabilities (CWD) from education begins from the very basic levels of education. Only 2% of individuals with disabilities in developing countries receive any form of special services (Eleweke & Rodda, 2002). Despite the free education many African governments now provide, disabled children are rarely considered and the support and facilities they need to access education are seldom provided (UNESCO, 2010).
In Kenya, persons with disabilities are a crucial sector of the marginalized population (Mulama, Mutua, Dimitrov 2001; Oriedo 2003). The total number of persons with disabilities is not substantiated but according to the census statistics of 2009 (KNBS, 2010) the population of people with disabilities in Kenya is about 1.3 million accounting for more than 3.5% of the total population. However, it should be noted that statistics give this as a conservative figure owing to the fact that only traditional areas of disability were considered (physical, mental, visual and hearing impairments) and only ‘conventional households’ were asked this question (Mugo & Oranga, 2010).

Enrollment rate in schools for learners with disabilities is still low in spite of efforts from all stakeholders in the provision of education to improve it. Even for those who enroll in primary schools, completion and transition to secondary schools is very low compared with other children who are not disabled (Mukuria and Obiakor, 2006; KNHCR, 2007) as shown in the tables below:

Table 1.1 – Primary to Secondary Transition Rates 2002-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year In Std. 8</th>
<th>Year In Form I</th>
<th>Enrol. In Std.8 ‘000</th>
<th>Enrol. In Form I ‘000</th>
<th>% Transition to Form I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>541.1</td>
<td>251.1</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>548.3</td>
<td>251.2</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>657.7</td>
<td>368.3</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>643.7</td>
<td>368.7</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>704.9</td>
<td>420.5</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics and EMIS Section, MOE (2010)
It can be observed from the Table 1.1 that transition rates from primary to secondary has been on the increase over the years. Transition rates for learners with disabilities (LWD) have not yet been measured but looking at the enrollment in primary schools compared with that in secondary schools as shown in table 1.2 it is clear that most CWD who enroll in primary schools do not move to secondary schools since enrollment in secondary schools is far too low in all the years shown.

Table 1.2 – Enrollment in SNE Institutions by Category, 2002-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Primary</td>
<td>12,511</td>
<td>13,303</td>
<td>35,211</td>
<td>37,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Secondary</td>
<td>3,864</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td>10,028</td>
<td>10,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Tech./Voc.</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>3,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Units</td>
<td>67,106</td>
<td>73,121</td>
<td>159,872</td>
<td>171,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>84,66</strong></td>
<td><strong>91,770</strong></td>
<td><strong>207,761</strong></td>
<td><strong>221,995</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Special Education Section Ministry of Education (2010)

Similarly, from table 1.2, it is notable that the highest growth of enrollment of children with disability was realized in the regular primary schools (integrated units) where the enrollment grew from 73,121 in 2003 to 159,872 in 2007 (a growth of over 118%). However this growth rate slowed down between 2007 and 2008 to about 7%. The earlier rapid increase (between 2003 and 2007) could be attributed to the introduction of free primary education (FPE) in January 2003. However a study by UNESCO in 2005 established that 5% of the re-enrolled
children had dropped out by 2004, which may explain reasons for the slackened growth between 2007 and 2008 (Mugo & Oranga, 2010).

Examining school transition in this set up, it is notable that the total enrollment for children with disabilities in 2003 was 86,424 for both special primary and integrated units and 3,984 for special secondary schools. With 8 years in primary and 4 years in secondary, it indicates that only less than 10% of learners completing primary schools could transit to secondary schools during the years in question.

A certain hidden discrimination seems evident in the Kenyan education system. For instance, the MOE statistics indicated that the number of institutions offering education services to children with special needs (the disabled included) had increased from 926 in 2002 to 1,574 in 2008 (MOE, 2009). The enrollment of children with special needs peaked at 218,950 in 2008. However 78% of this (170,781) were in Nairobi, and the other 22% spread among the other 7 provinces then (Mugo & Oranga, 2010).

Inequitable access to education for LWD was also noted by the NASMLA study in 2009 (KNEC, 2010) decrying especially low access rates in the then North Eastern Province. This indicates that, while progress may have been made at the national level, this applies more to urban settings, while many young persons in
the rural areas and far flung areas may be falling off through the cracks (Mugo and Oranga, 2010).

This situation of exclusion from education seems to be the trend not only in Kenya but throughout the globe. In Sri Lanka for example, despite a long history of special education, less than half of all school-aged children with disabilities benefit from education services. Non-school-going disabled children report disability as the main reason for not attending school (UNICEF, 2003). Further a 2011 UNICEF study undertaken in Madagascar found that on average only 11% of children with disabilities attend primary school. In South Africa only approximately 20% of potential eligible students have places in schools leaving others unaccounted for. Further inequalities exist on the basis of geographical location with the highest numbers of excluded children coming from slums and informal settlements at the edge of cities and rural marginalized and poverty stricken areas (Department of Education, 2001).

The scope and extent of this exclusion from education raises enormous concern. Limited access to education for LWD has generally been attributed to such hindrances as policy and system factors, social and community factors, and school factors. Policy and system factors include; lack of specific policy on education of children with disabilities, poor resource allocations, limited training of teachers working with disabled children and poor school support services (Results UK,
2010). Social and community factors include; social stigma and negative parental attitudes to disability, parental resistance to education for special groups especially to general schools and cost of uniform and transport (UNESCO, 2009). School factors on the other hand include; low school budgets hence lack of appropriate facilities, inaccessible school buildings, high pupil to teachers ratio, inadequate Special Needs Education (SNE) skills among teachers and school staff.

The biggest challenge over time has been the lack of reliable data and information about number of persons with disability, types and incidence of disability. The South Africa department of education (2000) points out that the available data on persons with disabilities vary widely and are frequently unreliable largely due to the historic failure to mainstream disability into government statistical processes.

Grol (2000) observes that in theory many African countries show interest in the education of pupils with special education needs but they fail to convert this theory onto practice due to lack of money, ineffective legislation and policies. Traditional and cultural attitudes towards disability alongside lack of adequate expertise to handle these learners has been identified as barriers to education of learners with disabilities.
Some interventions have however been put in place both at the international, regional and national fronts to arrest this situation of limited access to education for persons with disabilities. These can be said to have begun around 1948 with the UN Declaration of Human Rights with the declaration that everybody has a right to free education especially at the fundamental stages. In 1989 the UN Convention on the Right of the Child declared that all children have a right to a free education which should develop each child’s personality, talents and abilities to the fullest. This was followed by the World Declaration on Education for All (EFA) at Jomtien in 1990 which placed an obligation on governments to offer basic education to all children, youth and adults to reduce disparities (DCID, 2010).

The 1993 UN Standard Rules on Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities emphasized that states should recognize the principle of equal primary, secondary and tertiary educational opportunities for children, youth and adults with disabilities in integrated settings. Additionally the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action (1994), Millennium Development Goals (2000), and the World Education Forum for Action, Darkar (2000), all re-stated the need to reach the marginalized groups especially the disabled. The EFA Flagship on the Right to Education for Persons with Disabilities (2001) and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2007) further
emphasizes the need to ensure that persons with disabilities access education (DCID, 2010).

The government of Kenya is committed to the protection and provision of equal opportunities to persons with disabilities. The Ministry of Education has developed a number of policy guidelines on SNE. These includes; the Committee on Care and Rehabilitation of the Disabled (1964), the Ominde Commission (1964) which recommended that children with mild disabilities be integrated in regular schools. The Gachathi report of 1976 made a number of recommendations on SNE including; coordination of early interventions and assessment of children with special needs, creation of public awareness on causes of disabilities, establishment of ECDE programmes as part of special schools, research to determine extent and nature of handicaps for provision of SNE and development of policy of integration for LWD (MOE, 2008).

The Kamunge report of 1988 emphasized deployment of SNE inspectors at the district level, the Koech Report (1999) recommended the establishment of a National Special Education Advisory Board while the Taskforce on Special Needs Education (2003) recommended establishment of a SNE policy and a census to be conducted to establish the number and types of disabilities both in and out of school. Finally the government, in response to the Kochung report (2003)
formulated the Special Education Policy in 2008 which serves to harmonise education services provision for learners with disabilities (MOE, 2008).

Besides these policies the government has enacted various pieces of legislation to enforce and guide provision of education services to persons with disabilities. These include; Children Act (2001), Persons with Disability Act (2003) and Sessional Paper No.1 of 2005. The government has also established EARCs in most districts, special schools and units within regular schools. Training of teachers is done at KISE, Maseno and Kenyatta universities (MOE, 2008).

Even with all the above intervention in place enrollment for persons with disability is still low (MOE, 2009). Data on children with disabilities not enrolled in schools is still lacking. Besides, there seems to be no clear policy on transition of LWD from the primary cycle to secondary level. This study therefore sought to investigate if indeed the learners with disabilities who join primary schools in Kisii were able to move to secondary schools. The study further investigated what hinders the transition of those who never enroll in secondary schools. This was aimed at coming up with strategies that could harness their access and participation in secondary education.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

There are efforts from all stakeholders in the provision of education, particularly the governments of Kenya, to ensure LWD access education especially basic education. These include introduction of FPE in 2003, free tuition in secondary schools in 2008 and favorable policy and legal framework to name but a few. This however has not significantly changed the situation for learners with disabilities since their enrollment especially in secondary schools is still low. Besides this, limited studies have been conducted to establish the numbers of CWD excluded from education provision and even to establish levels of transition of the few that are enrolled in primary schools to secondary education. In view of this, the study sought to establish if LWD are able to access secondary education, what hinders those who do not and what may be done to ensure that most of those enrolled in primary schools are able to access secondary education.

1.2.1 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate if LWD are able to access secondary education, what hinders those who do not, from joining secondary schools and what may be done to enhance their access to secondary education in Kisii County.
1.3 Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of the study were:

a) To establish the level of enrollment of LWD in secondary schools in Kisii district.

b) Investigate factors hindering full access to secondary education for LWD in Kisii District.

c) Propose strategies that may be employed to enhance optimal access to secondary education for LWD in Kisii district.

1.4 Research Questions

The study was guided by the following questions;

a) What is the enrollment level of LWD in secondary schools in Kisii district?

b) What are the factors hindering access to secondary education for LWD in Kisii district?

c) What are the strategies that could be used to enhance access to secondary education for LWD?

1.5 Significance of the Study

Findings of the study were expected to contribute immensely both on the theoretical and practical aspects of education for LWD in secondary schools.
Theoretically, the study was expected to contribute to the knowledge base on the status of LWD with regard to levels of access to secondary education. It equally was to shade light on factors that hinder access to education for LWD. Practically it was expected that the study would come up with strategies that may be employed to correct the situation of low access to secondary education for LWD. This was to be of immediate importance to the government through the MOE as the study was to identify areas of concern which in turn the ministry may need to address.

Teachers and school administrators were also expected to find the study findings significant since the study was expected to address in-school factors that may improve access of learners with disabilities.

By and large the study was expected to come up with findings that could enable all the stakeholders in the provision of education to disabled learners contribute towards ensuring and achieving access to secondary education for LWD by removing all barriers to accessing education.

1.6. Limitations of the Study

The following were the limitations of the study;

a) The study limited itself to only three divisions of Kisii central district.
For a more conclusive result, all the four divisions should have been studied. This was however not possible due to financial and other logistical constraints like time.

b) Opinions of parents especially those with CWD and other stakeholders were not covered because tracing them required extra time, resources and other logistics.

c) There was limited data on learners with disabilities and their access and transition rates to secondary schools.

1.7 Delimitations of the Study

The study confined itself to primary schools offering SNE, general public secondary schools, and the district EARC. These are the institutions directly charged with the responsibility of offering education to all learners including those with disabilities.

Second, secondary school teachers and students on session at the time of study were included to determine their level of preparedness to work with LWD. They were also to shed light on features in their school that either hindered or facilitated access and also if there were CWD excluded from the school system.

The heads of special schools / units and secondary school principals were included in the study to shed light on whether their schools encouraged access and
transition of CWD from primary schools to secondary schools and weather there was full transition of LWD from primary to secondary schools.

1.8 Assumption of the Study

In the study it was assumed that optimal access to secondary education for learners with disabilities had not been achieved in Kisii District.

1.9 Theoretical Framework and Conceptual Framework

1.9.1 Theoretical Framework

The study was guided by the classical liberal Theory of Equal opportunities and Social Darwinism Theory. According to Bannister (1989), liberalism is a policy that considers individual liberty and equality as the most important goals; it emphasizes individual rights and equality of opportunity. Liberal theories support provision of basic rights to all and seek to avoid discriminating (Dorrien, 2001). Procedural liberalism allows individuals to pursue their own vision of life within the framework of the state law. Wolfe (2009) observes that classical liberalism emphasizes the individual and says that society must be arranged to allow the individual to live a good life in the way that he chooses. It therefore follows that, deliberate steps must be taken by the society (stakeholders in the provision of education in this case) to ‘arrange education to be accessible for all learners, those with disabilities included.
Opportunity for all individuals is the main concern of the classical liberal theory. Individuals are born with abilities, talents and given amount of capacity which to a large extent is inherited and cannot be substantially changed. Thus educational systems should be designed so as to remove any barriers that prevent LWD from taking advantage of their inborn talents through education (Orodho 2004).

The Social Darwinism Theory proposes the application of the theory of Natural Selection to social, political and economic issues (Bannister, 1989). This theory follows the mantra ‘the strongest survive’ and is used to promote the idea that social policy should allow the weak and unfit to fail and die (BCOOP, 2002-3). This study will borrow heavily from Darwin’s theory of Natural Selection which argues that:

- Resources of an environment are limited and therefore members of species must compete for limited resources and for survival,
- Members within a species are not exactly alike; each contains individual combination of inherited traits, some of which are useful while others are not.
- Organisms without useful traits eventually die off. The fittest survive.

From the above observations it is imperative that, opportunities for the disabled to improve their lot through education must be sought in earnest.
This is true, particularly due to the fact that, the disabled have traits that do not allow them compete fairly with their peers who are not disabled because they have inherited these unfavorable ‘traits’. Wolfe (2009) argues that societies can use the classical liberal theory to prioritize the disadvantaged (those with disability in this case) in forming social policy while allowing the competent (not disabled) to work their way to the top.

These theories guided this study in the sense that it was recognized that disabled learners risked ‘extinction’ from the education system if deliberate measures and strategies are not put in place to assure them equal opportunity of access and participation. These strategies should be able to embrace the fact that learners with disabilities are individuals with different abilities, needs and capacities. Whatever strategies that is to be employed should therefore seek to open chances for each and every disabled child according to their status without necessarily leaving out those that are not disabled.
1.9.2 Conceptual Framework

The researcher conceptualized the study as captured in the figure below.

*Fig.1.1: Conceptual Framework*

From the above figure learners with disabilities are either accessible to secondary education or not. For those who have been able to access secondary education...
certain factors have facilitated this situation. These include: financial aid, capacity building in communities and households, provision of assistive resources and presence of accommodative schools. Those who have not been able to access secondary education on the other hand are in this state due to such hindrances as: inadequate accommodative schools, lack of assistive resources e.g. Braille for the blind, stigma from the society and lack of basic infrastructure (World Vision, 2005). If these hindrances were addressed by strategies that counter their effect such as capacity building for households and communities with disabled children, putting in place a friendly school environment, provision of assistive resources and inclusive education, perhaps more learners would enroll in secondary schools; more will be able to participate in learning activities and eventually graduate to post-secondary institutions.
1.10. Operational Definition of Terms

**Access** – A situation where it is possible for LWD to go to schools. Achieved when LWD are able to overcome such barriers to education like financial, physical and social cultural barriers.

**Assistive devices**- this are instruments or tools that are used to increase functionality for persons with disabilities in such areas as mobility, communication, hearing and seeing.

**Disability** – include but not limited to hearing impairments, visual impairments, multiple disability, physical impairments behavioral and communication problems.

**Inclusion**- refers to changing of attitudes and environments to meet the diverse needs and to facilitate participation of persons with disabilities on equal basis with others in society.

**Inclusive education**- refers to schools and centers of learning and education systems that are open to all children including those with disabilities. It requires sourcing, planning and organizing the learning environment to eliminate all barriers to learning and participation of learners with disabilities.
**Learners with disabilities**- these are those learners with various challenges such as hearing, visual and physical impairments and communication problems.

**Participation** – being involved in day-to-day learning activities like attending lessons, examinations and co-curricular activities. It eventually leads to graduation from a given level of schooling.

**Secondary education**- a level of education offered after pupils have graduated from the primary cycle. It is from this level that learners are placed to middle level colleges and universities from where they pursue various careers that provide opportunities in the job market.

**Special needs Education** – Geared towards the unique needs of LWD. It is usually learner centered.

**Special school**- a school which is organized to exclusively provide education services to learners with disabilities.

**Special units**- a class within an ordinary mainstream school which offers special needs education.
CHAPTER TWO:
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter highlighted the state of LWD in terms of their level of access to education from the international, regional and national fronts. It also addressed the barriers that LWD face and the interventions that have so far been put in place to arrest these barriers. Finally the chapter identified the gaps that emanated from the reviewed literature which in turn justified the need to conduct this study.

2.2 Level of Access to Education by Learners with Disabilities
Disability may be the single most important factor excluding children from schooling (Peters, 2003). An estimated 40 million of the 115 million children out of school have disabilities (World Bank, 2003). The W.H.O estimates that about 80% of the World’s persons with disabilities live in developing countries (Oriedo, 2003) with 150 million of these, children.

In Sri Lanka, despite a long history of special education, less than half of all school-aged children with disabilities benefit from education services. Non-school-going disabled children report disability as the main reason for not attending school (UNICEF, 2003). Further a 2011 UNICEF study undertaken in Madagascar found that on average only 11% of children with disabilities attend primary school. In South Africa only approximately 20% of potential eligible
students have places in schools leaving others unaccounted for. Besides inequalities exist on the basis of geographical location with the highest numbers of excluded children coming from slums and informal settlements at the edge of cities and rural marginalized and poverty stricken rural areas (Department of Education 2001).

In Kenya, according to the national survey on disability from 2008, about 4.6% persons have a disability. The SIDA funded DRPI report from 2007 on the rights of persons with disabilities in Kenya on the other hand estimates that about 10% of the population or about 3,280,000 persons are living with a disability. Approximately 80% or 1.4 million live in slum areas, informal settlements at the edge of cities or under very poor conditions in rural areas (KNCHR, 2007).

It is worthy noting that the highest growth of enrollment of children with disability in Kenya was realized in regular primary schools (integrated units) where the enrollment grew from 73,121 in 2003 to 159,872 in 2007 (a growth of over 118%). However this growth rate slowed down between 2007 and 2008 to about 7%. The earlier rapid increase (between 2003 and 2007) could be attributed to the introduction of free primary education (FPE) in January 2003. However a study by UNESCO in 2005 established that 5% of the re-enrolled children had dropped out by 2004, which may explain reasons for the slackened growth between 2007 and 2008 (Mugo & Oranga, 2010).
Examining school transition in this set up, it is notable that the total enrollment for children with disabilities in 2003 was 86,424 for both special primary and integrated units and 3,984 for special secondary schools. With 8 years in primary and 4 years in secondary, it indicates that only less than 10% of learners completing primary schools could transit to secondary schools during the years in question.

A certain hidden discrimination seems evident in the Kenyan education system. For instance, the MOE statistics indicated that the number of institutions offering education services to children with special needs (the disabled included) had increased from 926 in 2002 to 1574 in 2008 (MOE, 2009). The enrollment of children with special needs peaked at 218,950 in 2008. However 78% of this (170,781) were in Nairobi, and the other 22% spread among the other 7 provinces then (Mugo & Oranga, 2010).

Inequitable access to education for LWD was also noted by the NASMLA study in 2009 (KNEC, 2010) decrying especially low access rates in the then North Eastern Province. This indicates that, while progress may have been made at the national level, this applies more to urban settings, while many young persons in the rural areas and far flung areas may be falling off through the cracks (Mugo and Oranga, 2010).
As much as majority of the developing countries are trying to move towards achievement of the Millennium Development Goal of UPE by 2015, education opportunities for children with disabilities is still a major challenge to the education sector. UNDP, 2005 observes that only 26,000 or 1.7% of the estimated 1.5 million children with disabilities in Kenya have actual access to some form of educational services. Whereas FPE has enhanced access to education generally, the same cannot be said of CWD whose education is grossly under-resourced (KNCHR, 2007). The number of CWD out of school is expected to rise as learners move to secondary schools as some drop out on the way and others may not be able to join due to general barriers like space and merit besides their unique challenges.

The scope and extent of this exclusion is simply unacceptable and raises enormous concern. The number of LWD excluded from schools is likely to be higher in rural set ups and poor households. Kisii District is predominantly rural and therefore children with disabilities from the community are likely to face barriers as those faced by others from similar conditions. This include; poverty, stigma and negative parental attitudes arising from retrogressive culture.

2.3 Barriers to Access to Secondary Education for Learners with Disabilities

Generally speaking, low enrollment among CWD is associated to poverty, long distance to schools, parental ignorance and retrogressive culture, limited training
of teachers and lack of assistive devices like Braille books for the visually impaired. According to UNESCO (2010) perceived barriers to educating children with disabilities may be physical, social or financial. Some barriers identified by results UK (2010) Survey, UNICEF and the Atlas Alliance includes: Policy and system factors, Social and community factors (Social stigma and negative parental attitudes) and school factors like inadequate trained teachers and inaccessible schools.

Sharma and Deppeler (2005) seem to concur with the above observation. They note that India faces these challenges in her quest to implement integrated education. Specifically they identify the following challenges: poverty, deeply held attitudes (especially by the majority Hindus who belief that disability is a consequence of wrong doing), dissemination and public information. There is also the challenge of providing adequate level of training to key stake holders as well as inadequate resources. All these greatly contribute to limited access to education by LWD

Epari (2005) in his study on Financing SNE in the Context of FPE in Bungoma district identified the following as the challenges of enhancing access to education for LWD: retrogressive cultural beliefs, poverty, limited government funding. Similarly he observed that there is a problem of poor administration of SNE funds
as well as equipment and devices used for SNE being too expensive and therefore out of reach for many LWD.

The above stated barriers allow only a limited number of children with disabilities to go to schools. The few that end up in schools usually drop out before they complete the full cycle. For example in 2006, a dropout rate of 12% was recorded in primary school education in Rwanda (MOE-2008). This was mainly from learners with disabilities. The government attributed this rate to such barriers as poverty, cultural attitudes, inadequate/ inappropriate provision of infrastructure, lack of instructional materials and inflexible curricula. Actually, in Rwanda, there is no curriculum specifically designed for teaching children with unique special education needs.

In Kenya on the other hand, majority of the 23,459 pupils with disabilities enrolled in the FPE programme in 2003 dropped along the way (MOE, 2008). This was attributed to such challenges as; lack of guidelines to support inclusive education implementation, inappropriate infrastructure, inadequate facilities, a limiting and rigid current examination system hence denying majority of LWD a chance for higher education and inadequate supervision and monitoring of SNE programmes.
Although the Government of Kenya approved a policy in 2009 that supports the equitable access to quality education and training of LWD, special needs education still face many challenges (McCall, McLinden, Mogesa and Mwaura, 2011). The factors which hinder the provision for LWD include: vague guidelines that describe the implementation of an inclusive policy, insufficient data on LWD, ineffective assessment tools, inappropriate curriculum and lack of qualified professionals.

The problems experienced by learners with disabilities in the classroom are often purely ascribed to a lack of necessary assistive devices or technical equipment. Equally limited attention is paid to the teaching and learning process and the extent to which it may marginalize or exclude some learners especially those with disabilities since many teachers besides regular teaching have no additional training on SNE (KNCHR, 2007).

2.4 Interventions that have been used To Facilitate Access to Education for LWD

Access to education is the most fundamental aspect of the right to education. It is not enough to just say that everyone has the right to education without putting in place mechanisms to ensure and facilitate access. Over the years, the international community, through international agencies like UNESCO has tried to put in place initiatives that could see more LWD access education. These can be said to have
begun in 1948 with the UN Declaration of Human Rights, which declared that everyone has the right to education and that education shall be free especially in the fundamental stages. In 1989 the UN Convention on the Rights of a Child declared that all children have the right to a primary education which should be free and that the education should develop each child’s personality talents and abilities to the fullest.

The 1989 convention was closely followed by the World Declaration on EFA at Jomtien in 1990 which placed an obligation on governments to offer basic education to all children, youth and adults to reduce disparities. In 1993, the UN Standard Rules on Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities were initiated. Here it was emphasized that states should recognize the principle of equal primary, secondary and tertiary educational opportunities for children, youth and adults with disabilities in integrated settings.

Additionally, the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on SNE was initiated in 1994. This requires schools to accommodate all children regardless of their physical, intellectual, social, linguistic or other conditions. These should include disabled and gifted children. In the year 2000, two important events were initiated i.e. Millennium Development Goals (to be achieved by 2015) and World Education Forum for Action, Dakar (which re-stated the urgency to reach marginalized groups). The EFA flagship on the Right to Education for Persons
with Disabilities (2001) and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2007) further emphasized the need to ensure persons with disabilities access education (DCID 2010)

Individual countries, most of which are signatories to the above initiatives have their policies on special education pegged on the provisions stated above. India, for instance, through the integrated Education for Disabled Children offers LWD with assistance towards books and stationery, uniforms, transport allowance readers allowance (for the blind) escort allowance (for the severely handicapped). The government also pays salaries to resource teachers and helpers, is involved in setting and equipping resource rooms, survey and assessment of disabled children and provides funds for modifying schools buildings (Government of India, 2003).

South Africa has adopted a standard curriculum across the system enabling many more LWD, at least in theory to obtain a matric (Yusuf, 2003). In Ethiopia the development of the Third Education Sector Development Programme (ESDP 3) ensures establishment of more special schools, teacher training and parental involvement (Tirussew & Teklemariam, 2007). Ghana’s poverty reduction strategy paper (PRSP) made specific reference to access as to “Ensure that buildings and other infrastructure in schools is made accessible to people with disabilities” (Hooker 2007).
The government of Sri Lanka on the other hand prioritized teacher training both at the pre-service and the in-service level. Besides this substantial efforts have been made to raise awareness among stakeholders especially teachers and parents alongside strengthening community based rehabilitation programmes. Similarly, they have built support for CWD through the creation of a support network of non-disabled peers hence promoting a non-discriminative school environment (UNICEF, 2003).

Sharma and Deppler (2005) in their paper on integrated education in India: challenges and prospects suggested some possible strategies to address the challenge of limited access to education for LWD. These included: training of teachers as the top priority, harmonise collaboration between different stakeholders and departments in government involved in the provision of education for LWD and establishment of an alternate system of examination.

Grol (2000) on the other hand suggested that countries should convert policy towards education of LWD into practice as well as incorporate special education issues in the training of teachers. He too suggested that states need to realize a broad campaign on the rights of persons with disabilities with a bid to deal with negative attitudes and retrogressive culture in societies.
It is a well known fact that the government does not work alone in the provision of education. Other stakeholders are involved especially NGOs. In Bangladesh for example the DCID – funded Leonard Chesire Trust project works with the government to provide inclusive education, train primary school teachers and reach out to 2400 children with disabilities (DCID, 2010).

In Kenya, the Ministry of Education has made deliberate steps towards achieving access to education for LWD. It all began in 1977 with the development of special education curriculum at KIE. In 1984 the MOE with the support of DANIDA initiated the EARCs to help in assessment of individuals with disabilities which was aimed at identification of children with disabilities and the provision of professional help to parents and guardians for the children’s rehabilitation and integration and provision of education assessment and related services across the country. In 1986, KISE (Kenya Institute of Special Education) was founded to train special education teachers. Further the government of Kenya is committed to the protection and provision of equal opportunities to persons with disabilities.

The Ministry of Education has similarly developed a number of policy guidelines on SNE. These includes; the Committee on Care and Rehabilitation of the Disabled (1964), the Ominde Commission (1964) which recommended that children with mild disabilities be integrated in regular schools. The Gachathi report of 1976 made a number of recommendations on SNE including;
coordination of early interventions and assessment of children with special needs, creation of public awareness on causes of disabilities, establishment of ECDE programmes as part of special schools, research to determine extent and nature of handicaps for provision of SNE and development of policy of integration for LWD. The Kamunge report of 1988 emphasized deployment of SNE inspectors at the district level, the Koech report (1999) recommended the establishment of a National Special Education Advisory Board while the Taskforce on Special Needs Education (2003) recommended establishment of a SNE policy and a census to be conducted to establish the number and types of disabilities both in and out of school. Finally the government, in response to the Kochung report (2003) formulated the Special Education Policy in 2008 which serves to harmonize education services provision for learners with disabilities (MOE, 2008).

Besides these policies the government has enacted various pieces of legislation to enforce and guide provision of education services to persons with disabilities. These include; Children Act (2001), Persons with Disability Act (2003) and Sessional Paper no.1 of 2005.

The government has also established EARCs in most districts, special schools and units within regular schools. Training of teachers is done at KISE, Maseno and Kenyatta universities. Besides these institutions, integration programmes that assist children with visual, mental, physical and auditory impairments have been
established to cater for the educational needs of LWD. Additionally, vocational training centers and recreational programmes that train youths with disabilities in courses such as carpentry and tailoring are available although limited in number.

In Kisii District, the District EARC is functional. There is one special primary school (handling general disabilities) one special secondary school (handling hearing impairments) and 17 special units within regular primary schools. According to the DEO, there are plans to increase the number of special schools so that each of the four divisions has one special primary school and one special secondary school to reach more LWD. There is no official data on the number of teachers with training on SNE in the district, neither is there any official data on number of CWD out of schools.

2.5 Summary

From the reviewed literature it is clear that there have been efforts to ensure access to education for CWD. These efforts however seem to be addressing access to primary education without necessarily putting in place measures to ensure that those LWD who enroll in primary schools are able to move to secondary schools upon completing the primary cycle. Besides, these efforts seem to be addressing the policy aspect of dealing with the problem of limited access to education, leaving out other necessary efforts including implementation of the same policies.
Similarly little seems to have been studied to establish if those enrolled in primary education are able to complete the cycle and graduate into secondary schools.

The study therefore investigated the factors that hindered CWD enrolled in primary schools from moving to secondary schools in Kisii district as well as suggested strategies that could be employed to enhance access to secondary education for LWD.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the research design, location of the study and the target population used in the study was discussed. The sample size and sampling technique alongside the research instruments used were also discussed. Finally data collection procedure and analysis were addressed in this chapter.

3.2 Research Design

The study adopted an exploratory approach using a descriptive survey design to investigate if LWD were able to access secondary education, what hindered those who did not access secondary education and the strategies that could be employed to see more LWD access secondary education. This is because descriptive survey designs allow researchers to gather information summarize, present and interpret it for purposes of clarification (Orodho, 2004). Descriptive survey is a method of collecting information by interviewing or administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals. The design seeks to uncover the nature of the factors involved in a given situation, the degree in which they exist and the relationship between them.
3.3 Location of the Study

The location of the study was Kisii District of Kisii County, Kenya. Kisii District is located in the south western parts of Kenya to the south west of Lake Victoria. The district is divided into four divisions namely; Keumbu, Kiogoro, Mosocho and Municipality. It is endowed with arable land which supports the main economic activities in the region i.e. subsistence agriculture, vegetable farming, dairy farming and tea growing. Being the mother district of all districts in the wider Kisii region (all other districts both in Kisii and Nyamira county have been split from Kisii district), information regarding the status of the disabled learners was expected to be available. The district was also expected by the researcher to have infrastructure and offices from where the plight of disabled children is handled. Finally the district being predominantly rural and since it was observed that majority of PWD live in rural areas it was expected that the district was likely to have characteristics that may be generalized to majority of PWD across the country.

3.4 Target Population

The target population for the study was 21,327 learners (both those with disabilities and those without) and 764 teachers (principals and head teachers inclusive) which were drawn from 3 special schools, 17 special units and 60 public secondary schools within the district. Thirty two Ministry of Education officials in the district were also part of the study population.
3.5 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

3.5.1 Sampling Techniques

The study combined use of random sampling and purposeful sampling techniques. Random sampling was used to identify the three divisions, three secondary schools from each of these divisions, four teachers and ten students from each of the selected secondary schools. Purposeful sampling on the other hand was used to identify the nine principals and six head teachers and also the special schools/units involved in this study.

3.5.2 Sample Size

The study targeted the District Education Officer, the director of the district EARC and three Area Education Officers. The principals, teachers and students of secondary schools as well as the head teachers of special primary schools/units were also targeted. Three randomly selected divisions within Kisii central district were targeted. From each of the selected divisions 5 schools (three secondary and two special schools/units) were selected. From each secondary school the principal and four other teachers were selected while from each special school/unit the head teacher was selected. This yielded 51 teachers (15 heads and 36 teachers). From the district EARC the director was selected. Finally ten students (five male and five female in case of mixed schools) were selected from each secondary school yielding 90 students. In total the target population had a size of 146 respondents as summarized in the figure below;
Table 3.1 – Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>% Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special School/Units</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners</td>
<td>21,327</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Officials</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Researcher (2011)

3.6 Research Instruments

The study employed use of questionnaires and interview schedules.

3.6.1 Questionnaires

The study used questionnaires for students and teachers. The questionnaire had both structured and open ended items. The structured questions were used since they are easy to administer and analyze and therefore economical in terms of time and money and they allow collection of data from a large sample (Gorard, 2001). Open ended questions were used since they give the respondent an opportunity to give an insight into their hidden feelings, background, deeper motivations and interests. The questionnaire were used to get information on the status of the LWD in terms of whether they access secondary education and whether the available secondary schools had the necessary physical and logistical infrastructure to accommodate LWD.
3.6.2 Interview Schedules

Interview schedules were used to get data from principals, head teachers, and MOE officials. Both unstructured and semi-structured interviews were employed. According to Kombo and Tromp (2006), an unstructured interview aims to get the informants to open up and allows the interviewer to be responsive to individual differences and situational characteristics. Semi structured interviews were used since they allow in depth information to be gathered by close ended questions.

3.7 Piloting

The study adapted previously developed instruments by other researchers. Gay (1992) argues that selecting an appropriate instrument developed by experts with necessary skills saves time and money for a researcher who is a beginner. Orodho (2005) also notes that one can select and adopt a method, instrument or even replicate the entire study already used by another researcher. The adopted instruments were modified by the researcher to suit the study.

Piloting of research instruments was necessary since it enabled the researcher to check whether the items were clear to the respondents, whether they attracted the needed information and to estimate the time the respondents required to respond to the items.
The instruments were piloted in one secondary school which was randomly selected from one division also randomly selected from among the four divisions in Kisii District. This school was not included in the final study but was only used to measure the validity and reliability of the research instruments. The lottery technique was used to select the pretest sample. The comments, suggestions and deficiencies in the instruments were modified.

3.7.1 Validity

Validity is the degree to which the empirical measure or several measures of the concept accurately measures the concept (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999); Orodho, (2004). For the purpose of this study the adapted instruments were piloted to subjects in exactly the same way as was done in the main study. The sample respondents were asked for feedback on ambiguous and difficult questions and the researcher then assessed whether each question gave the adequate range of responses. The researcher further sought help from the supervisors who helped identify irrelevancies and ambiguities. The supervisors also helped in determining if the questionnaire items could allow required responses. Information obtained was used to revise and modify the questions.
3.7.2 Reliability

Orodho (2004) points out that reliability of instruments is their consistence in producing the same results, over a number of repeated trials. Reliability of instruments was measured using the split halves method. This method required only one testing session. It split the test items into two equal groups by use of odd and even number style. A computation of each subject total score from the two groups was done using the spearman rank and eventually a correlation of the two groups was computed using the spearman Brown Prophecy formula.

A correlation coefficient of 0.8 was considered adequate since a higher coefficient of reliability (closer to 1.00) indicates higher levels of reliability hence the adoption of the items for the study.

3.8 Data Collection Procedure

The data collection instruments included questionnaires and interview schedules. Before the researcher could administer these instruments, permission to collect data was sought from the Ministry Of Higher Education Science and Technology to enable the study to be conducted without any administrative hindrances. The researcher also sought permission from the District Education Office before embarking on familiarization of the area where the study was to be carried out. Personal visits to the schools sampled for the study was done by the researcher and it is here that appointments were made with the heads of the institution on
when the questionnaires would be administered and the interview be carried out. On the agreed days the researcher administered the questionnaires to the students and teachers and at the same time conducted the interview on the heads of the institution. The questionnaires were collected the same day they were administered to avoid collusion among the respondents. Ministry of Education officials (the DEO, AEOs and the director at the EARC) were also visited on their convenient days and the interview conducted. The researcher also filled the observation forms during the school visits.

### 3.9 Data Analysis

Data from the study was first edited to identify and eliminate errors made by respondents. Qualitative data was edited, organized into themes and categories and presented in discussion form. This facilitated a better way of discussing the finds, drawing conclusions and making recommendations.

Quantitative data was also edited and coded. Coding was then done to translate responses into specific categories. Code numbers were assigned to each answer of survey question and from there the coding list/frame was obtained. The coded items were then analysed with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics such as percentages and frequencies were used to describe the data. The results were presented in tables and figures.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the finding of the study. The purpose of the study was to investigate if LWD from the primary school cycle are able to access secondary education, what hinders those who do not move to secondary schools and what may be done to facilitate optimal access to secondary educations for LWD. Data was analysed by use of the SPSS computer software. Quantitative data was analysed through frequencies and percentages while qualitative data was categorized and presented in discussion form. The data was organized in frequency tables and presented in form of bar graphs and pie charts. The study findings are presented in headings in line with the research questions thus:

4.2 Background information,

4.3 Levels of enrollment for LWD in secondary schools and transition rate from primary schools,

4.4 Factors hindering access to secondary schools for LWD enrolled in primary schools

4.5 Strategies that may be used to enhance access to secondary education for LWD enrolled in primary schools.
4.2 Respondents’ Background Information

4.2.1 Students’ background information

The researcher asked the students to state their age and their length of stay in their current schools. Regarding age the study found out that (Table 4.1) out of 90 students, 14.4 % were between 13-15 years, 62.2 % of them were within the age group of 16-19 years 16.7 % of these students were between the ages of 20-23 years while only 6.7 % of them were above 21 years. The researcher was keen to notice that majority of the over- age students (above 19 years) were those with some form of disability. This is an implication that LWD either enroll late in schools or repeat years hence taking longer time in schools.

Table 4.1 Age Brackets of Student Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13-15 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18 years</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 21 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (Student Questionnaire)

The researcher was also interested in students’ duration in their current schools. This was important in order to verify the respondents’ knowledge of the school and their reliability in giving the required information. It was found that a big
number (86.7%) had stayed in their present schools for a period of 2 years and above (Table 4.2)

Table 4.2 Students’ Duration in the School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 4 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (Questionnaire for Students)

4.2.2 Teachers’ Background Information

For purposes of investigating the background information of the teachers, the researcher asked them to state their professional qualifications, length of their teaching experience, if they had any special education training and the length of their experience as SNE teachers, if any. The study found that 13.9% had a diploma, 72.2% of the teachers had a bachelor degree in education, and 8.3% had a post graduate diploma in education while 5.6% of the teachers were master’s holders (Table 4.3). This implies that teachers in secondary schools have the prerequisite qualification to teach in secondary schools.
Table 4.3 – Teachers’ Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.G.D.E.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.ED</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (Questionnaire for Teachers)

The study was also keen to determine whether the teachers had any special education training. The study found that 83.3% of the teachers had no training in special education, and only 16.7% had special education training (Table 4.4). This is an indication that a limited number of secondary school teachers have special education training an implication that learners with disabilities may not be handled appropriately by majority of secondary school teachers. This confirms observation by various studies which had identified that LWD fail to access secondary education due to lack of qualified teachers in the area of SNE (UNESCO, 2010 and KNCHR, 2007).

Table 4.4 – Teachers’ Training on SNE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNE Training</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (Questionnaire for Teachers)
Regarding the length of teaching experience 41.7% recorded below 5 years, those who had taught between 5-10 years and 11-15 years recorded a similar percentage of 22.2% while only 13.9% of the respondents had taught for over 15 years (Table 4.5). This indicates that majority of the teachers under study had a substantial teaching experience and implication that the study could rely on them to give information that was reliable seeing that they had practiced for quite some time.

**Table 4.5 – Teachers’ Teaching Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and Above</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Data (Questionnaire for Teachers)*

The length of teaching experience as SNE teachers was also part of the background information for teachers. From Table 4.6, majority of the teachers (83.3%) said that they had no SNE teaching experience while 16.7% recorded a teaching experience of below 5 years an indication that majority of teachers in secondary schools under study lacked experience as SNE teachers and the few with SNE skills had little experience. This is an implication that the current teaching staff cannot be relied upon to properly handle LWD.
Table 4.6 – Teachers’ Experience in SNE Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (Questionnaire for Teachers)

4.2.3 Head Teachers and Principals’ Background Information

Head teachers and principals being key informants of the study were asked to state their highest professional qualification, if they had any SNE training, their length of teaching experience and whether they had any training in management of special schools/ institution. Regarding the level of education the study found that 60% of them had master’s degree, while those with diploma and a B. ED were represented by 20% each (Table 4.7). This is an indication that majority of the heads of the schools in the district under study had minimum education qualification of diploma.

Table 4.7 – Level of Education for Principals and Head Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Interview Schedule for Principals & Head Teachers
Regarding the length of teaching experience the study found that 86.7% (Table 4.8) of the heads of the schools had over 15 years of experience. This is a clear indication that the study had a very reliable source of information.

Table 4.8 – Teaching Experience for Heads of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and above years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Interview Schedule for Principals & Head Teachers

The researcher asked the principles to indicate whether they had any training on management of special schools/ units. The results (Table 4.9) indicated that 66.7% had no training while only 33.3% had some training. The researcher was keen to notice that those who indicated having training on management of special institutions were the head teachers of primary schools with special units and special schools. This indicates that most heads of public secondary schools in the district under study have no training on SNE and management of special schools/ units. This scenario shows how the personnel tasked with the handling of LWD lack the skills to properly handle them hence they themselves are a barrier of access to education for this category of learners.
Table 4.9 - Heads of Schools Training on Management of Special Schools/Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any Training</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Interview Schedule for Principals & Head Teachers

4.3 Enrollment and Transition Rates

Investigating enrolment in secondary schools and rates of transition from primary to secondary schools in Kisii district was important for the study to enable the researcher establish the level of access to secondary education for LWD. The researcher anticipated limited or no data on this area based on reviewed literature which had indicated that there was limited data on LWD especially on their enrollment in schools (MOE 2008). The researcher therefore asked questions that could help in pointing to the number of LWD enrolled in secondary schools. The study came up with the following findings.

4.3.1 Students Response on Enrollment & Transition of LWD

The researcher asked students to indicate whether they had any form of disability, and whether they knew of any LWD who ought to have been in secondary school but were not. On whether the respondents had any form of disabilities the study found that majority (84.7%) of the student in the study had no disability and only
15.3% of these students had some form of disability. The researcher noted that most of the student who reported to have disabilities were students in the one special secondary school in the district. This signifies a very low enrollment of disabled children in secondary schools in the district as shown in Figure 4.3, further confirming earlier observations that LWD are grossly under enrolled (UNHCR, 2007 and KNEC 2010).

Figure 4.1 Student Response on whether they had any form of disability
4.3.2 Teachers’ response on enrollment and transition of LWD

The researcher asked the teachers to indicate the number of disabled children in their class and whether they knew any LWD who ought to have been in their class but was not. As shown in Table 4.10 the study found that a large number (69.4%) of the teachers reported to have no disabled learners in their class, 19.4% of them said they had less than 5 disabled children in their class while only 11.2% reported to have more than 5 students in their class. The results confirm that there is a very low level of enrollment of disabled learners in the secondary schools in the district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of LWD</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 Students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 5 Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire for Teachers

Regarding teachers’ knowledge on LWD out of school, as shown in Table 4.11, 61.1% of those who answered the question said they were not aware, 2.8% said they were not sure while 36.1% admitted they were aware of such students. This is a sizeable number excluded from education considering that education should be a basic right to all.
Table 4.11 – Teachers’ Response on whether they knew LWD out of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LWD Out of School</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire for Teachers

The researcher further inquired from the teachers whether all LWD enrolled in primary school transit to secondary schools. 69.4% of the teachers reported that not all disabled learners from the primary cycle are able to join secondary schools. However 30.6% reported that a good number of them find places in secondary schools (Table 4.12). This is an indication that only a small number of LWD from the primary school cycle in the district under study are able to access secondary education. This seems to be in agreement by the observation by Mugo and Oranga (2010) that only less than 10% of LWD with disabilities are able to progress to secondary schools after their primary education.

Table 4.12 – Teachers’ Response on whether there is Full Transition of LWD from Primary to Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Transition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire for Teachers
4.3.3 Principals and Head Teachers’ Response on Enrollment & Transition Rates of LWD

The principals and head teachers were asked to state the number of LWD in their schools, whether they knew of any of them who ought to have been in secondary schools but were not and if, from their experience, all LWD from primary schools move to secondary schools. Regarding their knowledge on LWD who ought to have been in school but were not the result (Table 4.13) shows that 60% of those who answered the question said they were aware while 26.7% said they were not aware and 13.3% said they were not sure. This result indicates that there is a considerable number of children with disabilities in the district under study that are excluded from accessing secondary education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LWD out of School</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Interview schedule for principals & head teachers

As to whether all LWD enrolled in primary schools are able to move to secondary schools, table 4.14 shows that 66.7% reported that not all disabled learners join
secondary schools after completing the primary school while 33.3% said they were not aware since tracking their progress is hard due to their integration into regular schools at some point. This result indicates that optimal transition from primary to secondary for LWD has not been achieved in the district under study.

Table 4.14—Heads of Schools Response on whether there is full Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Transition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Aware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Interview Schedule for Principals & Head Teachers

4.3.4 M.O.E Officials’ Response on Enrollment and Transition Rates of LWD

The enrollment and transition rates of learners with disabilities from primary schools to secondary schools were of key interest to the researcher. The researcher inquired from the MOE officers on the number of LWD enrolled both in the primary and secondary schools in their areas of jurisdiction. As shown in Table 4.15, 40% of the MOE officials pointed out that the enrollment of learners ranges from 100-300 students, 20% said the enrollment ranges from 301-600 students and 40% said the enrollment was slightly above 600 students. The researcher was keen
to note that the division that recorded the highest enrollment was the one that was in the municipality (Kisii town and its environs). This suggests that 60% of the MOE officials pointed out that the enrollment of learners in both primary and secondary is below 600 students. This result besides further confirming the fact that there is no reliable up to date data on enrollment and transition rates of LWD, it clearly points out to a presumably low enrollment rate.

Table 4.15– Enrollment of LWD in Primary and Secondary Schools According to the MOE Officials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100-300 Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-600 students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 600 Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Interview Schedule for MOE Officials

The researcher expected to find data on rates of transition of LWD from primary schools to secondary schools in the district but the data was not available. The MOE officials reported that usually no follow up is done to trace the progress of individual disabled learner. Besides the MOE reported that at times some disabled learners are integrated into the regular class and there it becomes difficult to monitor their progression in classes up to their graduation from the primary cycle.
4.4 Factors Hindering Access to Secondary Education by LWD in Kisii District

The researcher asked the respondents to indicate the factors that contributed to the low enrollment of learners with disabilities in secondary schools in the district. Their various responses are presented below.

4.4.1 Students’ Response on Hindrances of Access to Secondary Education by LWD

Students were asked to state what hindered the LWD who were out of school from joining secondary schools. According to the students, financial hardships was ranked as the major reason for the lack of enrollment of the LWD in the schools (Table 4.16) with a representation of 23.3%, un-accommodative schools was ranked second with a representation of 18.9%. Discrimination by parents and by teachers was represented by 11.1% and 7.8% respectively while lack of specially trained teachers was represented by 5.6%. This result gave a clear view of financial hardships and lack of disability accommodative facilities as the major factors that deter the enrollment of LWD in secondary schools in the district.
Table 4.16 – Students’ Response on Hindrances of Access to Secondary Education by LWD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindrance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination by Teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination by Parents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Hardships</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-accommodative Schools</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of SNE Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Aware</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Questionnaire for Students*

4.4.2 Teachers’ Response on Hindrances of Access to Secondary Education by LWD

Teachers view on why LWD were not enrolled in their classes is presented in Table 4.17. According to teachers, discrimination of the LWD was rated the major reason for lack of enrollment with a representation of 36.1%. Financial hardship was rated second with a representation of 30.5%. Other reasons reported by the teachers included furniture not fit (8.3%), no assistive materials and devices to aid in teaching them (8.3%) and teachers having no special training to be able to handle LWD (11.2%). Class not accessible for students with disability was also reported to deter the enrollment LWD in school with a representation of 5.6%.
Table 4.17 – Teachers’ Response on Hindrances of Access to Secondary Education by LWD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindrance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class not Accessible</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture not Fit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No assistance Devices/Materials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No SNE Training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial hardships</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire for Teachers

The researcher also asked the teachers whether the current curriculum was relevant, 30.6% of the teachers said it was relevant, 41.7% said it was fairly relevant while 27.7% of the teachers said it was irrelevant (Table 4.18). It can be inferred from this result that the current curriculum has not been adequately developed to cater for LWD in secondary schools.

Table 4.18 – Teachers’ Response on the Relevance of Curriculum for LWD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Relevance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Relevant</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire for Teachers
4.4.3 Head Teachers & Principals’ Response on Hindrances of Access to Secondary Education by LWD

According to principals and heads of schools of the school under study (shown in Table 4.19) discrimination was rated the major hindrance of enrollment of LWD with a representation of 33.3%, followed by financial hardship (26.7%). Other reasons reported to cause limited enrollment are limited access to accommodative institutions (13.3%), and lack of parental awareness and ignorance (20%). From this result it can be deduced that majority of the LWD lack an opportunity to education due to their poor financial background and discrimination due to lack of awareness by the parents.

Table 4.19 – Principles and Head Teachers’ Response on why LWD are out of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Accommodative Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Ignorance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Hardships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</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>

*Source: Interview Schedule for Principals & Head Teachers*

Similarly, 73.3% of the principals and head teachers admitted that their schools were poorly equipped with learning resources for disabled learners while only
20% reported that the schools were moderately equipped (Table 4.20). This is a clear indication that majority of the schools in the district lack teaching and learning resources for disabled students.

Table 4.20 – Principals’ and Head Teachers’ Response on Availability of Teaching and Learning Resources for LWD in their Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poorly Equipped</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Equipped</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</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>

Source: Interview Schedule for Principals & Head Teachers

4.4.4 MOE Officials’ Response on Hindrances of Access to Secondary Education for LWD

Officials from the ministry of education recorded the challenges faced in the process of enrolling LWD in secondary schools. As shown below, 60% of MOE officials said that the hindrances to secondary school enrollment are few schools with accommodative facilities, 20% reported limited data on children with disability which makes it difficult to plan to cater for them. A similar percentage (20%) reported that few special education trained teachers contributes greatly to a scenario of limited access to secondary education (Table 4.21). From this study it
can be deduced that limited number of schools with accommodative facilities is a major drawback to the enrollment of LWD in secondary schools in the district.

Table 4.21 – MOE Officials’ Response on Hindrances of Access to Secondary Education by LWD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindrance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inaccessible Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Data on LWD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few SNE Teachers</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>

Source: Interview Schedule for MOE Officials

4.5 Strategies to Enhance Access to Secondary Education for LWD

The respondents were asked to identify some of the things they thought needed to be done to correct the situation of low enrollment and facilitate access to secondary education for LWD. Their various responses are presented below

4.5.1 Students’ Response on Strategies to Enhance Access to Secondary Education by LWD

Student contribution on what can be done to enhance the enrollment of LWD in secondary school is illustrated in Table 4.22. A good number of the students (27.8%) said that, formulation of inclusion policies by the government will be important in enhancing the enrollment of disabled students in secondary schools,
24.4% said that equipping schools with disability accommodative features will help in enhancing the enrollment of LWD in secondary schools, 16.7% said that community awareness on disabled persons rights is key to ensuring these learners enrollment in secondary schools. 13.3% of the students were of the opinion that training more special education teachers will enhance the enrollment of LWD in secondary schools, while 17.8% said parents awareness on the rights of disabled children will contribute to their enrollment to secondary school. From these results it can be figured out that government efforts especially in formulation of inclusion policies and equipping schools with disability accommodative features can greatly increase the enrollment of LWD in secondary schools.

Table 4.22: Students Response on Strategies to Enhance Access to Secondary Education by LWD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion Policies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Awareness</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Awareness</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipping Schools</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training more SNE Teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire for Students
4.5.2 Teachers’ Response on Strategies to Enhance Access to Secondary Education by LWD

Teacher view on what can be done to improve enrollment of disabled learners in schools was put to light. The study found that, 33.3% of the teachers were of the opinion that community sensitization would increase the enrollment of disabled learners in secondary schools. 25% of them said that the enrollment can be increased by giving more teachers special education training, 22.2% of the teachers were of the opinion that improving school infrastructure to accommodate students with disability would increase their enrollment to secondary school. Other opinion presented by 13.9% of teachers was that government should formulate policy to accommodate disabled children during admission, while 5.6% of them said that provision of assistive devices and materials to aid teaching and learning of disabled children would increase their enrollment in secondary schools. It can be concluded from this results that community sensitization, improving schools infrastructures to accommodate disabled learners and availing special education trained teachers in the schools will help a great deal in enhancing the enrollment of disabled learners in secondary schools.
Table 4.23 – Teachers’ Response on Strategies to Enhance Access to Secondary Education for LWD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion Policies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify Schools</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNE Teachers’ Training</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistive Devices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Sensitization</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire for Teacher

4.5.3 Head Teachers and Principals Response on Strategies to Enhance Access to Secondary Education by LWD.

The researcher asked the principals to state what may be done to increase the enrollment of disabled learners in secondary schools. As Table 4.24 shows, 33.4% of the principles believed community awareness was the best approach to enhancing enrollment of disadvantaged learners in secondary schools. Modification of structures to accommodate disabled learners and training more special education teachers each had a representation of 25%, while government hand in formulation of policy that will enable their admission and allow a smooth learning in institution and availing assistive devices and materials for disabled learners was each represented by 8.3%. It can be figured out from these results that community awareness, modified structures and ensuring the availability of
special education trained teachers are the key strategies that will enhance the enrollment of disabled learners in secondary schools.

**Table 4.24 – Principals’ Response on What can be done to Increase Enrollment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Policies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training SNE Teachers’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistive Devices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society Awareness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Interview Schedule for Principals & Head Teachers*

**4.5.4 MOE Officials’ Response on Strategies to Enhance Access to Secondary Education by LWD**

MOE officials’ opinion on what can be done to improve access for disabled learners in secondary schools was sought. The study was able to find out that 40% of MOE officials believed that training more teachers on special education would improve the access. Other opinions pointed out by these officials included; creating parental and societal awareness on importance of disabled children education and equipping schools with disability friendly and assistive devices each with a representation of 20% (Table 4.25).
Table 4.25 – MOE Officials’ Response on Strategies to Enhance Access to Secondary Education by LWD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental Awareness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNE Training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipping Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society Awareness</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>

Source: Interview Schedule for MOE Officials

4.6 Discussion

The major concern of this study was to investigate if LWD in Kisii district were able to access secondary education by investigating their enrollment and transition rates, what hinders those who do not access and suggesting strategies that may be employed to facilitate their access to secondary education. The study was able to come up with the following findings:

4.6.1 Level of Access to Secondary Education by LWD in Kisii District

The researcher had anticipated limited data on enrollment and transition rates of LWD in the district based on reviewed literature which indicated that data on enrollment and transition of LWD in schools had not been properly sourced (MOE, 2008). The researcher therefore asked the respondents to state the current enrollment in their schools. The study established that:
There was no reliable, up-to-date data on the number of LWD enrolled in secondary schools in Kisii district. Similarly, data on transition rates was not available. The data that was available was on LWD enrolled in special schools/units at primary school level and that of LWD in the one special secondary school in the district. Even then this data was not uniform since the various MOE officials (DEO, AEOs, and EARC director) gave different figures (Table 4.15). These findings are in tandem with an earlier observation by MOE(2008) and the South Africa department of education (2000) which pointed out that, the biggest challenge over time has been the lack of reliable data and information about number of persons with disability, types and incidence of disability. The study similarly alludes to the fact that the available data on persons with disabilities vary widely and are frequently unreliable largely due to the historic failure to mainstream disability into government statistical processes.

Majority (84.7%) of the student in the study had no disability, only 15.3% of them had some form of disability (Figure 4.1). A large number (73.5%) of the teachers reported to have no LWD in their class, 17.6% of them said they have less than 5 LWD in their class while only 8.8% reported to have more than 15 students in their class (Table 4.10). This signifies a very low enrollment of LWD in secondary schools in the district justifying earlier observation by UNDP(2005) and KNCHR.
who observed that only about 1.7% of the estimated 1.5 million children with disabilities in Kenya have actual access to some form of educational services.

All categories of respondents indicated having knowledge of LWD who ought to have been in schools but were not. For instance 75% of head teachers/ principals and 32.4% of teachers admitted they were aware of LWD out of school. This result proves that there is a very low enrollment rate of LWD in the secondary schools in the district. These findings were in consensus with earlier findings particularly by the Ministry of Education (in 2004 and 2008) which had indicated that reliable data on LWD was not available and that enrollment of PWD was still low. Mugo and Oranga (2010) in their study on Testing Youth Transition in Kenya also observe that only less than 10% of learners completing primary schools could transit to secondary schools.

4.6.2 Hindrances of Access to Secondary Education by LWD in Kisii District

Various respondents suggested different hindrances of access to secondary education. These included: Financial hardships, lack of accommodative facilities (Class not accessible, furniture not fit for them, poorly equipped with learning resources), and discrimination by teachers and by parents, lack of special education trained teachers.
Respondents also identified lack of assistive materials and devices to aid in teaching LWD, current curriculum not well developed to adequately cater for LWD in secondary school, limited access to accommodative institutions lack of parental awareness and Limited data on children with disabilities as some of the major hindrances of access to secondary education for LWD.

These findings tally with those earlier identified by Results UK survey (2010), UNICEF and the Atlas Alliance an implication that barriers of access to education have already been identified before yet little effort and perhaps follow up has been made to address them in a bid to assure LWD a place in secondary schools. Similarly Epari (2005) in his study on Financing SNE in the Context of FPE in Bungoma district identified the following as the challenges of enhancing access to education for LWD: retrogressive cultural beliefs, poverty, limited government funding. Similarly he observed that there is a problem of poor administration of SNE funds as well as equipment and devices used for SNE being too expensive and therefore out of reach for many LWD.

In addition to that, these hindrances are not a preserve of the Kenyan situation only but they seem to be applicable across the globe. Sharma and Deppeler (2005) note that India faces the following challenges: poverty, deeply held attitudes (especially by the majority Hindus who belief that disability is a consequence of wrong doing), dissemination and public information. There is also the challenge
of providing adequate level of training to key stakeholders as well as inadequate resources. All these greatly contribute to limited access to education by LWD.

4.6.3 Strategies to Enhance Access to Secondary Education by LWD in Kisii District

Respondents proposed the strategies to be employed to enhance access to secondary education for LWD in Kisii district as including: Formulation of inclusion policies by the government, equipping schools with disability accommodative features, training more special education teachers. Parental awareness and community sensitization on the rights of disabled children was also identified as a means of dealing with stigma. Similarly improving and modification of school infrastructure to accommodate students with disability as well as provision of assistive devices and materials to majority of public secondary schools to aid in teaching of LWD was identified.

Other studies by other scholars on this area reported similar strategies. For instance Sharma and Deppler (2005) in their paper on integrated education in India: challenges and prospects suggested some possible strategies to address the challenge of limited access to education for LWD. These included: training of teachers as the top priority, harmonise collaboration between different stakeholders and departments in government involved in the provision of education for LWD and establishment of an alternate system of examination.
Crol (2000) on the other hand suggested that countries should convert policy towards education of LWD into practice as well as incorporate special education issues in the training of teachers. He too suggested that states need to realize a broad campaign on the rights of persons with disabilities with a bid to deal with negative attitudes and retrogressive culture in societies.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the summary of the study, conclusion, recommendations and suggestions for further research based on the issues raised by this study.

5.2 Summary of Findings

The major concern of this study was to investigate if LWD in Kisii district are able to access secondary education, what hinders those who do not access and suggesting strategies that may be employed to facilitate their access to secondary education. The study established that data on enrollment and transition rates of LWD in the district was lacking. The schools that were studied, however, reported limited number of LWD enrolled there which painted a picture of low enrollment and transition rates in the district. Respondents identified poverty (and therefore financial constraints), discrimination arising from retrogressive culture, and unavailability of accommodative schools as the major factors hindering CWD from accessing schools. The study therefore suggests that access to secondary education by LWD will be enhanced if more secondary schools are modified to be accommodative to LWD, improving funding towards education for CWD, thorough community sensitization and formulation of policies that make it possible and mandatory for LWD to be enrolled in public secondary schools.
5.3 Conclusions

Based on the study findings, the following conclusions are made:

First, enrollment of LWD in schools especially secondary schools is still low, in spite of data on number of those enrolled lacking. The enrollment in the studied schools was recorded at less than five LWD for majority of the schools and in some schools there was not even a single LWD yet the students, teachers and heads of the institutions agreed to have known LWD who ought to have been in school but were not.

Hindrances of access to education have remained known and fairly similar across regions and over a long period of time. The study findings on hindrances to education specifically tallied with those of results UK (2010) Survey, UNICEF and the Atlas Alliance which also identified physically inaccessible schools, financial hardships and discrimination arising from retrogressive culture and lack of specially trained teachers to handle LWD in schools.

In spite of government policy on ensuring access to education for all, LWD are still left out of schools, an implication that enforcement of these policies has not been emphasized. Implementing the strategies will assure LWD a place in schools, and should involve all stake holders.
5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings from this study the following recommendations are made:

i) It was found that data on enrollment and transition rates and number of children with disability both in and out of school was missing. As such there is need to conduct a census in the district and indeed the entire nation to ascertain the exact numbers so that the government may adequately prepare for them in terms of provision of essential services like education.

ii) Enrollment for LWD was found to be minimal meaning that majority are being excluded. This should be corrected by employing the strategies identified by this study. These include: appropriate teacher training, increasing awareness on disability rights and making schools accessible and accommodative.

iii) The main challenges/ hindrances of access to education were identified as economical (poverty and inadequate funding) and legislative i.e vague policy on inclusive education as well as challenges of implementation of existing policy. There is need for a paradigm shift from just policy formulation to implementation. Economic empowerment of households with children with disabilities should also be sort in earnest.

iv) There is need to empower the district EARC with resources and manpower to enable it carry out its mandate efficiently. This will ensure that all children with
disability are assessed and placed in schools and also that regular follow up is done on them to monitor their progress.

v) Modification/ improvement of existing schools is necessary to make them accommodative to LWD. The government should ensure that a good number of schools are modified so as to make them closer to the communities and therefore physically accessible to the LWD who may need them. Modification is also economical since construction of new schools may be too expensive and therefore discouraging due to limited budgetary allocations.

5.4.1 Suggestions for Further Study

Since the study could not exhaustively uncover all the hindrances of access to secondary education by LWD, the following suggestions for further study are proposed:

I. Research on enhancing access to secondary education by LWD covering a wider geographical area and large sample so as to provide data that may be generalised across a broader and more inclusive spectrum.

II. A study to investigate the possibility of including LWD in regular schools i.e. the workability of inclusive education policies in the quest of offering education to persons with disabilities.
III. An investigation on the prevalence of various types of disabilities by gender and region for planning purposes.

IV. A study on efficiency of special schools/units in provision of education services to persons with disabilities.
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APPENDIX 1
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information on strategies that could be employed to ensure access to and participation in secondary education for disabled learners. Please answer the questions by either ticking or filling in the spaces provided where applicable. For confidentiality do not write your name anywhere in this questionnaire.

Please fill in or tick [✓] the appropriate answers to the following questions according to your opinion.

1. Date of birth
   __________________________________________

2. State the year you joined your current school -
   __________________________________________

3. Do you have any form of disability?  Yes [✓]  No [☐]

4. If yes, please state the nature of your disability
   __________________________________________

5. a) Do you believe that students with disabilities should learn together with the Non-disabled in the same class?  Yes [☐]  No [☐]

   c) If no, where do you think they should be educated? Special schools [☐]

   Regular schools with special units [☐]  at home [☐]
6. Are there any learners with disabilities in your school?

Yes □     No □

7. a) In your opinion, is your school well suited to allow students with disabilities to learn there?

Yes □     No □

b) If yes, please tick [✓] features present in your school that you think enable disabled learners comfortably learn in your school.

i) Accessible rooms

ii) Specially designed furniture

iii) Assistive devices e.g. Braille and wheelchairs

iv) Special education teachers

v) Any other (specify) ____________________________

2.0 If no, please state what in your opinion is missing in your school that may make it difficult for students with disabilities to learn in your school.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

8 a) Do you know of any disabled students who should be in Secondary School but for one reason or another he/she is not in school?

Yes □     No □
b) If yes, please state the reason(s) that you think are hindering him/her from joining secondary school.

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

9(a). In your opinion what do you think should be done to ensure that students with disabilities are enrolled in secondary schools?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your responses.
APPENDIX 2
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information on strategies that could be employed to ensure access to and participation in secondary education for disabled learners. Please answer the questions by either ticking or filling in the spaces provided where applicable. For confidentiality do not write your name anywhere in this questionnaire.

SECTION ONE

1. What is your highest professional qualification?

   Diploma ☐ PGDE ☐ B.E.D. ☐
   Master’s degree ☐ other ☐
   (specify) ____________________

2. How long is your teaching experience?

   Below 5 years ☐ 5-10 years ☐
   11-15 Years ☐ over 15 years. ☐

3. Have you ever been trained to teach disabled learners?

   Yes ☐ No ☐

4. How long is your teaching experience as a special education teacher?

   None ☐ below 5 yrs ☐ 5-10 yrs ☐
   11-15 yrs ☐ Over 15 yrs ☐
SECTION TWO

1. How many disabled students are admitted in your class/ school?

________________________________________________________________________

2a) From your personal knowledge, do you know of any disabled student(s) who should have been enrolled in your class/ school but for some reason, they are not enrolled?

Yes □ No □

b) If yes, state the reason(s) why you think they are not enrolled in your class;

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

b) If yes, state the reason(s) why you think they are not enrolled in your class;

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

d) What, in your opinion, can be done to increase enrollment of disabled students in your class?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. a) Are the physical facilities in your school structured to accommodate disabled learners?

Yes □ No □

b) If yes, in what ways are the physical facilities structured to accommodate disabled learners?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
c) If no, what needs to be improved to accommodate disabled learners in your school?
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

3. a) How would you rate your school in terms of availability and adequacy of teaching and Learning resources for disabled students? Ill-equipped □
moderately equipped □       Well equipped □

b) Are the available teaching and learning resources appropriate for disabled learners?
Yes □                No □

e) If No what type of teaching and learning resources do you think should be provided for disabled learners to be accommodated in your school?
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

4. a) Do you think pre-service training prepared you adequately to handle disabled learners?
Yes □                No □

b) if No state what can be done so that you can be adequately prepared to handle disabled learners
5. a) In your opinion can learners with disabilities cope with the present secondary school curriculum? Yes ☐ No ☐

b) How relevant is the curriculum offered for the disabled learners? Very ☐ relevant Relevant ☐ fairly Relevant ☐ Irrelevant ☐

SECTION THREE

3.0 In your opinion are the disabled learners from the primary cycle able to join secondary schools? ______________

If no, what do you think is contributing to this scenario?
____________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________

4.0 what do you think can be done to enhance access to and participation in secondary education for the disabled learners?
____________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________

Thank you for your responses.
APPENDIX 3

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR HEAD TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

SECTION I

1. Highest Professional qualification
2. Any training on SNE
3. Length of teaching experience
4. Any training on management of special school/units

SECTION II

1. Number of disabled students in your school.
2. Types of disabilities.
3a) from personal knowledge, any disabled student out of school?
   b) Reasons why they are out of schools (hindrances)
   c) What can be done to increase enrolment of disabled learners in your school?
4a) Do all the disabled learners in your school move to secondary schools when they graduate?
   b) If no, what prevents them from joining secondary schools?
5a) Are physical facilities accommodative to disabled learners
   b) If yes how?
   c) If No. what modifications are required?
6a) Availability and adequacy of teaching learning resources for disabled learners
   b) Appropriateness
c) If not what resources should be provided for disabled learners

7a) Government contribution towards making the school more accommodative to disabled learners

b) Level of financing education for disabled learners in your school?

8) Any other funding of disabled learners other than from government?

9a) How relevant/irrelevant is the current curriculum to disabled learners?

10 To what extent do you think are teachers in your school prepared to handle SNE?

b) What can be done so that the teachers may adequately handle disabled learners?

SECTION THREE

1. From your knowledge, are the disabled learners from the primary cycle able to join secondary schools?

2. In your opinion, what do you think needs to enhance access to and participation in secondary education for the disable learners in your region?
APPENDIX 4

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MOE OFFICIALS

District
Division

1. How many schools do you have in your area of jurisdiction?

2. Categories:
   - Primary
   - Secondary
   - Public
   - Private
   - Special
   - Special Units
   - Other (Specify)

3. Total enrollment of disabled students in the primary/secondary schools

4. Do you offer advisory services from your centre?
   If yes which type of services do you offer to schools regarding education for the disabled?

5. What hindrances have you encountered in your area of jurisdiction related to access to secondary schools by learners with disabilities?

6. What methods/actions is your office currently employing to ensure that disabled pupils go to secondary schools and complete the cycle?

6. What do you think needs to be done to ensure optional access to and participation in secondary education for disabled
# APPENDIX 5
## TIME FRAME OF THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proposal/writing and presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Field work- Piloting/test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Modification of instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Administering of questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Report writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Submission of Thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 6
PROPOSED BUDGET OF THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY/ ITEM</th>
<th>AMOUNT (KSHS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATIONERY</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVELING AND ACCOMODATION</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECRETARIAL SERVICES</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER SERVICES</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARATION AND BINDING (REPORTS)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELENEOUS</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>110,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>