



The Elusiveness of Inclusive Education in Kenya

Josephine Oranga & Dai Gaungying

Southwest University, China

ABSTRACT

Notably, research effort on education of persons with disabilities has been expended on primary and secondary education. However, research on barriers to inclusion of learners with disabilities has not been adequately explored in Kenya. To fill this gap, a descriptive survey was utilised to address the objectives of the study which included: determining socio-cultural, curriculum, economic, physical and structural barriers to inclusion. The sample consisted of 22 teachers, one head teacher and 6 parents. The sample was drawn from a regular primary school with a special unit that caters for learners with intellectual disability in Kakamega County, Kenya. Purposive and simple random sampling techniques were utilised to select the sample. Findings revealed that the

barriers were socio-cultural (stigma, opposition from parents, lack of awareness of the importance/benefits of inclusion), curriculum (lack of learning resources, lack/poor syllabi adaptations and shortage of trained teachers) physical/ structural (lack of support employees, absence of structural modifications in the school environment) and economic. It was thus, recommended that the government conducts awareness programmes targeting parents on the benefits of inclusion and develop an adopted curriculum/syllabus that would be responsive to the needs of learners with disabilities among others.

Key words: Barriers, Inclusion, Kenya, Learners with Special Needs

Published: 13th April 2019

Disclosure statement: No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

To cite this article: Josephine Oranga & Dai Gaungying (2019) *The Elusiveness of Inclusive Education in Kenya*, Nairobi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences 3:1, pp58-92, Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at www.royallitepublishers.com/nairobi-journal

Orcid ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003->

Background

The Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS, 2010) indicates that the population of people with disabilities in Kenya stands at 1.3million, accounting for 3.5 percent of the total population of 42 million. However, it should be noted that estimates of persons with disabilities in Kenya vary considerably as was noted by International Labour Organisation (ILO, 2004). Another Government report, GoK 2015 reveals that 25 percent of persons with disabilities are of school-going age (between 6-18 years), translating into 113,750 children. According to the Ministry of Education, (MoE,2013), only 34% of learners with disabilities of school-going age are in school (in regular, special schools and special units), thus a majority 66% of learners with disabilities of school going age in Kenya are still school-excluded. According to KNCHR (2014) special schools have the majority of learners with disabilities who are in school. Statistics from the Kenya schools directory reveal that Kenya has a total of 29 Special Primary Schools and 22 Special Secondary Schools (MoE, 2015). There are also a total of Regular schools with Special Units which strive to cater for the educational needs of learners with disabilities but they provide them with separate special classes, still resulting in segregation and seclusion of learners with disabilities as inclusion is only achieved when barriers separating learners with and without disabilities are removed. Additionally, inclusion can only be achieved when learners with and without disabilities learn in the same classroom and taught by the same teachers. Inclusion is important as it seeks to combat discriminatory attitudes by acknowledging that every child has unique characteristics, interests, abilities and learning needs and that these learners with disabilities must have access to and be accommodated in the general education system (KNCHR 2014).

However, in Kenya, the practice of sending students to special schools is still the order of the day and no structures whatsoever have been put in place to ensure that the principles of inclusive education is adhered to (Kenya National Commission on Human Rights, KNCHR 2014). A study conducted by KNCHR (2014), also revealed that implementation of the inclusive policy in Kenya is a challenge and many actors on the ground are not clear on what inclusive education entails (KNCHR 2014). Subsequently, in practice, inclusive education in Kenya remains elusive. According to the study, the Educational Assessment and Resource Centre (EARC) officers indicated that it was hard for them to recommend children with disabilities for placement in regular schools as the schools were not accommodative (KNCHR 2014).

From the discussion above, it is clear that inclusive education has not been implemented as segregation and seclusion of learners with special needs still occur due to a number of reasons. This study sought to carry out an in-depth investigation into these barriers with a view to contributing to theory and practice of inclusion in Kenya.

According to Mutisya (2012), the current practice of education in Kenya emphasizes on the use of integration and special schools to cater for the educational needs of learners with special needs as opposed to creating inclusive settings thus disadvantaging learners with disabilities. Mona, 2011, Hayeth, 2008 and Musoma, 2006 reveal that inclusion offers significant opportunities to both learners with and without disabilities. Benefits to learners with disabilities include: learning in the least restrictive environment (LRE), greater acceptance of students with disabilities and promotion of better understanding of the similarities amongst students with and without disabilities

In many African countries, research on learners with disability has focused on issues of academic performance, integration and perceptions (Kanake 2001, Achola 2004, Ajayi 2006) at the expense of investigating barriers to inclusion. Additionally, there are no known studies conducted in Kakamega County, Kenya on barriers to inclusion of learners with disabilities. For example, Onyango (2004) focused on Curriculum adaptations for students with Visual Impairments in Kenya Polytechnic; the researcher did not address inclusive education at all, the study was also not conducted in Kakamega County. Another study conducted by Orangah (2012) focused on Transition of Learners with visual impairments to the university. A study by Ruto (1996) too, looked only at Integration of the Visually Impaired into the Mainstream of Vocational Training in Kenya, it did not concern itself with issues of inclusive education, while a few studies have focused on enabling factors (Alwell and Cobb 2006; Vancil 1997), and these studies are outside African contexts. Hence the need to investigate barriers to inclusion in Kakamega county Kenya, understanding the barriers to inclusion might contribute to theory and practice of inclusivity. Kakamega County is home to 4 Special schools and 5 special units that are attached to regular schools. It is the second most populous county in Kenya after the capital city, Nairobi; the county is located 385 kilometers west of Nairobi. The researcher proposes to conduct an in-depth investigation into barriers to inclusion, by establishing the socioeconomic barriers, physical, structural barriers and curriculum barriers.

Meaning of Inclusion

There is a growing consensus throughout the world that segregation or seclusion of children with disabilities in special schools or units is only right for learners with severe disabilities that rendering them unable to benefit from the regular classroom. The prevailing view is that learners with disabilities should be educated together with their peers in the regular classroom. A single system rather than a dual system of education is more acceptable (Rustermier, 2002). In this study, inclusion refers to the realization/ implementation of structural/physical and curriculum modifications geared towards accommodating learners with disabilities

resulting in the actual learning together with these learners in the regular classroom.

Inclusion follows from integration but differs from it in that, inclusion advocates for school adjustments to accommodate or include children with disabilities (Smith et al 2001, Kirk et. al 2003). It requires the educational system to meet the needs of the child as normally and inclusively as possible rather than the child with special needs being made to adapt to suit the needs of the system (Kluth, Villa and Thousand, 2001; Evans, 2000). Inclusion strives to make the regular schools welcoming for all learners regardless of difficulties the learners might have. Inclusion is seen as a process of addressing and responding to the diversity of needs of all learners through increasing participation in learning, culture and communities, and reducing exclusion within and from education UNESCO (2001).

Legal Framework for Inclusive Education in Kenya

In Kenya, quality education for persons with disabilities is protected by law and as such, learners with disabilities have a right to quality education that is responsive to their needs. Quality education for persons with disabilities is protected and recognized in the Constitution of Kenya, Education Act of 2013, Persons with Disabilities Act 2003 and The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD 2008) to which Kenya is a signatory. The documents emphasize the need for inclusion at all levels directed at enabling persons with disabilities to participate effectively in the society (KCSSPP, 2009). However Kenya is yet to set up structures that support inclusion in public schools and learners with special needs continue to attend special schools resulting in segregation and seclusion of these learners from society (Karanja, 2013). In Kenya, Persons with Disabilities Act (2003) requires that learning institutions take into account the special needs of all persons with disabilities with respect to the entry requirements, pass marks, curriculum, examinations, auxiliary services, use of school facilities, class schedules, physical education requirements and other similar considerations that would in the end help realize inclusion in schools in Kenya. However this act has not been fully implemented, rendering inclusion a mirage in Kenya.

Research Design and Methodology

This study employed descriptive survey design and used the mixed method (qualitative and quantitative) approaches. Descriptive survey was appropriate for this study as it enhanced in depth investigation into the barriers to inclusion of learners with disabilities in Kakamega County, Kenya. Relevant interpretation and discussion were drawn from the analysed data. Themes and patterns as per the objectives of the study were also arrived at from which general statements, conclusions and recommendations were made.

The researcher employed stratified random sampling technique to select 23 teachers who took part in the study. Stratified random sampling ensured that 14 regular school teachers and 9 special unit teachers were sampled totalling to 23 teachers. The headteacher was sampled purposively as he alone could provide the information required by the researcher. The parents too were sampled purposively. The research instrument consisted of a questionnaire and an interview guide. The questionnaire (See appendix 1) was prepared by the author based on related literature. The questionnaire had several sections derived from the research objectives. The first objective sought to determine the socio-economic barriers that bar the implementation of inclusive education while the 2nd and 3rd section sought to determine the physical and structural barriers hindering inclusion respectively. The last section ought to establish the curriculum barriers that hinder the implementation of inclusion in Kakamega County, Kenya.

On the other hand, data from the headteacher and parents were gathered by use of an interview guide. The interview guide had open-ended questions only. Quantitative data generated by the questionnaires were processed using SPSS version 20.0 while the qualitative data from the interview guide were analyzed by content analysis that involved selecting and grouping data according to emerging codes and themes in line with objectives of the study.

Presentation and Discussion of Findings

The demographics sought by the researcher included sex, age, academic qualifications and length of time in the teaching profession. Table 1 gives a summary of the findings:

Table 1: Demographic Information of teachers

		Frequency Percentage	
Gender	Male	13	59.1
	Female	9	40.9
Age	31-40 yrs	8	36.4
	41-50 yrs	10	45.5
	51-60 yrs	4	18.2
Highest Academic qualification	Certificate	11	50
	Diploma	8	36.4
	Degree	3	13.6
Highest academic qualifications in Special Needs	Certificate	3	13.6
	Diploma	3	13.6
	Degree	1	4.5
Length of time in teaching	Less than 5	5	22.7

profession	years		
	6-10 years	9	40.9
	11-15years	5	22.7
	16-20 years	2	9.1
	Over 20 years	1	4.5

Table1 shows that a majority (59.1%) of the teachers were male while slightly lower percentage (40.9%) were female. This shows that there is some degree of gender parity as the school has an almost equal number of teachers from both genders. This school was close to fully implementing the gender equality and equity policy (Republic of Kenya, 2006) which seeks to attain equal representation of both genders in job opportunities, education and other areas of the economy (Republic of Kenya, 2006)

Most 45.5% of the teachers were aged between 41-50 years, followed by those aged between 31-40 years, at 36.4%. Further those aged between 51-60 years were 18.2% of the total sample. This implies that the respondents were all mature and able to reason logically in attempt to respond to the questionnaire. Additionally the most, 41% of the teachers had 6-10 years teaching experience followed by 22.7 % who had 11-15 % teaching experience. Thus a majority of the teachers were experienced in teaching and were capable and knowledgeable enough to make informed reflections and deductions concerning the issues raised by the study and other school related phenomenon. Their vast experience made them quite ideal for the study and increased the likelihood that their responses would be genuinely held opinions as a result of many years of experience.

Additionally, most (50 %) of the teachers had certificate (commonly known as primary 1, P1, in Kenya) followed by 36.6% who held a diploma in teaching. The least 13.6% had a degree in teaching. This implies that all the teachers were qualified and well placed to teach in the Primary school. Establishing the teachers' qualifications was important as this would reveal whether the learners were taught by qualified teachers or not. Qualified teachers are expected be more knowledgeable on educational and disability issues and are better placed to respond to the questionnaire. It is important to note that a majority of Kenyan teachers hold P1 (Certificate in Primary Teaching) qualifications as this is the minimum requirement for teaching in a primary institution in the country. Certificate or P1 qualifications are attained through training for two years in Primary Teachers Training College. For one to qualify for admission to these colleges, one must score a minimum of mean grade C in the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education Examinations (KCSE).Consequently, some P1 Certificate holders usually further their studies and attain diplomas and degrees while some do not. Table 2 gives a summary of demographic information of the parents.

Table 2: Demographic information of the parents

		f	%
Gender	Male	1	20
	Female	4	80
Age	21-30 yrs	1	20
	31-40 yrs	2	40
	41-50 yrs	2	40
Highest Academic qualification	Certificate	1	20
	Class 8(KCPE)	2	40
	O-Level(KCSE)	2	40

Table 2 shows that most (80%) of the parents interviewed were female with the least just 20% were male. The highest academic qualification of the parents was O-levels (currently called form 4) at 40%, with a similar at standard eight /KCPE level. The least, 20% held a training certificate in a profession. Hence, most parents' education level was relatively low. This might have influenced their views and perceptions of disability issues. A study by Hardy (2008) indicated that the more knowledgeable and educated a parent was the better their understanding and handling of disabilities issues when they occurred in the family (Hardy, 2008). A study by Muimi (2013) too, indicates that parents level of education is a determinant of how well a family may handle disability issues. Three of the sampled parents had children with disabilities while two had children without disabilities.

Table 2 also shows that 13.6% of the respondents had certificate training in special education. A similar percentage had a diploma in education. The least, 4.5 % had a degree in special education. These findings imply that 4.5% of the teachers had no special education training at all. However, the fact that a majority of teachers had some special education qualifications was a good indicator. This also meant that the students were mostly taught and handled by professionals. According to Mutisya (2012), it is common for teachers without any special educational training to teach learners with special needs in Kenya due to shortage of trained teachers. According to Mutisya (2012), these teachers usually learn on-the-job, however they require a lot of supervision as they might make mistakes .The study also revealed that the teachers who taught learners with special needs had been doing it for a relatively long time as shown in Table 3:

Table 3: How long the teachers had taught learners with special needs.

	Frequency	Percent
6-10 years	6	27.3
11-15 years	2	9.1
Total	8	36.4

Most (27.3%) of the teachers had taught learners with special needs for a period between 6-10 years followed by 9.1% who had taught these students for 2 years. This implies that these teachers had acquired lot of experience teaching learners with special needs, hence very suitable for the study as they would give informed responses from their years of experience with learners with disabilities.

The respondents were further required to state the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with the given statements. The statements sought to establish socio cultural, curriculum, economic, physical and structural barriers to inclusion, thus:

Table 4: How much the respondents agreed or disagreed with the given statements:

STATEMENT		100 (SA)		75(A)		50(NS)		25(D)		0(SD)		MEAN
		F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1	Inclusion means learners with/without disabilities learning together in the same classroom	5	22.7	9	40.9	5	22.7	3	13.6	0	0	68.18
2	Structural modifications of school environment to accommodate learners with disabilities would hasten inclusion	5	22.7	9	40.9	6	27.3	2	9.1	0	0	69.33
3	The current curriculum lacks/ has poor curriculum adaptations	12	54.5	7	31.8	3	13.6	0	00	0	0	33.40
4	Learners with disabilities require a lot of attention	5	22.7	9	40.9	2	9.1	6	27.3	0	0	64.77
5	There is shortage of trained teachers (SNE) in Kenya	6	27.3	11	50.0	3	13.6	2	9.1	0	0	74.13
6	I would rather teach learners without disabilities alone	3	13.6	2	9.1	10	45.5	4	18.2	3	13.6	47.72
7	Removal of social- cultural barriers might lead to success of inclusion	1	4.5	11	50	5	22.7	4	18.2	1	4.5	57.95
8	All teachers need to be trained on how to handle learners with disabilities	6	27.3	9	40.9	2	9.1	3	13.6	2	9.1	65.90
9	Teaching learners with disabilities is an additional burden to regular teachers	8	36.4	4	18.2	1	4.5	9	40.9	0	0	62.5
10	Teachers' positive attitude towards inclusion might help lead to the successful implementation of	2	9.1	14	63.6	2	9.1	4	18.2	0	0	65.90

	inclusion in Kenya											
11	Inclusion requires a lot of financial input from the government	8	36.4	9	40.9	1	4.5	4	18.2	0	0	73.86
12	Stigmatization of learners with disabilities is a major social barrier to inclusion in Kenya	5	22.7	10	45.5	5	22.7	2	9.1	0	0	70.45
13	Parents of learners with disabilities would rather have their children learn alone than mixed up with those without disabilities	8	36.4	11	50.0	1	4.5	2	9.1	0	0	78.40
14	Inclusion will require that the government employs more personnel in schools	9	40.9	6	27.3	3	13.6	4	18.2	0	0	72.72
15	The society needs to be sensitized on benefits and the need to have inclusive schools	11	50	7	31.8	2	9.1	2	9.1	0	0	80.68
16	Learning materials for learners/without disabilities need to be availed for inclusion to take off	9	40.9	8	36.4	1	4.5	2	9.1	2	9.1	72.72

(A) Curriculum Barriers

These are barriers that arise from syllabi and learning activities. From the study, these included lack of learning materials, untrained teachers and lack of enough syllabi adaptations

(i) Lack of Learning Resources / Materials

Table 3 shows that 77.3% of the teachers indicated that learning materials that cater for learners with/ without disabilities need to be availed for inclusion to be implemented with only 18.2 disagreeing with the statement. The least 4.5% were not sure if the statement was true or not. For learning to be effective in inclusion, learner with and without disabilities have to be availed with the right teaching resources. Learners with disabilities particularly require numerous teaching resources to help them understand the subject matter or example learners with blindness need to be provided with enough tactile (touch) experiences for them to learn as they mostly learn through listening and touching in order to get the concept. Hence lack of learning materials is a major economic barrier to inclusion. Thus, without the necessary learning resources, inclusion may not take place at all and should it take off, learning might never occur, consequently nullifying the whole process. Learners with mental retardation too require numerous learning resources to aid in their teaching. Thus for inclusion to be implemented learning resources are very important. Parker, (2013), states that learners with disabilities require more learning resources/ materials than learners without disabilities. He however says that both categories of learners must be availed with the right learning resources. It is worth noting that the practise of inclusion must be supported by other resources for it to be successful. According to Archer (2011) it is not enough to just have learners with and without disabilities, to learn together,

the learners need to be availed with enough learning resources to help them comprehend concepts as they are already disadvantaged as a result of their disabilities. The head teacher also reported that public schools lack the right facilities and other equipment used by learners with disabilities like abacus and talking calculators, and for learners with visual impairments and Braille books and textbooks.

(ii) Lack of / poor syllabi adaptations

Teachers reported that the syllabus had very little adaptations that would benefit learners with disabilities. Table 3 shows that 54% of the teachers strongly agreed and 31.1% agreed with the fact that the syllabus lacked adaptations that would benefit learners with disabilities, just 13.6% of the respondents disagreed with this fact. Thus a lot needs to be done on the syllabus in order for inclusion to be implemented. Furthermore the head teacher reported that most syllabi used in general education (or integrated settings) classes do not have accommodations in terms of adapted activities for students with disabilities including those with visual impairments and mild mental retardation. According to the head teacher, the worst accommodations for learners with disabilities are in Mathematics. Thus it would be impossible to teach learners with disabilities using the current syllabus. As Learners with visual impairments and mental retardation need to have a syllabus with a lot of adaptations“

Thus the head teachers thought that the current syllabus may not benefit learners with visual impairments, hearing impairments and mental retardation as most of the content required practical work which might be hard for learners with visual impairments and abstract thinking which would be an uphill task for learners with mental retardation.

(iii) Untrained Teachers

From table 3 above, the majority, (77%) of the respondents indicated that there was an acute shortage of trained teachers with just 9.1% of the respondents disagreeing with the statement. Furthermore, most, 68.2% of the respondents thought that all teachers needed to be trained on how to handle learners with different kinds of disabilities with just 22.7 % disagreeing with the statement. The least, 9.1% were not sure whether all teachers need to be trained to handle learners with disabilities or not. It also emerged from the study that some teachers taught learners with mental retardation in the school without any special needs knowledge as was shown on table one, 4.5% of the teachers had no special education training at all.

This is in agreement with Songe (2005), as discussed in the literature review in this study. Songe (2005) cited lack of qualified staff as a major barrier to total integration of students with visual impairments in Kenya.

The concept of inclusion requires that all teachers be trained to handle learners with different kinds of disabilities, of course with the help of support staff such as teaching assistants and other therapists like occupational therapists. In the absence of adequately trained teachers it will be almost impossible for inclusion to be implemented. In Kenya currently, teachers are trained to handle a specific category of disability as a result teachers specialise in one area of disability only, these teachers might not handle learners with disabilities outside their area of specialization as is the requirement under inclusion. This calls for an “inclusion approach” in training of all teachers. As was reported by the headteacher during the interview, regular teachers too, needed to be trained on how to handle learners with various kinds of disabilities as under inclusion, these teachers are expected to teach learner with disabilities. For example all teachers needed training on how to use abacus in calculating mathematics in order to teach learners with visual impairments how to use it. Teachers too should learn sign language in order to be able to teach learners with hearing impairments in their classes

(B) Social –cultural Barriers

This study sought and investigated societal and cultural factors that pose a challenge to the implementation of inclusion. From Table 3 above, the social barriers to inclusion that emerged from the study included myths/ stigma, opposition from both parents of learners with disabilities and without disabilities and lack of awareness on the benefits of inclusion by the parents.

(i) Stigma

Stigma which implies a mark of disgrace associated with a particular circumstance or quality was a predominant theme in the study. This was as a result of the negative perceptions that the society bore towards learners with intellectual disabilities. Findings show that most of the respondents agreed with the statement that stigmatization of learners with disabilities was a major social barrier to inclusion. According to the head teacher, stigmatization makes it hard for parents of learners with disabilities to take their children who are deemed capable to learn in the regular class, this is because the parents fear mistreatment and ridicule of their children who might not be able to defend themselves adequately. Most (68%) of the teachers thought that stigma plays a major role with only 23 % of the respondents indicating that they were not sure. The least, only 9%, disagreed with this statement. Hayeth (2009) indicates that for inclusion to take place, all cultural and societal stereotypes connected with disability must be erased from people’s minds through public education and awareness campaigns. According to Hayeth (2009), stakeholders in developing countries should invest in these kinds of campaigns in order to change society’s skewed thinking about disabilities and to

have a society that respects and accepts persons with disabilities. Furthermore 55% of the respondents indicated that removal of socio-cultural barriers like stigma would lead to successful implementation of inclusion, only 22.7% disagreed with this statement while 22.3% were not sure if removal of stigma would lead to successful implementation of inclusion. The respondents who disagreed with the statement might have done so due to the fact that there exists other factors that also hinder inclusion and as such removal of stigma alone might not be helpful. However generally, removal of stigma might make it a lot easier even in the face of other obstacles that still need to be dealt with.

The findings concur with those of the Kenya Society for the Blind KSB (2006), which recommends sensitization of the communities as a way of reducing stigma. Accordingly stigmatization is attributed to retrogressive cultural beliefs, poor attitudes and ignorance of the potential of learners with disabilities by the society, accordingly, stigma bars transition and participation in education of learners with disabilities.

(ii) Parents opposition to inclusion as a social barrier

Parents of learners without disabilities also feared that if their children learnt with learners with disabilities, their speed of learning would reduce and their intellectual capacities might not be enhanced. Both categories of parents also seemed to prefer to have their children to learn on their own without being mixed up, yet for inclusion to take place, learners with disabilities who are deemed able, should share a class with those without disabilities. According to Hayeth (2009) inclusion requires goodwill and understanding from both parents of children with or without disabilities. According to the author the parents have a big role to play to ensure the success of inclusion according to Hayeth (2009), if parents do not trust that their children would benefit from inclusion, they would not take their children to such settings.

The teachers agreed with the statement that the society needs to be sensitized on benefits and the need to have inclusive schools with a high majority 80% agreeing with the statement and the least 9.1% indicating they were not sure. No single teacher disagreed with this statement. Hence it is imperative for the society to be sensitized and enlightened on the need to have inclusion. Apparently, lack of sensitization and education on the benefits and importance of inclusion was a major social barrier to the implementation of inclusion. The teachers too agreed with the fact that removal of socio-cultural barriers might help in the implementation of inclusion with 54.5% agreeing to the statement and only 23% disagreeing with it. The rest of the teachers (22.7%) were not sure if this statement was true.

(ii) Lack of parental awareness of inclusion

Most of the teachers understood the meaning of inclusion and 68.18% agreed with the fact that inclusion entails learners with and without disabilities learning together in the regular classroom. The respondents also mentioned some benefits of inclusion to both learners with and without disabilities. The teachers mentioned the fact that if students with disabilities learned in the same classroom with learners without disabilities, strong relationships would emerge between them which would be helpful to all of them in the long run. Studies by Mona (2011) and Musoma, (2006) reveal that inclusion offers significant opportunities to both learners with and without disabilities as it provides a forum for both categories of learners to interact and understand each other. On the other hand the parents' understanding of inclusion was limited, according to them; inclusion meant the same thing as integration. They indicated that it was not right to have their children learn in the same classroom with learners without disabilities, they thought that regular classrooms did not have the right learning atmosphere for their children and that teachers would concentrate on learners without disabilities at the expense of their children. This however also points to the fact that the regular schools do not have the capacity to accommodate and handle learners with disabilities. Lack of parental awareness made the parents have a negative attitude towards inclusion as they generally to have their children learn in the special class/ school regardless of the fact that they were capable of learning in an inclusive setting.

(C) Economic Barriers

The study sought to establish monetary barriers that bar the implementation of inclusion. the main economic barrier as revealed by the study was parents' lack of finances to support their children in regular schools and lack of support employees required to support learners with different kinds of disabilities in regular schools.

(i) Parents' lack of finances

At the personal level, the teachers indicated that most parents could not afford to pay the fess required if they took their children to ordinary schools. This is because government support for special schools or special units was higher than the support of regular schools. If the parents transferred their children who were thought to be capable to the regular class they feared they would lose government support and their children would have to drop off school. Thus lack of finances was a major barrier to inclusion. McAdam (2009) indicates that inclusion might require parents to play a big role financially as they might be required to meet deficits and shortfalls in the school budgets. Hence parents' in a lower socio economic status might suffer financially. Parents might be required to arrange for transport back home for students who were otherwise in a special boarding school. This might

cause financial constraints in a family that was hitherto not used to this. Parents also lacked money to purchase school requirements like charts, colored pens and books. The parents of learners with disabilities indicated that they were not economically able to support their children's education if they left special schools as special schools are almost fully supported by the government. The parents believed that if the children joined the normal class, the support would stop. Thus they preferred the special unit or school.

(ii) Lack of support employees in schools

The head teacher stated that inclusion would call for employment of more personnel in schools and modification of structures and landscape to make it suitable for learners with / without disabilities. According to the headmaster occupational therapists, teaching assistants and other personnel needed to be employed for inclusion to be implemented. Accordingly the government had not sent them money to do that. The same sentiments were echoed by the teachers. Most (68%) of them agreed with the statement that Inclusion will require that the government employs more personnel in schools, only 16% disagreed with this statement. The head teachers indicated that currently there were no support employees in their schools due to financial constraints. For the concept of inclusion to be actualised, different types of personnel have to assist the classroom teacher. There is need for class assistants, occupational therapists, speech therapists etc. to be present in order to provide services to learners who require them. Classroom assistants would assist the teacher to handle the learners should need arise. Alemna (2004) indicates that teaching assistants are mandatory in a classroom that has learners with disabilities as some learners have conditions that require additional support. Thus lack of personnel would hinder the implementation of inclusion as some categories of disabilities require that other personnel like occupational therapists and teaching assistants be present in all classes to help the regular teacher. These personnel would help learners with toileting, pushing wheelchair and so on.

(D) Physical and structural barriers

For inclusion to take place, it is expected that the environment should be made disability sensitive especially in view of learners with visual and physical disabilities. Learners with physical disabilities need to have access to all building in the school; these would call for establishment of ramps or lifts as some of these learners use wheelchairs. Rough terrain is disadvantageous to learners with visual impairments as they may skid and fall due to boulders on the way. Inclusion envisions learners with disabilities benefiting from the environment as their non-disabled counterparts as much as is practically possible.

From the interview with the head teacher, study established that schools in Kakamega County had many physical and structural barriers, the head teacher reported these included **lack of ramps/ lifts in the schools** and **rough/unfriendly terrain**. According to the head teacher, the buildings too were **not acoustic** as is the requirement for classrooms for learners with hearing impairments. Most, 68 % of the teachers indicated that it was mandatory for learners with disability to learn in a disability- sensitive environment with just 22% disagreeing with this fact. Furthermore, 63% of the respondents indicated that there is need for structural modifications of school environment to accommodate learners with disabilities. This simply implies that the schools lacked basic modifications that would help learners with disabilities to move with ease. Only 9.1 % of the teachers did not agree with statement. Eden & Flame, (2004) assert that the environment in which learners with disabilities learn play a big role. Accordingly, the environment will determine whether learners with disabilities will benefit from the learning process or not. According to the authors, learners with disabilities should never be exposed to an environment that is neglected and unfriendly as this poses a danger to them. A bad environment, according to Eden & Flame (2004) will definitely render learning impossible and in some extremes, might cause injuries and harm to learners with disabilities. Hence there is need for regular schools to improve infrastructure and terrain for learners with different kinds of disabilities to fit in the system

(E) Recommendations

The Ministry of Education should improve the ability of learners with disabilities to access education and the world in general **by mobilizing educational resources and raising public awareness of the issues relevant to persons with disabilities**. Further, the Ministry of Education should strive to make regular school-environments disability friendly to enable learners with disabilities to fit and benefit from such schools as apparently special schools are the only ones that have disability friendly structures and environments thus rendering inclusion impossible in some schools. The government also needs to support and educate parents on the benefits of inclusion. Furthermore the Ministry of Education should develop a syllabus that is responsive and sensitive to learners with disabilities' as opposed to the current syllabus that just has a few modifications. Lastly, the Ministry of Education should be cautioned against reducing financial support to learners who might join the regular class through the process of inclusion.

References

- Achola, P. (2004). *Access, Equity and Efficiency in Kenyan Public schools*. Nairobi: Lyceum Educational Consultants.
- Ajayi, K. (1996). *The African Experience with Higher Education*. London: James Curry Ltd.
- Alemna, A. (2004) *Library Provision for the Blind*. New York: the Haworth Press
- Alwell, M and Cobb, B (2006) *Teaching Functional Life Skills To The Youth With Disabilities, Department of Special Education and child Development 9201 University City Blvd, Unc Charlotte, NSTTC*.
- Eden, K. & Flame, L. (1999). *Disability and Response*. United Kingdom: Marsden Group.
- Government of Kenya (GoK, 2015).
- International Labour Organisation (ILO, 2004:9).
- Ministry of Education. (2013). *Essential Examination Statistics during the Release of KCSE examination*.
- Musoma, K. 2006). *Youth with disabilities; disability in Studies the African Context*. Toronto: Bel Ltd.
- Mutisya, B. (2012), *Disability and Marginalisation in Kenyan school*. Hethel Park: USA
- Karanja, M. 2013. *Inclusive societies? A critical analysis of disability variables*. Tewin: MN
- Kenya Society for the Blind. (2006). Newsletter, issue 1.
- Persons with disabilities Act (2003)
- UNHCR (2008). *The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)*
- Ministry of Education. (2008). *Essential KCSE Examination Statistics during the release of 2008 KCSE examination*
- Smith et al 2001, Kirk et.al 2003) *Transition to college*. Journal of Education 72, 85-87.
- The Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS, 2010)
- Vancil, D. (2001). *Steps to Success in College for students With Visual Impairments Living Skills Centre for the Visually Impaired, 138- San Pablo Avenue, San Pablo, and CA 94806*.
- Songe, O. (2006). *Curriculum Barriers to Successful Inclusion of Students with Visual Impairments in Kenya Polytechnic*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Kenyatta University
- Orangah (2012). *Transition of learners with visual impairments to public universities in Kenya, a Case of Kenyatta university*. Unpublished Masters- Thesis, Kenyatta University
- Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (2014), KNCHR

- Kanake, L. (2001). *Gender Disparities among the Academic Staff in Kenyan Universities*. Nairobi: Ed Consultants.
- Kirk et. al (2003): *Disabilities in Developing Nations* Ham. New Jersey