RESEARCH ARTICLE

PREPAREDNESS OF SCHOOLS OFFERING INCLUSIVE EDUCATION TO CHILDREN WITH PHYSICAL DISABILITIES IN INCLUSIVE SETTINGS IN KENYA

[1]Washingtone Wachianga, [1]Dr. Charles Makori Omoke and [2]Dr. Jack Odongo Ajowi

[1]Department of Special Needs, School of Education, Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology, Box 210, Bondo, Kenya

[2]Department of Curriculum and Education Management, School of Education, Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology, Box 210, Bondo, Kenya

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	Establishing inclusive schools in Kenya is apriority however not all schools practice inclusion. The purpose of the study was to determine educational experiences of children with physical disabilities in inclusive settings in Kenya. The objective was to determine the state of preparedness of schools offering inclusive education to children with physical disabilities in inclusive settings. The study was guided by Constructivist Learning Theory. The study employed mixed methods approach. The research design used was Concurrent Triangulation Model. The target population was made up of 337 participants. The sampling techniques used were purposive, simple random sampling and stratified random sampling. The sampled population for the study was 264 participants. The instruments were questionnaires, Focus Group Discussions, interview schedules and observation checklist. Piloting was done to determine reliability of research instruments which was through by test-retest where correlation co-efficient (rho) was worked. Authorization and permit to conduct research was given by National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). Qualitative data was collected in conformity with the chosen mixed methods research design. Quantitative data from questionnaires were analyzed with the assistance of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), computer version 20. It generated descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages. The qualitative data was analyzed using content, narrative and thematic methods and presented in direct quotes and narrative in line with the study objectives. The study revealed that preparations done in schools involved sensitization and awareness campaigns with all stakeholders, general adaptation of physical facilities and training of teachers in the schools. Schools were faced with various challenges. The overall conclusion was that all stakeholders were involved in the preparations. Based on the study findings some recommendations were made: that all stakeholders should strive to remove barriers that prevent children with physical disabilities from benefiting from education which is a human right. There is need for adapting school facilities. Sensitization and awareness campaign should be ongoing in the community and public schools to enroll children with physical disabilities. Children with physical disabilities should be provided with adequate, specialized, relevant equipment and teaching/learning resources that are conducive to their needs.

INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education has become a world-wide movement in terms of providing education that caters for all children in the neighborhood schools. The Salamanca Declaration of 1994 was the cornerstone in understanding the practice of inclusive education. Countries were inspired to review their education policies in line with the new philosophy that re-affirms the

*Corresponding author: Dr. Jack Odongo Ajowi
Department of Curriculum and Education Management, School of Education, Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of, Science and Technology, Box 210, Bondo, Kenya.

right to education to every individual child (Seehorn, 2011). Inclusive education is understood as a developmental approach geared to meet the educational needs of all children and emphasizing for opportunity of those who are subjected to marginalization and exclusion. The teaching approach should respond to the diverse needs of children including those who are physically disabled in inclusive settings. The system requires that teachers working with these children develop competencies that involve knowledge, skills and dispositions in order to qualitatively teach and promote learning of children who are physically challenged in the inclusive settings. Porter (2001) observes that if inclusion was to be successful, educational managers need to ensure that there are varied and

systematic supports services and structures available to the teacher. Costa Rica has very progressive and wide ranging laws and policies about inclusive education. However, most of the students with severe disabilities remain segregated in special schools or special classes in general education campuses due to shortage of trained special education teachers with skills in teaching, a fixed curriculum and negative attitude (Villa and Thousand, 2012). Availability and adequacy of trained teachers in special needs pose a great challenge in inclusive settings. However the level and nature of training in special needs education is not mandatory in meeting the needs of children with disabilities in inclusive schools. This study sought to establish the nature of attitudes of teachers towards educating children with physical disabilities in inclusive settings. While India enshrines a strong commitment to inclusive education, negative public attitudes are among the greatest constraint to equal opportunity for education in the country (Rieser, 2008). Education policy can be comprehensive on inclusive education but if it is not glued with positive attitudes and commitment, then implementation of such policies becomes unsuccessful. Public attitude can impact on human and physical resources that should be availed to children with physical disabilities in regular schools. Garuba (2003) argues that while countries with advanced economies have gone beyond categorical provisions of full inclusion, most developing countries in Africa were still grappling with the problem of making educational provisions for children with special needs. Gadagbui (2008) gives an example in Ghana of a Kindergarten to Basic 4 where there is inclusion for children with hearing impairment, but teachers' attitudes remain a major challenge. The study was based on children with hearing impairment but is of relevance to a study that deals with challenges of including children with physical disabilities in inclusive settings. In Uganda, Odyek (2012) observes that there was no direct support from stakeholders for children with disabilities in inclusive schools. A study by Kristensen and Kristensen (as cited in Charema, 2005), also indicate that most regular schools in Uganda where most children with disabilities were integrated, the required materials were not provided or were inadequate. The current study wished also to consider specific materials for learners with physical disabilities in inclusive settings. In Kenya there have been various policy recommendations given by education commissions and committees that direct and advice on the provision of education to all learners with special needs and disabilities since independence. According to SNE Policy (2009), these challenges include inappropriate infrastructure, inadequate facilities, inadequate equipment, inadequate capacity of teachers to handle learners with special needs and disabilities and expensive teaching and learning materials. It was against this background that the current study was going to establish the challenges faced in educating children with physical disabilities in inclusive settings. It would also determine schools' preparedness before the establishment of inclusive education and coping strategies which schools used to deal with the challenges faced in the management of schools having children with physical disabilities in inclusive settings. Establishing of inclusive schools takes priority. However, there still exist special schools not only in Nyanza region but also in other parts of the nation without considering including children with all categories of special needs. Therefore the overall research problem addressed in this study was that despite the government emphasis on inclusion, only a few

schools in Nyanza include children with physical disabilities in regular schools. Hence there was need to establish the experiences of educating learners with physical disabilities in inclusive settings in Nyanza region. The study is guided by the following objective; To determine the preparedness of schools offering inclusive education to children with physical disabilities. This study was guided by constructivist learning theory which describes the process of knowledge construction. It refers to the idea that learners construct knowledge for themselves; each learner individually (and socially) constructs meaning as he/she learns. The crucial action of constructing meaning is mental, it happens in the mind. Physical actions, hands-on experience may be necessary for learning, especially for children but it is not sufficient; we need to provide activities which engage the mind as well as the hands or what Dewey called reflective activity (Hein, 1991). The Kenyan education curriculum is a one-fits-all one and teachers may find its fixed nature a major challenge. This signifies why relevant and adequate physical and learning materials should be provided and adapted. In order to allow children with physical disabilities to actively participate in constructing meaning and knowledge, the challenges that would interfere with their process of learning need to be addressed.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study used a mixed methods approach which combines both qualitative and quantitative approaches. According to Kothari (2004) quantitative research is based on the measurement of quantity or amount while qualitative research is concerned with qualitative phenomena relating to or involving quality where data is described in words rather than in numerical terms. Within the mixed methods approach the research design to be used in the study was concurrent triangulation model. This design was be suitable for this study because it allowed for quantitative and qualitative data collection at the same time in the research procedure. The study will be conducted in Nyanza Region which has 6 counties, that is; Siaya, Kisumu, Homabay, Migori, Nyamira and Kisii. The region is located in the south western part of Kenya around Lake Victoria. The study population was made up of 337 participants from schools practicing inclusive education, which included 136 teachers from 11 schools, 11 head teachers, 22 professionals and 168 primary school pupils from class (grade) six to eight. The study used purposive sampling to select all primary schools in Nyanza region that had adopted inclusive education, school administrators and professionals attached to each school. This is described as a continuation of sampling until no new conceptual insights are generated (Bloor and Fiona, 2006). In total 11 groups of 8 pupils making 88 participated in the FGDG. The study used questionnaires, Focus Group Discussions, an interview schedule, and observation checklist as the tools for collecting data. The selection of these tools had been guided by the nature of data to be collected, the time available as well as the objectives of the study. This study ensured this validity by strictly adhering to research procedures, reporting what the respondents expressed and giving interpretation to non-verbal communication that formed part of the data for the study. Guion, Diehl and MCDonald (2013) stated that triangulation is a method used by qualitative researchers to check and establish validity in their studies by analyzing a research question from multiple perspectives. This study ensured

further validity by employing interviews and focus group discussions to collect data. In quantitative approach, internal validity refers to the extent to which an experiment rules out alternative explanations of the results (Kazdin, 1998). In this study threats to internal validity such as attrition were controlled by conducting data collection within a specified period in the individual schools. In the current study threats to external validity such as reactivity by the participants during the data collection were maintained by encouraging the informants to be as honest as possible while responding to the questionnaire items.

Reliability

To ensure reliability Test – retest technique was used. The instruments were administered twice in two weeks to the same individuals in each school. The following formula was used to calculate the correlation co-efficiency to judge reliability.

$$Rho = 1 - \frac{6 \sum D^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}$$

Where

rho is Spearman correlation index,
D is the difference in ranks for a pair of scores and
N is the number of within each distribution

The result was used to modify and remove the ambiguous items from the instruments. Since the study used a mixed methods approach, reliability of tools for collecting qualitative data was done. The study used descriptive statistics, content, narrative and thematic data analysis. Descriptive analysis uses measures of central tendencies such as mean, median and mode, tabulating, graphing and describing data (Orotho, 2009). This study used descriptive statistics where frequencies and percentages were used to summarize quantitative data.

RESULTS

Findings on the Schools Preparedness before Admitting Children with Physical disabilities in the Schools

The study sought to establish the state of schools preparedness before admitting children with physical disabilities in the school. The findings and discussions were presented in line with the responses from head teachers, teachers, pupils, professionals and observation checklist.

Establishment of Inclusive Schools

The study sought to find out when an inclusive system in the primary schools was first established. The head teachers responded by mentioning the year of inception of this programme in their schools. It was found that the earliest establishment in the first school was done in 2001 and the latest was in January 2014. This range in the implementation is quite dragging. It seems the government is not keen in fast tracking inclusion. If it has taken a period of 13 years to see the implementation of inclusion of children with physical disabilities in only 11 schools in Nyanza region, then the move

towards full inclusion is too slow. This finding is in support of Garuba (2003) in a study on challenges and opportunities on inclusive education in the 21st.centuary for Nigeria, argued that while countries within advanced economies have gone beyond categorical provision of full inclusion, most developing countries of Africa are still grappling with the problem of making educational provisions for children with special needs.

Piloting by Schools for Inclusive Education

This study aimed at ascertaining whether piloting was done in the schools already having an inclusive programme for children with physical disabilities. Piloting was not done in majority of the schools having children with physical disabilities. The responses from the head teachers were presented in the table below:

Piloting by Schools for Inclusive Education (n=11)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.	4	3.9	36.4	36.4
	2.	7	6.9	63.6	100
	Total	102	100.0	100.0	100

The table shows that piloting was done in four school representing 36.4% while those who never did piloting were 7 representing 63.6%. Many of the head teachers in this study stated that piloting was not done before rolling out an inclusive programme for children with physical disabilities. They stated that it was out of their own initiative that they started to include children with physical disabilities in the schools. They even made efforts and initiated a baseline survey in the local community to establish how many children with physical disabilities were not attending school. One of the head teachers observed:

"Piloting not done but out of interest as teachers we felt that these pupils should not be left out, baseline survey was done in the community around."

This finding does not concur with Crawford (2005) in a study in Canada of an overview of current issues in the inclusive education of students with intellectual and other disabilities, who reported that inclusion first started in Hamilton-Wentworth and was later followed by other regions which suggested doing piloting before national implementation of full inclusion. In starting a new programme it is imperative that piloting is done to identify the strengths and weaknesses. This could minimize the challenges the inclusive primary schools having children with physical disabilities face.

Stakeholders Involvement in Preparations

The study sought to establish whether the stakeholders were brought on board during the preparations to include children with physical disabilities in inclusive schools. The head teachers were asked to respond on the involvement of stakeholders before admitting children with physical disabilities in their schools. It was reported that stakeholders were involved in the preparations before including children

with physical disabilities in the schools. The responses of head teachers are presented in the table below:

Table 4.18. Stakeholders Involvement in Preparations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	10	9.8	83.3	83.3
	2	1	1.0	8.3	91.7
	11	1	1.0	8.3	100.0
	Total	12	11.8	100.0	
Missing	System	90	88.2		
Total		102	100.0		

According to the data presented in Table 4.18, 10 head teachers representing 83.3% reported that stakeholders were involved in the preparation to establish an inclusive setting for children with physical disabilities. Only one head teacher representing 8.3% responded that stakeholders were not involved in the setting up of the inclusive education programmes. The stakeholders were head teachers, teachers, and parents, well wishers in the community and education officials. The data in the table reveals that stakeholders were involved in the preparations before admitting children with physical disabilities into the regular schools. The data in the table reveals that stakeholders were involved in the preparations. This concurs with UNESCO (2007) observing that to achieve inclusive agenda all stakeholders should be involved. This finding is also in agreement with Subban and Sharma (2005) who stated that teachers believed that the support of principals and other stakeholders was critical for them to implement inclusive practices. To roll a new program there is need for policy makers to sensitize people on what the government requires before starting a new program. This means that the stakeholders must be involved to plan for the program in terms of human and physical resources. The government alone cannot provide the needed financial resources and therefore members of the community must be involved to take responsibility for the inclusion of children with physical disabilities in the regular schools to succeed.

Roles Played by Stakeholders

The role of Head teachers

The study sought to establish the role played by head teachers in the preparation of the regular schools before admitting children with physical disabilities. The head teachers took the lead in mobilizing the community and directing the decisions made by other stakeholders in the preparations a part from creating a welcoming school environment for children with physical disabilities. The responses of head teachers were similar as one of the head teachers observed:

"I was chairing meetings for support groups, mobilize the communities around to bring children to school and communicating information on policies regarding inclusive education and creating conducive environment".

This means that the administrators support for inclusion is a requirement right before including children with physical disabilities in their schools. This finding is in line with Milsom (2006) who observed that the successful implementation of any programme depends on support from school administrators and cooperative efforts from school personnel.

Therapy (2002) observes that it is up to the principal to prepare the school for inclusion and provide backing for both human and material resources. This implies that the school head teachers as managers must fully support the implementation, take lead and be actively in the preparations of the schools to be ready to admit children with physical disabilities.

Role of parents

The study sought to find out the role parents played during the preparations to include children with physical disabilities in the schools. The parents were willing to have their children admitted in the regular schools by showing their commitment in attending meetings and mobilize other fellow parents to do the same.

During the interview one of the teachers observed:

"Parents attended meetings and bring their children to school. They also mobilized fellow parents to bring their children to school"

The statement by teacher indicated that parents were willing to discuss the conditions of their children with the professionals when called upon. This finding does not concur with Wachianga (2012) in a study of provision of support services to learners with physical disabilities, in Kisumu county involving pupils with physical disabilities and teachers. The study found out that parents were uncooperative when called to school to discuss the conditions of their children with professionals when it was thought the problems have a link from home. This may imply that the attitudes of parents are changing with time and they now ready to take responsibility in their children's education. However this further indicates that for inclusion to succeed parents must play a major role through resource mobilization and creating awareness for inclusion. Their willingness to bring children with disability to school is a major role to grace the success of inclusion. Similarly, Leonard Chesire Disability Representative (2012) observes that parents can plan, advocate for inclusive policies and practices for their own children and other disabled children. While Will (1986) believes that, in experimental efforts parents should be deeply involved and their due process and participation in planning should be assured

Role of Teachers

The study sought to establish the role of teachers during the preparation of schools before including children with physical disabilities. From the head teacher's responses, teachers were involved in creating awareness among the public on the need for including children with disabilities in the schools. They also played an active role in sensitizing parents of children with special needs who could be identified in the community. They were involved in training programmes and workshops to acquire skills for teaching children with special needs. One of the head teachers observed:

"Teachers were willing to teach children with special needs inclusive of those with physical disabilities. They were involved in training progrmmes through self sponsorship mostly in KISE long distance training programme. Some

teachers were attending seminars and workshops organized by Leonard Chesire Disability.

This means that teachers were equipping themselves with skills and willing to teach these children from the onset of admission. This finding is in line with Crawford (2005) a study of an overview of current issues in inclusive education in Canada found that inclusive education started in Hamilton-Wentworth led by educators on the basis of a reasonable examination of students with disabilities. The finding is also in agreement with Stanley (2013) who observed that for a teacher a key aspect of working with children with special needs is to identify individual needs and being responsible for creating a safe, stimulating and supportive environment. This means that teachers were involved in creating awareness and preparing the schools to receive children with disabilities. The involvement of teachers is very dear to children with physical disabilities because their attitude and competency would facilitate the academic and social performance of those children.

Role of Community in Preparing Inclusive Schools

The study wished to determine the role played by the community during the preparations of schools to include children with physical disabilities in their schools. It was found that the communities supported inclusion in various ways. They supported schools with resources including finances to construct buildings. They sensitized and mobilized other community members over children with special needs. They accepted children and advocated for them to be enrolled in the nearby schools. An interview with teachers reveals that the community members were involved in the preparations of schools to admit children with physical disabilities. One of the teachers stated:

"The members of the community including the local leaders were active in campaigning for inclusion and organized fund raisings to build classrooms"

This demonstrates the preparation and willingness of community to provide a safe learning environment for children with disabilities. This is in line with Save the Children (2002) working on school for all reports that education for the disabled was seen as valuable with the community based rehabilitation workers who were encouraged to promote integration of disabled children into their schools. The finding is also in agreement with Nyende's (2012) study on children with disabilities in Universal primary in Uganda noted that community members in general have a critical role to play in education of children with disabilities. However the finding is not in agreement with Ladbrook (2009) who reported lack of community involvement inclusive education in South Africa. The education of children with physical disabilities requires involvement in the provision of physical and human resources for them to receive quality education. It is critical to believe that inclusive education of children with physical disabilities can succeed without community support.

The Role of other Education Officials

The study sought to establish the role played by other education officials in the preparation for inclusion of children

with physical disabilities in the schools. It was reported that other education officials assess and refer children with special needs to the schools and these are professionals working in the Educational Assessment and Resource Services. They helped in mobilization of parents of children with disabilities to enroll their children in schools. They also posted teachers and held workshops. They inspected schools to ensure that they are environment was learner friendly. During the interview one of the teachers stated that:

"All children with disabilities that we receive in our school are referred from the Educational Assessment and Resource Services. They carried awareness campaign and also mobilized the community to bring children with disabilities to school. Teachers had been posted from the education office. They also visited the school to ascertain that it is disability friendly."

Children with physical disabilities had to go through the assessment centre for assessment and placement as reported by the head teachers. This concurs with Kathenya and Mwereria (2007) who posit that the first step in supporting learners with special needs in education involves the assessment of their difficulties and abilities. They placed emphasis on assessment and intervention. This is also in agreement with SNE Policy (2009) which emphasizes the Kenya government commitment on inclusive education through regular schools for learners with special needs and disabilities, sensitization and in-servicing of teachers. This implies that the government the government has put in place the strategies to ensure that children with physical disabilities access education through regular schools.

Adaptations in the School Environment Adaptation of Physical Facilities

In an attempt to establish the adaptation of physical facilities suitable for learners with physical disabilities, teachers were asked to state whether the facilities were adapted before admitting children with physical disabilities in the schools. The study established that the physical facilities were adapted. Their responses were as shown in the table below:

Adaptation of Physical Facilities (n=86)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1.00	61	59.8	70.9	70.9
Valid	2.00	25	24.5	29.1	100.0
	Total	86	84.3	100.0	
Missing	System	16	15.7		
	Total	102	100.0		

Those teachers who reported that the adaptation of the facilities was done were about 70.9% indicating that physical facilities in the school were adapted while 29.1% of the teachers stated that there was no adaptation in their schools. This higher per cent draws attention to the need for adapting the school facilities to suit the learners' diversity in the schools. Children with physical disabilities have varying characteristics and they are individuals whose needs must be met independent of their peers. The adaptation was confirmed by the observation checklist in most of the schools studied of which some included adapted seats in the classrooms. This

finding is in agreement with Special Needs Technology Assessment Resource Support Team (START) (2001) which is a group of educators to oversee best practices in the educational application of technology. The team argued that often students with physical disabilities have additional disabilities such as visual or hearing impairments, learning disabilities or cognitive delay. Therefore a student with physical impairment may require adapted materials/equipment as well as additional support from teachers and other professionals to modify and adapt the teaching/ learning environment to meet her/his unique needs.

General School Environment

The study sought to establish the adaptation of the school environment in the schools studied. The study reveals that most school had ramps of which some were very steep. The ramps were leading to head teacher's office and class entrance. In some of schools the construction of ramps was done through sponsorship. During the interview one of the teachers stated:

"ramps were constructed to office and classrooms sponsored by the initial donor that later withdrew."

Another teacher observed:

"ramps were also constructed leading to classes"

One of the teachers also observed:

"ramps, pavements and rails were put towards classrooms and office entrance"

These views of teachers give an insight on the significance of adapting the school environment to facilitate accessibility of children with physical disabilities in the school. This is similar to a study carried out by UNESCO (2003) in Bangladesh on an example of a working model inclusive school which found out that the school was adapted to ensure accessibility of children with disabilities within the school building. The observation checklist revealed that most of the ramps were steep and narrow. This complicated independent movement of those using wheelchairs who must be pushed by fellow peers through child to child support. However, in one of the schools there was no sign of any adaptation in the school. During the interview a teacher in the school said:

"Inclusive started in 2005, the school had not been adapted and disability unfriendly even for normal children. The school is full of stones as you can see, in classes not so much has been done"

Focus Group Discussion also revealed no effort was made to make the environment disability friendly. The FGD session had this remark:

"no arrangement was made to make the school better for us"

It is very difficult for children with physical disabilities to access facilities in a school where even children without disability are experiencing mobility problems because of school's physical environment. Alternatively the school with

no arrangement for adaptation exposes children with physical disability to a more stressful condition in terms of academic and social participation. This is in line with Nyende (2012) who found that one of the schools constructed in 1954 in Uganda has never undergone modification necessary to facilitate learning for children with disabilities. Schools had tried to construct pavements to facilitate the movement of children with physical disabilities in the school both with and without assistive devices. Observation checklist revealed that in some schools only corridors were had cemented pathways.

"only corridors were cemented to make movements easier. This school is always flooded during the rainy seasons".

The similar situation was found in another school studied where because of rains the school regularly makes the path leading to the main tarmac road.

"we tried to make the road to the tarmac to be used especially during bad weather, when it rains. However, rehabilitation continues"

The infrastructure for mobility becomes pertinent for learners with physical disabilities and any school should strive to enhance their movement in the school. The finding is concurrent with that of Najjingo (2009) in a study on challenges of accessing all- inclusive education by children with disabilities in Uganda, which revealed that facilities in question included wide walkways and wide corridors. This means that these pavements should be wide enough to accommodate wheelchairs, crutches, walking frames and other mobility devices.

Leveling

The general terrain of the school environment is a precondition for the mobility of children with physical disabilities because some categories like cerebral palsy with ataxia condition depend so much on an even environment without stumps for their mobility. In the schools sampled some had tried to make the school ground flat as reported by the following respondents. Some inclusive schools had leveled their school grounds as revealed by the study. During the interview one of the teachers stated that:

"we leveled the school compound because as you can see from the vicinity this area is stony. We uprooted the stones and murrum the school and filling the holes with soil".

Another teacher observed:

"The environment was leveled starting from the gate because this was a modern school built using foreign donor fund from Germany in partnership with Kenya government".

The architectural designers seemed to have considered the diversity of would be learners in the school as it later came to be an inclusive school although the above respondent might have not considered this design in relation to the diversity of their learners. This means that flat school environment for children with physical disabilities is a prerequisite for their indoor and outdoor activities which is both academic and social. A study by Baptiste, Malachie and Struthers (2013) on

physical barriers to school attendance found out that 83.3% of parents/care givers whose children dropped out of school after developing disability reported the main barrier as being children's inability to play with others.

Classroom Preparation

The study sought to establish the preparation of classroom environments for children with physical disabilities. The study revealed that some schools had narrow doors with neglected lighting systems and ventilations. Classrooms were also congested in some schools with limited space for assistive devices. The study also established that most schools had adapted doors and windows. It also established that the classroom displays did not consider the readability of children with physical disabilities. From the observation checklist four schools that is; F, G, I and K, had door entrances that were very narrow. The lighting systems and ventilations were not considered. This could be a risk to the situations of children with other health impairments such as asthma who may require a well ventilated environment. Observations further revealed that the classes in most schools were congested with no adequate space for assistive devices; in school K wheelchairs were left outside the classrooms. This indicated architectural barriers and mobility problems for these children in the class. This is not in agreement with Watson and MCCatheren (2009) who observed that all classrooms used by children with physical disabilities should be large enough so that a child who uses mobility equipment can turn round easily. The lack of space impedes the participation of learners with physical disabilities because they require changeover by joining group activities. The height of teaching aids on the walls in all the schools studied as evidenced through the observation checklist did not consider lowering them down for those using wheelchairs so that they are able to read. Most children with mobility difficulties require spacious classrooms with wide door entrance to enhance moving in and out at will. However, most schools had made some adaptations as was observed by the checklist. The doors and windows were enlarged, furniture like special desks and tables were also adapted. During the interview one of the teachers observed:

"Narrow doors opening inside were replaced by double doors opening outside"

Another teacher stated:

"The doors were widened to allow those using wheelchairs to enter the class".

One of the teachers noted:

"First small doors were enlarged plus windows"

During the interview still one of the teachers stated:

"Special desks were made but put in front of the class in the classroom seating arrangement"

One of the teachers also observed:

"Tables were adapted by cutting their legs for children with cerebral palsy"

Some children need chairs and tables that are different from standard size (UNESCO, 2009) while embracing diversity in inclusive settings. A student with a physical disability who is positioned correctly is able to pay attention better, focus for longer periods of time and access learning materials easily (South Carolina Assistive Program, 2012). This implies that if a child feels comfortable in class his/her learning experiences are augmented. This finding is also in agreement with Najjingo (2009) in her study of inclusive schools who noted that school facilities in inclusive settings included wide doors.

Toileting

The study sought to establish whether toilets were adapted for use by children with physical disabilities. It was found that not more than half of the schools studied had adapted toilets and nearly all the toilets where found were constructed through donor support. The study confirmed from the observation checklist that five out eleven schools had no adapted toilets. During the interview one of the teachers observed:

"Adapted toilets were built by Leonard Chesire Disabilty when we were in the process of admitting children with special needs when changing from our first unit of children with mental retardation which started from the year 2010 that was done away with and merged into inclusive system"

Another teacher said:

"Two adapted toilets were constructed with the aid from Leonard Chesire. Disability and later got some aid from UNICEF which we used to build three modern toilets. Teachers have also one adapted toilet, one side is free and one adapted"

Toileting is a major skill that children with physical disability need to acquire right from home without which they undergo a lot of stress. Muscular dystrophy campaign (2007) observed that toilets or washrooms should have at least enough space for portable hoist and any other transfer equipment that may be required such as an overhead tracking hoist and carers need privacy during transfers as well as spacious safe and warm environment. Najjingo (2009) in a study on challenges of accessing all- inclusive education reported that special facilities included special latrines. The finding of this study is in agreement with the two studies above. Most of the children like the spina bifida have incontinence yet would also require special toilets that are adapted. Children with neurological conditions such as cerebral palsy often have mobility difficulties involving balance would depend so much on adapted toilets. It seems that the government is not keen on funding adapted toilets because most of the schools in this study that had adapted toilets built for them through foreign donor funding. A study by Nthia (2012) on constraints facing inclusive education in Embu- Kenya revealed that learners with special needs were denied some of the physiological facilities and in particular those which catered for physiological needs such as adapted toilets prompting parents to prefer to retain their children at home. This stresses the importance of adapted toilets to children with physical disabilities.

Influence of School Environment on Social Interaction

Children with physical disabilities are always under stress about their mobility, thus requiring adapted environment. The study aimed at determining the influence of adapted environment on the interaction of children with physical disabilities in the school. It was revealed that the adapted environment enhanced participation in co-curricular activities. Their mobility is made easier and can join clubs. Some of the teachers interviewed on the influence of adapted environment on social interaction of children with physical disabilities had the following responses:

"Adaptation of the school environment has enhanced participation of these Children in co-curricular activities. It is easy to take them to the toilets and out for play. They mixed with others especially volley ball while seated on the field".

One of the teachers said:

"They play together in the leveled field and this makes them feel strong, they are not isolated, they participate in games, music among others. We have a slogan, Disability is not Inability".

Another teacher observed:

"Adapted environment allows children with physical disabilities to play with others. They can attempt to run; movement is now made a little easier. They can participate in other social clubs like child to child support"

This reveals that adapted physical environment facilitate movement which enable children with physical disabilities, to move about in the school compound even if supported by peers, and their interaction with others is reinforced. This is in line with Stoecklin (1999) who reported that the physical environment can either contribute to children's development, support learning and exploration which is central to active, creative play and exploration. This implies that schools that do not consider adapting their physical environment limit the social participation of children with physical disabilities.

Equipment and Teaching/Learning Materials

The study was interested to establish the availability of equipment during the preparation stages before admitting children with physical disabilities in the schools. During the interview the study revealed that there were a variety of equipment in the schools or the gymnasium attached to the schools. It was established that some children with physical disability require equipment that facilitates their positioning and mobility. During the interview one of the physiotherapists attached to an Inclusive primary school reported the following when responding to availability of equipment:

"Arrangement was from donor support- Adventist Development and Relief Agency of Canada (ADRA). They built gymnasium hall and bought equipment. A professor in physiotherapy came and set the gymnasium operational and stayed for 6 months to set the equipment and start Rehabilitation programme which is attached to the School"

Through the use of observation checklist the following assistive devices formed part of the equipment in one of the schools; wheelchairs, crutches, calipers, walking frames and cerebral palsy chair. Major equipments included rolling machine, hand roller, wall frame, high mat, parallel bars and static bikes. Similar equipment was found in some other schools of which the wheelchairs, crutches and walking frames were common. During the interview with one of the physiotherapist, the following was observed:

"The assistive devices were bought in advance and those found to be using wheelchairs and crutches were provided with and these were donated by the initial donor who later withdrew".

The Australian Human Rights Commission (2015) report observed that obtaining appropriate equipment as needed for individual students from electronically adapted to mobility devices, to walking frames for students is a continuing barrier to providing education access for education providers for students from kindergarten and child care through school system. This implies that children with physical disabilities require a wide range of equipment for them to access education in the inclusive settings. Most children with physical disabilities may not need adapted teaching and learning materials while some cannot participate effectively in class without necessary adaptations. This was confirmed during observations in the classroom setting. Some children may need adaptation of teaching/learning materials but were reluctant to use them. Teachers were asked to give their views on adaptation and availability of teaching/ learning materials. One of the teachers said:

"Teaching/ learning materials such as adapted pens using tape and thread for needy children are always available"

During the interview one of the teachers observed:

"Some children who should use adapted materials are reluctant to use them"

The finding on the use of adapted teaching and learning materials are in support of what is articulated in the Special Needs education policy (2009) which state that children with special needs often need specialized educational resources at individual and school levels depending on the nature and extent of their disability. However it was also noted that some children experience low-self esteem when using materials different from those used by their peers in the class. It can be argued that some children are not at ease to use dissimilar items in class unless encouraged. Depending on the nature of the child's condition adapted materials become a precondition for their academic achievement.

Availability and Relevance of Equipment

The study was also interested to establish from the physiotherapists the availability and relevance of the equipment. During the interview the study revealed that the equipment are relevant but need maintenance. The government support had been limited. The imported equipment are expensive and less durable because they had been made for a different environment. The pattern of disability had changed

complicating the acquisition of relevant equipment. Children with physical disabilities have varied conditions that meeting individual needs entails a lot of challenges. The availability of equipment does not guarantee their appropriateness. In an interview one physiotherapist attached to an inclusive school observed:

"Equipment are relevant but need to be replaced regularly. Local support from the government has not been. They get worn out, they need periodic replacement. They are not conducive, for conventional wheelchairs from Europe and if you buy they do not last long because the environment is very different. The spare parts are not easily available and if you get them they are very expensive. The pattern of disability has also changed from polio which mostly affected the limbs".

This response reveals that the equipment are not very relevant and cannot stand time, this can imply that children normally outgrow the assistive devices therefore there is need for periodic replacement. It was also noted that the equipment are designed for a different environment. They are also inadequate due to high cost and the fact that in many occasions, poverty and disability are closely linked. This finding was similar to that of Mumbi, Mugo and Chege (2013) who argued that at family level, poverty seems to aggravate the situation for persons with physical or other disabilities, particularly with regard to schooling. Rehabilitating children on the use of assistive devices is challenging because of the nature of some children with disability. A physiotherapist attached to an Inclusive primary had this remark on their experience with the use of equipment by children with physical disability in the school.

"You put a child in a wheelchair they don't see the need, you also give a crutch or alker and they leave it and crawl because of low mental capacity. They are also inadequate I use some of my personal equipment the basic ones are lacking".

This reveals that rehabilitation is quite difficult and in class, teachers find it hard to have children understand instructions. In most schools studied the basic equipment were lacking as confirmed by the observation checklist. This was also supported by the finding of Kenpro (2010) in Kenya that resources used in inclusive primary school having children with physical disabilities are inadequate.

Staffing Before Admission of Children with Physical Disabilities

The study sought to establish the schools preparedness in terms of teachers trained in special needs before admitting children with physical disabilities. The interview with teachers established that relatively few teachers had acquired training in special needs during the preparation to admit children with physical disabilities in the inclusive primary schools. During the interview one of the teachers noted:

"By the time we were starting inclusive program only one teacher had acquired 3 months training in SNE at KISE in physical disabilities. The one trained teacher guides other teachers on how to handle these children".

One of the teachers stated:

"only one teacher happened to have been trained and was in special school who was transferred to this school".

Another teacher said:

"At the beginning those who were trained in SNE were two up to now"

One of the teachers also observed:

"The government recruited one teacher in every two years. Training was done at KISE. The government was training and deploying teachers".

The initial number of teachers trained before admitting children with physical disabilities were not more than three in each of the schools studied. This implies that inclusive education was effected with inadequate staffing in all inclusive schools. However, the government realized at the beginning the importance of acquiring special skills by teachers to competently teach children with special needs in the schools and established KISE to train teachers on special needs. This finding is in agreement with UNICEF (1999) which reports that in Armenia implementation strategies as a new initiative for including children with disabilities would be through capacity building for pre- and in-service training of teachers.

There was a similar study finding in Botswana where international agencies were involved in capacity building in mainstream pre-primary and primary schools with a purpose of enabling the implementation of best practice in inclusive learning and teaching. The government managed to train about 13,400 pre-primary and primary school teachers (African Caribbean and Pacific Group of Secretaiat [ACP] 2011). This means that in order to implement inclusive education successfully, teacher training is important. The study was also interested in ascertaining preparedness of teachers from the perspective of the school heads. It was revealed that not all teachers were trained before admission of children with physical disabilities in inclusive primary schools. To explore the teachers' preparedness to teach inclusive primary schools the head teachers' responses were scored in a likert scale and the findings are presented in the table below.

All Teachers were Trained (n=11)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.	7	6.9	63/6	636
	2.	2	2.0	18.2	81.8
	3.	1	1.0	9.1	90.9
	4.	1	1.0	9.1	100.0
	Total	102	100.0	100.0	

The table show the state of teachers trained before the admission of children with physical disabilities. The responses of head teachers were scored using the likert scale which indicated that 7 head teachers representing 63.6% strongly

disagreed that all teachers were trained before the admission of children with physical disabilities in the school. Two head teachers representing 18.2% disagreed, 9.1% agreed while another 9.1% were not sure. From the table it can be concluded that not all teachers were trained before the initial inclusion of children with physical disabilities in the schools. This finding is not in agreement with Mwangi (2008) who argued that management of special needs require that seven components are harmonized, that is the style, staff, shared vision, systems, structure and strategy which must be understood and conceptualized by the entire school. It could be imperative if head teachers and the staff in general of inclusive primary schools acquired training in special needs before admitting children with physical disabilities in their schools so that they could effectively deal with issues of these children in their schools.

The study further sought to establish which category of teachers trained in the school before admitting children with physical disabilities. It was ascertained that panel leaders were not trained. The head teachers' responses were represented in the table below: The study aimed at determining if panel leaders were trained in the schools studied before inclusion of children with physical disabilities in the schools. The data shows that 6 head teachers comprising 54.5% had strongly disagreed that panel leaders were trained before admission of children with physical disabilities. The head teachers who disagreed were 3 representing 27.3%. 1 was not sure representing 9.1%, same as those who agree (9.1%). Following the data on the table, it reveals that above half of the head teachers disagreed that only panel leaders were trained before commencement of inclusion in their schools.

Training of Panel Leaders (n=11)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.	6	5.9	54.5	54.5
	2.	3	2.9	27.3	81.8
	3.	1	1.0	9.1	90.9
	4.	1	1.0	9.1	100.0
	Total	102	100.0	100.0	

This is not in agreement Miles (2000) observing that teacher education and ongoing support and training are therefore crucial for any changes introduced in education. The training of panel leaders in primary schools is important because they are the ones that are in charge of individual subjects. The study further sought to establish if class teachers were trained before admission of children with physical disabilities in the schools. The study revealed that there was no specific training for class teachers before admission of the children. The head teachers' responses were illustrated in the table below:

The data indicates that 6 head teachers representing 54.5% strongly agreed that only class teachers were trained before including children with physical disabilities in the school. Those who disagreed were 2 representing 18.2%. Those who were undecided were 2 representing 18.2%. Those who were undecided were 2 representing 18.2%. Only 1 head teacher

agreed with 9.1%. The table reveals that about 72.2% disagreed that only class teachers were trained before the inclusion of children with physical disabilities. This finding is similar with the study done by Oliver and Williams (2008) who observed that the challenge facing many teachers in the country is that they have not been adequately trained to cope with the diversity in their classes. The class-teachers need to be equipped with the necessary skills to enable them attend effectively to children with physical disabilities in their classrooms. The study was interested in ascertaining if teachers in administration were trained before admission of children with physical disabilities in the inclusive schools. The study established that teachers in administration were not trained as a specific group before admitting children with physical disabilities. The head teachers' responses are shown below in the table below.

Training of Class Teachers (n=11)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.	6	5.9	54.5	54.5
	2.	2	2.0	18.2	72.7
	3.	2	2.0	18.2	90.9
	4.	1	1.0	9.1	100.0
	Total	102	100.0	100.0	

Training of Teachers in Administration

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.	6	5.9	54.5	54.5
	2.	3	2.9	27.3	81.8
	4.	2	2.0	18.2	100.0
	Total	102	100.0	100.0	

The study intended to determine whether teachers in administration were trained before children with physical disabilities were included in the schools. The responses indicated that 6 head teachers representing 54.5% strongly disagreed that teachers in administration were trained before inclusion. Those for disagreed were 3 representing 27.3% and only 2 teachers represented by 18.2% agreed that teachers in administration were trained earlier before children with physical disabilities were enrolled in the schools. This data reveals that in majority of the schools studied, teachers in administration were not trained before including children with physical disabilities in the school. Teachers in administration in the schools were head teachers, their deputies and senior teachers. This means that there is inadequate professional development in working with children with physical disabilities. This finding concurs with Travers, Balfe, Butter, Day, Dupont, McDaid, O'Donnell and Pruty (2010) who recognized that there is insufficient per-service and continuing professional development opportunities for teachers in relation to inclusive education in SNE, Similarly, Nthia (2012) in the study of constraints facing inclusive education in Embu East Sub-Couty found that in 12 public primary schools studied

only one head teacher was trained in special needs. The study was interested in ascertaining whether training was pegged on teaching experience before admission of children with physical disabilities in the inclusive schools. The study revealed that training was not done according to teaching experience.

Training Teachers with 5 years and above Experience in SNE (n=11)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1.	5	4.9	45.4	45.4
Valid	2.	2	2.0	18.2	63.6
	3.	1	1.0	9.1	72.7
	4.	2	2.0	18.2	90.9
	5.	1	1.0	9.1	100.0
	Total	102	100.0	100.0	

The study sought to establish if the teachers were trained in SNE according to the period they have served in the profession. The responses indicated that 5 head teachers with 45.5% strongly disagreed that teachers who have stayed in the profession for above five years were trained. Similarly those who disagreed were 2 with 18.2%, 1 head teacher was not sure representing 9.1% while 2 head teachers with18.2% agreed that teachers with 5 and above years were trained before including children with 5 years and above in the profession, yet only 1 head teacher representing 9.1% strongly agreed the mentioned teachers were trained. The data indicates that in 7 schools teachers had not been trained according to the years they have served in the profession. Therefore no significant attempt is given in training teachers on inclusive education. This does not concur with UNESCO (1994) that appropriate preparation of all educational personnel stands out as a key factor in promoting progress towards inclusive education.

Other Teachers Trained

The study aimed to establish from head teachers the way other teachers were prepared for inclusion of children with physical disabilities. The head teachers were asked to specify how other teachers were trained. The study established that teachers were trained through self or NGO sponsorship. During the interview one of the head teachers observed:

Teachers who had interest in helping the learners sponsored themselves to further their education, only a few teachers were trained in different groups at different times by Leonard Chesire Disability."

This means majority of teachers trained were either self-sponsored or were trained by an NGO. This is in line with UNESCO (2009) which observed that teacher competence is regarded as a key factor in developing quality education for all children, but it is of critical importance in the achievement of successful outcomes for children and youths with disabilities. This means that teachers were mostly self-motivated to seek further training with a view of assisting children with special needs. It therefore implies that the self-motivated teachers

would provide quality service to children with physical disabilities compared to other teachers who wait for the training opportunity from the sponsors. If the same trend continued then fewer teachers would be trained and there would inadequate number of teachers of children with physical disabilities. This might compromise academic quality of children with physical disabilities.

Enhancement of Academic Participation Based on School Facilities and Teacher Preparations

The study set out to establish whether the preparations made on school facilities and if teachers had any impact on the children's academic performance. Teachers' views on the influence of school facilities and training of teachers on academic performance of children with physical disabilities were sought. The study found out that training improved academic performance of children with physical disabilities. It further established that those who attended training returned with positive attitudes. Preparation in physical facilities and involvement in exercises enhanced academic performance of children with physical disabilities. During the interview one of the teachers stated:

"It improved academics and quite a number went to secondary schools at the end of the 8 years course."

One other teacher also observed:

"yes, without the learning facilities, assistive devices and trained teachers with skills, children whose upper hands are compromised could not write, others are trained to use their legs, others use head pointers and mouth stick as you can see in the classes. We use the resource centre to teach ADL skills. Gymnesium help to exercise the body parts both fine and gross motor and it has improved their writing speed and style".

Another teacher observed:

what I can say about teachers is that when they come from hat place they are changed, they take time to learn the background of the child before handling him. They are prepared to receive these children".

The teachers perceived that preparations in terms of competency and school facilities, led to academic achievement of learners with physical disabilities. Their responses during the interview seemed to suggest that the attitude of teachers before the preparation was negative but was changing positively, yet attitude is a major asset in the teaching of children with physical disabilities in inclusive settings. It can therefore be concluded that the preparation of teachers and school facilities can impact positively on children's academic performance. This finding reiterates conclusions in other studies which recognized the significance of availing school facilities in the learning environment and ensure teacher training for successful inclusion of children with physical disabilities in regular schools (UNESCO, 2009; Zachary, 2012; ACP, 2011; and Norad, 2007). However, some teachers also had their own reservations. The study also established that preparations of facilities and teacher training did not improve academic performance of children with physical disabilities.

During the interview one of the teachers had the following remarks:

"yeah to some extent it does because some workshops were organized by Leonard Chesire Disability in Kisumu County so that even those not trained in SNE could gain skills that enhance academic performance".

Another teacher also observed:

we have encouraged them to work hard, we adapt pens, but not to the standard, for facilities are not enough.

The respondent from one of the school was hesitant indicating that he doubted the impact of physical facilities and teacher preparations while a teacher in another school recognized the effect but decried the inadequacy of resources. This reveals that according to the teachers, the facilities and teacher training are crucial in academic performance of learners with physical disabilities. This finding is supported by Trevers *et al*., (2010) who argue that even with willingness of staff in school, it is difficult to include children with physical disabilities in regular classes without what they consider to be the necessary resources and support.

Teachers and Pupils' Reception of Children with Physical Disabilities in the Regular Schools

Acceptance

It is imperative to ascertain that the social environment is conducive for the learning of children with physical disabilities in the inclusive schools. Pupils were asked to express how other pupils and teachers were prepared to receive them. The study established that they were accepted in the school. In the FGD discussions one of the pupils came up with:

"We were welcomed the way we were by both teachers and pupils"

During the FGD another pupil observed:

"We were welcomed, 'welcome to our school and work hard."

One of the pupils during FGD session also stated:

"Pupils welcomed us, we were supported to move around. They were happy with me. They told me! don't be afraid, if you want something just be free, I asked for mobility support which they did freely without being reminded."

This acceptance showed that teachers and pupils had developed positive attitude towards children with physical disabilities and expected them to perform well. This agrees with a study finding by Sellers and Pozniak (2010) who observed that for inclusive education to succeed, it was necessary that teachers, principals and other education stakeholders maintain a positive attitude towards inclusion and embrace respect for diversity.

ii) Pity

The study sought to establish the kind of reception given to children with physical disabilities in the school when they first

came. The study revealed that some children were shown pity when they first arrived. During the FGD the issue of pity emanated with reactions such as the following from one of the pupils:

"Other children were perplexed how I walk, some of them commented: 'see how this boy is walking, this went on for a long time."

Another pupil stated:

"They showed sympathy but there was stigma for one week."

One of the pupils remarked:

"Personally, I would say that they were willing to receive me but they were asking me what happened. Teachers and pupils just said sorry and told me to work hard in class"

These views towards children with physical disabilities reflect the social model of disability which is in agreement with Scope (2014) who argues that disability is viewed as being caused by the way the society is organized rather than by the person's impairment or difference. It seems children with physical disabilities were not amused by the remarks from the teachers and their peers. The Illinois Department of Human Services *(n. d.)* observed that "people with disability aren't victims to be viewed as having done something wrong". In this situation the learning environment can not avail free opportunities for children with physical disabilities to explore their potentials in academic and social participation in inclusive primary schools.

Cold Reception

In further exploration of the kind of reception given to children with physical disabilities when they first joined the schools, the study found that in some instances they were given a cold reception. During the FGD one of the pupils remarked:

"They never liked me, they say I will make them burn like me".

This was from a child who had an epileptic condition in the class. The response during the discussion stresses the negative attitudes other children who are not disabled have towards those with disabilities. This reveals that the society still holds negative attitudes towards people with disabilities. This corroborates Getachew's (2011) observation that societal negative attitudes are obstacles for PWDs in meeting their life goals. The negative attitude impedes the social participation of children with physical disabilities.

Strategies of Teaching Children with Physical Disabilities

The study was interested in establishing the kind of teaching strategies used in teaching children with physical disabilities when teaching. The study ascertained that teachers do not modify their teaching methods. The head teachers' responses are shown in the table below: To determine how teachers modified or varied their teaching strategies to accommodate children with physical disabilities in the inclusive schools, the responses were given in likert scale and the head teachers responded as indicated above. The table indicates that 3 head

teachers representing 27.3% disagreed that teachers modified their teaching strategies while 2 head teachers representing 18.2% were not sure whether modification of teaching strategies was taking place in the schools or not. Those who agreed that teachers modified their teaching strategies were 3 representing 27.3%, similarly those who strongly agreed were 3 representing 27.3%.

Table 4.25 Strategies of Teaching Children with Physical Disabilities (n=11)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.	3	2.9	27.3	27.3
	3.	2	2.0	18.2	45.4
	4.	3	2.9	27.3	72.7
	5.	3	2.9	27.3	100.0
	Total	102	100.0	100.0	

More than half of the head teachers in this study agreed that head teachers modified their teaching strategies to fit children with physical disabilities. This finding is in agreement with a study by Bright Hub Education (2012) which found that that educating children with physical disabilities requires modifications and diverse methods of teaching. It is interesting to establish that some head teachers were not sure of what goes on in the class rooms. This implies that some head teachers are not committed to better performance of children with physical disabilities.

Activities given to Children with Physical Disabilities in Class

The study sought to ascertain whether the same activities were given to children with physical disabilities with the rest of the class. The study found out that same tasks are given in the class without considering children with physical disabilities. The head teachers' responses are shown on the table 4.26 below:

Table Activities given to Children with Physical Disabilities in Class (n=11)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1.	2	2.0	18.2	18.2
Valid	2.	1	1.0	9.0	27.2
	3.	5	4.9	45.5	72.7
	4.	3	2.9	27.3	100.0
	Total	102	100.0	100.0	

The responses of the head teachers showed that 5 teachers representing 45.5% were not sure whether same tasks are given in class during the teaching process. Three head teachers representing 27.3 % agreed that same tasks were given while 2 teachers strongly disagreed that the same tasks are given in class and 1 teacher disagreed that same tasks are given in class during the teaching. The finding above therefore shows that head teachers were not very clear on what happens in the classes. The Special Needs Technology Assessment Resource Support Team (1996) observes that the teacher should modify

the volume of work produced to the child with physical disabilities. It is hard to believe that a good number of the head teachers were not sure of what goes on in the classes. In the prevailing circumstances children with physical disabilities are likely to gain very little in the schools where head teachers are no sure of what goes on in the classes. This implies that the supervisory role of such head teachers is inadequate and children with physical stand to lose in life because some of them require adaptation of tasks in the classroom deliberations.

The practical Aspect of Inclusion for Children with Physical Disabilities

The study set to establish practical inclusion of children with physical disabilities in class, the study found out that children with physical disabilities are taught in the same class together with other children. During the interview one of the teachers noted:

"*These children are put in mixed grouping during project work in social studies*"

Another teacher said;

"*These children are taught together with others as one class*"

According to the remarks it reveals that these children are not excluded from their peers in class during the teaching process. This finding is concurrent with Bright Hub (2012) who observed that children with physical disabilities who were once taught in separate classes and even separate schools are now taught besides their peers in regular classes. This implies that children with physical disabilities are taught in the natural environment and this can enhance their academic and social performance.

Adaptation of Curriculum

The study was interested in establishing if the curriculum used in teaching children with physical disabilities is adapted to their conditions. The study found that there was no priority given for curriculum adaptation. The responses of the head teachers were shown in the table below:

Adaptation of Curriculum for Children with Physical Disabilities (n=11)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1.	3	2.9	27.2	27.3
Valid	2.	2	2.0	18.2	45.4
	3.	1	1.0	9.1	54.5
	4.	5	4.9	45.5	100.0
	Total	102	100.0	100.0	

The responses indicated that 5 head teachers representing 45.5% agreed that the curriculum used in teaching children with physical disabilities is adapted. 3 teachers strongly representing 27.3% disagreed that curriculum is adapted while 2 teachers representing 18.2% disagreed that the curriculum used is adapted. The data reveals that there is a close link

between those who agreed and those who did not agree. This reveals that the curriculum adaptation is not given attention to determine whether it is adapted, because the responses fall below average suggesting that the curriculum is not adapted. However this may affect the academic performance of some children with physical disabilities whose conditions require adaptation of the curriculum. This finding is supported by Villa and Thousand (2012) who observed that a fixed curriculum was a hindrance to the education of children with physical disabilities.

Methods used in Sensitization and Awareness on Inclusion

The study sought to establish how sensitization and awareness was done before admitting children with physical disabilities in the inclusive schools.

i) Sensitization of the Community Based on Government Policy

The study was interested to ascertain whether sensitization and awareness of the community was based on government policy. The study established that sensitization and awareness was done without considering government policy. The teachers' responses were indicated in the table below:

Sensitization of the Community based on Government Policy (n=88)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	20	19.6	22.7	22.7
	2.00	10	9.8	11.4	34.1
	3.00	16	15.7	18.2	52.3
	4.00	17	16.7	19.3	71.6
	5.00	25	24.5	28.4	100.0
	Total	88	86.3	100.0	
Missing	System	14	13.7		
Total		102	100.0		

The table above reflected the responses of teachers scored in a Likert scale. The responses for Strongly Agree were 28.4%, Strongly Disagree was 22.7% while Agree was represented by 19.3%. The response for Disagree was 11.4% and those Not sure was represented by 18.2%. The information on the table indicates that the number that agreed was higher than that which did not agree while those who were not sure had the least per cent. The data indicates that teachers in the schools studied did not consider the government to have been involved in the awareness campaign on inclusive education in the primary schools. This finding does not agree with what the government of Kenya articulates in the Special Needs education Policy (2009).

In the policy, it is stated that the government places emphasis on inclusive education through regular schools for learners with special needs and disabilities as opposed to the practice of using special schools and special units attached to regular schools. The question one would ask is why the SNE policy articulates something different from what is practiced. If the policy is in place in the country then it must have influenced the sensitization and awareness campaign since an education programme could not be initiated without the government consent.

Awareness by Education Officers

The study sought to find out whether awareness on including children with physical disabilities was done by education officers. The study established that awareness was not done by education officers. The teachers' responses were recorded in the table below:

Awareness on Inclusion of Children with Physical Disabilities by Education Officers (n=88)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	24	23.5	27.9	27.9
	2.00	18	17.6	20.9	48.8
	3.00	16	15.7	18.6	67.4
	4.00	13	12.7	15.1	82.6
	5.00	15	14.7	17.4	100.0
	Total	86	84.3	100.0	
Missing	System	16	15.7		
Total		102	100.0		

The study sought to establish the involvement of education officers in preparations to admit children with physical disabilities in inclusive primary schools. The data in the table above shows that 27.9% of the teachers strongly disagreed that awareness was done by education officers while 20.9% of the teachers disagreed. Those who were not sure were represented by 18.6%. The number of teachers who agreed were 13 representing 15.1% and those who strongly agreed were 15 representing 17.4%. From the table it can be deduced that majority of the teachers did not agree that awareness campaign was conducted by education officers. This finding negates the position taken by UNESCO (2007) indicating that no individual nation can achieve the inclusive agenda without policy makers, professionals in academia and stakeholders playing effective role. This includes the involvement of education officers in a deliberate sensitization programme.

It should be noted that in the structure of the ministry of education in Kenya, the education officers have a responsibility to explain government education policy to the schools, a thing that appears to be lacking in implementing inclusive education. This also does not agree with Muscular Dystrophy Campaign (2007) which observes that education welfare officers should work closely with schools and families to resolve attendance issues and promote effective relationship between home and school. This finding contradicts Miles' (2000) conclusion in Lesotho that a great deal of networking, lobbying and awareness raising went on prior to the establishment of the integrated programme.

Awareness of the Community by NGOs

The study was interested in establishing if awareness and sensitization campaign was done by the NGOs. The study ascertained that awareness campaign was done by NGOs as evident in teachers' responses tabulated as shown in the table below:

Awareness of the community by NGOs, *(n= 88)*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1.00	7	6.9	8.0	8.0
	2.00	8	7.8	9.1	17.0
Valid	3.00	21	20.6	23.9	40.9
	4.00	21	20.6	23.9	64.8
	5.00	31	30.4	35.2	100.0
	Total	88	86.3	100.0	
Missing	System	14	13.7		
	Total	102	100.0		

The study set to determine the involvement of NGOs in inclusion awareness campaign for inclusive education. The results showed that 31 teachers representing 35.2% strongly agreed that an awareness campaign was done by NGOs, 21 teachers representing 23.9% agreed. Those who were not sure, were 21 representing 23.9%. Those who strongly disagreed and disagreed represented 8.0% and 9.1 respectively. According to the data as shown in the table, it appears that an awareness campaign was carried out by the NGOs. This finding is supported by NGOs emphasis on methods for integrating all stakeholders and school staff in the identification and formulation of inclusive interventions (Leonard Chesire Regional Representative report, 2012) It means that NGOs play an active role in advocacy and sensitization in preparing the community for inclusive education (Republic of Kenya, 2009; MoE, 2001). This that partnership and networking between the governments and NGOs can lead to education programmes for children with physical disabilities.

Use of Chief's Baraza to Sensitize the Community

The study sought to ascertain whether chief's baraza was used to sensitize the community. The study established that sensitization was not adequately done through chief's barazas as responses from head teachers in the table below suggest: The study aimed at determining if the community was prepared through chief's baraza to enroll their children with physical disability in the schools. The data indicates that 5 head teachers were not sure whether the school community was prepared through chief's baraza representing 45.5% of the schools studied.

Chief's Baraza used to Sensitize the Community (n=11)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	1.	1	1.0	9.1	9.1
	2.	1	1.0	9.1	18.2
Valid	3.	5	4.9	45.5	63.7
	4.	3	2.9	27.2	90.9
	5.	1	1.0	9.1	100.0
	Total	102	100.0	100.0	

Those who agreed were 3 representing 27.2% of the head teachers. While those who strongly agreed and disagreed were having one respondent each representing 9.1%. There was only 1 head teacher (9.1%) who disagreed. Since only 36.3% of the head teachers agreed that sensitization was done through

chief's barazas, it can be concluded from the table that sensitization of the community to prepare them for inclusion was not done through the chief's barazas. This does not agree with UNESCO's position that local administrators should encourage community participation by giving support to representative associations and invite them in decision making, and that monitoring should involve community leaders UNESCO, 1994). This also does not agree with UNESCO's (2007) position that to achieve the inclusive agenda, key stakeholders must be involved, nor is it in support of UNICEF's (1999) suggestion that implementation strategies as a new initiative should involve creating public awareness. This implies that the community may not be fully aware of the preparation to include children with physical disabilities in primary schools.

Teachers Role in Enrolment of Learners with Physical Disabilities

The study sought to establish the role of teachers in the enrolment of learners with physical disabilities in inclusive primary schools. The study found that teachers took a leading role in the enrolment of learners with physical disabilities in inclusive primary schools. The responses from the head teachers are presented in the table below:

Teachers' Role in enrolment of Learners with Physical Disabilities (n=11)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	2.	2	2.0	18.2	18.2
Valid	4.	8	7.8	72,7	90.9
	5.	1	1.0	9.1	
					100.0
	Total	102	100.0	100.0	

The study sought to establish the role of teachers in encouraging parents to enroll their children with physical disabilities in schools. The table shows that 8 head teachers representing 72.7% agreed that teachers took a leading role in convincing parents to enroll their children in the schools. It is further revealed from the table that 1 head teacher representing 9.1% strongly agreed that teachers took an active role in encouraging parents to enroll their children in the schools while 2 head teachers representing 18.2% disagreed on the role of teachers in the enrolment of children with physical disabilities in the schools. It is revealed from the table that majority of the respondents recognized the teachers' active role in encouraging parents to enroll their children in the schools. This finding is in line with Madan and Sharma (2013) who reported that parents of all children in schools must undergo orientation and sensitization to ensure full cooperation, interaction with experts, meeting administrative head and teachers to educate parents about the need for the inclusive program. This finding is also in agreement with Villa; Welther-Thomas (cited in Whitebread, n.d.) observing that principals, special educators, superintendents, teachers, parents and community members must all be involved in the successful outcome of inclusion. The full involvement of teachers has positive influence in the academic and social participation of children with physical disabilities.

Initial Inclusion of Children with Physical Disabilities in Schools

The study was interested to find out how initial inclusion of children with physical disabilities was done in the primary schools studied. The study established that most schools began by admitting children from class (grade) one to class (grade) eight. The responses from the head teachers were presented in the table below: The study intended to establish how inclusion was done when enrolling children with physical disabilities in the school. The table indicates that 6 head teachers representing 54.5% admitted children with physical disabilities from class (grade) one to eight.

Initial inclusion of Children with Physical Disabilities in Schools (n=11)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1.	4	3.9	36.6	36.4
2.	1	1.0	9.1	45.5
3.	6	5.9	54.5	100.0
Total	102	100.0	100.0	

The head teachers who admitted children with physical disabilities from class one to three were 4 representing 36.4% while those who started admission from class 4 to eight was 1 representing 9.1%. This showed that in most schools the admission of children with physical disabilities was done from class one to eight. The implication of this is that those children who are admitted in upper classes especially class (grade) eight may take long to adjust thus interfering with their academic and social participation. In another instance is that the school may not be prepared to effectively teach all classes at the initial stages.

Conclusion

From the findings a number of conclusions can be made. The first inclusive school was established in 2001 and the last was in 2014.There was no piloting done before initiating inclusive schools. Stakeholders were involved in the preparations of schools. The physical and human resources prepared were inadequate and remained crucial for academic and social participation of learners with physical disability. The admission of children with physical disability was done running from class one to eight.

Recommendations of the Study

Based on the research findings, the following recommendations were made:

- All stakeholders should strive to remove barriers that prevent children with physical disabilities from benefitting from education which is a human right.
- There is need for adequate adaptation of school facilities to enhance accessibility to all buildings and spaces on the school compound by children with physical disabilities.
- Sensitization and awareness creation should be ongoing in the community and public schools to enroll children with physical disabilities in public schools instead of hiding or staying with them at home.
- Sensitization and awareness creation among teachers, parents and other stakeholders should continue to assist in development of positive attitude towards the education of children with physical disabilities in inclusive schools.
- Sensitization of children without disability should be ongoing to enhance appreciation of differences, reduce stigmatization, discrimination and bullying of children with physical disabilities.

REFERENCES

Al-Zyoudi, M. 2006. Teachers' Attitudes Towards Inclusive Education in Jordan Schools. *International Journal of Special Education, 21*. No. 2. 200607Alzyoudi (READONLY Compatible Mode) Microsoft word. Retrieved on 10/2/2012.

Al Zyoudi, Al Sartwai, A. and Dodin, H. (n.d.). 2014. Attitude of Pre-service Teachers Towards Inclusive Education in UAE and Jordan: A comparative study. *International Journal of Disability, Community and Rehabilitation,. 10*. No.1. Retrieved March, 26th 2014 from www.ijdcr.ca/vol.10_01/articles/al Zyoudi.shtml.

Anjeh, D. 2007. *Dealing with Emotional, Behavioral and Physical Disabilities: The Teachers Challenge.* Reterieved April 20th 2014 from QFjAB and url=http%3A2F%2Files.eric.ed.gov%Ffulltext2FED5003816pd.

Armold, P. and Chapman, M. 1992. *Physical Disability Studies.* Retrieved December 14, 2014 from www.ncbi.n/minih.gov/pubmed/1531135

Babie, E. (n .d). *The Practice of Social Research* (11th ed.) Thomson Waedsworth.

Barg, C. J., Armstrong, B. D., Hetz, S. P. and Latimer, A. E. 2010. Physical Disability, Stigma and Physical Activity in Children. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 57*. No. 4. Pp. 371-382. Retrieved December 10th 2014 from eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ907447.

Belson, S., I. 2014. (n.d.) *Foundations of Special Education: Physical Disabilities*. Retrieved September 23, 2014 from sped.wikidot.com/physical-disabilities

Beyene, G. and Tizazu, Y. 2010. *Attitude of Teachers Towards Inclusive Education in Ethiopia*. Retrievedon7/1/2012. http://www.ajoi.info/index.php/ajex/article/viewFile/65383/53076.

Bloor, M. and Wood, F. 2006. *Theoretical Saturation*. Retrieved August 23, 2013 from https://statistics.laerd.com/statistical-guides/descriptive-inferential-statistics.php

Brandon, D. P. 2006. Botswana's Family and Consumer Science Teachers' Attitude Towards the Inclusion of Students with Physical Disabilities. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences Education, 24*. No1 Spring/Summer, 2006. Retrieved on 16/12/2011 from http:www.natefacs.org.JFCSE/v 24 no1.Brandon.

Bristol, City, Council 2011. *Disabled Childrens' Home to School Travel*. Retrieved January4, 2015from www.bristol.gov.uk/page/children-young-people/school-travel

Campbell, J., Gilmore, L., and Cuskelly, M. 2003. *Changing Student Attitudes Towards Disability and Inclusion.*

Journal of Intellectual & Development Disability, Vol. 28. No. 4 pp.369-379. Retrieved November 15, 2013 from http://eprints.qut.edu.au/4305/1/4305.pdf.

Campbell,W. and Missiuma, C. 2011. Bullying Risk in Children with Disabilities: A review of Literature.RetrievedNovember19th2014fromwww.canchild.ca/en/canchildresources/bullying_risk_children_disabilities.asp

Charema, J. 2005. *From Special Schools to Inclusive Education: The Way Forward for Developing Countries of South Sahara.* Retrieved May 18, 2013 from www.Isec2005.org.uk/isec/abstracts/papers-c/charema-j.s.html

Chatalka,T. 2007. *Inclusive Education in Zimbambwe: Policy, Practice, Family and Teacher Education Issues. Journal of International Association for Childhood Education International Focus Issue* 2007, vol,83. No 6.pp, 342-346. Retrieved May 18,2013fromwww.academia.edu/283491/Inclusive_Education_in_Zimbabwe_Policy_Practice_Family_and_Teacher_Education_Issues.

Choudhuri, M. A., Khandake, Alam, J., Hassan, R. and Rashinda, S. A. 2005. *Disability: Knowledge and Research, Situational Analysis and Assessment of Education of Children in Bangladesh, South Asia, East Asia and South Africa.* Retrieved May 18, 2013 *from www.hpod/pdf/kar-kamatic-edu-pdf*

Colorado Department of Education, 2013. Compulsory School Attendance Law. Retrieved November 25, 2014 from www.cde.state.co.us/choice/homeschool-_attendance

Crawford, C. 2005. *Scooping Inclusive Education for Canadian Students with Intellectual and Other Disabilities.* Retrieved April15, 2013 from www.ibechonga.ca/uploads/scoopngInclusive Education -Roecher.pdf

Create (n.d.) *Special Education Support Services.* Retrieved March 26, 2012 from http://sped.lausd.net/ sepg2s-services.htm

Creswell, J., W. 2014. *Research Design* (4th ed.). London: Sage publications Ltd.

D'Angela, C., Touchman, S., Clark, D., O'Donnell, Angela., Mayer, R., Dean, D. and Hmelo-Silver, C. 2009. Constructivism. Retrieved March 20/2014 from www.education.com/reference/article/constructivism

Das, A. and Kattumuri, R. 2011. *Children with Disabilities in Private Inclusive Schools in Mumbai: Experiences and Challenges.*Retrievedon7/1/2012.from www2/se.ac.uk/asiaResearchCenter-files/ARCWP34-Daskattumuri.pdf.

DFID, 2000. *Disability, Poverty and Development.* Retrieved on 4 September, 2008 from http://wwwdfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/disability.pdf

Dixon, E., Lambert, F., Stairs, C., Tejeda, K. and Williams, S. 2009. *Running Head: Teacher PerceptionofInclusion.*RetrievedMarch10,fromwww.google.com/url?Sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=S&Source=web&cd=1&ved=OCCKQFJAA&url=http%3A%2F%Femurillo.org%2FC.

EADSNE. 2004. *Inclusive Education and Classroom Practice in Secondary Education.* RetrievedJanuary28,2012fromhttps://www.european-agency.org/publications/ereports/inclusive-education -and-effective-classroom-practice/ECP-se

Eldis. 2010. Reducing School Drop outs Through Inclusive Approaches to Education in Ghana. Retrieved December 15, 2014 from www.eldi.org/index-cfm?objectid=132A5A5-9EOB-0456-5BB4C5495BO4E#.VlaxZGfs7Dc

Fraenkel, J., R. and Wall, N., E. 2009. *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* (7th ed.) Boston: Mc Graw- Hill.

Gadgbui,G.,Y. 2008. *Inclusive Education in Ghana: Practices Challenges and the Future ImplicationsforallStakeholdres.* Retrieved March 20, 2013 from wwww.natcomreport.com/Ghana/livre/inclusive-ducation.pdf

Gargiulo, M. R. 2006. *Special Education in Contemporary Society: An Introduction to Exceptionality.* Toronto: Thomas Wardswarth.

Garuba, A. 2003. *Inclusive Education in the 21st Century: Challenges and Opportunities for Nigeria.*RetrievedonJanuary22/2012from http://www.aifo.it/english/resources/online/apdij/apdrj203/included-nigeria.pdf.

Getachew, A. T. 2011. Attitudes of Ethiopian College Students towards People with Visible Disabilities. Retrieved November 15, 2014 from http://ir.uiwa.ed/ed/1139

Guion, L., A. David, C. Diehl, D., C. & McDonald, D. (2013) *Triangulation: Establishing the ValidityofQualitativeStudies.*RetrievedMay27, 2014from edis.ifas.ufl.edu/fy394.

Hastings, E 1996. Access to Education for Students a Disability: Barriers and Difficulties. RetrievedDecember12,2014fromhttp://www.humanrights.gov.au/publications/access-education-students-disability-barriers-and-difficulties

Harvey, G. 2004. When Special and General Education Unit, Everyone Benefits. *A publication of West Ed . 6.* No.1. Retrieved May 25, 2014 from www.westEd.org/catalog.

Holmberg, J., B, 2004. *Inclusive Education and Classroom Practice in Secondary Education.* RetrievedJuly17,2013fromwww.european-agency.org/publications/ ereports/inclusive-education-and-effective-classroom-practice/IECP-secondary-Literature.

Human Rights Watch, 2011. Futures Stolen: Barriers to Education for Children with Disabilities inNepal.RetrievedJanuary2,2015fromhttps://www.google.com/search?biw=1366bih=610&noj=1&cclient=psyab&q=future+student%3A+Barrirers+to+Education+for+children

Illinois Department of Human Resource Services (n.d.) *DHS: People First: a guide to Interacting with People with Disabilities.RetrievedOctober25,2014from www.dhs.state:il.us/page.aspx?item=32276*

Jackson, M. R. 2011. *Curricula Access for Students with Low-Incidence Disabilities: The Promise of UDL.*Retrieved February 20, 2013 from aim.cast.org/learn/historyarchive/backgroundpapers/promise_of_udl/what_Curricula.

Jeffels, S. 2012. *What is the Meaning of Conceptual Framework in Research?* Rerieved on 20/11/2012.fromwww.enhow.com/about-6664512-meaning-conceptual-framework-research-html

Joffrion, C. 2010. *Mixed Method Research Defined.* Retrieved May19, 2014 from www.prolog.org/108142-mixed-method-research-defined.html

Kathenya, M. and Mwereria, S. 2007. *Introduction to Special Needs Educational Assessment and Intervention.* Nairobi: KISE.

Katarina, A, R. 2007. *Vygotsky's Social Constructionist's of Disability.* Retreaved on 25/10/2013 from Ichc.uesd.edu/mca/paper/vyogtskyDisability EJSNE2007.pdf.

Kothari, C. R. 2004. *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques* (2nd ed.). New Delhi: sNew Age International (P) Limited Publishers.

Kenpro. 2010. *Challenges Facing Inclusive Education in Regular Primary Schools in Kenya.* RetrievedJune23, 2012fromwww.kenpro.org/papers/challenges-facing-Inclusive-education-in+kenya.htm

Kimu, A., M. 2012. Parental Involvement in Public Primary Schools in Kenya. Retrieved May 22, 2014 from desertation-kimu-a.pdf

King, Gillian. and Polatajko. 2015. The Importance of Self-Esteem: Implications for Practice. RetrievedJanuary23rd2015fromwww.canchild.ca/enchildre nfamilies/selfesteem.asp

KNCHR 2007. *Objects of Pity or Individuals with Rights: The Education for Children with Disabilities.* Retrieved on 17/11/2012 from www.knchr.org/portals/D/Reports/ Objects of pity OR Individuals with Rights-Final April 2007.pdf.

Kochung', E. J. 2011. *The Role of Higher Education in Promoting Inclusive Education: Kenyan Perspective.* Journal of Emerging Trends in Education, 2 No. 3.jesteraps. scholarlinkresearch.org/articles/Role of Higher Education in promoting Inclusive Education.pdf.

Kombo, D. K. and Tromp, D. A. 2006. *Proposal and Thesis Writing: An Introduction.* Nairobi: Paulines Publications Africa.

Konza, D. 2008. *Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in New Times: Responding to the Challenge.*RetrievedJanuary20th2015from www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=we b&ed=4&ved=OCD.QFjAD&URL=http%3AOF2F%2Fro. uow.edu%2Fcgi%2Fviewcontent.cg%.

Leatherman, M. J. 2007. "I just See All Children". Teachers' Perceptions About Inclusion. *Qualitative Report,12.*November4December 2007594-611.Retrievedon 10/2/2012 http://www,noa,edu/ssss/qr/qr12-4leatherman.pdf.

Leonard Chesire Regional Representative Report, 2012. *Nyanza Inclusive Education Program.* RetrievedNovember25,2012from www.disability.database.org/Education/nyanza-inclusive education-program

Lingfoot, J., Wright, S. and Sloper, P. (n.d.) *Service Support for Children with A Chronic Illness or Physical Disability Attending Mainstream Schools.* Retrieved December21, 2014fromwww.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=&esrc=s&source =web&cd=2&ved-OCCYQFjABBurl=http%3A%2Fwww.york.ac.uk%2Finst %Espr.

Longo, R., J. 2006. *Inclusive Education: Policies, Teachers' Attitudes and Perspectives.* Retrievedon7/2/2012fromhttp://www.thefreelibrary.com/ inclusive+education%+policies%30+policies%2c+teachers '+attitudes+and+pespectives-ao17998526.

Macbi, C. Z. (2007). *Attitudes of Selected Groups of Teachers Towards Inclusive Education.* http://196.21.83.35/bi+stream/handle/10530/173/Attitudes %20selected groups% of 20teachers%20-% cz%20macbi.pdf? sequence=1

Madam, A. and Sharma, N. 2013. Inclusive Education for Children with Disabilities: Preparing Schools to Meet the Challenge. Retrieved November 17th 2014 from www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=we b&ed=1&ved=OCDMQFjAA&url=http%3A%2Fcoreschol ar.libraries.wright.educ.

Maestad, O. 2006. *Human Resources of Health in Tanzania: Challenges, Policy Options and Knowledge*Gaps.RetrievedSeptember23,2012fromwww.cm i.no.publications/file/2175.human+resources-for-health-in-tanzania-challenges.pdf

Makaa, F. M. 2014. Challenges Facing Implementation of Inclusive Education in Primary Schools in Yatta Division-Yatta District Machakos County- Kenya. Retrieved November 13th 2014 from http://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/handle/123456789/6448.

Marie-Pierre, P. 2011. *Position Paper.* Retrieved on 12/8/2012 from www.unicef.org/ceecls/ UNICEF-Right-Disabilities-En-web.pdf.

Massenga, C. R. and Mwandawire, H. 2007. *Ministry of Education and Vocational Training in Tanzania.* Retrieved January 14 2013 from www.unesco.org/fileadmin/user-upload/inclusive-Education/Reports/nairobi-07/tanzania/inclusive-07.pdf

Mc Donald, T., Caswell, P. and Penman, M. 2001. *Integrated Effective Service Provision For Children and Young People with Physical Disabilities: Report to the Ministry of Educations Reference Group on Physical Disability.* Retrieved on 8/1/2012 from www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/schooling/5157

Miles, S. 2000. *Enabling Network Education Inclusive: Enabling Inclusive Education. ChallengesandDilemas.*RetrievedFebruary13,2013fromww w.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/bonn_2.php

Milsom, A. 2006. *Creating Positive School Experiences for Students with Disabilities.* Retrieved on 15/11/2013 from www.colorincolor.org/article/26319/

Ministry of Education. 2005. *Education Policy in Kenya.* Retrieved on 10/9/2012.Soft Kenya.com/education/ educationpolicy-in-kenya.

Ministry of Education. 2008. *The Development of Education: National Report of Kenya.* Retrievedon17/11/2012.fromwww.ibe.unesco.org/National -Report/ICE-2008/Kenya-NR08.pdf.

Ministry of Education Science and Technology. 2003. *A Report of the Taskforce on Special Needs Education.* Nairobi: Government Printer.

Ministry of Education Science and Technology. 2004. *Development of Education in Kenya.* Retrievedon29/1/2012from www.ibe,unesco.org.International/ICE47/English/Natreps/r eports/kenya.pdf.

Moodley, S. 2002. *Inclusive Education: Challenges for Distance Learning, Policy and Practice.* Retrieved on 13/10/2012 from http:www.adcet.edu.au/stored File.aspx? id=9688.fn=sive%20 moodley.pdf.

Mount-Cors, M., F. 2007. *Special Education in Mexico. Retrieved* February 10, 2013 from

www.learnc.org/Ip/editions/brdlangbarriers/1911

Mpofu, J. & Shumba, A. 2012. Challenges Faced by Students with Special Educational Needs in Early Childhood Development Centers in Zimbabwe as Perceived by ECD TrainersandParents.RetreivedDecember11,2014from www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=we b&cd=4&ved=OCDgQFJAD&url=http%3A%2Fwww.edd e.org%2Fdocument

Mugenda, M. O. and Mugenda, A. G. 1999. *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches.* Nairobi: Acts Press.

Mukhopadhyay, S., Johnstone, N. and Abosi, A. 2009. *Inclusive Education for Learners with Disabilities in Botswana Schools.* Retrieved May 18, 2013 from sgo.sagepub.com/content/early/2012/05/25/21582/4401245 1584.

Mumbi, K. F., Mugo, J.K. and Chege, F. N. 2013. Poor, Disabled and Unemployed: Linking Education to Labour Market Outcomes for Persons with Physical Disabilities in Nyeri, Kenya. *Journal of Special Needs and Disability Studies.*. No 1.pp.100-110.

Munyi, C. W. 2012. Past and Present Perspectives Towards Disability: A Historical Perspective. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 32. No 2. (2012) Retrieved March 13th 2014 from dsq-sds-org/article/view/3197/3068

Muscular Dystrophy Campaign, 2007. *Inclusive Education for Children with Muscular Dystrophy and other Neuromuscular Conditions: Guidance for Primary and SecondarySchools*(2[nd]ed.).RetrievedOctober24[th]2014from www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=we b&=i&ved=OCDQQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.m uscular.dystrophy.org&2Fassets%

Myers, J. and Bagreen, S. 2011. *Policy Paper Making Inclusive a Reality.* Retrieved May 25, 2012 from www.google.com/url?sa-t&rct=j

Muwana, F., C. 2012. *Zambia Student Teachers Attitudes Toward Including Students with Disabilities in General Education Classrooms.* Retrieved May 23, 2012 from http://www.idealsillinos.educ/bitsream/handle/2142/3121/ muwana-Florence.pdf?

Mwangi, W.K. 2008. *Management of Special Needs Education Programme.* Nairobi: KISE.

Mwesigy, S. 2013. Inclusive Education an Ideal too Expensive? Retrieved November 20th fromwww.observer.ug/index.php=com_content&view=arti cle&id=23927%3Ainclusive-education-an –ideal-too-expensive

Najjingo, H. 2009. *Challenges of Accessing All- Inclusive Education Service by Children with Disabilities (CWDs): A case of Mijwala sub-County Ssembabule District.* RetrievedApril22, 2012fromnews.mak.ac.ug/documents/ makfiles/kases/Najjingo-Hellen.pdf

Odyek, J. B. 2012. *Will Inclusive Education Deliver its Intended Results in Uganda (Ruwezori Voices).*Retrieved February 15, 2013 from wecovoice.blogspot.con/2012/08/will-inclusive-education-deliver-its.html.

Ogot, O. 2008. *Making Primary Education Meaningfully Inclusive: A Study in Kenya* Retrieved on20/11/2012fromhttps://www.googleh?q=ogot+(2008)+m aking+primary=education-meaningfully+inclusive%3A+A+study+in+Kenya&ie=utf-8

Oliver, T. and Williams, E. E. 2008. *Challenges of Inclusive Education in South Africa: Voices ofTeachers.*RetrievedFebruary27,2013from108.cgpublisher .com/proposals/607/index_html.

Ondimu, K., N. 2010. *Child Exclusion among Internally Displaced Population in Rift valley and Nyanza Provinces of Kenya.* Retrieved February 20, 2014 from https://books.google.co.ke/book?id=Tw7q7PwG=cC&pg= PA35&dq=ondimu+Area+of+Nyanza+Province+in+kilom etre+square

Orotho, A. J. and Kombo, D. K. 2002. *Research Methods.* Nairobi: Kenyatta University Institute of Open Learning.

Orodho, J. A. 2009. *Elements of Education and Social Sciences Research Methods*. Maseno: Kanezja Publisher.

Owens, T. 2013. *Disabled People in Africa have been Marginalized for too Long.* Retrieved March 4th, 2014 from theconservation.con/disabled-people-in-africa-have-been-marginalized-for-too-long-18207.

Parenting and Child Health, 2014. *Child and Youth.* Retrieved November 22, 2014 from www.cyh.com/HealthTopics/Health-TopicDetails.aspx?p=114&np=306&id=1874

Pass water, G. 2009. *ParentingSpecialNeeds.*RetrievedDecember28,2014from parentingspecialneeds.org/article//122

Peterson, M. 1998. *For Better or Worse: Building Inclusive Schools in Poor Urban Communities.*RetrievedSeptember23,2011fromwww.whole schooling.net/WSPress/ForBetter orWorse.html

Phelan, C. and Wren, J. 2006. *Exploring reliability in Academic Assessment.* Retrieved July 10,2012 from www.uni.edu/chfasoa/reliability and validity.htm

Phelan, P. S. 2013. (n.d.) *Inclusive Education: Integrating Special Needs and Typical Students in the Classroom.* http://www.parentguidenews.com/Articles/InclusiveEducat ion

Phiri, P. M. 2012. *The History of Special Education Towards Inclusive Education in Zimbabwe.*RetrievedOctober15[th],2013from www.academia.edu/234966/The_History_of_Special_educ ation_Towards_Inclusive-education_in_Zimbabwe

Pivik, J., Mccomas, J. and Laflamme, M. 2002. Barriers and Facilitators to Inclusive Education. *Exceptional Children,l 69*. No.1.pp.97-107. Retrieved onNovember10[th],2013form http://www.itari.in/categories/facilitors/ResearchbyFacilitat orsforspecialchildren.pdf.

Porter, G. 2001. *Disability and Inclusive Education.*www.disabilityworld.org/05-06-01/children/inclusiveed.shtml. Retrieved on 9/11/2011.

Reiser, R. 2008. *Implementing Inclusive Education: A Commonwealth Guide to Implementing Article 24 of the UN Convention on Rights of Persons with Disabilities.* Retrieved May 16,2013 from http://www.google.co18IEVMwiaRD2xfHZ0g

Report of Norad (in full). 2011. *Report of Norad On Desk Review of Inclusive Education Policies & Plans in Nepal, Tanzania, Vietnam and Zambia.* Retrieved on 12/11/2012 from www.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/policy-review-forNorad.pdf. .

Rinyka, A. 2011. *The Leaved Experiences of General and Special Education Teachers in inclusion classrooms- A Phenomenological Study.* Retrieved on 30/10/ 2013

fromwww.geu.edu/ken-blanchard-college-of-business/The-canyon/journal-org-interdisciplinary-students/The-Lived-Experiences.

Robinson, S. and Truscott. 2015. (n.d.) *Belonging and Connection of School Students with Disability.* RetrievedJanuary6ᵗʰ2015fromwww.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=7esrc=s&source=web&cd=5&ved=OCEQFjA&&url=http%3A%2Fwww.eda.org.au%2F_literature_164402%FBe

Rodriguez, B., Dyesi, H. and Laner, T. 2012. *Critical Issues: Meeting the Diverse Needs of YoungChildren.*Retrievedon3/1/2012.from www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/students/earlycldea400.htm.

Salkind, N, J. 2010. *Encyclopedia of Research Design.* Retrieved on 13/9/2013, fromsrmo.sagepub.com/view/ency-of-research-design/n428.xml

Sharma, U. and Deppler, J. 2005. Integrated education in India: Challenges and Prospects. *Disability Studies Quaterly* [Winter 2005], *25*. No 1. www.dsq.org> [incomplete]

SaveChildren,U.K.2002.ShoolsForAll:DisabledChildreninEducation:RetrievedOctober16ᵗʰ2014fromwww.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=4&ved=OCDIQFjAD&url=http%3A%2F%Fwww.eenet.org.uk%%2F&resources

Schmitt, M., J. and Mark, P. 2011. *Inclusive Education for Young Disabled People in Europe: Trends, Issues and Challenges. A Synthesis of Evidence from Academic Network of European Disability experts.Country.* Retrieved June 23, 2012 from reports and additionalresourcessageEbersold.disability-europe-net/content/ANED2010Task5Educationfinalreport-Final(2)0.pdf

Schwartz, D. 2005. *Including Children with Special Needs Education: A handbook for Education Parents.* London: Greenwood Press.

Seehorn, A. 2011. *Challenges of Implementing the Individuals with Disabilities Act.* Retrieved on 3/10/2011fromwww.enhow.com/info-8237502-Challenges-Individuals-Disabilities-education-act.html

Sellers, A. and Pozniak, M. 2010. *Preparing Teachers for Inclusive Education- Catholic Relief Services.* Retrieved March 07, from www.crsprogramquality.org/storage/pubs/education/edhowto-vietnam2.pdf

Serpell, R. and Jere-Folotiya, J. 2011. *Basic Education for Children with Special Needs in Zambia: Progress and Challenges in the Translation of policy into Practice.* Retrieved March 15, 2013from www.academic.edu/1206930/Basic-Education-for-children-with-special-in-zambia-progress and challenges-in

Shore, K. 2014. Education World. Retrieved November 17, 2014 from www.educationworld-com/a_urs/shore/shore059.shtml

Simon, M. K. and Goes, J. 2013. *Ex Post Facto Research.* Retrieved June 22, 2013 from www.desertationreceipes.Com/wp-Content/uploads/2011/04/Ex-Post-Facto-research.pdf. p.1

South Carolina Assistive Technology Program. 2012. *What is Assistive Technology.*Retrieved September 21, 2014 from www.sc.edu/sctp/exp/exp12.html

Special Needs Technology Assessment Resource Support Team. 2001. Technology Tools, Tips for Students with Learning Disabilities. Retrieved May 12, 2014 from www.nsnet.org/start/

Stoecklin, V. L. 1999. *Designing for All Children.* Retrieved December 10ᵗʰ 2014 from https://www.whitehutchinson.com/children/article/designingforall.shtml

Subban, P. and Sharma, U. 2005. Understanding Educator Attitudes Toward the Implementation of Inclusive Education. *Disability Studies Quarterly* , 25. No. 2. Retrieved on 15/6/2011. From dsq-sds.otg/article/view/545/22

Susan, J. P. 2003. *Inclusive Education: Achieving Education For All by Including Those with Disabilities and Special Needs.* Retrieved from www.hiproweb.org/fileadmin/cdroms/Education/EducationIntegreeEM.pdf

Susan, S. and Williams, S. 2000. *Inclusion: A Guide for Educator.* Baltimore: Paul H: Brooks Publishing Co.

The America Occupational Therapy Association. 2007. *All Students Can Participate- Including Students with Disabilities in the Classroom.* Retrieved on 26/3/2012 from http://www.aota.org/Archive/NewsA/IDEA-a/emOTPracticeenarticlesonIDEA20002005

The Australian Human Rights Commission. 2015. Access to Education for Students with Disability: Barriers and Difficulties. Retrieved January 7, 2015 from https://www.humanrights.org.gov.au/publications/access-education-students-disability-barriers-and-difficulties

The Canadian Epilepsy Alliance. 2008. *Behavioural and Emotional Changes in Persons with Epilepsy.*RrievedJuly12ᵗʰ2014from www.epilepsymatters.com/english/iwebbehavioural.html.

The Challenge of Education (n.d.) The Future of Syria. Retrieved December 13, 2014 from unhcr.org/Futureofsyria/thechallenge-of-edcation.html

The Longitudinal Study of Australian Children Annual Statistical Report. 2012. *Is it Okay to be away? School Attendance in Primary School Years.* Retrieved November 19ᵗʰ 2014 from www.growingupinausralia.gov.au/pubs/asr/2012/asr2012e.html

Thendu, P.,G. 2006. *The influence of Teachers Preparedness on Quality of Teaching HIV/AIDSCurriculum in Primary Schools in Ol jororok Division, Nyandarua District, Kenya.* Unpublished MED Thesis: Kenyatta University.

Therapy, O. G. 2002. Autism Treament. Retrieved December 20, 2014 from www.ericdigests.org/2003-5/inclusion.htm

The University of Manchester. 2012. Research Methods in the Social Sciences: Narrative Analysis.Retrieved26May,2014fromwww.methods.manchester.ac.uk/methods/narrative/

Thirteen Education Online. 2004. *Constructivism as a Paradigm for Teaching and Learning.* RetrievedMarch20/2014fromwww.thirteen.org/edonline/concept2class constructivism/

Thomson, S. B. 2011. *Qualitative Research: Validity.* JOAAG. Vol. 6. No.1. Retrieved June 4, 2014 from https://www.google.com/search?biw=1366&bih=610&cclient=psy-ab&q=thompson+5%ZC+B.(2011)+Qualitative+Research+validity+vol.

Thompson, D., Deeming, C. and Sawrika, P. 2011. *Community Attitudes to People with Disability: Scoping Project.* Retrieved November22nd 2013 from 39_community_attitudes_to_disability_accessible.pdf

Thurlow, M. L., Sinclair, M. and Johnson, D. R. 2002. Students with Disabilities who Drop out of School – Implications for Policy and Practice: Examining Current Challenges in Secondary Education and Transition.Vol.1.Issue 2.Retrieved from www.ncset.org/publications/viewdescasp?id=425

Travers, J., Balfe, T., Dupont, M., O'Donnell M. and Prunty, A. 2010. *Addressing Challenges and Barriers to Inclusion in Irish Schools.* Retrieved April 22, 2014 from www.spd.dcu.ie/site/edc/documents/StPatricksCollege.SE NReport2010.pdf

United Nations Educational, Scientefic and Culturel Organization 1994. The Salamanca Statement and Framework of Action on Special Needs Education. Retrieved March,12th2012fromwww.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q= &esrc=web&cd=2&ved=OCCoQFJB&url=http%3A%2F% 2Fwww.kth.ch%2Fuploads%2Fdco%2Fdokul

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization 2001. Inclusive Education: SupportMaterialsforManagersandAdministrators.Retrieved November26,2014fromwww.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j& q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=OCCQFjAA&url=h ttp%3A%2F%2Funesco.org%2images

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization 2003. Inclusive Education: Retrieved June 22, 2013 from www.unesco.org./education/sne/

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. 2007. *Regional Seminar Poverty Alleviation, HIV and AIDS Education and Inclusive Education: Priority Issues for Inclusive Quality Education in Eastern and Western Sub-Saharan Africa*RetrievedMarch11,2013fromwww.ibe.unesco.org/fil eadmin/uses upload/inclusive-Education/Reports/nairobi-07/ghana-inclusion07.pdf

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2009. Towards Inclusive Education for Children with Disabilities: A Guideline: Retrieved October 22 14,www.google.com/url?c=t&rct=i&q=&e&crc=web&c d=ved=oCCQFjAA&url=http%3A2Fwww.u&.unesco.org %FLibrary

UNICEF. 1999. *Examples of Inclusive Education-Bangladesh.* Retrieved on 5/8/2011. From http://www.unicef.org/rosdinclusiv Ban/pdf University of Strathclyde. (n.d.) What is observation? Retrieved May 25, 2014 from www.strath.ac.uk/aer/materials/3datacollection/unit5/what is observation/

U.S. Department of Education, 2004. Building the Legacy: IDEA 2004. Retrieved January 5th, 2015 from idea.ed.gov/explore/view/p/.root.regs.300.A,A300%25E34

Van Laecke, E., Hoebeke, P. & Laecke, E. (2010). Urinary Incontinence in Physical / or Intellectually Disabled Children: Amultifactorial Problems. *Journal of Pediatric Urology.* Retrieved September, 23rd 2014 from www.jpwol.com/articles/s+477-513/(0)00157-9/abstract

Villa, A. R. and Thousand, J. S. 2012. *Restricting for Caring and Effective Education: A global Perspective.* Retrieved May15, 2012.from www.ravillabeyridge.com/ Africa Key note.pdf

Villeneuve, M. and Hutchison, N. L. 2012. *Enabling Outcomes for Students with Developmental Disabilities Through Collaborative Consultation:* Quantitative Report 2012, 17. pp.1-29.RetrievedMay18,2013fromhttp://.www.novaedu/ssss/Q R/QR17/Villeneuve.pdf

Wachianga, J.O.W. 2012. *Support Services To Learners with Physical Disabilities in Kenya.* Saabrucken: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing GmbH&Co.Kg.

Waruguru, M. N. and Kabuchuru, C. 2008. *Introduction to Inclusive Education.* Unpublished: KISE.

Watson, and MCCatherene (209) *Including Children with Special Needs: Are You and Your Early Programme Ready?* Retrieved May 12, 2014 from htttps://www.google.com/search?biwoclo&noj2j&q=Wats on=2009watson%Bmccatherene+model%2Bphysical+disa bilities&0q=2009watson%Bmccatherene+model%2Bmcca therene+classroom+model%2E

Weaver, R. 2014. *Coping with Stigma of Having a Physical Disability.* Retrieved December 9th 2014 from www.empowher.com/mental-health/content/coping-stigma-having-physical-disability

Weaver, A. and Dobson, P. 2007. *An Overview of Faecal Incontinence in Children.* Retrieved December 14 2014fromwww.nursingtimes.net/an-overview-of-faecal-incontinence-in-children/26751.article

Windhowe 2013. Conctructivism: A Holistic Approach to Teaching and Learning. Retrieved March 12/2014 from www.shdymode.come/essay/Constructivism-a-Holistic-Approach-To-Teaching-1906295.html

Winter, E. and O'Raw, P. 2010. *National Council for Special Education: Literature Review of Principles and Practices Relating to Inclusive Education for Children with Special Needs.* Retrieved July 26, 2012 from www.ncse./uploads/NCSE-Inclusion.pdf

Wolley, H., Armitage, M., Bishop, J., Curtis, M., and Ginsberg, J. 2006. Benefits of Play and Playwork.RetrievedDecember6,2014fromwww.google.co m/url?sa=t&rct=egrcs&source=web&ed=4vfd=OCDYQFj ad&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.scolandscolleges.ac.uk%

Wynne, K. 2009. *Ontario's Equity and Inclusive Education Strategy.* Retrieved March 13, 2013 from www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/policyfounding/equity.pdf

Zachary, A. 2011. *Special Education Services for Physically Disabled Students in Public Schools.* Retrieved on 9/11/2011 from www.brighthubeducation.com/special-ed-physical-disabilities/29178-services-physical-disabilities

****