JRIIE — **Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education**
ISSN: 2520-7504

Management of Learners with Special Needs in Inclusive Education in Makueni County, Kenya

Prof. Lazarus Ndiku Makewa, PhD[1*], Josephine Mbithe Mutie, PhD[2]
[1]Rwenzori International University, Uganda
[2]Scott Christian University, Kenya

[*]Corresponding author: ndikul@gmail.com

Abstract: *The purpose of this study was to investigate how learners with special needs in public primary schools were managed inclusively in Makueni County –Kenya, based on instructional strategies, learner engagement, resource materials, assessment, and physical environment. The study used concurrent mixed methods design. Purposively the study selected nine schools that had adapted inclusive education and had boarding facilities, county director of education, nine EARC officers in charge of special needs education in each sub-county, nine head teachers, teachers with/without special needs training, focus groups of learners with /without special needs and 18 support staff as respondents. Questionnaires were administered to 107 teachers who were present when data was collected, interviews, observations and documentation was done to verify how the special learners were managed. Teachers moderately used instructional strategies, assessments and engaged learners. Most schools had inadequate resources for managing learners with special needs inclusively. Physical environments in most schools were minimally adapted.*

1. Introduction

Internationally, inclusive education is pictured as a process where mainstream schools and early year's settings are changed so that all children are supported to meet their personal, academic and social potentials that involve removing barriers in environment, communication, curriculum, teaching, socialization and assessment at all levels (Forlin, 2011). UNESCO (2010) views inclusive education as a means of eliminating social exclusion that is as a result of attitudes and responses to diversity in race, social class, ethnicity, religion, gender and ability. However, a study by Eleweke and Rodda, (2002) found out that inclusive education has not been implemented to satisfaction thus a challenge in enhancing it in developing countries due to lack of a systematic management of learners with special needs in inclusion.

The MoEST (2009), further, affirms that it faces a number of challenges in its effort to address barriers to education for children with Special Needs. These include issues relating to; access, equity, quality, relevance, attitude, stigma, discrimination, Cultural/taboos, skills, Physical environment, Physical facilities, and poverty. Management of learners with special needs in the Inclusive system of Education in Kenya poses a great challenge to the school managers, teachers, parents, support staff and other learners (Obegi, 2014). There is also very high dropout rates among children with disabilities, as curricula and pedagogy is not designed to accommodate their needs, this is worsened by the doubling numbers of learners receiving special education services in schools due to the onset of Free Primary Education (FPE) (Ellman, 2012)

2. Review of Related Literature and Studies

This section presents the review of related literature and studies:

2.1 Instructional Strategies

Flexible curriculum, use of individualized instruction and plans are important elements of a successful inclusion program (Osberg & Biesta, 2010). This is because educating learners with special needs calls for special

instructional strategies (Raymond, 2008). For proper class management, the teacher must be fully prepared to minimize disruptions and prevent negative behavior as much as possible (Jull, 2008, Oliver &Reshly, 2010). McLeskey and Waldron (2011) documents three instructional strategies that can be employed to successfully educate learners with Learning Disability (LD) in inclusive classrooms, which include: co-teaching, differentiated instruction, and peer mediated instruction and interventions.

Co-teaching
This is a typical arrangement involving a general and a special education teacher, working together to provide support for students with Learning Disabilities in an Inclusive Class (Solis, Vaughn, Swanson, and McCulley, 2012). It is a partnership of a general education teacher and a special education teacher or another specialist to jointly deliver instruction to a diverse group of students in a way that is flexible and deliberately meets their learning needs (Friend, Cook, Chamberlain, &Shamberger, 2010, p. 241). A study on students' reflections, both special and normal, in co- taught classrooms reported that their favorite aspects of co-teaching included their aspiration to: ask questions, ask for help, get more time with teachers, understand the subject more and do more fun things (Conderman, 2011, p.25).

Differentiated Instruction
This involves learners with LD, and others with diverse learning needs, being supplied with instructional methods and materials that are matched to their individual needs (Scruggs, Mastropieri, &Marshak, 2012). The use of differentiated instruction requires general and special educators to possess flexible teaching approaches as well as to be flexible in adjusting the curriculum based upon student need (Obiakor, Harris, Mutua, Rotatori, &Algozzine, 2012).

Peer-Mediated Instruction and Interventions
McLeskey and Waldron (2011) reveal that Peer-Mediated Instruction and Interventions PMII are a set of alternative teaching strategies that employ the use of students as instructors for learners in their class shifting the role of the teacher goes from being the primary provider of instruction to that of a facilitator of peer provided instruction. AstudybyCalabrase, Patterson, Liu, Goodvin, and Hummel (2008) discovered that Circle of Friends program (COFP) increases social interactions both inside and outside the classroom by fostering a culture of acceptance through encouraging relationships between learners with/without special educational needs and disabilities.

2.2 Students' Engagement
This aspect is viewed as students' participation in educationally effective practices, leading to a range of potentially measurable outcomes(Cooper, Jacobs, and Busher, 2011).The process involves measuring the student's engagement academically, communicatively or socially, to promote more active engagement by the student with what is learnt and taught in schools (Cooper, Jacobs &Busher 2011). Shaddock, MacDonald, Hook, Giorcelli, and Arthur-Kelly, (2009) document that participation becomes an issue for any student, despite disability, gender, behavior, poverty, culture, refugee status or any other reason, the desirable approach is to expand mainstream thinking, structures, and practices so that all students are accommodated..

2.3 Necessary Resources
El-NFor successful inclusion, all the necessary resources must be availed for both the students and the teachers (Anderson, Klassen, and Georgiou, 2007). Peters, Johnstone and Ferguson (2005) hold that in order to provide the educational support needed by disabled learners, a programme should be developed to provide appropriate welcome, access, support and accommodations

.Adaptive Devices for Special Learners
KISE (2002) posits that specific educational resources should be adapted for learners with special needs; Introduction of technology into the education system is a way of revolutionizing teaching methods, trained and empathetic teachers are necessary to engage the students and enhance "lesson plans that use instructional and assistive technology" (Assistive Technology for Students with physical disabilities, 2007, para. 5). Computer-based technology is constantly evolving, however Higbee, Kalivoda, Know & Totty (2000), indicate the importance of understanding the issues involved with disabilities in order to find the technologies that best fit the students. Henderson (2002) documents that Studier hardware programs lessens the use of computers even though they are relatively expensive due to the low demand and more complicated software programs, such as Speech Recognition.

2.4 Assessment
This is an initial component of the Inclusive program provided through an external agency to determine eligibility for extra support. A needs-based questionnaire is used to determine the level of educational support required (Department of Education and Early Child Development (DEECD), 2013). It is a process of collecting data, analyzing and evaluating information about a student's achievement or characteristics in order to make educational decisions about that individual student (Whitebread, 2009). Okumbe&Malatsi (2005) observed that most students with special needs are progressing through school without proper assessment therefore unable to access specific educational programs, including modified classroom instruction, curriculum, tests and examinations. For success teachers should access Abilities Based Learning and Educational Support (ABLES) for assessment tools, individual reports, and guidance about teaching strategies and resources that will enable them to effectively plan and teach for the individual needs of

students with disability and additional learning needs" (DEECD, 2013, p. 5).

2.5 Physical Environment

The main goal of special education is to give students with disabilities opportunity to participate in a least restrictive environment so that they receive education as non-disabled students (Wiebe & Kim, 2008). This is because the environment handicaps an individual with a disability more than the actual impairment due to the large impact the environment has on an individual's success (Leicester, 2011). McPherson and Lindsay (2011) document how positive environment are conducive to learning and encourages learning for all students. A study by (Schoger, 2006) showed that a comfortable environment makes learners with special needs work successfully by developing friendships with their peers, having a sense of respect which increased their self-esteem, and their cognitive learning increased significantly. Inclusion is providing an inclusive working environment where disabled students can work with their peers rather than being segregated into special areas (Banes & Seale, 2002, p.2).

3. Research Methodology

The study used a concurrent mixed methods research design. This is because it allowed the researcher an opportunity to collect quantitative and qualitative data simultaneously giving both equal priorities. In addition, it has the advantage of offsetting weaknesses inherent to one design by using both (Gay, Mills, G. &Airasian, 2008). The use of both quantitative and qualitative approaches, equipped the researcher with a more detailed understanding of the research problem than any approach alone (Somekh&Lewin, 2011). Mixed research design involves collecting and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data (Kothari, 2011). According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), quantitative approach was used to: describe, explain and explore the existing status of the given variables at the time. Further, qualitative research approach was used because it allowed the researcher to gain insight into the problem by having one to one interview with the county director, sub-county officers in charge of special needs, the head teachers, teachers, and support staff, learners with and without special needs in form of focus groups of learners with / without special needs based on classroom and dormitory interactions.

Interviews also helped the researcher to understand more on how the school manages learners with special needs, the inclusive awareness strategies available, teacher preparedness, attitude of the head teacher, teachers, learners and support staff towards learners with special needs, Instructional strategies, learner engagement, assessment, resource materials, Physical environment and the challenges they face in managing learners with special needs.

The researcher also had an observation period to establish how learning takes place in a classroom setting, how the special and none special learners interact with each other, the teachers and support staff. Further, the researcher observed the school compound, the terrain, buildings, and structures and finally viewed vital documents in the schools to ascertain policy issues related to inclusion to chart a way forward towards the management of special need learners in Inclusive Education.

3.1 Population and Sampling Techniques

The target population for this study included the 300 schools in the county that had embraced Inclusive Education, the County Director of Education, 9 sub-county officers (EARC Officers) in-charge of special needs, 300 head teachers, 2900 teachers,7500 learners, and 600 support staff as per Makueni county education office statistics 2015.

3.2 Sample Selection and Size

The sample size, for this study, was selected purposively to allow the researcher to target the county, persons and Schools with vital information for the study which included: Makueni county which was purposively chosen to represent the 47 counties in Kenya because it had the right content required for the study. In addition, geographically, it was convenient to the researchers in terms of time, distance and cost. Further, no related studies had been done in the county. The county Director of Education, was purposively chosen due the virtue of his office as the overseer of education in the county. 9 sub-county officers in charge of special education in every sub-county were chosen because they were trained in special education and inclusion in general, therefore, deemed knowledgeable as respondents to the study. 9 schools which had boarding facilities and the highest population of learners with special educational needs, that is, one school in every sub-county was chosen for it was assumed to have the right facilities for managing learners with special needs.

Nine head teachers from those 9 selected schools were chosen by the virtue of their offices for they are the human, resource and financial managers, therefore well placed to participate in the study. Eighteen teachers with special educational needs training were chosen because it is a policy requirement for every school to have at least two. Nine teachers without special needs training, that is, one teacher per school selected in every sub-county who had many years of service in the school for it was deemed vital due to long period experience, 18 support staff, 2 from every selected school in every sub-county, that is the house mother/matron and the cook for they are always in touch with the special learners.

A focus group of 6 learners with special needs per category of disability was randomly chosen from class 3-8; at least one per class to present the views of each category of disability/special needs and a focus group of 6 learners without special needs in every class that has the highest population of special need learners for they were

assumed to have a wealth of experience due to their daily interaction with learners who had special needs per the selected school in every sub-county. Four learners with/without special needs from every school who are roommate in the hostel and a confidant in class for they were assumed to understand each other better. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2009) support this and documents that researchers may handpick a specific sample for given purpose. All the teachers (107) in the selected schools were chosen to respond to the questionnaire of this study for they were assumed to be of substance in the study.

4. Results and Discussion

This section presents results and discussion of findings:

4.1 Instructional Strategies

This facet was averagely rated by the teachers with an overall mean score of 3.05 and a standard deviation of .085, a suggestion that generally the variances were not homogenous as shown in table 1. This might have been caused by the fact that not all teachers work hand in hand with the special needs teacher, work with colleagues to

come up with standardized testing, use learners as instructors/tutors. This mode of rating indicates that the teachers use instructional strategies to a level that is almost good. This is similar to the findings of Obiakor, Harris, Mutua, Rotatori, and Algozzine (2012), who found that the use of different teaching/learning strategies is vital for it has the power of addressing the needs of all learners. When interviewed, the teachers indicated that special learners acquire knowledge in their classes if they: Mobilize the teachers and students to understand and assist them in all aspects, guide the head teacher in purchasing the right materials and adaptive devices depending on the level and nature of disability, modify, adopts, varies, uses practical teaching methods and practical lessons and creates a peaceful learning atmosphere to include the learner with special needs.

4.2 Learners' Engagement

This management function was averagely rated with an overall mean of 3. 26 and a standard deviation of .83 indicating lack of homogeneity of the variables as shown in table 2.

Table 1: Instructional Strategies

Instructional Strategies	Mean	Std Dev
Use individualized instruction and plans	2.45	1.021
Believe that all learners are capable of learning	3.30	1.075
Work hand in hand with the special needs teacher	3.06	1.089
Hold that teaching assistants are important in facilitating inclusion	3.21	1.071
Work with colleagues to come up with standardized testing	3.00	1.073
Support learners with special needs to acquire knowledge and skills	3.31	.985
Match instructional materials with special learners needs	3.00	1.037
Use assessment as a testing tool	2.93	1.075
Engage every student in the teaching /learning process	3.19	.973
Balance tasks between what I assign and what the learner selects	2.83	1.041
Provide learning opportunities for all learners within an inclusive class	3.25	1.020
Use students as instructor/tutors for learners with special needs in their class	2.79	1.147
Believe that peer instruction in an inclusive class help in social and academic development	3.12	1.007
Hold that peer instruction creates a culture of acceptance through encouraging a relationship between learners with special needs and their non-challenged peers	3.21	1.055
Instructional Strategies	**3.0467**	**.84993**

Table 2: Students' Engagement

Students' Engagement	Mean	Std Dev
Allow all learners with or without special needs to participate in all school activities Accommodate all the learners' needs	3.19	1.029
Support learners engagement as essential part of learning in an inclusive setting	3.32	.987
Allow learners to be emotionally, socially, cognitively and academically attracted to school	3.38	.951
Guide and support learners to prove that they are not what they are ultimately judged to be	3.28	.969
Measure learners engagement beyond participation	3.07	1.030
Promote learners' engagement by what is taught and learnt	3.09	1.033
Increase learners' sense of presence, access and participation in a learning situation	3.30	.924
Ensures learners' engagement academically, communicatively and socially to promote more active participation	2.79	1.147
Measure learners' engagement academically, communicatively and socially to promote more active participation	3.31	.956
Promote and facilitate self-reliant participation in everyday activity for special needs	3.30	.954
Learner's Engagement	**3.2591**	**.83421**

This points out that although teachers engage the learners in the teaching learning process to a moderate extent, there are some who fail to comply .These findings are contrary to Messiou (2012) who found that learners should completely own and actively participate in the learning process. Teachers when interviewed indicated that learners with special needs acquire knowledge in their class depending on the nature of the disability, when appreciated, valued ,motivated by the government and NGO'S like Wings to fly, head teachers, teachers and abled learners; subjected to an atmosphere which is conducive and special learner friendly. This is similar to Walker (2010) who found that when appreciated, accepted and treated fairly by teachers and fellow learners, learners with special needs learn better and develop a desire to remain in school. When interviewed the focus groups of learners with special needs felt that their normal colleagues help them learn better when they: Help them in areas where they are severely challenged, encourage them, support them in class discussions. An interview with focus groups of learners without special needs indicated that they were tickled when the special learners: Make their beds, wash their utensils, solve challenging math sums, answer questions, take an active part in sports, and wash clothes. This is a manifestation that what a normal learner can do, a special learner can do even better if provided with the right learning environment, learning materials both assistive and instructive therefore challenging the normal learners. These findings are similar to those of Slavin (2009) in the Observational Learning Theory who found that special need learners can be the best teachers when given time and opportunity.

When interviewed on how they handle special needs learners inside and outside the hostels some support staff stated that they: mop their rooms, spread their beds, polish their shoes, bath and dress them, escort and carry their books and guide the girls on how to manage themselves during their menstruation, and feed them. This is an indication that some support staff in the county fail to give the special learners an opportunity to develop their potentials. This is opposed to the special learners who felt that they should be allowed to do the best they can without help and similar to the findings of Singal (2008) who found that learners with special needs are not given opportunities to participate in any learning or school activities. In contrast, the other cadre of support staff felt that with love and a lot of understanding, they: Train the learners with special needs to be self-reliant. This is an indication of a cadre of support staff who are conversant with the main purpose of inclusion, which is impacting skills on the special needs learners to make them self-reliant and productive members in the society. These findings are similar to Rieser (2012) who found the need of developing the skills of learners with special needs.

4.3 Resource Materials
Generally, the teachers rated the availability of resources low with an overall mean of 1.79 and a standard deviation of 0.73, which indicates heterogeneity among the variances as shown in table 3.

Table 3: **Resource Material**

Resource Material	Mean	Std Dev
We have adaptive/assistive devices for learners with motor problems	2.32	1.356
We have adaptive/assistive devices for learners with visual problems	1.51	.894
We have adaptive/assistive devices for learners with hearing problems	1.48	.862
We have adoptive/ assistive devices for learners with communication problems	1.75	1.038
We have adaptive/assistive devices for learners with emotional and behavior problems	1.81	1.038
We have adaptive/assistive devices for learners who are gifted and talented	1.91	1.129
We have adaptive/assistive devices for learners with intellectual difficulties	1.82	1.071
We have enough trained special needs teachers to man learners with special needs inclusively	2.03	1.077
We have enough funds to support and purchase materials for learners with special needs	1.75	.881
We have advanced technologies/ resources to help special needs learners realize their potentials	1.48	.744
Resources	**1.7918**	**.72738**

This might have been caused by some schools having resources of some kind while other schools had none. This is a signal that the resources available in schools are few or completely unavailable. These findings are similar to those of Frances and Potter (2010) who found that there were inadequate teaching learning materials for learners with special needs in most schools. One to one interview with the head teachers revealed that they cater for learners with special needs by; purchasing assistive devices, advising teachers to handle special students, setting up small homes, creating awareness, constructing special

room for specialized attention, sourcing for funds, including learners with special needs in the learners' leadership council, Identifying the talents of the learners and developing them. This demonstrates that the head teachers are aware of what should be done, however due to negative attitude as indicated by the EARC officers, practically they have done very little for the teachers who are very close to the learners with special needs indicated lack the necessary teaching learning materials with a mean of 1.79 therefore, mismanaging the learners with special needs. One to one interview with special needs learners

indicated that their movement from one place to another in the school is facilitated by: Their friends, teachers and support staff who carry them to various places within the school compound and assistive devices like crutches, wheel chairs, specks, and grills.

This demonstrates that with the right assistance, whether human or technological learners with special needs can move freely and comfortably within an adapted Inclusive environment. These findings are in line with Dalton (2011) who found that assistive devices provide the learners and the teachers with a variety of support. Further, the normal learners stated that their schools are different because they: Accommodate and treat learners with special needs as human, give them an opportunity to exercise their potentials fully, have put in place learning facilities that are special learner friendly, have adapted the physical environment and all the facilities. On observation, it was confirmed that: In most schools due to Free Primary Education funds at-least they have: Enough textbooks per subject, geometrical sets for upper primary classes, world maps and charts for social studies and charts showing parts of the body, digestive system, the solar system, and circulatory system. However, they were not special needs friendly.

This is an indication that though the schools are trying to be inclusive however, they have not adapted all the learning resources to be special learner friendly. These findings are in contrast to Salend (2011) who found that for inclusion to be effective the teaching learning resources must be adapted to be special learner friendly. However, some schools: Had very nice and exceptional materials that helped a lot more so those learners who are mentally challenged. They had: animal television, animal puzzle/picture, blocks with letters and numbers, weigh balances, flash cards and sorting box,; calendar board, abacus, weather chart, clock face, and word builder box.

This is a manifestation of schools that are resourceful which is similar to the findings of Dalton (2011) who found that proper provision of resource materials to learners with special needs reflects on how inclusive the school community is. More to the above few schools had: Computer laboratories equipped with over twenty - five computers each from Imlango, an NGO in conjunction with Squit, Mathswizz and the ministry of education. The teachers in charge said that the computers have made the teaching learning process very simple and special learner friendly. This they said was due to the programs installed. It helps the learner with special needs to acquire knowledge because each learner has a user name and a password; therefore each can assess storybooks to read designed for every category and cadre of learners with special needs, math's exercises designed for all classes according to their ability. This is because the computers are designed to assess the learners math age. Teachers also use the same computers as registers were all the learner swaps their Squit cards and are reflected by the head

teachers office computer, ministry and squid people who gave the computers, teach every class life skills, English, giving learners assignments per class and ability, marking assignments and giving feedback to learners and parents. This is in line with Scheeler, Congdon, and Stansbery (2010) who noted that if fully embraced technology can provide feedback to co-teachers and learners.

This implies that at least from the former study to the current there are some schools that have embraced technology. On keen observation, it was noted that majority of the schools had: A variety of playing materials including and not limited to balls, weight lifters, swings, skipping ropes, rollers, skaters and Physiotherapy devices. However, most of the play materials were not special learner friendly. This is an indication that learners with physical challenges in the county are taken care of and properly managed in the Inclusive system of Education, however, learners with hearing and speech challenges are sidelined. These findings are similar to Dalton (2011 who found that learners with non-visible disabilities like mental, hearing and autism are prone to negligence unlike visible ones.

On close documentation, it was discovered that all the schools had: Both admission and attendance registers in place, drop out records and reasons for it. This is a signal that schools in this county keep a close look on their learners by proper record keeping which enables them to monitor the attendance of the learners and if any drops out of school the reason is known, therefore easy to make follow ups.

4.4 Assessment
In table 4, teachers indicated the assessment strategies available in schools to manage learners with special needs in Inclusive Education.

Teachers generally rated this management strategy averagely low with an overall mean score of 2.22 and a standard deviation of 0.79. This is a disclosure that learners with special needs in Inclusive Education were poorly assessed and therefore, poorly placed, an indication of poor management. One to one Interviews with the County Director of Education and the EARCS revealed the following as the assessment tools in the county and the sub counties: Questionnaires, Referral document, school readiness test, Audiogram/Audiometer and in Makueni County there is only one, broken and there is no capital and a specialist to repair the damaged keys which are rare therefore, learners with hearing issues are referred to Machakos School for the deaf, Makueni Referral Hospital for advanced diagnosis; Low vision project Kenya, a revised set of assessment tools by the Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD) which is very comprehensive/Bucky and expensive to reproduce due to lack of funds, a torch, E-illiterates and pinhole apparent useful for magnifications, use observation for physically challenged.

Table 4: Assessment

Assessment	Mean	Std Dev
Have proper assessment in our school for learners with special needs	1.81	.933
Use assessment to design proper instructional methods, material and monitoring for learners with special needs	2.11	.994
Assess learners with special needs for proper placement	2.32	1.051
Assess learners with special needs to see whether they meet the criteria for special education services	2.25	1.029
Assess learners with special needs to select the proper program for them	2.26	1.031
Allow learners with special needs to join our school if they have been assessed diagnostically	2.46	1.143
Assess to get information for a large number of learners with special needs	2.28	1.035
Assess to get opportunity to provide better classroom support for learners with special needs and disability	2.39	1.035
Assess to plan for better teaching and learning strategies for learners with special needs and disability	2.31	.994
Have psychologists, social workers, youth workers, speech pathologists and visiting teachers who help in the assessment and management of learners with special needs and disability	2.04	1.018
Assessment	**2.2234**	**.78974**

Table 5: Physical Environment

Physical Environment	Mean	Std Dev
Least restrictive for learners with special needs	2.17	1.059
Ramps in all our classes, hostels, restrooms, dining etc for easy movement of learners with disability	2.35	1.174
A play ground that is special learner friendly	1.94	1.017
Adaptive toilets for learners with special need as per their number	2.35	1.117
Proper class arrangement with enough free space for ease movement of learners with disability	2.36	1.013
Set very challenging physical activities as a powerful means to promote respect for learners with special needs and disabilities	2.02	.951
Put in place proper sport activities which are helpful in campaigning to reduce stigma against learners with special needs and disabilities	2.26	1.022
Have enough and adequate physical facilities to cater for learners with special needs and disability	2.07	.898
Have physical facilities that help learners with special needs and disability to compete with their non-challenged peers	2.04	.941
Physical Environment	**2.1734**	**.83792**

This is an indication that although the centers are supposed to cater for the assessment needs of the learners with special needs, there is very little the EARCS can do for they are seriously under resourced. These findings are in line with Okumbe and Matatsi (2005) who found out that in most schools learners with special needs go through the system when they are not properly assessed. strategies available in the school indicated that; termly evaluation tests, Continuous Assessment Tests (C.A.T.S.), Sub-County and County evaluation tests were administered which are all mean score oriented. This is an indication that the evaluation systems in the schools are not special learner friendly, for majority are not performers and as a result they end up being frustrated for being branded as non performing. This is a pointer that an alternative evaluation system, which is not pegged on grades but on how well a learner performs on a given task at a given period of time having the learners' ability in mind should be put in place for better management.

Interviews with the county Director of Education and the EARCs revealed that mental disability is very common in the County; data from the county indicated that nearly every school has a child or children with this mode of handicap which has been associated with: Geographical topography of the county, health institutions are far apart and not readily available, high level of malnutrition population, high level of stilted children, diseases like malaria and ignorance.

Teachers rated their schools physical environments low with an overall mean of 2.17 and a standard deviation of 0.84 meaning they were generally less restrictive only to a

minimal level. This might be contributed partly by ignorance and negative attitude of the school headteachers because as per the governments' special needs policy, they are supposed to have ramps in all the school structures for easy movement of learners with handicaps, but this has been achieved minimally (MoEST, 2009). On keen observation it was noted some compounds and playgrounds are seasonal and unreliable and a disaster to the learners with special needs. These findings are in line with Bastidas (2010) who found out that in most schools the safety of the learners is not seriously put into consideration, which is unfortunate.

In the schools visited, it was observed that; majority of the schools had enough classes, a minimal number had few classes compared to the total number of learners. This posed a challenge to the learners with special needs, especially those on wheel chairs for they lacked enough and free space. This is an indication that with the free primary education, the admissions are higher than the facilities, therefore a managerial issue and more on learners with special needs. The current findings are similar to Ellman (2012) who found that with the onset of Free Primary Education the intakes were doubling, therefore, there was a scramble for facilities and resources.

In all the schools visited, there were two to four dormitories, depending on the number of learners in the school. The dormitories were set as per gender, with enough and good beds that were adapted to the needs of the learners; had good ramps, inside toilets and bathrooms that were adapted to the needs of special learners. A few schools had improvised a system where by learners with special needs used the lower beds while the normal used the upper ones. Some schools had grills on the pathways to enable the challenged learners to move freely.

These findings are in line with Wiebe & Kim (2008) who noted that one of the major objectives of special education is to provide the special learners with opportunities to operate in a less restrictive environment to interact freely socially and academically with their abled peers. Adapted toilets were minimally found in the schools visited, the number was not enough for learners with special needs crowded to use the facility, learners without special needs also competed for the same service an indication that they were not fully sensitized to understand, respect and keep off from the few facilities set for learners with special needs. This is the opposite of Schoger (2006) who found that when special learners are kept in a conducive environment they learn better.

One to one interview with the support staff to identify what helps them in managing the special learners indicated that: Some schools had adapted beds, toilets, bathrooms and ramps; others had a good and regular supply of light, a strong and powerful television fitted with good and encouraging programs, few schools had recreational rooms, very few schools had computers. This discloses that if well-embraced and used, technology can play a very important role in managing the learners with special needs, both at school and at home. These findings are supported by Brayant, Brayant, Shih &Seoko (2010) who found that availability of assistive technology supports the learners with disability to achieve their educational and social goals.

On keen observation to identify availability of ramps in the classes, washrooms, toilet, staircases and offices and speech therapy gears, it was sad to realize that although during the interviews, all the head teachers claimed to have put ramps in all the school structures, only a minimal number of schools had ramps placed nicely in the right places, the rest had them in the open area where government officers could see and appreciate, stairs were still found in many schools and even in the head teacher's offices; none had speech therapy gears. This is an indication that though a policy issue to have ramps in all the school structures, this had been done minimally, a sign of mismanaging the learners with special needs .In all the schools visited and observed, none had speech therapy gears, an indication that learners with speech challenges are mismanagement for they lack the basic devise to model their speech to a certain level; so they are invisible to the school administrators when it comes to the purchase of assistive devices. This is similar to IDA (2011) which discovered that most learners remain invisible in their community and schools due to the nature of their disability.

It was found that most schools have succeeded in placing the special need learners in lower beds or adapted ones as the matron and the head teacher had said. However, some bathrooms were not special need learner friendly because they lacked ramps and grills, the lighting system was too poor and the bath rooms were dark even during daytime, a sign of structures which were put in place without the special learner in mind. These findings are similar to the grievances aired by Obegi, (2014) who stated that in most schools the structures are set without the special needs learner in mind. Majority of the schools visited had proper sitting arrangements which were special needs learner friendly with enough space to allow learners with wheel chairs to move in and out of the classes freely. In many schools learners sat according to their height and ability. In some schools the learners were paired according to ability, type and degree of challenges such that the abled mentors their colleagues.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

This part presents conclusions and recommendations of the study based on results.

Based on discussed findings, the study gives the following conclusions:

1. Teachers used instructional strategies effectively; however they minimally used individualized instructions and plans, assessment.
2. Teachers engaged learners with special needs; however, when asked about the participation level of learners with special needs, they had varied views, that ranged from the nature and level of disability to how the teacher related to the learner.
3. Most schools had inadequate resources for managing learners with special needs in the Inclusive system of Education especially assistive devices for learners with hearing and speech impairments, and advanced technological resources.
4. In most schools learners with special needs were poorly assessed, placed, assigned appropriate activities and supplied with the right educational resources.
5. Physical environments in most schools were adapted to suit the special needs learners to a minimal extent.

From the findings of this study it is recommended:

1. The MoEST to evaluate how learners with special needs are Managed Instructional strategies, Students engagement, Resource materials, Assessment and Physical environment.

2. The administration, teachers, support staff and the normal learners in the name managing or helping the learners with special needs so long as they do not kill the potentials of those learners.

3. The MoEST should train and post enough teachers who have special needs/disabilities in Public primary schools to act as role models to learners with special needs and eventually promote them to schools heads to act as a motivation in Inclusive Education.

4. The current curriculum and mode of examinations should be changed to be special learner friendly.

5. The County Governments should strive and establish County Assessment Resource Centre (CEARC) with modern assessment tools to be used as a referral for the sub-counties.

6. Each county in Kenya spare some amount and construct a center of excellence for the learners with special needs to act as a model school for other schools.

References

Anderson, C., Klassen, R., & Georgiou, G. (2007). What teachers say they need and what school psychologists can offer. *School Psychology International*, 28(2), 131-147.

Assistive technology for students with physical disabilities (2007). Retrieved 5/ 6/ 2015, from http://www.axistive.com/assistive-technology-for-students-with-physical-disabilities.html

Banes, D., Seale, J. (2002).*Accessibility and inclusivity in further and higher education:* an overview. In L.

Bastidas, P. (2011). *School Safety Baseline Study*, UNISDR: Thematic Platform on Knowledge and Education (TPKE)

Bryant, B. R., Bryant, D. P., Shih, M., &Seok, S. (2010). Creating a classroom team: Classroom tips. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers. ... Qualitative Studies in Education, 12(6), 707- ... On concepts and paradigms in mixed methods research. ... *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, DOI: http://researchonline.nd.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?filename=7&article=1065&context=theses&type=additional

Calabrase, R., Patterson, J., Liu, F., Goodvin, S., & Hummel, C. (2008). An appreciative inquiry into the circle of friends program: the benefits of social inclusion of students with disabilities. *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, 4(2), 20-42.

Chitiyo, M., Makweche-Chitiyo, P., Park, M., Ametepee, L. K., &Chitiyo, J. (2011). Examining the effect of positive behavior support on academic achievement of students with disabilities. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 11(3), 171–177.

Cohen, L,.Manion.,&Marrison, K. (2009). Research methods in education. (6thed.). New York: Routledge.

Conderman, G. (2011), Middle school co-teaching: Effective practices and student reflections. *Middle School Journal*, 42(9), 24-31.

Cooper, P., Jacobs, B. &Busher, H. (2011).*From inclusion to engagement: Helping students engage with schooling through policy and practice*. London:

Dalton, C. 2011. Social-emotional challenges experienced by students who function with mild and moderate hearing loss in educational settings. *Exceptionality Education International*.21(1), pp.28-45. (Dalton and ROUSE)

Department of Education and Child Development (SA).(2013). *Special options and statewide programs for students with disability*. Retrieved from: http://www.decd.sa.gov.au/speced/pages/specialn eeds/intro/.

Dessemontet, R.S., Bless, G. & Morin, D. (2012). Effects of inclusion on the academic achievement and adaptive behavior of children with intellectual disabilities.*Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 56 (6), 579–587.

Eleweke, C.J. &Rodda, M. (2002): 'The challenge of enhancing inclusive education in developing countries'. *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 6(2): 113-126.

Ellman, L. (2012). Opening Eyes to the Blind: *A Unit Plan that Confronts Ableism in a Standards-Based General Education Classroom*. The Clearing House, 85, 15-22.

Filmer, D. (2008). 'Disability, poverty, and schooling in developing countries: Results from 14 household surveys'.

Forlin, C. (2011). From Special to Inclusive Education in Macau (SAR).*International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 15(4) 433-444.

Frances, J., & Potter, J. (2010). Difference and inclusion: beyond disfigurement -the impact of splitting on pupils' social experience of inclusive education. *Emotional & Behavioural Difficulties*, 15(1), 49-61.

Friend. C., Cook, L., Chamberlian.,&Shamberger, C. (2010). Co-teaching: an illustration of the complexity of collaboration in special education. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 20(1), 9-27.

Gay, L., Mills, G. &Airasian, P. (2008). Educational research: competencies for analysis and application (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Hang, Q. &Rabren, K. (2009). An examination of co-teaching: Perspectives and efficiency indicators. *Remedial and Special Education*, 30(5), 259-268.

Henderson, P. (2002). Physical disability and technology. In L. Phipps, A. Sutherland & J. Seatle (Eds.), *Access all areas: disability, technology and learning* (pp. 29-32). UK: JISC TechDis Service and ALT. Retrieved 5/6 2015, from http://www.techdis.ac.uk/resources/files/AAA.pd f

Higbee, J. L., Kalivoda, K. S., Know, D. K., & Totty, M. C. (Spring 2000). Serving the diverse needs of students with disabilities through technology. *Journal of College Reading and learning*, 30(2), 144.

IDA (2011). The Right to Education: Enabling Society to Include and Benefit from the Capacities of Persons with Disabilities. Statement to ECOSOC High-Level Meeting, Annual Ministerial Review, 4-8 July 2011 Geneva: International Disability Alliance. Retrieved on 3/5/2015 from http:// www.internationaldisabilityalliance org/sites/disalliance.epresentaciones.net/file /public /files/IDA-Position-Paper-The-right-to-education-14-June-11.doc

Jordan, A., Glenn, C., &McGhie–Richmond, D. (2010). The Supporting Effective Teaching (SET) project: The relationship of inclusive teaching practices to teachers" beliefs about disability and ability, and about their roles as teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(2), 259–2doi:10.1016/j.tata.2009.03.005

Jull, S. K. (2008). Emotional and behavioural difficulties (EBD): The special educational need justifying exclusion. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 8, 13– 18.

KISE (2002) *Managing learning in an inclusive setting* (module2).Nairobi: KISE/UNISE

Kothari, C. R .(2011).Research Methodology: *Methods and Technique (2nded)* New Age International Publishers: New Dheli, India

McLeskey, J. & Waldron, N. L. (2011). Educational programs for elementary students with learning disabilities: Can they be both effective and inclusive? *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 26, 48-57.

McPherson, A. C., & Lindsay, S. (2011). Strategies For Improving Disability Awareness And Social Inclusion Of Children And Young People With Cerebral Palsy. Child: Care, Health and Development, 38, 809-816

Miller, (2011).*Theories of developmental psychology* (5th ed.). New York: Worth Publishers.

Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST, 2009) Republic of Kenya Final Draft the National S special Needs Education Policy Framework.. Kenya Education Sector

Mugenda,O.M.,Mugenda,A.l.(2003).Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative approaches. Nairobi: Acts Press.

Mulholland, M. & Patel, V.(2014) SEND in ITT Project .Presentation at conference. Ways forward for SEND in teacher education, 26th June 2014, Institute of Education, London

O'Sullivan, M.C., (2010). 'Educating the teacher educator: A Ugandan case study' .*International Journal of Educational Development*, (30)5, 377-387. 155

Obegi, B. (2014).Children with special needs come second in resource allocation: The Standard, Wednesday 17th of December, 2014, pp.12

Obiakor, F. E. (2008). *The eight-step approach to multicultural learning and teaching* (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Obiakor, F. E., Harris, M., Mutua, K., Rotatori, A., &Algozzine, B. (2012).Making inclusion work in general education classrooms. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 35, 477- 490.

Okumbe M.A. &Malatsi N.M. (2005). The Need for Inclusive Educational practices in Botswana: The Case of Learners with Special educational needs: *Paper presented at Moi University First Annual Conference*- 14th-16th February, 2005.

Oliver, R.M.,&Reschly, D.J. (2010). Special education teacher preparation in classroom management: *implications for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. Behavioral Disorders*, 35(3), 188-189.

Osberg, D., &Biesta, G. (2010). The end/s of education: Complexity and the conundrum of the inclusive educational curriculum. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14(6), 593-607.

Peters, S. (2004). *Inclusive education.*An EFA strategy for all children. World bank Michigan, USA.

Peters, S.J., Johnstone, & C., Ferguson, P, (2005), 'A disability rights model for evaluating inclusive education'. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 9(2): 139–160.

Rieser, R. (2012*). Implementing Inclusive Education*: A Commonwealth Guide to Implementing Article 24 of UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Second Edition. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Salend, S. J. (20011). *Creating inclusive classrooms: Effective and reflective practices* (4 ed.). New Jersey: Merrill.

Scheeler, M. C., Congdon, M., Stansbery, S. (2010).Providing immediate feedback to co-teachers through bug-in-ear technology: An effective method of peer coaching in inclusion classrooms. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 33, 83-96.

Schoger, K. (2006) Reverse inclusion: Providing peer social interaction opportunities to students placed in self-contained special education classrooms. Teaching Exceptional Children Plus, 2(6), 1.

Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., &Marshak, L. (2012). Peer-mediated instruction in inclusive secondary social studies learning: Direct and indirect learning effects. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 27, 12-20.

Shaddock, A., MacDonald, N., Hook, J. Giorcelli, L. & Arthur-Kelly, M. (2009). Disability, diversity and tides that lift all boats: *Review of special education in the ACT. Chiswick, NSW:* Services Initiatives.

Singal, N., (2005).'Mapping the field of inclusive education: a review of the Indian literature'. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 9(4): 331-350. Skritic, T. (1995) .

Slavin, R. (2009). *Educational psychology: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Solis, M., Vaughn, S., Swanson, E., &McCulley, L. (2012). Collaborative models of instruction: The

empirical foundation of inclusion and co-teaching. *Psychology in the Schools*, 49, 498-510.

Somekh, B., & Lewin, C (Eds) (2011).*Theory and methods in social research* (2nd ed.). Washington, D.C: Sage

UNESCO (2009) *Policy Guidelines on Inclusion in Education*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2010) EFA Global Monitoring Report - Reaching the marginalized. Oxford: Oxford University Press & UNESCO Publishing.

Walker, G. (2010). Inclusive education in Romania: Policies and practices in post-communist Romania*. International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14(2), 165–181.

Whitbread, Kathleen (2009) *what does the research say about inclusive education?* Retrieved 9/4/2015 at:http://www.wrightslaw.com/info/lre.incls.rsrch

Wiebe, R., & Kim, N. (2008).Exploring teacher talk during mathematics instruction in an inclusion classroom*. Journal of Educational Research*, 101(6), 363-378.

Williams, G. L. & Obiakor, F. E. (2009).*The state of education of urban learners and*

possible solutions: The Milwaukee experience. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt