

**IMPLICATIONS OF SPECIAL NEEDS EDUCATION POLICY ON ENROLMENT  
OF LEARNERS WITH MULTIPLE DISABILITIES IN SPECIAL PRIMARY  
SCHOOLS IN KISUMU COUNTY, KENYA.**

**BY**

**PETER SIMON OTIENO**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT  
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN RESEARCH AND PUBLIC POLICY**

**SCHOOL OF DEVELOPMENT AND STRATEGIC STUDIES**

**MASENO UNIVERSITY**

**©2018**

**DECLARATION**

**Declaration by the Student**

This thesis is my original work and has not been submitted either wholly or in any part to any other university for the award of any degree or diploma.

**Simon Otieno Peter MA/DS/00133/2014**

**Sign.....**

**Date.....**

**Supervised by:**

**1. Professor Oracha, P.**

Department of Special Needs Education  
Maseno University

**Sign.....**

**Date.....**

**2. Professor Kioli, F.N.**

Department of Sociology and Anthropology,  
South Eastern Kenya University

**Sign.....**

**Date.....**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The fruitful completion of this work is a contribution of many people. I am greatly indebted to my supervisors; Prof Oracha Peter and Prof Felix Kioli for their patience as they guided me in the course of preparing this thesis. Their criticism and close supervision have substantially helped the thesis see the day of academic light.

I gratefully acknowledge the contribution of Dr. C. Luvega, Dr. Pamela Oloo and Mr. Tom Mboya for their encouragement, motivation and frequent reminders. I wish to thank my research assistants for their dedication to deliver to the expectations of the research standards. I extend my appreciation to the respondents and key informants who cooperatively sacrificed their time and efforts to voluntarily participate in this project.

Heartfelt thanks to my family for the encouragement and unceasing support. I sincerely thank my son Simon who joined my late-night analysis and brought a new meaning to work and family.

I wish to express my appreciation to the entire Make Me Smile family, Austrian family, Irmgard, Maximilian and the entire Ullrich's for granting me research funds that enabled me to effectively undertake this study.

## **DEDICATION**

To my brother and colleague at work, Maximilian Ullrich, I may not have enough to give you, but I can show my appreciation by dedicating the fruits of this work to the less fortunate in the society and for building what we started together – Make Me Smile Kenya.

## ABSTRACT

The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) estimates that 93 million children around the world are living with moderate to severe disability of one kind or another. Although education is considered by the United Nations (UN) as a basic human right, implications of education policies on learners with disabilities on enrolment seem to have attracted limited attention. In Kenya, for instance, the National Special Needs Education Policy (NSNEP) is in place to ensure, among other things, that children of school going age with disabilities are assessed, enrolled, and placed in special schools up to the highest level. However, there are evidences from Educational Assessment and Resource Services (EARS) that educational needs of Learners with Multiple Disabilities (LwMDs) are unmet, especially in Kisumu County. Out of 350 LwMDs assessed and recommended for placement in 2015, only 95 (27%) were enrolled in the special institutions. It therefore remains unclear how the NSNEP contributes to enrolment of LwMDs in special schools in Kisumu County. The purpose of this study was therefore to determine the implications of the NSNEP on the enrolment of LwMDs in special schools in Kisumu County, Kenya. The objectives of the study were to: Establish the implications of EARC assessment on enrollment of LwMDs, Explore the contribution of parental involvement in the enrolment of LWMD, Examine the contribution of service provision to the enrollment of LwMDs, Find out the contribution of schools' physical and curriculum adaptation to the enrolment of LwMD in Kisumu County. The study was guided by incrementalism theory by Bryan and Frank (2005) which view policy making as based on the previous ones focussing on incremental rather than wholesome future changes that consider both the means and ends simultaneously. The study used cross-sectional descriptive design combining both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Target population comprised 8 head teachers, 110 teachers, 2 Educational Assessment Resource Services (EARS) officers, 1 county education officer, and 350 parents/guardians of LwMDs. Multi-stage sampling was used in the study, whereby purposive technique was used to select 7 head teachers, 100 teachers and 2 EARS officers, while stratified sampling was used to select 35 parents from the seven sub counties. Triangulation method was used to collect data comprising Questionnaires, KII interviews, Observation, and FGDs. Reliability of the instruments was established through split-half method during a pilot study in one special primary school where coefficients of 0.82 and 0.78 was obtained for both parts. Validity of the instruments was ascertained by experts from Maseno University. Quantitative data was analyzed by means of descriptive statistics through the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20. Quantitative data was analyzed by means of descriptive statistics through the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Qualitative data was analysed thematically. The study established that assessment can enhance enrolment of LwMDs. The study also established that assessment reports were often wrongly compiled; most parents were ignorant of the provisions of NSNE policy; service provision to LwMDs was poor owing to inadequate resources and poor motivation of teachers; and content of curriculum as well as procurement of assistive devices in the special schools did not suit educational needs of LwMDs. The study therefore recommends that assessment process be bi-directional; teachers should be motivated; curriculum content for LwMDs be developed to suit the needs of LwMDs. Further studies need to be done on Implications of SNEP Provision for Assessment on Enrolment; Implications of SNEP Provision for Public-Private Partnership on Enrolment; Implications of SNEP Provision for Motivation of Teachers on Enrolment.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE .....	i
DECLARATION .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	iii
DEDICATION .....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS .....	ix
OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS .....	x
LIST OF TABLES .....	xi
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem .....	7
1.3 Research Questions .....	7
1.4 Objectives of the Study .....	7
1.5 Significance of the Study .....	8
1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study .....	9
1.7 Theoretical Framework .....	9
<b>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	11
2.2 Implications of EARC Assessment on Enrolment of Learners with Multiple Disabilities(LwMDs).....	11
2.3 Provision for Parental Involvement on Enrolment of LWMD.....	13
2.4 Role of NSNEP on Service Provision to LwMD in Special Schools.....	16
2.5 Role of the NSNEP in the Schools' Physical and Curriculum Adaptation on Enrolment of LwMD.....	18

<b>CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>22</b>
3.1 Introduction .....	22
3.2 Study Design .....	22
3.3 Study Area.....	22
3.4 Study Population .....	23
3.5 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size.....	23
3.6 Methods of Data Collection .....	24
3.6.1 Questionnaire.....	24
3.6.2 Key Informants Interviews .....	24
3.6.3 Observation.....	24
3.6.4 Focus Group Discussions .....	25
3.6.5 Secondary sources .....	25
3.7 Validity of the Research Instruments .....	25
3.8 Reliability of Research Instruments .....	25
3.9 Data Analysis and Presentation.....	26
3.10 Ethical Considerations.....	26
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSIONS .....</b>	<b>27</b>
4.1 Introduction .....	27
4.2 Socio-demographic characteristics of Respondents.....	27
4.2.1 Distribution of respondents by School .....	27
4.2.2 School Location.....	28
4.2.3 Gender of Respondents.....	29
4.2.5 Years of Stay in a Particular School.....	30
4.2.6 Education level of Respondents .....	30
4.3.1 Implication of Assessment on the Enrolment of LwMDs .....	31
4.3.2 Role of Policy on parental Involvement during Admission .....	35

4.3.3 Role of Policy on Service provision to LwMDs.....	39
4.3.4 Role of Policy on physical and Curriculum Adaptation to LwMDs .....	43
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>48</b>
5.1 Introduction .....	48
5.2 Summary of findings.....	48
5.2.1 Implications of assessment on enrolment of LwMDs .....	48
5.2.2 Role of the Policy on the parental Involvement during the Admission of LWMD.	48
5.2.3 Role of the policy on service provision to LwMD .....	49
5.2.4 Role of the policy on the school physical and curriculum adaptation for LwMDs.	49
5.3 Conclusion.....	50
5.4 Recommendations .....	50
5.4.1 Recommendations for Policy Improvement .....	50
5.4.2 Recommendations for further Research .....	51
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>62</b>

## **ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

<b>ACPF</b>	:	African Child Policy Forum
<b>ADA</b>	:	Americans with Disability Act
<b>EARS</b>	:	Educational Assessment and Resource Services
<b>EFA</b>	:	Education For All
<b>KADDN</b>	:	Kisumu Action Disability Development Network
<b>KNBS</b>	:	Kenya National Bureau of Statistics
<b>KISE</b>	:	Kenya Institute of Special Education
<b>LwMDs</b>	:	Learners with Multiple Disabilities
<b>MDG</b>	:	Millennium Development Goals
<b>MoE</b>	:	Ministry of Education
<b>MoH</b>	:	Ministry of Health
<b>NSNE</b>	:	National Special Needs Education
<b>PLD</b>	:	People Living With Disability
<b>SDGs</b>	:	Sustainable Development Goals.
<b>SDSS</b>	:	School of Development and Strategic Studies
<b>SSA</b>	:	Sub Saharan Africa
<b>UDHR</b>	:	United Declaration on Human Rights
<b>UNIYDP</b>	:	United Nations International Year of Disable Persons
<b>UPE</b>	:	Universal Primary Education
<b>WHO</b>	:	World Health Organization

## **OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS**

- Assessment** : Measuring the extent of disabilities of a potential learner for the purpose of placing him/her in a learning institution
- Children** : Are young people of school going age with one form of disabilities or another
- Disability** : This is lack or restriction of ability to perform an activity in a manner that is in the range considered normal by human being.
- Enrolment** : Placement and retention of learners with disabilities into schools
- Learners** : Are pupils or students with disabilities who have been enrolled or recommended for enrolment in a special school
- Multiple Disabilities:** Are learners with more than one type of restriction in performing activity in the range considered normal by human being
- Policy** : Are set guidelines for integrating learners with disabilities into education system
- Special Needs :** Are specific educational requirements to be addressed for learners with disabilities
- Special schools** : Are schools set aside to offer education to children with special needs in education, based on their respective disability.

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 4.1:</b> Distribution of respondents by schools.....	276
<b>Table 4.2:</b> Distribution of respondents by school location .....	287
<b>Table 4.3:</b> Distribution of respondents by Gender .....	28
<b>Table 4.4:</b> Distribution by years of stay in the school .....	29
<b>Table 4.5:</b> Distribution of respondents by level of education .....	29
<b>Table 4.6:</b> Teachers’ Response on the implications of Assessment on Enrolment of LwMDs .....	320
<b>Table 4.7:</b> Teachers’ Response on the implications of policy on parental involvement .....	364
<b>Table 4.8:</b> Distribution by role of Policy on Service Provision to LwMDs.....	408
<b>Table 4.9:</b> Distribution by role of Policy on Physical and Curriculum adaptation.....	441

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Background of the Study

Education is a fundamental human right that is essential for the exercise of all other human rights. Several global human rights treaties which include the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization UNESCO, (2015), Convention against Discrimination in Education (1960), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966) and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (1981) reaffirm the entitlement to education. The right to education therefore extends to all people; children, youth and adults with disabilities, (UNESCO, 2015). However, persons with disability have for a long time been considered socially and physically less capable and have therefore been rejected and stigmatized even by their own families and communities (Murphy, Hatton & Erickson, 2009). Disability problems across the world are compounded by the fact that most of the people with disabilities are extremely poor and live in areas where educational services are not available (Eleweke & Rodda, 2002; Meja- Pearce, 1998).

The World Disability Report (2011) affirms that persons with disability constitute 15% of the general population. This implies that more than 1 billion persons in the world have some form of disability. The number of persons with disability remains high and continues to grow due to aging populations and the increase in chronic conditions (World Report on Disability, 2012). Other factors like road traffic accidents, violence and disasters contribute to the growing numbers in certain contexts (World Report on Disability 2012). According to the European Commission (2013), approximately 800 million young children worldwide are affected by biological, environmental and psychosocial conditions that can limit their growth and cognitive development (Carpenter, 2005; cited in European Commission, 2013).

The World Bank (2009) reports that research on child disability in middle and low income countries is very limited and the resultant lack of evidence hinders good policy making and service delivery for children who are among the most vulnerable. UNICEF (2015) estimates that 93 million children around the world, many of whom are invisible and excluded from school are living with a moderate or severe disability of some kind (UNICEF, 2015). However, the education systems and educational programs seems to have failed to take into account the unique characteristics, interests, abilities and learning needs of learners with

disability. Children with disabilities face various forms of exclusion and are affected by them to varying degrees, depending on factors such as the type of disability, where they live and the culture or class to which they belong (UNICEF, 2015). This has been attributed to the failure of policies and legislations to comprehensively recognize the legal capacity of learners with disability. Though enrolment, retention and transition gaps in education have been found across all age groups and all settings, the pattern is more pronounced in poorer countries. Even in countries where most non-disabled learners attend school, many of those with disabilities do not go to school. For example, in Bolivia where about 98% of non-disabled children attend school, less than 40% of children with disabilities are enrolled in school. In Indonesia, while over 80% of children without disabilities go to school, less than 25% of those with disabilities do not (World Report on Disability, 2012). Furthermore, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 indicates that Learners with Multiple Disabilities (LwMDs) are not yet equal participants in the society, raising concerns that they remain marginalized and their interests are often neglected (Schur & Adya, 2015). However, the developed countries such as Canada, Australia, Germany, and France among others have reformed schools in ways that extend their capacity to respond to diversity (Ainscow and Haile-Georgis, 1998).

The United Nations Convention on the rights of persons with disability (UNCRPWD) 2006 affirms the need for policies to enhance access, transition rates and retention of learners with special needs and their right to education in an inclusive setting for all children. The focus is to enable children with special needs to enroll in schools of their choice within their localities (UNCRPWD, 2006). Despite the existence of guidelines to support the education of LwMDs, there still exist barriers within the education system that prevents them from inclusiveness and equity.

In the Republic of Ireland, Cooper and Jacob (2010) identified early intervention as essential in supporting learners with special educational needs. Early intervention and preventive measures can help to ameliorate the difficulties children experience before these difficulties become deeply entrenched and thereby more resistant to intervention. Timely and appropriate identification and assessment are important factors in ensuring that appropriate intervention commences as soon as is feasible (National Council for Special Education [NCSE, 2013]). A comparative study by Desforges and Lindsay (2010) on practices and standards in Ireland and seven other countries, concluded that assessment of students with special educational needs

should not be regarded as a one-off diagnostic event but rather as an on-going process closely linked to intervention (Desforges and Lindsay 2010)). However, information related to whether the process of assessment is bi-directional and enhances enrolment is limited in most parts of the world.

Ruskus and Gerulaitis (2010) explored Lithuanian research on parental involvement in the education of their children with mental disabilities through individual education planning and found that individual education planning enables all participants to create common understanding of the objectives, develop mutual cognition, actualize internal resources, legitimate parental expectations, and open up parents and educators to new challenges. Wong, et al (2013) examined the experiences and perceptions of parents whose children with disabilities were attending mainstream secondary schools in Singapore and found that parental perspective on inclusive education is not only about classroom support but also reflects a deeper concern about whether their children with disabilities will emerge from school as contributing individuals in society (Wong, et al. 2013) .

Africa has one of the largest populations of children with disabilities in the world with the prevalence for moderate and severe disability at 6.4 per cent. Regionally, article 17(1) of the African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights guarantees the right to education. Article 2 of the same decrees that rights assured by the charter be enjoyed without any form of discrimination and article 18 (4), specifically targets persons with disabilities and provides that persons with disabilities should be accorded special measures of protection in reference to their physical and moral needs (OAU, 1981). It further endeavors to guarantee the right to education. Article 3(a) of the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child states that every child has a right to education (OAU, 1990). However; fewer than 10% of these are enrolled in school (Peters, 2007) with only 1-2% experiencing equity in terms of access to education.

According to the African Child Policy Forum (ACPF, 2014), Children with multiple disabilities in sub-Saharan Africa comprise one of the most neglected groups, both socially and economically. For example, more than 79 per cent of children with visual impairments and 24 per cent of children with multiple disabilities are not registered in Ethiopia, while in Uganda; about 79 per cent of children with multiple disabilities and 58 per cent of children with intellectual impairments are not registered at birth. Consequently, the strengths and abilities of children with multiple disabilities are invisible, their potential is consistently

underestimated, and inadequate resources are allocated to social services for meaningful inclusion (ACPF, 2014). Yet, for meaningful participation of LwMDs in education, proper assessment to reveal the extent of their disabilities and consequently establishment of the special educational needs requirements is essential. However, information regarding the effectiveness of assessment process and eventual enrolment of LwMDs to special schools, particularly in the developing countries, seems to be scanty.

The involvement of parents to enhance enrolment, support diverse needs of individual learners and to provide additional resources is part of the prescribed educational reforms (Wong, Poon, Sarinajit, and Zi, 2013). Parents play a pivotal role in the initiation and maintenance of support for inclusion. They have been the driving force behind the movement to include children with disabilities in mainstream education (De Boer, Pijl & Minnaert, 2010). Humphrey-Taylor (2015) argues that there are clear gaps between the rhetoric on parental involvement found in the literature and typical parental involvement practices found in schools. Equally, Hornby and Lafaele (2011) stress that school policy means nothing unless it is backed up by action on the school's part to include parents and make them feel that their contributions are worthwhile. Although a positive relationship has been established between the role of parents and success in education of their children, studies focusing on LwMDs and the role of parents on enrolment in special schools are scanty. However, studies focusing on parental involvement in enrolment of children with special educational needs in special schools as provided by education policies are scanty.

Access to experienced and qualified teachers is a key factor in student progress, including those with complex educational needs (WHO, 2011). The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in its review of teaching and teacher education in 25 countries suggested that raising teacher quality and standards are likely to lead to substantial gains in school performance (OECD, 2005). Omede (2015) assessed trends of service delivery to persons with disabilities in India, Brazil, Kenya, Malaysia and Nigeria and identified challenges in teacher-pupil ratio and use of assistive technology. Mwiti and Mburugu (2014) investigated attitudes of public primary school teachers from Kenya towards inclusion of children with hearing impairment and established that despite teachers' positive attitude towards inclusion they are not ready to adopt this change without prior training on how to teach the hearing impaired. It is essential to notice that services to enrolled LwMDs as

stipulated by the education policy seems not to have been given much attention compared to challenges and performance faced by learners with special educational needs.

In Kenya, the right to education is explicitly provided for in Article 53(b) of the Kenya Constitution 2010 which guarantees the right to free and compulsory basic education for every child. Article 54 of the Constitution particularly targets persons with disabilities and provides that persons with disability have a right to access educational institutions and facilities that are integrated into society to the extent compatible with their interests and needs (GOK, 2010). Persons with disability in Kenya make up more than 10% of the total population with approximately 25% made up of school going children (WHO, 2008; World Data on Education, 2007).

Policy guideline about Special Needs Education (NSNEP) in Kenya has assumed the theory of Incrementalism, which was first developed in the 1950s by the American political scientist Charles E. Lindblom as a response to the ideal rational policy making theory (Bryan and Frank, 2005). The NSNEP development recognized that there are multiple actors involved in the policy making process. Consequently, problems are addressed without ever fully being solved. Therefore, NSNEP policy makers built on past commission reports, task force reports and policies focussing on incremental rather than wholesome changes. The process is therefore a result of several issues comprising public participation, human cognitive ability or certain interest groups (Bryan and Frank, 2005).

Policy guideline about Special Needs Education (NSNEP) in Kenya dates back to 1964. Several presidential committees and commissions came up with guidelines to govern special needs education including: Mwendwa Report (1964); Ominde Report (1964); Gathachi Report (1976); Kamunge Report, (1988); Koech Report (1999) and Kochung Report (2003). After signing the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education in Spain in 1994, the Kenyan government incrementally started the development of Special Needs Education policy to enable children with special needs access education. The Kochung Task Force (2003) established that research in special needs education in Kenya had not received significant attention because of lack of specialized technical personnel and initiatives (Kenya National Commission of Human Rights [KNCHR, 2007]). In January 2010, Kenya adopted the NSNEP to ensure that learners with disabilities including those with multiple disability access free education from primary school to university

(National Special Needs Education Policy Framework, 2009). The successful implementation of NSNEP was expected to improve the quality and access to education provided to all learners with special needs. It was also meant to address issues of equity and improvement of learning environments in all schools and consequently improve the participation and involvement of people with special needs in national development in general (National Special Needs Education Policy Framework, 2009). However, despite the existence of the NSNEP, enrolment of LwMDs remains low. Kisumu County has a 5.471% prevalence rate of PLWD higher than the national percentage of 3.461. Among these, 86% have visual disability, 1.02% hearing disability, 0.64% speech disability, 2.11% physical and self-care disability, 0.47 mental disabilities and 0.43% with other disabilities (KNBS, 2009). Furthermore, statistics from Kisumu County Educational Assessment and Resource Centre (EARC, 2015) indicate that in the 2015 academic year, out of 350 LwMDs assessed and recommended for placement, only 96 were successfully enrolled to various special schools. This implies that more than 70% of LwMDs in Kisumu County are out of school which is contrary to the provisions in the NSNEP. It is, however, unclear whether low enrolment was due to inadequate physical facilities or inappropriate curriculum that suits the needs of LwMDs.

The Ministry of Education Policy on Special Education (2009) stipulates the responsibilities of the EARSs as follows; identification and assessment of learners with disabilities, guidance and counseling for parents of children with special needs, running courses for parents of children with special needs, establishment of special needs units in regular schools and making referrals of children with special needs to special schools, units and integrated programmes or medical examination and treatment, among many other responsibilities. Additionally, the policy recognizes collaboration of parents with EARS officers to enable policy makers learn through a process of trial and error until they gradually arrive at optimum enrolment through a process of successive approximations (NSNEP, 2009). Despite the NSNEP guidelines, enrolment of LwMDs remains low. This is against the background that the government of Kenya is a signatory to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), which recognizes children's rights as fundamental to development and thus forms the basis for policies and programming for children.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

Globally, there are instruments and treaties, which stipulate access to education for LwMDs as a right. Kenya for instance, adopted the National Special Needs Education Policy (NSNEP) to ensure that learners with disabilities, among them those with multiple disabilities, access barrier free education from primary school to university. Despite the existence of this policy, statistics from Kisumu County Educational Assessment and Resource Centres (EARC) indicate that during the 2015 academic year, out of 350 LwMDs assessed and recommended for placement, only 96 (27%) were successfully enrolled in various special schools. This brings to question the role played by assesment in placement of LwMDs in special schools. Similarly, the requirement of NSNEP thatparents play their role as active collaborators in ensuring that their children who live with disabilities are enrolled and participate fully in mainstream education is not clearly understood. Furthermore, the availability of tailor made physical facilities and educational curriculum for this category of learners is yet to be established. This study therefore assessed the implications of the NSNEP on the enrolment of LwMDs in special primary schools in Kisumu County, Kenya

## **1.3 Research Questions**

The study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the implication of EARC assessment on the enrolment of LwMDs in special schools in Kisumu County?
2. How has parental involvement contributed to enrolment of LWMD in special schools in Kisumu County?
3. What is the the contribution of service provision to enrolment of LwMDs in special schools in Kisumu county?
4. What is the contribution of schools' physical and curriculum adaptation on enrolment of LwMD in Kisumu county?

## **1.4 Objectives of the Study**

The overall objective of the study was to assess the implications of the provisions of NSNEP on enrolment of LwMDs in special schools in Kisumu County, Kenya. Specifically, the study intended to:

1. Establish the implications of EARC assessment on enrollment of LwMDs in special schools in Kisumu County
2. Explore the contribution of parental involvement in the enrolment of LWMD in special schools in Kisumu County
3. Examine the contribution of service provision to the enrollment of LwMDs in special schools in Kisumu county,
4. Find out the contribution of schools' physical and curriculum adaptation to the enrolment of LwMD in Kisumu county.

### **1.5 Significance of the Study**

This study is a contribution to knowledge that may be vital in addressing issues of equity and attainment of Education for All (EFA). The study may therefore help to provide a basis for fulfillment of the obligations of state parties in line with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC, 1948).

The study findings were intended to reveal whether provision of SNEP with regard to assessment, parental involvement, provision of services, and physical and curriculum adaptation enhance enrolment of LwMDs in special schools. Research findings may additionally provide new knowledge with regard to the contribution of special needs education policies towards interventions for LwMDs.

Furthermore, the findings of this study may provide necessary information for scaling up child rights-based programming Learners with disability in Kenya and other sub-Saharan Africa countries. Recommendations provided by the study are intended to inform basis for further research on implications of SNE policy in the enhancement of education for learners with simultaneous impairment.

Lastly, the study adopted a cross-sectional survey where subjects were contacted at a fixed point in time and relevant information obtained from them. Findings were based on prevalent (existing) rather than incident (new) cases, therefore, the associations derived may require follow up by cohort studies, which this study did not intend to undertake.

## **1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study**

The study was limited to special schools in Kisumu County, and it involved head teachers, teachers, parents, and EARC officers from whom data used in the study were collected. Therefore, caution should be observed when making generalizations to all LwMD in other Counties with different socio-economic and cultural backgrounds.

This study involved caregivers, some who may have experienced stigma. However, the researcher explained to them the purpose of the research and created rapport with them so that issues of suspicion were dealt with. Moreover, since LwMD are a sensitive category, caution in terms of language used was taken so that the caregivers felt at ease to open up to the discussion.

## **1.7 Theoretical Framework**

The study was guided by the theory of Incrementalism, which was first developed in the 1950s by the American political scientist Charles E. Lindblom as a response to the ideal rational policy making theory (Bryan and Frank, 2005). The theory assumes that there are multiple actors involved in the policy making process. This is because human problems are extraordinarily complex yet the analytic capacities and resources are quite limited. Consequently, problems are addressed without ever fully being solved. Therefore, policy makers built on past policies focussing on incremental rather than wholesome changes. Incrementalism is a result of several issues comprising public participation, human cognitive ability or certain interest groups (Bryan and Frank, 2005).

Incrementalism lays emphasis on improvement of concrete problems rather than the pursuit of abstract ideals. Policy makers in practice do not identify objectives and then examine alternative means, as called for by the rational ideal. Instead, means and ends are considered simultaneously (Arrow, 1951; Braybrooke and Lindblom, 1963). Bryan and Frank (2005) further note that people do not know all their goals or the trade-offs they are willing to make and that humans disagree about almost everything, and have no satisfactory analytic method for resolving disparate perceptions and priorities into collective choices (Bryan and Frank 2005). This implies that large changes that touch on peoples' lives are therefore only possible through the accumulation of incremental steps resulting from repeated policy cycles. This enables policy makers to learn through a process of trial and error until they gradually arrive at the solution through a process of successive approximations.

Although well intended, traditional understandings of disability in special education have inadvertently inhibited limited research methods, narrowed pedagogical practice, and determined largely segregated policies for educating students with disabilities. Incrementalism asserts that the field of special education, historically founded on conceptions of disability originating within scientific, psychological, and medical frameworks, will benefit from acknowledging broader understandings of disability. (Love Publishing Company, 2004).

Incrementalism accepts the legitimacy of established programs and fears unintended consequences. In terms of theoretical utility there is a widespread agreement that incrementalism offers accurate description of how policy process actually works much of the time (Ham and Hill 1983, 1984). Incrementalism has been used in policy analysis in education to describe the process and parameters of decision making in education to help avoid problems of goal displacement thus encouraging innovation without risking the policy survival (Leila B. Helms, 1981).

Critics of this theory assert that incrementalism is a slow and incoherent process that favors the status quo thus making real reforms nearly impossible. That incrementalism omits critically important elements of policy making process by focusing on just one kind of decision-making process ignoring the problem orientation of decision makers and contexts in which they operate (Brewer and Deleon 1983). However, pragmatic policy makers have found incrementalism to be a realistic and practical way to pursue needed reforms gradually, through a pluralistic process of trial and error. Despite the shortcomings, the theory is relevant for this study because it helps explain how large changes that touch on people's lives are only possible through the accumulation of incremental steps resulting from repeated policy cycles as expounded in the development of the NSNEP in Kenya. As the rights of LwMDs gain impetus, reviews and incremental modifications are made to the existing NSNEP thus ensuring that new and emerging needs of LwMDs are addressed.

## CHAPTER TWO

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1 Introduction

This section presents review of previous studies covering enrolment of LwMDs. The review is configured from global to local context and in line with study objectives. This chapter therefore aims at exposing the knowledge gaps in literature thereby forming the basis of this study.

#### 2.2 Implications of EARC Assessment on Enrolment of Learners with Multiple Disabilities(LwMDs)

Assessment of children with disabilities starts with identification (Mc Loughlin & Lewis, 2005). According to federal special education laws, the education agencies are responsible for identification of learners with disabilities and this is done through screening (Niparko, 2000). Screening is a form of assessment where a general assessment tool is being used to identify children with special needs and disabilities (Niparko, 2000). When teachers identify learners with disabilities in school, pre-referral activities are applied in an attempt to ameliorate the problem (Mc Loughlin & Lewis, 2005). When pre-referral interventions do not bring about desired changes, the learner is referred for special education assessment (Gargiulo, 2006). The parents of the child are notified concerning the assessment of their child and are required to give their consent in writing towards the assessment exercise and how to share the resulting report(Roger & George, 2006).

Results of the assessment procedures are reported by a team comprising both the EARC officers as well parents of children with disabilities. They make legal decisions about eligibility for special education services to learners with disabilities (Gargiulo, 2006). However, there is scanty of information with regard to how assessment has enhanced enrolment of LwMDs.Hornby (2012) used literature to review the debate about inclusive education and outlined some issues surrounding inclusion that have emerged from this debate. Hornby (2012) then provides a critique of policies and practices regarding inclusive education in New Zealand, in comparison to those in other developed countries, such as the USA and England. He concluded that inclusive special education requires: a commitment to providing the best possible education for all children with disabilities in the most appropriate setting, through all stages of a child's education; a focus on effectively including as many

children as possible in mainstream schools; a continuum of placement options from mainstream classes to special schools; and, close collaboration between mainstream and special schools. However, Hornby (2012) has not highlighted on the role played by the process of assessment on enrolment of LwMDs which the current study intends to cover.

Similarly, Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC, 2012) examined equal learning opportunities for students with disabilities under the Integrated Education System in Hong Kong. In the quantitative questionnaire survey, 230 schools comprising 139 primary schools and 91 secondary schools completed the questionnaires, and a total of 5,136 stakeholders participated. Equally, 475 stakeholders from 20 schools were interviewed in the case study. It was established that schools do not receive enough government subsidies/ resources to implement inclusive education, particularly in funding amount, teacher training, manpower allocation and professional support. Many respondents indicate that teachers have heavy workloads and do not have sufficient time to support different types of SEN students. Still, assessment process as it relate with enrolment of LwMDs has not been focused upon.

Mosia (2014) looked at how the education of Learners with Special Education Needs (LSEN) has developed in Lesotho as a result of international policies on human rights and education. In particular, Mosia explored various challenges to inclusive education such as proper understanding of inclusive education, the development of a policy on special and inclusive education, and the availability of resources to support inclusive education. It was found that, though efforts are made to support LSEN in both special and mainstream schools, the support may not result in successful academic and social development for LSEN. There was also a lack of understanding by teachers and educationalists about what constitutes inclusive education. The Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) was also found to be slow in developing a policy on special needs and there are inadequate resources for inclusive education to succeed. However, given the fact that there is lack of LSEN policy in Zambia as enthused by Mosia (2014), the impact of policy on enrolment of LwMDs could not be highlighted. The education of LwMDs is best focused upon under the lenses of SNE policy that provides guidelines to the steps to be followed in enrolment.

In Kenya, Kipkosgei (2013) investigated the factors influencing enrolment of learners with disabilities in an inclusive education in primary schools in Nandi South district. The objectives of the study were to determine how physical facilities are structured to accommodate learners with special needs, determine sufficiency of teaching and learning

resources, teacher preparedness to handle learners with disability, relevancy of curriculum to meet needs, aspirations and expectations of special learners, and to determine the adequacy of available funds in financing special needs education. The study used descriptive survey research design and data was gathered using two questionnaires for head teachers and teachers. It was found that pupils' enrolment has hindered implementation in terms of straining of physical facilities, increase in teacher workload which ultimately contribute to decline in standards of education. The study also concludes that lack of adequate teaching and learning resources, lack of teacher preparedness and curriculum not fully integrated to address special learning has affected enrolment of learners. Nevertheless, the contribution of assessment on enrolment of LwMDs still seems to be elusive to researchers.

Similarly in Kenya, Nyakundi (2015) did a study focused on factors influencing the assessment and placement of learners with hearing impairment in Kajiado North Sub-County, Kenya. The study specifically examined the influence of personnel, parents/guardians, cost of education and availability of learning institutions in the placement of learners with hearing impairment. This study was anchored on Labelling Theory. This was a descriptive study covering various learning institutions with a sample of 78 respondents. Data was collected by use of questionnaires, which were then analyzed descriptively, and reported in percentages, tables, pie charts and graphs. Significant factors that influenced placement of learners with hearing impairment in the district were parents, cost of education and availability of learning institutions. However, Nyakundi (2015) did not focus on the role of assessment on enrolment of LwMDs in special schools. Moreover, the study only used learners with hearing impairment as opposed to those with multiple disabilities.

### **2.3 Provision for Parental Involvement on Enrolment of LWMD**

Special needs education policy fully requires the participation of parents straight from the assessment and placement level through to completion of education cycle for these learners. Yet investigations that have revealed the extent of participation of this category of stakeholders remain limited. Wong et al (2013) examined the experiences and perceptions of parents whose children with disabilities attend mainstream secondary schools in Singapore. Data was drawn from interviews with 13 parents of children with mild disabilities. Findings revealed that parental perspective on inclusive education in Singapore is not only about classroom support but also reflects a deeper concern about whether their children with disabilities will emerge from school as contributing individuals in society. While parents

strive to effectively include their children with disabilities in mainstream classrooms, there were dichotomies in their (a) understanding of disabilities, (b) expectations of school support, and (c) expectations for their child with disabilities. Findings in Wong, et al (2013) were however silent on the understanding of parents regarding SNE policy. This area needs to be assessed and its contribution towards enrolment of LwMDs revealed.

In another study, Mohsin, Khan, Doger, and Awan (2011) sought to identify the parents' multiple roles in the education of children with intellectual disabilities in Pakistan, focusing on the role of parents in development of assessment tool, need assessment of functional skills, programme, implementation, and evaluation of training program by involving parents in all stages. Two children one male and one female and their parents who showed their written commitment to participate in the program were involved in the study. A needs assessment of the functional skills of each child was done through ecological inventories, functional skills training programs were developed for each child, implemented and evaluated by involving parents. Data showed that parents played multiple roles as observed in the whole study; their teaching style, use of different behavior modification technique, among others led enhanced performance among children. However, little information was provided by Mohsin, et al (2011) with regard to policy provision on parental involvement in educational activities of LwMDs,

Talbott, Fleming, Karabatsos and Dobria (2011) examined the extent to which the race and gender of 1,394,024 students, alone and nested within 2,104 schools, predicted identification in the special education categories of mental retardation (MR), emotional retardation (ED), and learning disabilities (LD). The study used student enrollment, race, gender, and disability status in the state of Illinois from the 2004-2005 to create the individual level data file. Results revealed that, alone, student race and gender significantly predicted identification in all three categories. However, when student race and gender were nested within school context variables, they were not significant predictors; school variables alone predicted identification. School variables that were significant included school attendance rate, for all three special education categories. For MR, school mobility rate, teacher education, adequate yearly progress, and size and locale of the district were also significant predictors. However, even though parental role could also be a predictor of identification in the special education needs, Talbott et al. (2011) did not cover it. The role played by parents in the identification of educational needs of LwMDs requires close scrutiny given that the closest people to these

learners are their parents. The current study was therefore set to determine the role of parents during admission of LwMDs under the lenses of NSNE policy.

On the other hand, Ncube and Hlatywayo (2014) explored the issues, realities and challenges regarding the provision of special needs education in Zimbabwe. Specific constructs studied were parental involvement, the nature and scope of the curricula and the general strengths of specialist teachers. The study was qualitative in nature though certain aspects of quantitative research were used such as the questionnaire and descriptive statistics. The results showed that parents are fairly involved in school activities. However, parents were mainly involved in administrative issues rather than in making decisions about the education of their children. While the curriculum for learners with disabilities was found to be satisfactory it lacked components that ensure the smooth transition of learners with disabilities into adulthood and employment. Lastly the study found that there are challenges faced in the recruitment of specialist teachers; shortage of trained teachers; refusal by trained teachers to teach special classes; centralized recruitment system; and poor incentives. Nonetheless, Ncube and Hlatywayo (2014) did not explore these issues under the lenses of provisions of the special needs education policy.

Erlendsdóttir (2010) sought to establish how parental involvement at Combretum Trust School in Namibia affects the academic achievement of student. Data was gathered by interviewing parents of seven students at Combretum Trust School in Windhoek, who all have achieved academically. The main findings were that all the parents who were interviewed were highly involved with their children's education. They had high expectations towards their children's education and their future. In addition, they were all quite vocal about their expectations to their children. All the parents wanted to know how their child spends his or her time outside of school and with whom. Most of the parents considered themselves to have a good relationship with their child's teachers and the school. Homework was considered to be important by each parent and they all assisted their child with homework if the need arises. However, Erlendsdóttir (2010) did not focus on role of parental involvement in enrolment of LwMDs in special schools as provided for by special needs education policy.

In Kenya, Kimu (2012) investigated existing programmes and models of parental involvement in schools as well as legislation pertaining to parental involvement in Kenya. A qualitative design utilizing Epstein's model of parental involvement was used to examine

parental involvement practice in public primary schools in Kenya. Accordingly, a qualitative approach within purposefully selected schools study was conducted. The findings suggested that parental involvement activities in the study sample fitted Epstein's typology comparatively well. Still, Kimu (2012) failed to pay attention to enrolment in special schools as provided for by NSNEP.

#### **2.4 Role of NSNEP on Service Provision to LwMD in Special Schools**

National special education needs policy provides for formulation of a mechanism to ensure and oversee adequate services for all including those with exceptional needs (Mukuria & Obiakor, 2006). Policy development requires re-examination of the knowledge of teachers and consequently their preparation, work and careers. Although teachers are expected to develop knowledge on special education, on appropriate management processes and in working with support personnel, studies confirming this remain scanty (OECD, 2005).

Hayes (2014) sought to determine the level of experience obtained by classroom teachers located in Columbus, Ohio in the area of the educating LwMDs. Other areas of interest in the survey included the additional education regarding hearing loss in children and the willingness to make accommodations for children with hearing loss. Questions in the survey focused on the teachers' experience with hearing loss, educating children with hearing loss and their willingness to work with students with hearing impairment. Subjects were contacted twice via electronic mail requesting their voluntary and confidential participation. Results indicated that a significant minority of respondents reported having formal education about hearing loss. In contrast, many respondents reported they had classroom experience with teaching children with hearing loss. The majority of teachers responded that they would be willing to work with LwMDs and make accommodations for these students. However, this study (Hayes, 2014) did not determine service provision to LwMDs as provided by NSENP and how this contributes to enrolment of LwMDs.

Efau (2014) investigated accessibility to inclusive education for children with disabilities in two selected districts in Ghana (Ga East and New Juabeng respectively). Analysis of data showed evidence of acceptance of children with disabilities into the mainstream schools but there were factors that posed challenges for complete practice of inclusive education. These factors included stigmatization, discrimination and cultural beliefs, teacher's competence and attitudes, parental involvement, unavailability of resources and inadequate policies. These factors were found to be barriers influencing accessibility to education for children with

disabilities. Discussions of the study attempted to demonstrate children with disabilities get access to inclusive education as a result of general education policy, albeit with vast challenges. As a result of these challenges, children with disabilities were found not to be benefiting from education policy. Efa (2014) did however not pay attention to service provision to LwMDs particularly in special schools.

Tshabalala (2013) investigated the effectiveness of the integration of units in schools to accommodate the learners with disabilities in Zimbabwe. The results from the study highlighted that inclusive teaching was not effective enough to cater for disabled children's individual needs. Lack of funding to purchase special gadgets for children with special needs was a common problem. However, Tshabalala's (2013) study did not focus on service provision to LwMDs in special schools, besides failing to highlight how the same relate with enrolment of these categories of learners.

Omede (2015) did an assessment of trends of service delivery to persons with disabilities in India, Brazil, Kenya, Malaysia and Nigeria. Individuals with disabilities, who are the subjects of special education, encounter difficulties that prevent or make it strenuous to use a part of their body completely or easily or that they cannot learn easily. The assessment identified challenges in the areas of teacher-pupil ratio, funding, failure of parental instruction, individualized education programme, special facilities, equipment and assistive technology, poor rehabilitation services, inclusion, attitudes to persons with disability amongst others that must be tackled to enable efficient service delivery for persons with disability. However, Omede (2015) did assess the trends under the lenses of special needs education policy guidelines within the areas in which the study was carried.

Mwiti and Mburugu (2014) investigated attitudes of public primary school teachers from central region of Kenya towards inclusion of children with hearing impairment. The results indicated that males and females differed significantly on their attitudes toward inclusion of learners among teachers in regular primary schools. The study concludes that despite teachers' positive attitude towards inclusion they are not ready to adopt this change without prior training on how to teach the hearing impaired. Male teachers were more positive to teaching learners with hearing impairment than their female counterparts. This study (Mwiti and Mburugu, 2014) concentrated on learners with hearing impairment only without considering those with multiple disabilities. The need to shed light on teachers who handle LwMDs provided the motivation for the current study.

It is evident from the reviewed studies that enrolment of LwMDs in special schools have received minimal focus under the lense of SNE policies across the globe. Moreover, the reviewed literature has not highlighted the contribution of special needs education policies towards services provision to LwMDs. Similarly, the efficiency of teachers, who are the main providers of curriculum for LwMDs, have not been focused in the reviewed studies.

## **2.5 Role of the NSNEP in the Schools' Physical and Curriculum Adaptation on Enrolment of LwMD**

Despite the fact that SNE policy spells out the necessity of providing physical resources and curriculum which suits LwMDs, studies (Yusuf, Priyono and Yeagerb, 2011; Sunardi, Yusuf, Gunarhadi, Priyono, and Yeager, 2011; Farooq, 2012; Oluremi and Olubukula, 2013) have not fully assessed the role played by the policy on school physical and curriculum adaptation for these learners. Yusuf et al (2011) sought to describe the implementation process of inclusive education for students with special needs in Indonesia by focusing on the institutional management, student admission/identification/assessment, curriculum, instruction, evaluation, and external supports. The results showed that the majority of inclusive schools had developed strategic plans (for inclusion) and conducted regular coordination meetings; most of the schools have set a quota for SEN students; most schools had modified their curriculum, including a variety of standards; majority of inclusive schools reported that they modified their instructional process but with minimal provision of special equipment for students with visual impairment, physical impairment, speech and hearing problems, and autism and gifted and talented students; majority of the schools reported that test items, administration, time allocations, and students' reports were modified. For the national exam, this number decreased dramatically. Finally, external supports in the forms of funding, coaching, and facilities were mostly provided by provincial governments and by the Directorate of Special Education. Yet Yusuf et al. (2011) have remained silent on what SNE policy requires in terms of provision of physical and curriculum adaptation for LwMDs; this prompted the current work.

Sunardi, Yusuf, Gunarhadi, Priyono, and Yeager (2011) assessed the implementation of inclusive education for students with special needs by focusing on among other areas, curriculum, instruction, evaluation, and external supports in Indonesia. In a student evaluation, more than 50 percent reported that test items, administration, time allocations, and students' reports were modified. For the national exam, this number decreased dramatically.

Finally, external supports in the forms of funding, coaching, and facilities were mostly provided by provincial governments and by the Directorate of Special Education. Nonetheless, implication of policy on adaptation of curriculum and evaluation was not focused in Sunardi et al's (2011) study. This would have provided the view as to whether or not policy expectations were met.

Farooq (2012) sought to explore problems faced by students with special needs (SWSN) studying in general education schools/ordinary schools in Pakistan. Both parents and students indicated that general education schools are better places for SWSN than the special schools. All groups of participants agreed that there were structural problems faced by students with special needs in general education schools. Classmates of SWSN were found to have positive attitude towards them. Implications of this in terms of special education delivery services in Pakistan were also explored. Farooq (2012) recommended a positive attitude of teachers and society was needed to eradicate the problems faced by SWSN. However, this study was conducted within a general school and not special school hence the need to do the same among special schools prompted the current study.

A study by Oluremi and Olubukula (2013) investigated the impact of facilities on academic performance of learners with special needs in mainstreamed public schools in South-Western Nigeria. The study showed that there was a significant relationship between the availability of facilities and academic performance of learners with special educational needs. The study concluded that inadequate provision of facilities and materials to mainstreamed public schools would lead to poor academic performances of learners with special educational needs. Although this study (Oluremi and Olubukula, 2013) focused on learning facilities for learners with disabilities, it did not pay attention to the provision of the policy towards the same. Additionally, the study failed to highlight on how facilities contribute to enrolment of LwMDs in special schools. The need to evaluate the contribution of SNE policy provision to adaptation of physical facilities and curriculum for LwMDs therefore informed the choice for the current study.

Akakandelwa and Musanje (2011) carried out a study to determine the provision of learning and teaching materials for pupils with visual impairment in basic and high schools in Zambia. A survey approach utilizing a questionnaire, interviews and a review of the literature was adopted for the study. The findings demonstrated that most schools in Zambia did not provide adequate and suitable learning and teaching materials to pupils with visual impairment.

Further, many schools did not have resource rooms for storage and use of learning and teaching materials for these pupils. Though most schools have a policy for procurement of learning and teaching materials, their budgetary allocations for such activities are usually too small or non-existent. Consequently, most children with visual impairment appear to perform poorly in their studies and are required to drop science and mathematics subjects due to lack of teaching and learning materials. It is, however, critical to note that Akakandelwa and Musanje (2011) carried out their study in basic and high schools instead of special schools. Moreover, attention was not paid to the provision of special needs policy with regard to physical and curriculum adaptation to LwMDs. These were the areas that the current study sought to focus on.

Musembi (2014) investigated school factors affecting public primary schools head teachers' provision of special needs education in Kangundo Sub-County, Machakos County, Kenya. Findings revealed that (42.9%) of head teachers revealed that they had barrier free pavements in the school to accommodate children with special need; there were inadequate financial resources for the special needs children in the school; funds provided were not adequate for serving the needs for SNE; schools did not have finances to outsource SNE teaching and learning materials; schools were not able to purchase items that SNE children needed for learning; financing of special education still remains a major challenge for the government. Nevertheless, Musembi (2014) did not cover the role played by SNE policy in regard to physical resources or curriculum adaptation for LwMDs. The current study was set to bridge this gap by carrying out a survey among special schools in Kisumu County, Kenya.

A study by Njoka and Syallo (2013) employed a historical critique of literature from policy documents, books, journals, magazines and internet to assess the implications and practice of special needs education in Kenya. It revealed that the international community and national governments have put in place legal and policy guidelines to govern the provision of special needs education. However, the grand legal frameworks and policies seem to be faced by a myriad of challenges such as inadequate budgetary support, negative attitudes and slow pace of enactment of relevant laws to guide provision of special needs education.

It is appreciated that the provision of special needs education has now been removed from the social services ministry to the mainstream education but efforts at effective inclusive education are yet to be realized. Nonetheless, Njoka and Syallo (2013) have not highlighted on the role of SNE policy on ensuring that physical resources as well as curriculum adaptation are achieved in special schools. These are areas which were extensively looked at in the current study through a survey among special schools in Kisumu County.

## CHAPTER THREE

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology used in the study and how it has aided data collection, analysis, and presentation. The chapter is divided into the following sections namely; the research design; study population, sampling techniques and sample size; data collection methods and instruments; validity and reliability of data collection instruments, methods of data analysis, and finally ethical considerations.

#### 3.2 Study Design

The study used a cross-sectional descriptive design combining both qualitative and quantitative approaches. This design aided in achieving a snapshot picture of the situation of LwMDs in the study area, hence was useful in eliciting information within a short period of time. This design was preferred for this study since it enabled quantitative analysis to be corroborated by qualitative data obtained through the use of questionnaires, observation, focus group discussions and interviews. Thus, the mixed methods approach enabled the researcher to triangulate and come up with better understanding of additional perspectives around parameters of investigations and provide room to verify the information obtained from the previous data collection methods.

#### 3.3 Study Area

The study was conducted in Kisumu County. Kisumu County occupies a total area of 2, 085.9 km<sup>2</sup> and a water mass of 567 km<sup>2</sup>. The county has a total arable land of 1, 342 km<sup>2</sup> and non arable land of 209 km<sup>2</sup> (KNBS, 2016). The population of the county is 1,145,749 people, with 561,351 males and 584,396 females, according to KNBS (2016). It lies within longitudes 33° 20'E and 35° 20'E and latitudes 0° 20'South and 0° 50'South. The mean annual maximum temperature ranges 25°C to 35°C and the mean annual minimum temperature ranges 9°C to 18°C. Appendix 8 presents the map of the study area.

Kisumu County has a 5.471% prevalence rate of PLWD, higher than the national prevalence rate of 3.461% in Kenya. Among these, 86% have visual disability, 1.02% hearing disability, 0.64% speech disability, 2.11% physical and self care disability, 0.47 mental disabilities and 0.43% with other disabilities (KNBS, 2012). The rate of poverty (adult equivalent poverty head count) is 46.8% higher than the national rate of 45.9% and its ranked 21 out of 47

counties. Furthermore, statistics from Kisumu County Educational Assessment and Resource Centre (EARC) indicate that in 2015 academic year, out of 350 LwMDs assessed and recommended for placement, only 96 (27%) are enrolled in special schools. Kisumu County has a total of 11 special schools, of which 3 are secondary schools (EARS, 2015; KISE, 2014), hence leaving eight primary special schools. This area was deemed desirable for this study given that enrolment of learners into special schools as espoused by NSNEP seems not to be successful.

### **3.4 Study Population**

This study targeted head teachers and teachers from all the 8 special primary schools in Kisumu County, Educational Assessment and Resource Centers (EARCs), County education officer of Kisumu County, and all the 350 parents/guardians of LwMDs who were assessed and recommended for placement in 2015 academic year. However, the study excluded one special school with teachers using simple random sampling method for the purpose of pilot study.

The head teachers were desired because, as the chief executive officers of the schools, they were in a position to give information on administrative issues, status of admission, physical resources and curriculum adaptation. The teachers being in charge of curriculum implementation were considered to be in a position to provide information on inclusion and service provision to LwMDs. The EARS officers often conduct assessment, placement, referrals, and follow up activities. The EARS staff therefore gave information on prevalence of disabilities by category, placement, and the status of the inclusion based on follow up exercises done by them after placement. Equally, the County education officer was preferred because the policy and data related to enrolment and retention in school for LwMDs is collected, analysed and disseminated by the office. Lastly, parents/guardians of LwMDs were included in the study because they were the stakeholders upon whom the responsibility of day to day care of the learners lies.

### **3.5 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size**

Purposive sampling approach was used to select the study respondents. Thus, 7 head teachers and 100 teachers in the special schools under study were selected for questionnaire administration, alongside 2 EARS officer and 1 education officer for Key Informant Interview (KII). Similarly, 35 parents/guardians of LwMDs who were assessed for enrolment in special schools in 2015 were selected for Focus Group Discussions (FGD).

### **3.6 Methods of Data Collection**

The study used triangulated method which involved questionnaires, KII interviews, observations, and FGDs for data collection. This aided validation of information gathered from different categories of study respondents.

#### **3.6.1 Questionnaire**

The study used structured questionnaire to collect data from 5 head teachers and 80 teachers in special primary schools. Questionnaires were used to collect quantitative data on socio-demographic characteristics of teachers; the role of policy on the enrolment of LwMDs; role of the policy on the parental involvement during the admission and placement of LWMD; role of the policy on service provision to LwMD, and the role of the policy on the school physical and curriculum adaptation for LwMD in Kisumu county. The significance of this method is that it enabled the researcher to draw short and simple questions which required short and precise answers from the respondents. The study was able to achieve 70.1% (N=75) questionnaire return rate out of a possible 107 sampled head teachers and teachers. The questionnaire used for data collection is found in Appendix 3.

#### **3.6.2 Key Informants Interviews**

Key informant interview was used to collect data from the EARS Officer and 1 County Education Officer. Key informant interview gave a deeper understanding of the role of NSNEP with regard to enrolment of LwMDs. This method was preferred because it allowed the study to follow up on responses that were not expected. The interview schedule used to collect data from key informants is presented in Appendix 4.

#### **3.6.3 Observation**

Observation was used to collect data on curriculum adaptation methods of teaching, provision and use of resources, as well as classroom dynamics. The researcher observed one lesson in each school making a total of 5 observations. Lesson observations allowed the researcher to see how teachers handle LwMDs during the teaching process. The researcher observed was service provision in terms of lesson delivery, class participation of learners, teacher confidence as well as proficiency in handling learners and assistive devices among others. Additionally, the study observed the usage of learning and teaching materials, adequacy of facilities and resources, and how such resources were used by learners. The observation checklist used in this study is in Appendix 5.

### **3.6.4 Focus Group Discussions**

The study conducted 5 FGDs consisting 7 members who were purposively sampled in each of the seven Sub-Counties with the aid of EARCs officers. The discussants comprised parents whose children with multiple disabilities had been assessed and recommended for placement in special schools during 2015 in the study area. The aim of FGDs is to produce rich multifaceted, nuanced and even challenging explanations of how people attribute meaning to construct their understandings (Kamberelis and Dimitriadis, 2011). The FGDs were conducted using three predominant languages, Dholuo, Kiswahili, and English. Each FGD was conducted for approximately 45 minutes. The FGDs were held in nearby schools that were unanimously agreed upon by the respondents. The researcher facilitated and moderated the discussion using an FGD guide in the local language (Luo) for ease of expression of the discussants. A research assistant who was well versed in the local language took notes and the entire discussion was tape-recorded. The FGD guide for the study is shown in Appendix 6.

### **3.6.5 Secondary sources**

Other information was obtained from secondary sources such as review of related literature from the libraries, national archives, magazines, newspapers, journals and publications, various computerized databases and the internet. Literature based on LwMD, Assessment of LwMD, Service provision to LwMD and Physician and curriculum adaptation for LwMD. Secondary sources were important because they provided a basis for comparison for the data that was collected by the researcher.

### **3.7 Validity of the Research Instruments**

Content and face validity of the research instruments was ascertained by experts in the School of Development and Strategic Studies (SDSS), Maseno University. They examined and assessed the relevance of the questions to the objectives of the study, judging them independently and making recommendations on the validity of the instruments.

### **3.8 Reliability of Research Instruments**

Split –half test method was used to measure reliability of the questionnaires obtained from pre-test done on 11 purposively selected teachers and one head teacher. Pre-test helped the researcher to eliminate any ambiguity in the research instruments to ensure they generated valid results of the study. Respondents were asked to note any ambiguous or inappropriate questions. Input from invaluable sources was obtained during the study that was useful in

modifying the research instruments before a final set of questions were produced. Mugenda and Mugenda notes that reliability is concerned with estimates of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results after repeated trials (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). The questionnaire items were divided into two parts and Spearman-Brown's coefficient of correlation ( $r$ ) between the two halves calculated. Reliability coefficients of 0.82 and 0.78 were obtained for both the first and second parts respectively. This was an indication that the study instruments were capable of yielding consistent responses from the sampled respondents (Nunnally, 1978).

### **3.9 Data Analysis and Presentation**

Data collected through questionnaires were checked for completeness, cleaned, coded, and entered into a computer for analysis. Quantitative data was then analyzed by the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20. Descriptive statistics involving measures of frequencies and percentages alongside mean ( $M$ ) were used for data analysis. Analysed data was presented in frequency tables.

Qualitative data was analyzed using thematic analysis. This involved categorizing generated data from open ended questions and interviews into themes in relation to the research objectives and presented in verbatim statements. The qualitative data was used to compliment the quantitative data and was presented using verbatim narrations and direct quotations.

### **3.10 Ethical Considerations**

Research permit was obtained from Maseno University Ethical Review Committee (MUERC). Permission was also sought from the Kisumu County gatekeepers. Notification letter was sent to the D.E.O and the head teachers of the sampled schools. Permission was also sought from the head teachers of the five schools sampled by the study. An agreement was reached on when to collect the data. Research participants were informed of the nature of the study, and were informed that participation in the study was completely voluntary. To this end, a consent form was presented to care givers to be signed prior to the commencement of data collection exercise. Confidentiality was maintained throughout the data collection and analysis process by keeping in secret any personal information and ensuring that identities of participants were concealed.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### RESULTS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSIONS

#### 4.1 Introduction

This chapter is divided into two main sections. The first section deals with the description of socio-demographic characteristics of the study population. Socio-demographic data provides a general overview of the respondents' socio-economic indicators in the study area. The second section presents and discusses findings the implications of the provisions of NSNEP on enrolment of LwMDs in special schools in Kisumu County, Kenya.

The study collected data from 75 respondents out of the sampled 107 using study questionnaire. This was due to the fact that two of the targeted special schools did not have enrolment records for 2015. This however represents 70% return rate. According to Kothari (2007), this is an acceptable percentage return rate in a social research study. In addition, three key informants were interviewed besides five FGDs in each of the sampled special schools that participated in the study. For the purposes of confidentiality, the key informants were provided with codes ranging from *Officer 1* to *Officer 3*. Similarly, FGDs were coded as *FGD 1* to *FGD 5*.

#### 4.2 Socio-demographic characteristics of Respondents

The first part of the study questionnaire sought to determine the socio demographic details of the sampled respondents. The first section began by assessing the distribution by school.

##### 4.2.1 Distribution of respondents by School

**Table 4.1: Distribution of respondents by schools**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
St. Martin Special School	16	21.3
Ng'eny School for HI	7	9.3
Lutheran Special	21	28.0
Maseno School for the Deaf	26	34.7
St Monica Ombaka Special School	5	6.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 4.1 illustrates that most (34.7%) of the sampled teachers were selected from Maseno School for the Deaf, while 28% were selected from Lutheran Special School; 21% were from St Martin Special School; 9.3% from Ng’eny School for HI; and 6.7% were from St Monica Ombaka Special School. This selection was based on the population of teachers in each of the sampled schools.

Findings in Table 4.1 tend to suggest that general special schools and schools for the deaf have more teachers, a possible indication that service provision to learners with these forms of disabilities could have been more available than the others in the study area. The explanation given from key informant interviews was that general special schools receive more referrals since the schools are assumed to offer diverse services as compared to indication specific schools raising questions about whether other schools are less likely to enroll LwMD.

The study finding therefore could be an indicator that the low enrolment in special primary schools probably is attributed to socio-cultural stigma on LwMD which may have a negative effect on the active participation of parents towards enrolment of LwMD. These children face discrimination from both their families and their community (UNICEF, 2013).

#### 4.2.2 School Location

Equally, the sub counties in which the respective special schools are situated were also determined by the study. Table 4.2 presents the distribution of respondents according to sub counties in which their respective schools are located.

**Table 4.2: Distribution of respondents by school location**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Nyakach	16	21.3
Nyando	5	6.7
Muhoroni	7	9.3
Kisumu West	26	34.7
Kisumu Central	21	28.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100.0</b>

As shown in Table 4.2, most respondents (34.7%) were selected from schools in Kisumu West Sub County while 28% were from Kisumu Central Sub County; 21% were from schools

in Nyakach Sub Count; 9.3% from Muhoroni Sub County; and 6.7% from Nyando Sub County. Kisumu West and Kisumu Central Sub Counties are the locations where Maseno School for the Deaf and Lutheran Special School respectively, are situated. These findings therefore seem to reveal that service provisions to LwMDs as well as physical facilities were expected to be available in these areas more than the others.

The reasons given for this kind of trend from some of the FGDs held with the caregivers were that LwMD require more personalized assistance thus when important choices come up or things go wrong, there are often the teachers who act as mentors to help learners find success.

We believe our children will feel that they are in charge of their learning and have an important role to play in shaping their learning experiences. We believe that, by making these connections with many teachers, our children will be motivated (FGD 2).

The NSNEP affirms that all incoming learners are assigned a teacher with whom they meet daily. In addition, the schools should run small classes, incrementally track the learner’s skills and interests over time, and host programs to develop common interests among learners, teachers, and administrators need it most (NSNEP, 2009).

#### 4.2.3 Gender of Respondents

The researcher established the gender of the sampled head teachers and teachers. Table 4.4 presents distribution of respondents by gender.

**Table 4.4: Distribution of respondents by Gender**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Male	35	47
Female	40	53
<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100.0</b>

It is illustrated that majority (53%) of the sampled head teachers and teachers were females while 47% were males. This finding indicates that more female than male teachers are employed to handle LwMDs in the sampled special schools. Investigation of gender would enable the researcher to determine if gender has influence on enrolment of LwMD. Furthermore, KII of EARC Officers showed that female teachers dominated the region further confirming the findings.

#### 4.2.5 Years of Stay in a Particular School

The sampled head teachers and teachers were additionally requested to indicate the number of years that they had stayed in their respective special schools. Table 4.5 presents the distribution of respondents by number of years that they have stayed in the respective stations.

**Table 4.5: Distribution by years of stay in the school**

<b>Years</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1 - 2 years	10	13.3
3 - 5 years	18	24.0
Above 5 years	47	62.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 4.5 indicates that majority (62.7%) of the sampled respondents have served in their respective schools for five years and above. Equally, 24% of the respondents have stayed in their respective schools for between three and five years, while the remaining 13% of the respondents have provided services in their respective schools for between one and two years. The report indicates that a majority of the class teachers have served for long enough to give factors influencing enrolment of LwMD. Being in one station for over five years, one would be expected to understand the school environment. The sampled respondents were therefore expected to be in a better position to provide adequate information in relation to the school physical and curriculum adaptation for the benefit of LwMDs.

#### 4.2.6 Education level of Respondents

Finally, the study sought to establish the education levels of the sampled respondents. Table 4.6 shows the distribution of respondents according to the level of education.

**Table 4.6: Distribution of respondents by level of education**

<b>Education Level</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Certificate	6	8.0
Diploma	32	42.0
Degree	35	46.0
Masters	3	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 4.6 illustrates that most (46%) of the sampled head teachers and teachers had degree level of education; 42% had diploma level of education; 8% had certificate level of education; while 4% had masters level of education. This finding indicates that 50% of the sampled teachers and head teachers who handle LwMDs possess degrees of masters and bachelors education levels. This seems to suggest that the respondents have fair level of education and were expected to have adequate mastery skills in service provision for LwMDs. In addition, they were expected to both understand the policy, provide requisite services and are considered well suited to provide relevant information on enrolment of LwMD (NSNEP, 2009).

#### **4.3.1 Implication of Assessment on the Enrolment of LwMDs**

The first objective of the study sought to assess the implication of assessment on the enrolment of LwMDs. The sampled respondents were asked to provide their opinions with regard to statements depicting elements of assessment in relation to enrolment of LwMDs as: 1=Strongly Disagree (SD); 2=Disagree (D); 3=Un Decided (UD); 4=Agree (A); 5=Strongly Agree (SA). Table 4.7 presents distribution of respondents according to implications of assessment on enrolment of LwMDs. The mean rating was interpreted as:

##### **Key: Interpretation of Mean Ratings**

1.00 – 1.44:	Strongly Disagree
1.45 – 2.44:	Disagree
2.45 – 3.44:	Undecided
3.45 – 4.44:	Agree
4.45 – 5.00:	Strongly Agree

**Table 4.7: Teachers’ Response on the implications of Assessment on Enrolment of LwMDs**

No	Item	M	1	2	3	4	5	SD
1.	It enhances early identification of LwMDs	3.92	12	5.3	2.7	38.7	41.3	1.32
2.	It enables adequate screening of LwMDs	3.95	4	12	2.7	48	33.3	1.10
3.	It identifies functional levels of LwMDs	3.93	1.3	8	16	44	29.3	0.96
4.	It reveals educational needs of LwMDs	4.15	2.7	2.7	5.3	56	33.3	0.85
5.	It enables placement of all LwMDs	4.08	4	9.3	4	40	42.7	1.10
6.	Assessment enables amelioration of problems faced by LwMDs	3.99	2.7	6.7	6.7	57.3	26.7	0.92
7.	It adequately guides pre-referral of LwMDs	4.09	5	5.3	8	41.3	40	1.14
8.	Parents of LwMDs are often involved in assessment process	3.69	12	9.3	9.3	36	33.3	1.34
9.	Has helped to develop SNE professionals cope up with emerging trends	3.84	8	8	10.7	37.3	34.7	1.23

According to Table 4.7, the sampled head teachers and teachers agreed that assessment can enhance enrolment of LwMDs ( $M=3.96$ ;  $SD=1.107$ ): specifically, they agreed that: assessment enables amelioration of problems faced by LwMDs ( $A=57.3\%$ ;  $SA=26.7\%$ ); it reveals educational needs of LwMDs ( $A=56\%$ ;  $SA=33.3\%$ ); it enables adequate screening of LwMDs ( $A=48\%$ ;  $SA=33.3\%$ ); it identifies functional levels of LwMDs ( $A=44\%$ ;  $SA=29.3\%$ ); assessment adequately guides pre-referral of LwMDs ( $A=41.3\%$ ;  $SA=40$ ); it enables placement of all LwMDs ( $A=40\%$ ;  $SA=42.7\%$ ); it enhances early identification of LwMDs ( $A=38.7\%$ ;  $SA=41.3\%$ ); has helped to develop SNE professionals cope up with emerging trends ( $A=37.3\%$ ;  $SA=34.7\%$ ); Parents/guardians of LwMDs are often involved in assessment process ( $A=36\%$ ;  $SA=33.3\%$ ).

These findings imply that assessment as required by SNEP is known by stakeholders as an essentially first step in the provision of education to LwMDs. In addition, the findings suggest that through assessment; accurate placement can be done that suits the needs of LwMDs.

During KII, it was noted from one of the informants that it is during the process of assessment that disability issues are identified and the extent determined. One of the two officers stated that:

Besides advising the parents on the necessary educational step to take, assessment reports inform referral of LwMDs to particular special schools depending on specific needs that have been identified.....(Officer 1).

This statement attributed to Officer 1 implies that information concerning levels of disabilities in a learner is generated out of the process of assessment. This information is expected to be shared evenly with the parents who are in turn expected to come up with new interventions to address the emerging disability trends. However, discussants in FGDs decried inadequacies of assessment staffs as well as assessment centers, thus leading to heavy workload that hampers the entire process. During the discussions, one parent described the process as:

More often than not, assessors have always come up with inconsistent screening reports, thus making actual conditions of the LwMDs unknown, leading to wrong placement (FGDs 4).

This statement attributed to FGDs 4 denotes that parents felt that assessment reports have not been reflecting the actual special educational needs of LwMDs. This leads to placement in wrong institutions that eventually results into possible dropout hence reduced enrolment of LwMDs. Assessment reports that do not reflect the specific needs of these learners therefore emerges as one factor that impairs enrolment of LwMDs in special schools.

In another FGD, parents expressed the notion that a disconnect seem to exist between assessment and destination where the learners are referred to: parents are referred to specific institutions where assessors believe that educational needs of their disabled children would be addressed, while in the actual sense, the institutions are not able to meet such needs. One statement that emerged from the discussions was:

Wrong placements are common, and parents are obliged to visit many schools looking for institutions where special needs of their disabled children could be met. EARC seems not to have the right information with regard to relevant devices in the special schools where LwMDs are referred to (FGD 2).

This finding in FGD 2 suggests that poorly compiled assessment report is a recipe for wrong placement and delay in enrolment, thus leading to late admission. It could also lead to dropping out of school among these LwMDs. One parent narrated how assessment revealed the magnitude of the problem and referred her to specific special school. She stated that:

Ann (not real name) suddenly lost her eye sight, and her legs also became paralyzed when she was only in class five. Soon she also started developing memory lapses. Assessment officers, after assessing her conditions, referred us to one special school for enrolment. The institution proved unable to support the education needs of the girl and soon she was released from the school. Each subsequent school to which she was referred was unable to meet her special educational needs (FGD 6).

This statement attributed to FGD 6 implies that enrolment of LwMDs has not been enhanced much by assessment due to inadequate screening which end up generating wrong reports. Referrals have tended not to be considerate of the educational resources that can address the special needs of LwMDs in the schools to which a learner is referred. Discussants also alluded to the fact that assessors hardly follow up on their referees (that is, LwMDs whom they have referred to specific special schools.

The assessment is always a once-off activity without follow ups on whether the LWMD reaches the assigned schools. There is no proper guidance to the parents in assessment hence some parents have lost hope on issues that can be sorted out by the EARC staffs (FGD 1).

This statement implies that although assessment can identify the level of disabilities in a learner and consequently make recommendation for enrolment in a special school where the specific special needs of the learner can be addressed, poor screening can lead to low enrolment of LwMDs. The foregoing findings seem to go against incrementalism theory that assumes that there are multiple actors involved in the policy making process. Opinions of these actors: parents of LwMDs; teachers; head teachers, and educational officers seem not to have been merged so as to address the missing link between assessment and enrolment of LwMDs in special schools. Timely improvement on incremental basis as established in the study findings concurs with what Mosia (2014) established in a study done in Lesotho that looked at how the education of Learners with Special Education Needs (LSEN) had developed. The education ministry was found to be slow in developing a policy on special needs and there were inadequate resources for inclusive education to succeed.

Assessment also has the potential to reveal new and emerging educational needs of LwMDs that in turn may require reforms to be made in the relevant policy improvement as provided for by incrementalism theory (Bryan and Frank, 2005). Equally, confusion with regard to whether a learner should be included in mainstream school or taken to special school would

only be solved through assessment. This finding seems to concur with that of Mosia (2014) in a study that looked at how the education of Learners with Special Education Needs (LSEN) has developed in Lesotho as a result of international policies on human rights and education. It found that there is a lack of understanding by teachers and educationalists about what constitutes inclusive education. It can therefore be deduced that lack of proper enrolment of LwMDs is attributed to wrong assessment reports generated by inadequate screening of the learners.

#### **4.3.2 Role of Policy on parental Involvement during Admission**

The second objective of the study sought to assess the role of the policy with regard to parental involvement during admission of LwMDs to special schools. To this end, the sampled respondents were asked to provide their opinions concerning statements on elements of parental involvement in relation to admission of LwMDs as: 1=Strongly Disagree (SD); 2=Disagree (D); 3=Un Decided (UD); 4=Agree (A); 5=Strongly Agree (SA). Table 4.8 presents distribution of respondents according to implications of policy on parental involvement during admission of LwMDs.

The mean rating was interpreted as:

#### **Key: Interpretation of Mean Ratings**

1.00 – 1.44:	Strongly Disagree
1.45 – 2.44:	Disagree
2.45 – 3.44:	Undecided
3.45 – 4.44:	Agree
4.45 – 5.00:	Strongly Agree

**Table 4.8: Teachers' Response on the implications of policy on parental involvement**

<b>N</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>SD</b>
1.	Most parents take their children for assessment and abide by intervention measures.	2.48	25.3	34.7	13.3	13.3	10.7	1.313
2.	Most parents are willing to pay school levies for LwMDs	2.14	37.3	30.7	13.3	14.7	2.7	1.62
3.	Most parents often buy assistive devices for LwMDs	2.16	40	21.3	21.3	9.3	5.3	1.225
4.	Few parents allow disabled children to be in schools away from home	3.08	14.7	18.7	14.7	37.3	9.3	1.273
5.	Educated mothers prefer participating in assessment processes	3.77	13.3	12	16	37.3	20	3.681
6.	All parents often participate in assessment processes (to second slot)	2.86	24	24	10.7	18.7	20	1.503
7.	Most educated parents hardly consent to participating in assessment	2.79	22.5	25.3	13.3	21.3	14.7	1.14
8.	Results of assessment procedures are hardly read by parents	3.15	12	28	10.7	26.7	20	1.414
9.	Few parents do encourage their disabled children to yearn for better grades	3.12	17.3	21.3	10.7	30.7	18.7	1.71

Table 4.8 illustrates that the sampled teachers and head teachers disagreed that parental involvement have enhanced enrolment of LwMDs ( $M=2.84$ ;  $SD=1.653$ ). In particular, they stated that: most parents often buy assistive devices for LwMDs ( $SD=40\%$ ;  $D=21.3\%$ ); most parents are willing to pay school levies for LwMDs ( $SD=37.3\%$ ;  $D=30.7\%$ ); most parents take their children for assessment and abide by intervention measures ( $D=34.7\%$ ;  $SD=25.3\%$ ); all parents often participate in assessment processes ( $SD=24\%$ ;  $D=24\%$ ); and

that most educated parents hardly consent to participating in assessment (D=25.3%; SD=22.5%). On the other hand, the sampled respondents agreed that: few parents allow their children with disabilities to be in schools away from home (A=37.3%; SA=9.3%); educated mothers prefer participating in assessment processes (A=37.3%; SA=20%); few parents do encourage their children with disabilities to yearn for better grades (A=30.7%; SA=18.7%); Results of assessment procedures are hardly read by parents (A=26.7%; SA=20%).

These findings suggest that most parents are insensitive towards education needs of LwMDs, with the exception of educated ones. Lesson observation revealed that there was inadequacy of assistive resources in almost all the five schools that participated in the study: further indicating lack of support to LwMDs. Resources like text books, models, regalia and audio visual devices among others were inadequate for LwMDs. This raises questions on the extent of involvement of parents in formulation (and thereafter implementation) of NSNEP (2009), as recommended by incrementalism. The theory of incrementalism calls for participation of all stakeholders in solving diverse issues like those faced by LwMDs. Display of low commitment in education by parents of LwMDs would probably be as a result of misconception or inadequate information of policy requirements. This was perhaps the reason behind the study findings of Wong et al (2013) in Singapore: that there was a deeper concern about whether their children with disabilities will emerge from school as contributing individuals in society. Expectations of parents varied with regard to their understanding of disabilities, expectations of school support, and expectations for their child with disabilities. Contrasting finding was however revealed in Namibia by Erlendsdóttir (2010) that parents had high expectations towards their children's education and their future, and they were vocal about their expectations to their children. It seems therefore that due to lack of awareness of their role as provided by the policy with regard to enrolment of LwMDs in special schools, some parents display low involvement towards this endeavor.

The study also established from KII that most parents seem not to take education of LwMDs with equal seriousness as taken for learners without disabilities. This was noted from a statement from one of the officer who asserted that:

Few parents respond to request for participation in assessment of their children who have multiple disabilities. Moreover, most parents fail to abide by recommendations such referrals for their LwMDs..... (Officer 2).

This indicates that although parents are the original care givers to LwMDs, they seem to neglect this cardinal duty in as far as provision of educational opportunities is concerned. Similar themes were noted during FGDs, although discussants linked the failure to fully participate actively in the education of LwMDs with being ignorant of the SNE policy guidelines, socio- cultural beliefs, and negative information concerning the enrolment of their disabled learners in special schools among others. This was one major statement that commonly emerged during one of the FGDs:

Parents are not aware of the NSNE policy guidelines, although we are often invited to participate in assessment of our disabled children. There are no proper communication guidelines on service provision to LwMDs, hence some parents are disillusioned (FGD 5).

Lack of awareness of the NSNE policy guidelines among parents as revealed in FGD 5 might imply that parents of LwMDs would not be in a position to demand for the educational rights of their disabled children. Parents are therefore seemed to be left at the mercy of EARC and special schools. This finding concurs with Kipkosgei's (2013) observation in Kenya that special needs education in Kenya suffers from inadequate funding, lack of clear policy framework, and low progress in assessing and placing children with disabilities, among other factors.

Besides lack of information regarding the provisions of the NSNE policy, parents face financial constraints in supporting the education of the children as well as fear for mistreatment towards their disabled children in special schools far away from home. This was based on statements made by a group of parents during one of the FGDs. One of the statements captured during the session was:

Despite a section of parents supporting the learners admitted at boarding special schools, some are of the idea that the ECD and lower primary learners with disabilities stay close to them for fear of mistreatment in schools (FGD 4).

Parents are thus put on the spot as stakeholders who seem to be ignorant of the NSNE policy, are constrained by resources, and fear for mistreatment of their children in special schools away from home. These factors seem to limit the enrolment of LwMDs in special schools. This conforms to findings in Wong et al's (2013) that parental perspective on inclusive education in Singapore is only about classroom support as well as dichotomies in their

understanding of disabilities; expectations of school support, and expectations for their child with disabilities. However, contrasting finding was made by Mohsin et al (2011) in Pakistan which showed that parents use different behavior modification technique that ended up enhancing academic performance of their children with disabilities, although whether this was informed by awareness of policy provision was not stated.

In concurrence with the above findings, Ncube and Hlatywayo (2014) in Zimbabwe also revealed that parents were mainly involved in administrative issues rather than in making decisions about the education of their children. This could as well mean that parents do not participate in the purchasing of assistive devices, for example, for their children with multiple disabilities. Moreover, by failing to participate in assessment or reading of the assessment reports, parents seem to withdraw themselves from participation in incremental improvement of NSNE policy. Improving on the existing policy to ensure that essential assistive resources are provided to LwMDs would address the inadequacies of essential resources among public special schools as espoused by Arrow (1951).

#### **4.3.3 Role of Policy on Service provision to LwMDs**

Role of NSNE policy on service provision to LwMDs was also assessed in the fourth section of the questionnaire. The sampled respondents were requested to provide opinions concerning statements on possible indicators of roles of NSNE policy on service provision to LwMDs as: 1=Strongly Disagree (SD); 2=Disagree (D); 3=Un Decided (UD); 4=Agree (A); 5=Strongly Agree (SA). Table 4.9 presents distribution by role of policy on service provision to LwMDs. The mean rating was interpreted as:

#### **Key: Interpretation of Mean Ratings**

1.00 – 1.44:	Strongly Disagree
1.45 – 2.44:	Disagree
2.45 – 3.44:	Undecided
3.45 – 4.44:	Agree
4.45 – 5.00:	Strongly Agree

**Table 4.9: Distribution by role of Policy on Service Provision to LwMDs**

No	Item	M	1	2	3	4	5	SD
1.	All head teachers and teachers have proper skills in serving LwMDs	2.94	14.7	32	8	30.7	13.3	1.34
2.	Teachers are adequately motivated to provide services to LwMDs	2.74	18.7	32	12	25.3	9.3	1.30
3.	Teachers are aware of curriculum requirements for LwMDs	3.66	2.7	16	12	49.3	18.7	1.05
4.	There is proper in-service training for teachers who handle LwMDs	2.97	17.3	26.	9.3	32	13.3	1.37
5.	Performance evaluation of teachers is based upon NSNE policy	3.09	16	21.	12	36	13.3	1.41
6.	Promotion of teachers for LwMDs is based on their services to LwMDs	2.58	30.7	25.	6.7	26.7	9.3	1.29
7.	NSNEP guidelines are often disseminated to teachers in time	2.70	18.7	34.	12	24	9.3	1.45
8.	Sections in the NSNEP are discussed adequately by head teachers, teachers, EARS officers, and parents/guardians	2.96	21.3	22.	10.	26.7	17.3	1.23

Table 4.9 illustrates that the sampled teachers and head teachers agreed that service provision to LwMDs can enhance enrolment of LwMDs ( $M=2.955$ ;  $SD=1.305$ ). Specifically, they stated that teachers are aware of curriculum requirements for LwMDs (A=49.3%; SA=18.7%); and performance evaluation of teachers is based upon NSNE policy (A=36%; SA=13.3%). However, respondents disagreed that: promotion of teachers for LwMDs is based on their services to LwMDs (SD=30.7%; D=25.3%); teachers are adequately motivated to provide services to LwMDs (D=32%; SD=18.7%); and that NSNEP guidelines are often disseminated to teachers in time (D=34.7%; SD=18.7%). In the meantime, the sampled respondents seem to be undecided as to whether: sections in the NSNEP are discussed adequately by head teachers, teachers, EARS officers and parents/guardians (44% Disagreed; 44% Agreed); and whether there is proper in-service training for teachers who handle LwMDs (44% disagreed; 45.3% agreed).

Findings in Table 4.9 suggest that while teachers are prepared to offer educational services to LwMDs, there exists minimal motivation, in-service training as well as dissemination of policy guidelines by the education authorities. Public participation and involvement of certain interest groups are some of the basic requirements suggested by incrementalism theory for rational policy, including policies like NSNEP. Teachers, as the main provider of instructional services to LwMDs in class, are interested groups as enthused by incrementalism theory. They therefore need to be involved in all aspects of policy implementation for the benefit of enhancing enrolment of LwMDs. The contribution of teachers regarding the improvement of provision of services to LwMDs seems to be derailed by lack of motivation, in-service training, and lack of dissemination of policy guidelines.

During lesson observation, it was revealed that among the five special schools, teaching methods employed were adequate. Moreover, personality of teachers was established to be adequate. This provides further evidence that teachers who serve LwMDs possess requisite competencies to meet educational needs of the learners (see Table 4.6). This concurs with the findings in Hayes (2014) in Columbus, Ohio, that teachers had classroom experience with teaching children with hearing loss, and they would be willing to work with LwMDs and make accommodations for these students.

The KII also generated information that portray teachers for LwMDs as competent and well trained, although the sampled officers decried lack of motivation commensurate to the amount of work performed by the teachers. One of the officers stated that:

Teachers handling LwMDs possess high education qualifications and handle learners who suffer diverse impairments. Although this is a poor working environment compared to that of teachers who handle learners without disabilities, there is minimum motivation by the employer..... (Officer 2).

It therefore emerges that teachers are prepared to offer essential educational services although the same is hampered by inadequate motivation by the employer and lack of resources. Service provision seems to be adequate as supported by lesson observation exercises in the sampled schools. However, the opinion of parents who participated in the FGDs alluded to the fact there was no institution in the county handling LWMD. A section of the discussants mentioned having gone extra miles by deploying personal staffs to take care of their children in the special schools where they are admitted. One statement went as follows:

Sometimes we are forced to withdraw our children due to poor care at the institutions. For instance, when I visited my son in one school at which he was enrolled, I found him with wounds, a tooth missing, and was thin and untidy; then I said ..... “o my, ... there is no shop for children, I better stay with my son at home” (FGD 2).

Adequate care for LwMDs tends to be lacking among the special schools, as alluded to in FGD 2. The experience that the parent in FGD 2 had from this particular learning institution could be a major hindrance of enrolment of LwMDs in such schools. This is because most parents consider these special schools as poor in providing proper care and services to LwMDs. There is therefore fear for the safety of these children amongst their parents.

In another session of FGDs, it was revealed that most parents are disillusioned by the period of time elapsing between assessment and referral on one hand, and actual admission at the school of reference on the other hand. According to statements attributed to some parents, they considered that service delayed is almost equivalent to service denied. This was a the statements that emerged from one of the FGDs:

Once referrals are made at the EARC offices, the receiving institutions often delay admission citing lack of infrastructural capacity. The child is therefore put in the waiting list at times for as long as five years without communication from the school (FGD 3).

The statement attributed to FGD 3 suggests that enrolment of LwMDs is hampered by inadequate infrastructure in special schools. Service provision to learners with special needs is therefore delayed to a great extent. This would mean that LwMDs begin their education programmes late. This is generally a recipe for drop out. This begs for policy changes that address periods between assessment and admission of LwMDs on a continuous basis, as enthused by the theory of incrementalism..

Continuous adjustments of programmes based on the needs of the classroom environment concur with incrementalism theory. Incrementalism accepts the legitimacy of established programs that are adjusted according to circumstances. In terms of theoretical utility, there is an agreement that incrementalism offers accurate description of how policy and programme process actually works much of the time (Ham and Hill 1983, 1984). Factors such as stigmatization, discrimination and cultural beliefs, teacher’s competence and attitudes,

parental involvement, unavailability of resources and inadequate policies were also found by Efaa (2014) to be hampering enrolment of LwMDs in schools. It could therefore be argued that inadequacy of resources in the sampled special schools inhibits the provision of services to LwMDs. This further leads to low enrolment of such learners since most parents hardly see the benefits of enrolling their disabled children in schools.

#### **4.3.4 Role of Policy on physical and Curriculum Adaptation to LwMDs**

The last objective of the study sought to establish the role of NSNE policy on physical and curriculum adaptation to LwMDs. To realize this objective, the sampled respondents provided their opinions on possible indicators of role of NSNE policy on physical and curriculum adaptation to LwMDs as: 1=Strongly Disagree (SD); 2=Disagree (D); 3=Un Decided (UD); 4=Agree (A); 5=Strongly Agree (SA). Table 4.10 presents distribution of respondents according to their opinions with regard to the role of policy on physical and curriculum adaptation to LwMDs. The mean rating was interpreted as:

##### **Key: Interpretation of Mean Ratings**

1.00 – 1.44:	Strongly Disagree
1.45 – 2.44:	Disagree
2.45 – 3.44:	Undecided
3.45 – 4.44:	Agree
4.45 – 5.00:	Strongly Agree

**Table 4.10: Distribution by role of Policy on Physical and Curriculum adaptation**

No	Item	M	1	2	3	4	5	SD
1	Stair cases have been replaced by ramps	2.89	14.7	37.3	4	26.7	14.7	1.37
2	Toilets, etc, have been constructed to suit special needs of LwMDs	3.15	20	13.3	9.3	38.7	14.7	1.41
3	Assistive devices have been appropriately procured	2.84	13.3	34.7	9.3	34.7	5.3	1.21
4	Teachers have been trained to use assistive devices appropriately	3.58	8	16	2.7	53.3	17.3	1.20
5	Teachers do monitor the usability of the adapted infrastructure	3.64	2.7	14.7	12	52	14.7	1.01
6	Teachers conform to the best practices when using assistive devices.	3.68	1.3	14.7	12	54.7	14.7	0.96
7	Period of lessons have been designed to suit LwMDs	3.05	20	22.7	9.3	22.7	22.7	1.50
8	Evaluation tests have been designed to suit LwMDs	2.82	22.7	25.3	12	21.3	16	1.44
9	Specific syllabus has been designed to suit LwMDs	2.73	22.7	26.7	10.7	29.3	8	1.34
10	There are special national examinations for LwMDs	2.51	30.7	32	6.7	10.7	17.7	1.48

Table 4.10 illustrates that the sampled head teachers and teachers largely agreed that physical and curriculum adaptation in the selected sampled schools can enhance enrolment of LwMDs ( $M=3,089$ ;  $SD=1.292$ ). Specifically, teachers conform to the best practices when using assistive devices (A=54.7%; SA=14.7%); teachers have been trained to use assistive devices appropriately (A=53.3%; SA=17.3%); teachers monitors the usability of the adapted infrastructure (A=52%; SA=14.7%); and that toilets, have been constructed to suit special needs of LwMDs (A=38.7%; SA=14.7%). Conversely, the sampled respondents disagreed that: there are special national examinations for LwMDs (D=32%; SD=30.7%); stair cases

have been replaced by ramps (D= 37.3%; SD=14.3%); specific syllabus has been designed to suit LwMDs (D=26.7%; SD=22.7%); evaluation tests have been designed to suit LwMDs (D=25.3%; SD=22.7%); Assistive devices have been appropriately procured (D=34.7%; SD=13.3%).

Findings in Table 4.10 suggest that administration of curriculum by teachers of LwMDs was adequate. However, content of academic curriculum as well as progress tests seem not to favour LwMDs based on their conditions and learning abilities. Furthermore, there seem to be problems with the procurement of assistive devices for the learners.

Observation of lesson administration revealed that teachers were trying to use adequate teaching methods, with adequate task analysis, direct instruction, peer tutoring, and IEP strategy. In addition, teacher personality was observed to adequate: with adequate content mastery, content adaptation, attention to learners, and teacher confidence. However, lesson observation revealed that there was inadequacy in essential assistive resources such as text books, models, audio visual devices, and regalia among others.

During KII, statements from the sampled officers alluded to the fact that teachers lacked adequate support in resources and morally. One of the sampled officers stated that:

The NSNE policy, adopted in 2010, has not been as effective as to enhance provision of essential resources for use by LwMDs in their respective special schools. This is despite of the fact that teachers are competent enough to administer the curriculum for these learners (Officer 2).

This statement tends to imply that the NSNE policy has not enhanced the provision of resources for LwMDs besides failing to adequately recognise the effort of teachers who handle this category of learners. These issues also emerged during FGDs with the sampled parents. Parents had the opinion that the existing institutions were not able to provide educational needs of their disabled children. One of the statements that emerged from another FGD was that:

On being referred to special schools after assessment, some parents were told that educational needs of their children could not be met in those schools. They (parents) were advised to wait until the children in question learn to take care of themselves due to poor physical state of facilities (FGD 4).

The statement made in FGD 4 seems to imply that inadequacy of physical facilities hinders enrolment of LwMDs in special schools where they are referred to. Parents also decried the cost of assistive devices which they are required to buy for their disabled children. This is one of the statements that emerged from one of the FGDs:

Basically all assistive devices that the learners are required with are very expensive. For instance, the cheapest audio visual gadget costs two hundred thousand shillings (FGD 5).

This finding implies that provision of learning resources for LwMDs is beyond the economic ability of parents. During another FGD with the sampled parents, it emerged that lack of adequate resources had led to total lack of enrolment to some learners who have complicated multiple disabilities. This was established from one particular lady who was referred by the assessment officers to enroll her daughter in one special school. The special school was unable to accommodate the learner due to inadequacy of resources. All the schools she was referred to were unable to enroll her afterwards. She explained that:

Based on the assessment report, the officers sent us to one of the special schools in Kisumu County for enrolment. Unfortunately, the school could not enroll my daughter due to inadequacy of learning resources to assist her. Subsequently, all the schools to which the assessment officers sent us were incapable of addressing her special needs, citing lack of adequate resources (FGD 4).

Lack of learning resources in special schools for LwMDs seemed to be a major hindrance to enrolment of this category of learners. With this in mind, policy measures need to be adjusted to address the same so that the efforts that are put by teachers do not go in vain. This would be in line with similar adjustments as discovered in Yusuf et al (2011) during a study done in Indonesia. It found that the majority of inclusive schools had developed strategic plans (for inclusion), legally appointed coordinators, involved related and relevant parties, and conducted regular coordination meeting.

Lack of learning materials for LwMDs is however, not a unique occurrence hence there is a requirement for incremental adjustment of policies to address the same as enthused by the theory of incrementalism, based on the requirement needs that have been identified as well as forecasted demand. Earlier studies have also come out with findings that indicated inadequacy of learning resources in ECDE. In a study done in Zambia by Akakandelwa and

Musanje (2011), most schools were found not provide adequate and suitable learning and teaching materials to pupils with visual impairment. Despite the fact that most schools had a policy for procurement of learning and teaching materials, their budgetary allocations for such activities are usually too small or non-existent. It should therefore be accepted that employing NSNE policy to enhance provision of assistive resources has not been successful enough.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the findings of the study, conclusion and recommendations. The researcher also offers recommendations for the purpose of improving enrolment of LwMDs, as well as suggesting further studies based on the study findings.

#### 5.2 Summary of findings

The findings of this study are summarized in the sequence of the study objectives. These were to: determine the implications of assessment on enrolment of LwMDs; explore the role of the policy on the parental involvement during the admission and placement of LWMD; examine the role of the policy on service provision to LwMD; find out the role of the policy on the school physical and curriculum adaptation for LwMD in Kisumu County. Data collected from the sampled head teachers and teachers was analysed through descriptive methods and presented in frequency tables.

##### 5.2.1 Implications of assessment on enrolment of LwMDs

The study found that assessment reports basically inform enrolment decisions for LwMDs. In particular, it enables amelioration of problems faced by LwMDs; it has continued to reveal educational needs as well as adequate screening of LwMDs, identifies functional levels of LwMDs, adequately guides pre-referral of LwMDs, enables placement of all LwMDs, enhances early identification of LwMDs. Additionally, the study found that assessment has aided SNE professionals in coping up with emerging trends with regard to assistance offered to LwMDs. Furthermore, it was found that parents/guardians of LwMDs are often involved in assessment process (Table 4.7). However, wrongly compiled assessment reports have led to wrong placement, hence hampering successful enrolment of LwMDs.

##### 5.2.2 Role of the Policy on the parental Involvement during the Admission of LWMD

With regard to the role played by NSNE policy on parental involvement during admission of LwMDs, the study found that parents have failed in effecting enrolment of LwMDs into special schools due to ignorant of the provisions of the policy. It found that most parents do not often buy assistive devices for LwMDs and are not willing to pay school levies for LwMDs. It was also found that most parents do not take their children for assessment and they seldom abide by intervention measures, and not all parents often participate in

assessment processes and that most educated parents hardly consent to participating in assessment. In addition, the study also found that few parents allow disabled children to be in schools away from home, educated mothers prefer participating in assessment process, and few parents do encourage their disabled children to yearn for better grades. Moreover, findings revealed that results of assessment procedures are hardly read by parents (Table 4.8). The study also found that there is no proper communication of policy guidelines to parents that contribute to lack of active participation of parents in the education of LwMDs.

### **5.2.3 Role of the policy on service provision to LwMD**

Concerning role played by NSNE policy on service provision to LwMDs, the study found that the teachers for LwMDs are skilled and competent, and were able to impart cognitive and social skills to the learners. In particular, the teachers are aware of curriculum requirements for LwMDs, and that performance evaluation of teachers is based upon NSNE policy. Findings also revealed that promotion of teachers for LwMDs is not based on their services to LwMDs, teachers are not adequately motivated to provide services to LwMDs, and that NSNEP guidelines are not often disseminated to teachers in time. In the meantime, sections in the NSNEP are neither discussed adequately by head teachers, teachers, EARS officers, and parents/guardians, nor there is proper in-service training for teachers who handle LwMDs (Table 4.9). Parents, on the other hand, consider the special schools as ill prepared to meet all the educational needs of their disabled children. They are also worried about delays in admission after assessment.

### **5.2.4 Role of the policy on the school physical and curriculum adaptation for LwMDs**

Based on analysis of role of NSNE policy on school physical and curriculum adaptation for LwMDs, it was found that teachers conform to the best practices when using assistive devices and that they have been trained to use assistive devices appropriately. Findings also revealed that teachers do monitor the usability of the adapted infrastructure, and that toilets, etc, have been constructed to suit special needs of LwMDs. Other findings were that there are no special national examinations for LwMDs, staircases have not been replaced by ramps in most special schools, no specific syllabus has been designed to suit LwMDs, evaluation tests have not been designed to suit LwMDs, and assistive devices have not been appropriately procured (Table 4.10). Another finding was that parents felt that special schools that can adequately address educational needs of their disabled children are not available.

### **5.3 Conclusion**

Information concerning levels of disabilities in a learner is generated out of the process of assessment. Referral cases are informed by the discovery of new and emerging educational needs of LwMDs from assessment reports. Parents of LwMDs only admit their children to specific special schools based on information contained in the assessment report. However, wrong assessment reports have led to misplacement and consequently withdrawal of LwMDs from school.

In addition, parents are not aware of provisions of the NSNE policy. Few parents do support their children with disabilities with assistive devices models, realia and audio visual devices among others citing high cost. Parents would like that ECD and lower primary learners with disabilities stay close to them for fear of mistreatment in schools.

Similarly, there is minimal motivation to support teachers handling LwMDs. The teachers have adopted appropriate teaching methods, although they seemed to have negative attitude towards LwMDs. Inadequacy of educational resources have delayed enrolment of LwMDs, and have sometimes led to withdrawal from school of these learners.

Finally, it is concluded that the administration of curriculum by teachers of LwMDs is adequate. However, content of academic curriculum as well as progress tests seem not to favour LwMDs based on their conditions and learning abilities. Most of the special schools have failed to address educational needs of LwMDs.

### **5.4 Recommendations**

For the improvement of enrolment of LwMDs as well as enhancement of knowledge in the field of policy provision with regard to SNE, the study provides the following recommendations:

#### **5.4.1 Recommendations for Policy Improvement**

Given that referral and consequent enrolment of LwMDs basically relies on assessment reports, the NSNE policy should be structured to ensure that EARC officers conduct thorough screening to minimize cases of wrongly compiled reports. There is also need to develop a comprehensive referral mechanism for assessment and enrolment. Assessment should also be easy to implement and continuous with follow up visits by assessors. Finally, there is a need to include persons with disabilities as assessors.

The study has revealed that parents are ignorant of provisions in the NSNE policy. This is partly due to lack of clear communication of guidelines regarding role of parents in the education of LwMDs, cultural beliefs and high costs of assistive devices used by LwMDs. This study therefore recommends that the state should partner with the private sector and well wishers to ensure that LwMDs who have been assessed and recommended for enrolment are actually enrolled in the schools to which they are referred to.

With regard to service provision to LwMDs, the study revealed that teachers are competent and qualified to impart adequate cognitive and social skills to LwMDs. However, there is minimal motivation to support their effort. Parents, on the other hand, consider the special schools as ill prepared to meet all the educational needs of their disabled children. They are also worried about delays in admission after assessment. This study therefore recommends that teachers handling LwMDs should be well motivated through improved work environment, pupil teacher ratio, remuneration, and terms and conditions of work.

Finally, with regard to physical and curriculum adaptation, the study found that content of curriculum, procurement of assistive devices, and inability of parents to purchase requisite assistive devices has hampered enrolment of LwMDs. This study therefore recommends that the content curriculum for LwMDs should be adopted in consideration of the cognitive abilities of the learners. In addition, the government and well wishers should support procurement of assistive devices for LwMDs.

#### **5.4.2 Recommendations for further Research**

The study has found out that enrolment and referral for LwMDs decisions are made based on the assessment reports. On the other hand, the level of enrolment of LwMDs in regions like Kisumu County is still low. This study therefore recommends that a study be done on the Implications of Special Needs Education Policy Provision for Assessment on Enrolment of Learners with Multiple Disabilities in Special Schools in Kisumu County.

The study additionally revealed that parents do not actively participate in the enrolment of their children who have multiple disabilities due to cultural beliefs and high cost associated with enrolment in special schools. At the same time, there is limited information with regard to policy provision on public private partnership in education for LwMDs. It is therefore recommended that a study be done on the Implications of Special Needs Education Policy Provision for Public-Private Partnership on Enrolment of LwMDs in Special schools in

Kisumu County. The study also revealed that teachers handling LwMDs are competent and qualified to impart adequate cognitive and social skills to these learners although there is minimal motivation to support their effort. It is therefore recommended that a study be done on the Implications of Special Needs Education Policy Provision for Motivation of Teachers on Enrolment of Learners with Multiple Disabilities in Kisumu County.

Finally the study found that content of curriculum, procurement of assistive devices, and inability of parents to purchase requisite assistive devices has hampered enrolment of LwMDs. It is therefore recommended that a study be carried out on the Implications of Special Needs Education Policy Provision for Public Private Partnership in the Procurement of Assistive Devices on the Adopted Curriculum for LwMDs in Kisumu County.

## REFERENCES

- ACPF (2014). *The African Report on Children with Disabilities: Promising starts and persisting challenges*. Addis Ababa. The African Child Policy Forum (ACPF).
- African Network for the Prevention and Protection Against Child Abuse and Neglect (ANPPCAN) (2005). *Review of the Status of Provision of Education to All Children in Kenya*.
- Aghan, D. (2007). Media Coverage of Gender and Disability in Kenya: A Situation Analysis." Study Report Submitted to Handicap International.
- Akakandelwa, A. & Musenje, J. (2011). Provision of learning and teaching materials for pupils with Visual Impairment. *The British journal of Visual impairment*. 30(1) 42-49.
- Awori, B.B. (2010). *Relationship between Self-Esteem and Academic Achievement of Girls with Hearing Impairments in Secondary Schools for the Deaf in Kenya*. Unpublished Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Special Education of Kenyatta University.
- Carlberg, D. & Kavale, K. (2004). The efficacy of special versus regular class placement for exceptional children. A meta-analysis. *Journal of Special Education*, 4 (12), 28 – 39.
- Communications Commission of Kenya Annual Report (2007-08). [http://www.cck.go.ke/annual\\_reports/CCK\\_Annual\\_Report07-08.pdf](http://www.cck.go.ke/annual_reports/CCK_Annual_Report07-08.pdf)
- Constitution Kenya Review Commission (2003). *Report of the Constitution Kenya Review Commission: The Draft Bill to Amend the Constitution (Vol.2)*, Nairobi.
- Cooper, P. and Jacobs, B. (2010). *International Review of the Literature of Evidence in the Education of Children with Emotional Disturbance/Behavioural Difficulties*. Trim: NCSE.
- Decent Work KENYA 2007-2011 ILO's Country Programme for the Republic of Kenya August 2007.
- Desforges, M. and Lindsay, G (2010). *Procedures Used to Diagnose a Disability and to Assess Special Educational Needs: An International Review*. Trim: NCSE.

- EARS (2015), *Assessment Report for Children with Disability In Kisumu County*. Kisumu, Kenya.
- Efua E. M. (2014). *Accessibility to inclusive education for children with disabilities: A case of two selected areas in Ghana*. Dissertation (unpublished) submitted to University of Siegen, Germany.
- Erlendsdóttir, G. (2010). *Effects of Parental Involvement in Education: A Case Study in Namibia*. Unpublished thesis submitted to University of Iceland.
- European Commission (2013). Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion Support for children with special educational needs, *Commission Press Release*. As of April 2013.
- Farooq, M.S. (2012). Problems faced by students with special needs in ordinary Pakistani schools. *Journal of Quality and Technology Management VIII*, (I) 13 – 27.
- Finegan, Edward & Niko Besnier (1989). *Language: It's Structure and Use*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Gargiulo, M. R. (2006). *Special education in contemporary society. (2nd Ed)*. Belmont. CA94002-3098. USA.
- Government of Kenya Press Statement by the Minister for Education, Science and Technology, on the Free Primary Education. *Daily Nation*, Wednesday, June 23, 2004.
- Hayes, M. T. (2006). *Incrementalism and public policy*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Hayes, D.N. (2014). *Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Audiology in the Graduate School of the Ohio State University*. Graduate Program in Audiology. The Ohio State University.
- Hitge, G. and Van Dijk, E. (2012). *Incremental approach to public transport system improvements*. Abstracts of the 31st Southern African Transport Conference (SATC 2012) 9-12 July 2012 Proceedings Pretoria, South Africa.

- Hornby, G. (2012). Inclusive Education for Children with Special Educational Needs: A Critique of Policy and Practice in New Zealand. *Journal of International and Comparative Education*, 1, (1) 52 – 60.
- Hornby, G and Lafaele, R. (2012). Barriers to parental involvement in education: an explanatory model. *Educational Review*63 (1), 37–5212gETCGOa09adErar
- Humphrey-Taylor, H. (2015). Barriers to parental involvement in their children’s Education *Journal of Initial Teacher Inquiry*, 1 68 – 70.
- Hyden, Goran (1996). "Combining Civic Peace and Civic Freedom: The Role of the Electoral Commission," in Kibwana, K. et al, (eds.), *In SEARSh of Freedom and Prosperity: Constitutional Reform in East Africa*. Nairobi. Claripress, pp. 16-24.
- Kamberelis, G. and Dimitriadis, G. (2011). *Focus group: contingent articulation of pedagogy, politics and inquiry*. In Denzin and Lincoln (Eds). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4 ed;PP. 545-561). Thousand oaks, California; SAGE publications.
- Kenya Institute of Special Education (KISE, 2014). *List of Special Schools in Kenya*. Ministry of Education. Government Press, Nairobi.
- Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS, 2016). *Kenya National Household and Domestic Assessment Report*. Government Printer, Nairobi.
- Kenya National Survey for Persons with Disabilities Preliminary Report (2008), *National Coordinating Agency and Development (NCAPD) and Kenya National Bureau of Statistics*. Government Printer. Nairobi.
- Kibua, T.N. & Oyugi, L.N. (2007). Influencing development policies through research: The Kenyan experience. In Ayuk, E. T. & Marouani, M. A. (Eds). (2007). *Policy paradox in Africa: Strengthening links between economic research and policymaking* (pp. 239 - 261). Ottawa, Canada: IDRC Books. Retrieved from <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/asi/Doc?id=10187155>.
- Kimu, A.M. (2012). *Parent involvement in public primary schools in Kenya*. Submitted (unpublished PhD) to the University of South Africa.
- Kingdon, J. (1984). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Boston: Little Brown.

- Kipkosgei, K.J. (2013). *Factors Influencing Enrolment Of Learners With Disabilities In An Inclusive Education In Primary Schools In Nandi South District Kenya*. Unpublished Research Project Submitted for the Award of the Degree of Master of Education in Educational Planning, University of Nairobi.
- Kisumu Youth Football Association (2014). *Community Led Action For Child Rights And Welfare*. Kisumu: [www.kisumuyouthfa.org](http://www.kisumuyouthfa.org).
- Kombo, D.K. & Tromp, D.L.A. (2006). *Proposal and thesis Writing. An Introduction*. Paulines Publications Africa. Nairobi.
- Kothari, C.R. (2007). *Research Methodology: Methods and techniques*. New Delhi: New age international publishers.
- Laibuta, L. I. (2007). "Reviewing the Kenya Disability Act 2003." Paper presented at workshop on "Disability Rights in Kenya: Networks, Practices, and Resources," organized by Twaweza Communications, Lenana House Conference Center, Nairobi.
- Masakhwe, P.W. (2008, August 10). Opinion Article in the *Sunday Nation*
- Mbeke, Peter O. & Tom Mshindi (2008). *Kenya Media Sector Analysis Report*, November 2008.
- McLoughlin, J. & Lewis, R. (2005). *Assessing students with special needs, (6th ed)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Mohsin, M.N., Khan, T.M., Doger, A.H. and Awan, A.S. (2011). Role of Parents in Training of Children with Intellectual Disability. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 1 (9), 78 – 88.
- Mosia, P.A. (2014). Threats to inclusive education in Lesotho: An overview of policy and implementation challenges, *Africa Education Review*, 11(3), 292-310, DOI: 10.1080/18146627.2014.934989.
- Mugenda, M.O. and Mugenda, G.A (2003): *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Acts University Press, Nairobi.
- Muiti, M.J. (2010). *Hindrances to Effective Learning of Pupils with Hearing Impairment in Meru North District-Kenya*. Submitted Thesis (unpublished) to Kenyatta University.

- Musembi, K.D. (2014). *School factors affecting head teachers' provision of special needs education in public primary schools Kangundo Sub-County, Kenya*. Submitted project (unpublished) to the University of Nairobi.
- Murphy, J.L., Hatton, D., & Erickson, K.A. (2009). Exploring the Early Literacy Practices of Teachers of Infants, Toddlers, and Preschoolers with Visual Impairments. *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness*. 102 (3), 133-146.
- Mute, L. (2007). "Law and Disability." Paper presented at workshop on *Disability Rights in Kenya: Networks, Practices, and Resources*, organized by Twaweza Communications, Lenana House Conference Center, Nairobi.
- Mute, M.L and S. Wanjala (eds.) (2002). *When the Constitution Begins to Flower: Paradigms for the Constitutional Change in Kenya*, Vol. 1. Nairobi: Claripress.
- Mwiti, L.K.R. and Mburugu, B. (2014). An Assessment of Public Primary School Teachers' Attitude towards Inclusion of Children with Hearing Impairment in Central Region of Kenya. *International Journal of Education and Research* 2 (3) 1 – 10.
- Mwaijande, T. V. (2014). *Access to education and Assistive devices for children with physical disabilities in Tanzania*. Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences. Norway.
- Myres, M.D (2009). *Qualitative research in business and management*. London. Sage.
- National Council for Special Education (NCSE, 2013). *Supporting Students with Special Educational Needs in Schools*. NCSE Policy Advice Paper No. 4. www.ncse.ie.
- Ncube, C. A. and Hlatywayo, L. (2014). The Provision of Special Education in Zimbabwe: Realities, Issues and Challenges. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 19 (8) 72-77.
- Ngongi, A.M. (2013). *Food insecurity and coping strategies of farm households in Kahama district, Tanzania*. Unpublished dissertation submitted to Sokoine University of Agriculture. Morogoro, Tanzania.
- Niparko, J. K. (2000). *Assessment of implant Philadelphia*. USA: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins.

- Njoka, J.N., & Syallo, C. (2013). Special needs education: A review of legal and policy basis and their implications in Kenya. *Kenya Journal of Educational Planning, Economics & Management* 6 (1) 1 -7.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nyakundi, H.K. (2015). Factors influencing the placement of learners with hearing impairment in learning institutions in Kajiado North Sub-County, Kajiado County, Kenya. *International Journal of Education and Research* 3 (4) 210 – 221.
- Nyangito, H. (2002). Post-Doha African Challenges in the Sanitary and Phytosanitary and Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights Agreement. KIPPRA *Occasional Paper No. 4 November 2002*.
- Odhiambo M. et al (eds.) (2005). *Informing a Constitutional Moment: Essays on Constitution Reform in Kenya*. Nairobi: Centre for Law and ResEARSh International.
- Oluremi, F.D & Olubukola, O. O. (2013). Impact of Facilities on Academic Performance of Students with Special Needs in Mainstreamed Public Schools.
- Omede, A. A. (2015). Assessment of Special Education Service Delivery: A Global Perspective. *Global journal of human-social science: G. linguistics & education* 15 (5) 15 - 22
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2007). Sampling designs in qualitative research: Making the sampling process more public. *The Qualitative Report*, 12 (2) 238-254.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2005). *Education Trends in Perspective: Analysis of the World Education Indicators*. Montreal: UNESCO.
- Oso,W.Y, and Onen, D (2011), *General Guide to Writing Research Proposal and Report: A Handbook for Beginning Researchers*, 2nd ed. Makerere University, Kampala.
- O'Toole, L. J. (2000). Research on policy implementation: Assessment and prospects. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2), 263–288.
- Ottoson, J. M., & Green, L. W. (1987). Reconciling concept and context: Theory of implementation. *Health Education and Promotion*, 2, 353–382.

- Oyugi, W.O et al (eds.) (2003). *The Politics of TRANSITION in Kenya, from KANU to NARC*, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, University of Nairobi and Heinrich Boll Foundation, Nairobi.
- Persons with Disability Act (2003). *Kenya Gazetteer Supplement No. 111 (Acts No. 15)*. Nairobi 9<sup>th</sup> January 2004.
- Republic of Kenya (2009). *The National Special Needs Education Policy Framework*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya (2010). *The Kenya Constitution*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya. (1965). *Sessional paper No 10 of 1965 On African Socialism and its Application to Planning in Kenya*. Nairobi: Government Printers.
- Roger, P. & George, A. G. (2006). *Assessment in special education a practical approach*. 2nd Ed. USA: New York. Pearson.
- Ruskus, J. & Gerulaitis, D. (2010). Parental Involvement in Individual Education Planning for Students with Mental Disabilities: A Lithuanian Experience. *Illinois Child Welfare*, 5 (1), 15 – 32.
- Salamon, L. M. (2002). The new governance and the tools of public action: An introduction. In L. M. Salamon (Ed.), *The tools of government: A guide to the new governance*(pp. 1–47). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Safder, M., Akhtar, M.M.S., Fatima, G., and Malik, M. (2012). Problems Faced by Students with Hearing Impairment in Inclusive Education at the University Level. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education* 6 (2)129 -136.
- Schur, L., and Adya, M. (2015). *Sidelined or Mainstreamed? Political Participation and Attitudes of People with Disabilities in the United States*.
- Sen, Amartya (2000). *Development As Freedom*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. Society for International Development (2006). *Readings on Inequality in Kenya: Sectoral Dynamics and Perspectives*, Vol. 1. Society for International Development (SID).

- Sihanya, B. (ed) (2008) *The Impact of IMF policies on Education, Health and Women's Rights in Kenya*, Action Aid Kenya, Nairobi.
- Sunardi, Yusuf, M., Gunarhadi, Priyono, and Yeager, J. L. (2011). The Implementation of Inclusive Education for Students with Special Needs in Indonesia. *Excellence in Higher Education*, 2, (1), 1-10.
- Steadman Group Report for Kenya Advertising ReasEARSh Foundation, 2008.
- Talbott, E., Fleming, J., Karabatsos, G. and Dobria, L. (2011). Making Sense of Minority Student Identification in Special Education: School Context Matters. *International Journal of Special Education* 26 (3) 150 – 170.
- The United Nations and Kenya Fifty Years of Partnership, (2006). Office of the United Nations Resident Coordinator in Kenya Nations Office, Nairobi.
- Thussu, D. K, and Des F. (2003). *War and the Media: Reporting Conflict 24/7*. New Delhi: Vistaar.
- Tshabalala, T. (2013). Effectiveness of Inclusive Education Provision (Integrated Units) in all Schools in Zimbabwe Schools. *Greener Journal of Educational Research*,3 (9), 424-431.
- UNESCO (2015).*The Right to Education for Persons with Disabilities*. Overview of the Measures Supporting the Right to Education for Persons with Disabilities reported on by Member States. Paris, France.
- UN Treaty Collection,(2012). *Parties to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: List of parties*. United Nations. 2012-03-21. Retrieved 2012-03-21.
- Wanjiru, T.N. (2014). *Parental attitudes towards children with hearing impairment and academic performance: A case of Kambui School for the Deaf, Githunguri District, Kiambu County, Kenya*. Unpublished thesis submitted to Kenyatta University.
- Wong, M.E., Poon, K.K., Sarinajit, K. and Zi J. N. (2013). Parental perspectives and challenges in inclusive education in Singapore. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 35(1), 85-97.
- World Health Organisation (2011). *World Report on Disability*. Malta: WHO

- Yash, G. (2002). *Reviewing the Constitution: A Guide to the Kenya Constitution*. The Constitution of Kenya Review Commission, Nairobi.
- Yusuf, S.M., Priyono, G., and Yeagerb, J.L., (2011). The Implementation of Inclusive Education for Students with Special Needs in Indonesia. *Excellence in Higher Education* 2 (1) 1-10.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX 1: WORK PLAN

<b>MONTH</b>	<b>ACTIVITY</b>
Aug- Sep	Research topic Identification and statement.
Oct-Dec-	Writing chapter one and two of the proposal
Jan- Feb	Writing chapter three of the proposal and submitting first draft corrections.
Feb-Mar	Second Draft of the proposal and corrections
March	Presenting at departmental level
April	Correction and presentations at faculty level
May	Corrections and presentations at SGS level.
June	Pilot study and actual study.
July	Data analysis and writing the first thesis draft
August	Correction of thesis for examination.
October	Submission and defence of thesis.

## APPENDIX 2: RESEARCH BUDGET

S/N	SN. ACTIVITY/ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT/COST IN SHS	TOTAL COST IN SHS	
1	Travelling allowance	15 days	2000	30000	
2	Subsistence: lunch & breakfast	15 days	500 per day	7500	
	Supper & accommodation	15 days	1000 per day	15000	
	<b>Sub total</b>			<b>52500</b>	
3	Materials: Field not book	1	1000	1000	
	Flash disk	1	400	400	
	Foolscaps	2 reams	400	400	
	Pens	5	20	100	
	<b>Sub total</b>			<b>1900</b>	
4	Production: Typing & printing				
	Proposal	50 pages	30 per page	1500	
	Thesis	150 pages	30 per page	4500	
	Photocopying: Proposal	50 pages-20 copies	30 per page	3000	
	Binding proposal	150 pages -20 copies	30 per page	9000	
	Thesis	20 copies			
	Sub total	10 copies	30 per copy	500	
		10 copies	100 per copy	10000	
				28500	
5	contingencies(10% of the total cost				
			82900	8290	
	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>			<b>91,190</b>	

### APPENDIX 3: HEAD TEACHERS AND TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Respondent, my name is Simon Peter Otieno Reg. No. MA/DS/00133/2014 and I am a student at Maseno University School of Development and Strategic Studies. I am conducting a study on “**Implications of Special Needs Education Policy on Enrolment of Learners with Multiple Disabilities in Special Schools in Kisumu County, Kenya.**” as part of fulfillment for the requirements of a Masters degree in Research and Public Policy. You have been identified as an informant in this study since you are a stakeholder. The information you give is purely for academic purposes and will not be used for any other purpose.

I agree to take part in this study having understood the information above

**Signature** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Instructions**

Please place a tick (√) in the appropriate box and where an explanation is required, use the space provided.

#### **SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Please tick where applicable

1. School .....
2. Sub county .....
3. Type of School .....
4. Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ]
5. Number of years at school 1-2 [ ] 3-5 [ ] Above 5 [ ] Level of education .....

#### **SECTION B: IMPLICATIONS OF ASSESSMENT ON THE ENROLMENT OF**

##### **LwMDs**

The primary purpose of assessment is to ensure early identification, screening, intervention and placement of learners with special needs and disabilities in schools. Please, could you respond to the following statements related to the role played by the assessment process in regard to enrolment of LwMDs as: **1=STRONGLY Disagree (SD); 2=DISAGREE (D); 3=Un Decided (UD); 4=Agree (A); 5=Strongly Agree (SA).**

No	Item	SD	D	UD	A	SA
10.	It enhances early identification of LwMDs					
11.	It enables adequate screening of LwMDs					
12.	It identifies functional levels of LwMDs					
13.	It reveals educational needs of LwMDs					
14.	It enables placement of all LwMDs					
15.	Assessment enables amelioration of problems faced by LwMDs					
16.	It adequately guides pre-referral of LwMDs					
17.	Parents/guardians of LwMDs are often involved in assessment process					
18.	Has helped to develop SNE professionals cope up with emerging trends					

9. Kindly state any other influence that assessment has had in regard to enrolment of LwMDs in Kisumu County

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

**SECTION C:ROLE OF POLICY ON PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT DURING ADMISSION**

Ensuring that LwMDs are enrolled successfully into the education institutions is also the responsibility of parents, among other key stakeholders. Below are statements relating to the role of parents on enrolment of LwMDs. Kindly respond to the following by stating the extent to which they affect enrolment of LwMDs as:

1- To a very small extent; 2- To small extent; 3- Neither small nor large extent; 4- Large extent 5- Very large extent

No	Item	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Most parents take their children for assessment and abide by intervention measures.					
11.	Most parents are willing to pay school levies for LwMDs					
12.	Most parents often buy assistive devices for LwMDs					
13.	Few parents allow disabled children to be in schools away from home					
14.	Educated mothers prefer participating in assessment processes					
15.	All parents often participate in assessment processes (to second slot)					
16.	Most educated parents hardly consent to participating in assessment					
17.	Results of assessment procedures are hardly read by parents					
18.	Few parents do encourage their disabled children to yearn for better grades					

9. Could you indicate any other parental roles that ensure enrolment of LwMDs in special schools?

.....  
 .....

**SECTION D: ROLE OF POLICY ON SERVICE PROVISION TO LWMDs**

Serving educational needs of LwMDs is the key motive behind the formulation of NSENP in 2009. Below are statements which relate to service provision by teachers and other educators to LwMDs. Please, could you respond to them by stating the level of your agreement or disagreement as: 1=STRONGLY Disagree (SD); 2=DISAGREE (D); 3=Un Decided (UD); 4=Agree (A); 5=Strongly Agree (SA).

No	Item	SD	D	UD	A	SA
9.	All head teachers and teachers are proper skills in serving LwMDs					
10.	Teachers are adequately motivated to provide services to LwMDs					
11.	Teachers are aware of curriculum requirements for LwMDs					
12.	There is proper in-service training for teachers who handle LwMDs					
13.	Performance evaluation of teachers is based upon NSNE policy					
14.	Promotion of teachers for LwMDs is based on their services to LwMDs					
15.	NSNEP guidelines are often disseminated to teachers in time					
16.	Sections in the NSNEP are discussed adequately by head teachers, teachers, EARS officers, and parents/guardians					

**SECTION E: ROLE OF POLICY ON PHYSICAL AND CURRICULUM ADAPTATION TO LWMDs**

The National Special Education Policy spells out the specific physical resources and curriculum for adaptation so as to suit requirements of SNE learners. Please, could you respond to the following statements by stating the level of your agreement or disagreement as: **1=STRONGLY Disagree (SD); 2=DISAGREE (D); 3=Un Decided (UD); 4=Agree (A); 5=Strongly Agree (SA).**

No	Item	SD	D	UD	A	SA
1.	Stair cases have been replaced by ramps					
2.	Toilets, etc, have been constructed to suit special needs of LwMDs					
3.	Assistive devices have been appropriately procured					
4.	Teachers have been trained to use assistive devices appropriately					
5.	Teachers monitors the usability of the adapted infrastructure					
6.	Teachers conform to the best practices when using assistive devices.					
7.	Period of lessons have been designed to suit LwMDs					
8.	Evaluation tests have been designed to suit LwMDs					
9.	Specific syllabus has been designed to suit LwMDs					
10.	There are special national examinations for LwMDs					

#### **APPENDIX 4: KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE**

I would like to ask you a few questions pertaining to enrolment of LwMDs. Your response will be only be used for the purpose of this research. Your identity and that of the pupils, schools and teachers will be kept confidential. Please provide your opinion n regard to the following areas:

1. Role of assesment in early identification of LwMDs
2. Screening of LwMDs
3. Educational needs of LwMDs
4. Placement of all LwMDs
5. Amelioration of problems faced by LwMDs
6. Capacity of SNE professionals
7. Pre-referral of LwMDs
8. Roles of various stakeholders in the assessment process such as:

## APPENDIX 5: LESSON OBSERVATION SCHEDULE (LOS)

School.....

Class.....

Item	Adequate	Inadequate	None	Remark
<b>(a) Teaching methods.</b>				
(i) Task analysis.				
(ii) Direct instruction.				
(iii) Peer tutoring.				
(iv) IEP strategy/				
(v) Differentiated instructional methods				
(vi) Psychotherapeutic				
<b>(b) Resources</b>				
(i) Text books.				
(ii) Charts.				
(iii) Models.				
(iv) Flash cards				
(v) Black board.				
(vi) Diagrams.				
(vii) Audio Visual.				
(viii) Realia.				
<b>(c) Interaction</b>				
(i) Sitting arrangement.				
(ii) Seating arrangement.				
(iii) Learners participation.				
(iv) Class size.				
(v) Verbal reinforcement				
(vi) Tangible reinforcement.				
<b>(d) Teachers personality</b>				
(i) Content mastery.				
(ii) Content adaptation.				
(iii) Attention to learners.				
(iv) Teachers confidence.				
<b>(e) Student learning skills.</b>				
(i) Classroom participation.				
(ii) Completion of task.				
(iii) Answering questions.				
(iv) Liking of subjects.				

## **APPENDIX 6: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS GUIDE**

This guide will aid the researcher to conduct group discussions with three groups of Parents/Guardians of LwMDs: The researcher intends to use the information gathered from these interviews solely for her academic work.

### **Section I: NSNEP and Enrolment of LwMDs**

In regard to the contribution of NSNEP towards enrolment of LwMDs, please give your understanding on the following:

- i. Role played by NSNEP in enhancing assessment
- ii. How NSNEP enhances placement of LwMDs
- iii. Role of NSNEP in ensuring retention of LwMDs
- iv. Contribution of NSNEP on the provision of adequate resources for LwMDs

### **Section II: Teacher's Knowledge and understanding of NSNEP**

Considering teachers' knowledge and understanding of NSNEP, provide your understanding concerning the following areas:

- i. Skills of teachers in handling LwMDs in special schools
- ii. Teachers – pupils ratio in special schools
- iii. Recruitment of SNE teachers
- iv. Motivation of SNE teachers

### **Section III: Challenges of the implimentation of NSNEP by LwMDs in special schools**

Implementation of NSNEP has faced numerous challenges. What is your comment concerning the following?

- i. Stereotyping of LwMDs by culture and norms
- ii. Unresponsive school administrations
- iii. Lack of adequate infrastructure in special schools
- iv. Inadequate assistive devices
- v. Lack of skills in using assistive devices for instructions by teachers

## APPENDIX 7: LEARNERS' CONCENT FORM

### LEARNERS CONSENT FORM

Note: *This Form can be signed by the CARE GIVER ON BEHALF OF THE LEARNER*

I \_\_\_\_\_, of ID No \_\_\_\_\_ accept to participate in a study on “**National Special Needs Education Policy and its Implications on Enrolment of Learners with Multiple Disabilities in Special Schools in Kisumu County, Kenya.**” I do agree to have the learner under my care \_\_\_\_\_ (*name and relationship*) to participate in the above mentioned study.

I understand that the study is designed to strengthen the educational services offered to learners with multiple disabilities.

I therefore agree to participate in and fully support the research.

I also allow the researcher to use verbatim statement(s) and photographs gathered during the study in the final draft of the research.

#### PARENT/CAREGIVER DETAILS:

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

ID No \_\_\_\_\_

Relation to Learner \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Phone No (where available) \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX 8: MAP OF STUDY AREA

