

Teachers Attitude on Inclusive Education and Learners with Disabilities in Kisumu County, Kenya

Willis Acholla Ogadho¹, Jack Ajowi², Ruth Otienoh³

Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology,
Bondo, KENYA.

¹ waogadho@yahoo.com, ² jackajowi@yahoo.com, ³ rombonya@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Attitudinal disposition of teachers towards inclusive education in primary schools has drawn diverse reactions from educationist and parents alike. Positive attitude by teachers enhances success of inclusion while negative attitude is an impediment. Teachers play a pivotal role in curriculum implementation hence the significance of their attitude. The study was carried out in Kisumu County in Western Kenya to explore the influence of teacher's attitude towards inclusion and learners with disabilities in inclusive classrooms. Using descriptive survey design, it targeted 25 schools practicing inclusive education, 270 teachers including head teachers and 14 education managers. Both purposive and saturated sampling techniques were used to sample the units of analysis. The study findings indicated that teachers teaching in inclusive classrooms express negative attitude towards inclusion and children with disabilities and this impacts adversely on curriculum implementation. The study recommended a paradigm shift in teacher's attitude towards inclusion by reviewing the pre service curriculum to equip them with the right knowledge and skills.

Keywords: Teachers Attitude, Inclusive Education, Learners with Disabilities

INTRODUCTION

An attitude is a tendency to react positively or negatively towards a situation or idea. Teacher's attitude towards inclusion and learners with disabilities is a predictor for success in including disabled learners in the regular classroom (Turnbull & Turnbull, 2007). And as observed by Berry (2008), before any actual implementation of strategies for those with special needs are used in the classroom it is important to determine the attitude of curriculum implementers who are the teachers. One of the primary conditions for successful inclusion of students with disabilities in the regular classroom is a change from negative to positive attitudes of regular schoolteachers towards learners with special needs and their inclusion in the regular classroom (Learner, 2006). Inclusion is a frame of mind as much as a matter of practice, thus attitudinal barriers may be the most difficult to overcome (Kirk, Coleman & Hallaghan, 2004). Segal and Kemp (2001) stated that, attitudinal blocks may take the form of misconceptions, stereotypes, or labeling. If teachers have little exposure to people with disabilities, fear of the unknown may cause them to resist inclusive services. Furthermore, staff may not understand the concept of inclusion and what it represents in terms of people's rights and opportunities.

Teachers' attitudes play a pivotal role in ensuring the success of inclusive education (IE) because successful inclusion depends on developing and sustaining positive attitudes. (D'Alonzo, Giordano., Vanleeuwen, 2007). Myles and Simpson (2005) also pointed out that in order for inclusion to work in practice, teachers and administrators in regular schools must accept its philosophy and demands. Teachers have varying attitudes towards inclusion, their responses being shaped by a range of variables such as their success in implementing inclusion, student characteristics, training and levels of support (Gordano & Ncube, 2007).

Positive attitude on inclusion encourage learners to strive, whereas negative attitudes limit children to meet their potential ability (Dukmak, 2013). Some studies conducted in the USA on the attitude of teachers towards learners with disabilities in inclusive classrooms revealed that teachers generally express positive attitude towards inclusion and mainstreaming of general education settings (Brandon & Ncube, 2006). This is attributed to the adequate level of their training, good policies that are enacted and implemented and also availability of resources together with the strong support given by parents and the authorities. In their study of Canadian teachers and principals beliefs about challenges of inclusive education, Stanovich and Jordan (2001) found two predictions of effective teaching behavior in inclusive classrooms. The strongest one was the principal's attitudes towards heterogeneous classroom and the major predictor was an interventionist school norm, a measure derived from a scale ranging from the idea that problems exists within students.

In Kenya , studies by various researchers for instance the National Council of Persons with Disabilities (2001), UNESCO (2008), Oriedo (2003) United Disabled Persons of Kenya (UDPK), (2008) and Nkinge (2009) revealed that teachers attitude towards inclusion and learners with disabilities is negative. UDPK (2003) emphasized that any positive attitude that may be expressed is false. Research has also shown that there is correlation between attitudes of teachers to the mainstreaming of learners with special needs and the support they receive from the management, as well as other more technical variables. These variables include having more resources, smaller classes, more time, available to design special teaching materials (Ndurumo, 2001). Since it is essential that educators have a positive attitude towards inclusion, Chahbara, Srivastava and srivastava (2010) suggests that pre-service programs should emphasize and enhance teacher's thoughts and perception towards inclusion.

Polyzopoulou (2014) also observed that as inclusion requires the collaboration between general and special education, researchers must analyze the phenomenon of classroom teachers and building administrators' attitude about including students with disabilities in the general education setting. He noted that pre service teachers in general have more negative attitude towards persons with disabilities. Although teachers, especially those who are adequately prepared and access resources and have specialist support have been found to express positive attitude towards inclusion and mainstreaming, most teachers who are not trained in special needs education, often show negative attitude.

Nkinge (2009) and Motitswe (2014) attribute the declining rate of enrolment of learners with disabilities in regular schools to teachers' negative attitude towards inclusion. The belief was, and is that to receive equal access to public education; children with disabilities must be educated in the same schools as children without disabilities. Likewise, the rationale for inclusion is similar. For their education to be equal, students with special needs need to be in the same classrooms as their typically developing peers.

The teachers understanding about inclusion suggest that they do not regard students with disabilities, particularly those with sensory impairments as belonging in regular classes and would rather prefer them being educated in existing special schools (Ahar, 2009). However, as suggested by Hastings and Oakford (2003), there are multiple factors that can affect the teacher's attitude towards inclusion. Such factors include child, teacher and school variables. The manner in which the general education classroom teacher responds to the student with disabilities may be a far more important variable in ultimately determining the success of inclusion. Studies by UNESCO (2008), UNICEF, (2010) showed that the teacher's attitude towards students with disabilities could set the tone for the entire classroom. The teachers' attitude not only set the tone for the relationship between teachers and students with

disabilities but they also influence the successful implementation of the curriculum (Boling, 2007). Anastasiou, and Kauffman (2011) observed that in reality teachers teaching in inclusive classroom feel discouraged, dejected and uncomfortable because of either the disruptive nature of learners with disabilities or their inability to cope with the syllabus.

In Kisumu County, there is no known research that has been done to investigate the attitude of teachers towards inclusive education, hence the study. The assumption has been that head teachers accept inclusion to attract funding. This money may be difficult to account for since majority of students with learning disabilities are difficult to identify while those with physical disabilities are encouraged to join special institutions. It is therefore prudent that by addressing teachers' attitude as a problem towards inclusion, the problems experienced by teachers due to attitudinal disposition would probably be lessened. It is also envisioned that recommendations of this research might be used to prepare teachers to accept inclusion.

AREA OF THE STUDY

The study was done in Kenya and covered Kisumu County, which comprises of Kisumu East, Kisumu West, Seme, Muhoroni, MiwaniNyando and Nyakach Sub counties. Kisumu county covers a total area of 32,112 Km². with a total population of 112,000 people. There are 667 public primary schools out of which 25 practices inclusive education. It is in the public domain that students with disabilities in Kisumu County schools face many problems in learning probably because of challenges encountered by teachers in their classroom teaching. The study therefore sought to explore the perceived challenges and how they affect the implementation of curriculum in inclusive classroom.

METHODOLOGY

Study Population

The study targeted 25 primary schools practicing inclusive education, 25 head teachers, 250 teachers, 6 Education Assessment and Resource Centre Coordinators and 8 County Quality Assurance and standards officers(CQASO) They were targeted as participants in this study because they supervise the teachers, conducting in-service courses for the teachers and give advisory services.

Sample Size and Sampling Procedure

Table 1 shows the study population and the sample size. The sample size for the study was, 245 teachers, 20 head teachers and 6 CQASO and 4 EARCS.

Table 1. Study population and Sample size

<i>Category</i>	<i>Population (N)</i>	<i>Sample (n)</i>	<i>Percentages %</i>
Teachers	250	245	98
Head Teachers	25	20	80
CQASO	008	006	75
EARCS	6	04	67

Source: Researchers field data

The study sample was drawn using both purposive and saturated sampling to ensure fair representation of each category of the population. Purposive sampling technique was used to

sample schools because out of a total of 667 primary schools, only 25 practiced inclusive education and therefore had the desired characteristic that is learners with disabilities. The purposive sampling technique was also used to sample CQASO. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2004), a researcher who proposes to use purposive sampling must specify the criteria for choosing the particular cases. Simple random sampling technique was used to sample the teachers since it was possible that every teacher interacted with learners with disabilities. Random sampling allows each unit of the population an equal probability of inclusion in the sample without bias (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Teachers teaching in lower and those teaching in upper classes had equal chance of participating in the study.

Research Instruments

Research instruments were questionnaires, Focus Group Discussion, document analysis, interview and observation schedules.

Questionnaire

There was questionnaire for teachers, Head teachers and CQASO. Each questionnaire comprised of open-ended and closed or structured questions. Open-ended questionnaires give participants the freedom to express their opinion and possibly exploring new areas which the researcher had limited knowledge (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2008). Closed ended questions are restricted to avoid unnecessary responses (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009) since the total sample size population in this research was 657 participants. It was therefore necessary to restrict their responses to avoid answers that were not necessary. The use of questionnaire for data collection enabled the researcher to gather information from a larger number of participants within a short time (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2008). According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2009), questionnaires also enable the researcher to get responses that some participants would perhaps not feel free to give in face-to-face interviews (Kothari, 2004).

Head Teachers Questionnaire

Head teachers questionnaire addressed two areas that is, demographic information such as age, gender, experience in teaching and study objectives. The questions helped in assessing teachers' attitude towards inclusive education. The questionnaire was used to counter check the teacher's responses and illicit more information about their skills, knowledge, experience and the teachers' ability to adapt the curriculum for inclusive classrooms. Head teachers are managers and supervisors of their schools, hence the questionnaires sought to get information on the resources available and their adaptation by the teachers in inclusive classroom. See (Appendix)

Teachers Questionnaire (TQ)

Teachers in this study were pertinent participants because they are the implementers of the curriculum. The challenges they encounter while implementing the curriculum and how they mitigate the challenges influences the way they teach. They also gave information on their attitude towards inclusion and the learning barriers that impedes teaching in inclusive classroom. They responded to questions on the possible solutions to the challenges. The items consisted of both open and closed ended questions. See (Appendix c)

Interviews

Interviews are among the most challenging and rewarding form of measurement and require a personal sensitivity and adaptability as well as the ability to stay within the bounds of the designed protocol. Interviews were used at two levels: Individual interviews and FGD. Semi structured interviews were used.

Interview for County Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (CQASO)

Interview was administered to CQASO officers who supervise, conduct induction workshops and assist with curriculum interpretation and implementation to ensure quality teaching. An oral administration of a questionnaire interview provided in-depth data which was not possible to get using questionnaire (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). Interviews help to counter check the responses in the questionnaire. In addition, interviews help to explore more detailed information from the participants as it gives the researcher opportunity to probe them and to verify information in the questionnaire (Kothari, 2004). CQASO personnel as curriculum experts, teacher's supervisors and trainers were in a better position to know and understand the challenges faced by the teachers as regards to teaching in inclusive classroom. Therefore, the information they gave verified and reinforced the information given by the teachers.

The challenges the teachers encountered could be due their professional limitations and academic inadequacies. It was therefore likely that they could not answer questions that touched on these aspects with sincerity.

Interview for Educational Assessment and Resource Centre Coordinators

Interview for Educational assessment and resource Centre Coordinators addressed the study objectives and research questions to get more information on the challenges faced by teachers in the implementation of the regular school curriculum in inclusive classroom. EARCs work with teachers closely in identification, assessment and placement of children with disabilities. They also advise the teachers on how to handle such children in the classroom in terms of curriculum implementation and behavior modification. The EARCs bridge the gap between parents and the teachers. During their visits to the child's home, they gather a lot of information about the child which they use to advise the teacher to teach more effectively.

Focus Group Discussion Interview

A focus group discussion according to Lederman and Thomas (2007), is a technique involving the use of in-depth group discussion in which participants are selected because they are purposive, although not necessarily representative. The schools in this study were purposively sampled because they practice inclusive education therefore have learners with disabilities. The Participants were therefore selected on the criteria that they had something to say on the topic and that they were comfortable with the discussion (Richardson & Rabiee, 2013). Participants in the focus group in this study were selected through random sampling technique. Focus group provided information about a range of ideas and feelings regarding curriculum suitability, perception of teachers towards inclusion, influence of barriers in the classroom and attempts being done to address the challenges. It was possible that some of the ideas they brought forth probably may have not been fully captured in questionnaires.

Analysis of data generated from focus group interview begins during the data collection, by skillfully facilitating the discussion and generating rich data from the interview and complementing them with the observational notes and typing the recorded information (Smith, 2006). Familiarization with the data, which was achieved by reading the manuscripts in its entirety several times and reading the observational notes taken during the discussion. This, according to Richardson and Rubnee, (2011), enables the researcher to immerse in the details and get a sense of the interview as a whole before breaking it into parts. During this process, the major themes begin to emerge (Fade, 2004). The next stage of data analysis involved identifying a thematic framework by writing themes, ideas or concepts arising from the text and beginning to develop categories

Focus Group Discussion was guided to avoid unnecessary information or arguments and generation of irrelevant information.

Observations

The classroom observation check list helped to gather data on the number of students with disabilities per class, teaching strategies used by the teacher to teach, the ability of the teacher to modify the content, teacher pupil interaction, type of teaching and learning materials used and the classroom organization and management. The main advantage of observation method is the limitation of subjective biasness and that the information obtained under this method relates to what is currently happening (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2008). They further observed that observation method is not complicated by either the past behavior of future intentions or attitudes. This observation will be unstructured. Unstructured observation was given preference because it does not limit the researcher, it is open-minded. (Kothari, 2009)) The researcher will have the opportunity to assess the efficacy of the teacher in handling the inclusive class especially children with special needs. In this study, it gave the researcher opportunity to assess the curriculum suitability, their perception towards inclusion, the influence of barriers on learning and how teachers try to improve on these challenges they encounter

Document Analysis

Document analysis deals with the systematic examination of current records or documents as a source of data. The documents included admissions register, committee reports, minutes of inclusive education meetings and different education acts and child rights acts. Document analysis provides more information on the objectives (Nkinge, 2009).

Methods of Data Collection

The questionnaires were given out to the teachers after a brief introductory note by the head teacher. The researcher requested them to fill the questionnaires as he waited. The researcher later visited the offices of the CQASO and requested them for an interview which was conducted at the offices. EARCs were interviewed at their centers on different dates Arrangements were later made to have a discussion with focus groups, which were chosen randomly in three schools. The discussions were recorded verbatim. The sampling was representative of teachers from both lower and upper. The researcher guided the discussion to ensure that it focused on only relevant issues that touched on the objectives of the study. Important points were jotted down on a notebook for transcribing and analysis.

DATA ANALYSIS

Teacher's Attitude towards Inclusion

To determine the teacher's attitude towards inclusion, participants were asked questions about their perception towards inclusion and the responses were as in the table 2.

The results in table 2 indicates that 74(28.6%) of the respondents agree that teachers feel uncomfortable teaching in an inclusive class, 67(25.7%) strongly agree and only 20(7.8%) disagree with the statement. The research finding are in concurrence with the literature review, for instance Anastasiou and Kauffman (2009) stated that in reality teachers in inclusive classroom feel discouraged, dejected and uncomfortable because of either the learners disruptive behavior or inability to cope with the syllabus. On the appropriateness of the classroom environment for inclusion, probably in terms of student numbers, resources or physical size, 85(32.9%) and 78(30.2) respectively agree and strongly agree and only 25(9.4%) and 28(11.0) strong disagree and agree respectively. The implication according to the literature review, most of the classrooms have more learners than the required number due to the free primary schooling policy (Oketch & Rolleston, 2007).

Table 2. Teacher's Attitude towards Inclusion and Learners with Disabilities

<i>Teacher's Perception towards Inclusion</i>	<i>SD f(%)</i>	<i>D f(%)</i>	<i>SWAD f(%)</i>	<i>A f(%)</i>	<i>SA f(%)</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>STD</i>
Teachers feel uncomfortable teaching in inclusive classroom	20(7.8)	56(21.6)	41(16.1)	74(28.6)	67(25.7)	2.76	1.19
Classroom environments are not appropriate for inclusion	24(9.4)	28(11.0)	42(16.5)	85(32.9)	78(30.2)	2.36	1.27
Teachers view inclusive classroom as a problem in itself	35(13.7)	40(15.7)	56(21.6)	32(12.5)	94(36.5)	2.82	1.24
The curriculum is seen as exam oriented and non-accommodative to SNE learners	33(12.9)	24(9.4)	35(13.7)	72(28.2)	92(35.7)	2.36	1.38
Inclusive education weighs down the achievement of other learners who are non-disabled	49(19.2)	36(14.1)	62(24.3)	63(24.7)	45(17.6)	2.93	1.36
Inclusion a waste of resources	41(16.1)	44(17.3)	48(18.8)	51(20.0)	71(27.8)	2.99	1.38
Teachers have negative attitude towards inclusion	32(12.5)	15(5.9)	54(21.2)	93(36.1)	62(24.3)	3.72	1.24
SNE learners behavior impedes effective teaching	58(22.7)	58(22.7)	65(25.1)	25(9.8)	50(19.6)	3.21	1.44
Classrooms are least appropriate for inclusion.	22(8.6)	59(23.1)	34(13.3)	57(22.0)	85(32.9)	3.22	1.48
Teachers are unable to handle children with different disabilities	20(7.8)	56(21.6)	67(25.9)	74(28.6)	41(16.1)	3.05	1.21
SNE learners are referred to by their conditions in school	24(9.4)	28(11.0)	42(16.5)	85(32.9)	78(30.2)	2.87	1.38
Teachers rarely appreciate the presence of learners with SNE	35(13.7)	40(15.7)	56(21.6)	94(36.5)	32(12.5)	3.19	1.28
Teachers have positive feelings towards SNE learners	92(35.7)	72(28.2)	35(13.7)	24(9.4)	33(12.9)	2.76	1.29
The workload increases with the enrolment of learners with disabilities	34(13.3)	36(14.1)	62(24.3)	45(17.6)	78(30.2)	2.03	1.25

Key: SD: Strongly Disagree, D: Disagree, SWAD: Somewhat Agree or Disagree, A: Agree, SA: Strongly Agree

And as observed by Learner (2006) the inclusive classrooms are not equipped to respond to needs of learners with special needs. The classroom environment is not appropriate for inclusive teaching was agreed by 85(32.9%) and strongly agreed by 78(30.2%). Lieberman et

al (2003) noted with a lot of concern that the inclusive classroom lacks appropriate passageways, modified washrooms, ramps into the classes, enough spaces for use of assistive devices such as wheel chairs, crutches, white cane among others. This underscores the research findings. Regarding the statement that teachers perceive the curriculum as exam oriented and non-accommodative to SNE learners, 92(35.7%) strongly agree while 32(12.5%) agree.

United Disabled Persons of Kenya (UDPK), (2010) referred to the national curriculum as saturated with examination-oriented content that suits only learners racing against time. MacLeeskey and Waldron (2001) dismissed the regular school curriculum as document that is not designed on the basis of flexibility and tends to be rigid with inappropriate content sequence for learners with disabilities.

The attitude that inclusive education weighs down the achievement of other learners and is a waste of resources is by agreed by 63(24.7%) and strongly agreed by 45(17.6%) respectively. On the attitude towards inclusive education and learners with disabilities, 93(36.1) agreed that teachers espouse a negative attitude and a further 63(24.3) strongly agree. In deed this was supported by 92(35.7%) of the respondents who strongly disagreed that teachers have positive attitudes towards learners with SNE in inclusive classrooms. Motitswe (2014) supports the research findings when he observed that the declining enrolment of learners with disabilities is due to the negative attitude shown by teachers. Chhabra, Srivastava and Ishaan (2010) also argued that many regular education teachers display anger, frustration and negative attitude towards inclusion.

Other variables such as that the workload increases with enrolment of learners with SNE and that teachers are unable to handle learners with different disabilities in the same environment, are strongly supported by 72(28.2%) of the respondents Teachers have a positive feeling towards learners with special needs as 72(28.2%) respondents agree and 92(35.7%) strongly agree.

Although the findings of the study indicates that teachers manifest a negative attitude towards learners with disabilities, as indicated in table 4.4, it is in contrast with the literature reviewed from the developed countries which strongly indicates that most teachers in regular schools express positive attitude towards learners with disabilities in inclusive classrooms (Dukmak, 2013). This could probably be because in the developed world, the resources are available, teachers are adequately trained both psychologically and intellectually to handle inclusive classes. For instance, Chhabra, Srivastava and Ishaan (2010) examined the attitude and concerns of teachers towards inclusion of students with disabilities in the general classroom in India. The study revealed that many regular teachers in India have a positive attitude towards inclusion.

A study carried out on the teacher's attitude towards learners with disabilities in inclusive schools in the United Arab Emirates by UNICEF (2003), revealed that in general, teachers showed a positive attitude towards educational inclusion. The positive attitude shown by the teachers in these Countries could probably be attributed to adequate preparation of the teachers', availability of resources and the support given by both the governments and parents among many other factors.

The positive attitude shown by teachers in this study could probably be false positive attitude because according to the findings, correlation between teacher's attitude and rate of adaptation demonstrated that teachers were not adapting the curriculum to accommodate learners with learners with disabilities as shown in table 3.

Table 3. Correlation between Rate of Adaptation and Teachers Perception

		Rate of Adaptation	Perception of Teacher
Rate of Adaptation	Pearson Correlation	1	-.423**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	257	257
Perception of Teachers	Pearson Correlation	-.423**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	257	257

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The results presented in table 4.5 shows that there is a moderate negative ($r = -.423$) significant correlation ($p < .01$) between the level of adaptation of the regular curriculum and the attitude of teachers towards learners with disabilities. This implies that teachers had a positive attitude while the rate of adaptation is low thus the teachers' attitude was false positive since the rate of adaptation of curriculum was still low in schools in Kisumu County that practices inclusive education.

An interview with EARCs showed that most teachers have a negative attitude towards learners with special needs except for those who are trained in special needs education .When an EARC was asked whether teachers appreciated learners with disabilities in their school she pointed out that;

Only teachers trained in special needs understand them but the rest see them as a burden as they say they pull the class down. They are generally low achievers. Their rate of learning is low. They take most of the teacher's time.

Educational Assessment and Resource Coordinators are specialist teachers promoted to the position of education officers in charge of assessment centers. They are charged with the responsibility of assessing pupils with disabilities, their placement and advising teachers on how to handle such children. This probably puts them in a position to give credible comments on issues affecting inclusive education. The results of the research are also in concurrence with the views expressed by Onuigbo, Liziana and Uze (2012), who stated that teachers trained in Special Education have the capacity to handle children with special educational needs in inclusive classrooms and slightly are positive. They further argued that non specialist teachers in regular schools view such learners as a problem. They believe that including learners with disabilities in the regular class could lead to lowering academic standards. Eskay, Mezieobi and Eke (2013), Ayiela (2012) were of a similar opinion when they observed that teachers pretend to be positive in order to conceal their limitations in handling learners with disabilities when in fact their attitude is grossly negative. Further interview with the County Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (CQASO) revealed that the perception of teachers towards inclusion was negative. A County Quality Assurance and Standards Officer who had 14 years work experience when asked to comment on the attitude of teachers towards inclusion pointed out that:

Some teachers view inclusion as a waste of time. They espouse a negative attitude towards inclusion. They only pretend that they embrace inclusion for some personal reasons.

According to the research findings, the positive attitude shown by some teachers is false positive because the rate of curriculum adaptation is not commensurate with their attitude. The assertion of the CQASO attests to this.

One of the consensus conclusions of the focus group discussion was that:

Ideally, teachers teach in inclusion classroom not because they like it but because of some other benefits such as promotion and remuneration. Some find themselves in inclusive classrooms because they have no choice. Learners with disabilities are better handled in special institutions, which are designated for them.

The member of the focus group who was an interested party, definitely a teacher was probably expressing the feelings of the majority of the focus group members. That is they abhor inclusion.

Another point raised by the focus group was that there is lack of preparedness on the teachers and this is a precursor to negative attitude. The groups views was that majority of teachers teaching in inclusive classrooms are not special teachers and they show indifference to SNE learners and inclusion.

The results are consistent with similar views by D' Alonzo, Giordano and Vanleeuwen (2007) who observed that teachers exhibit a negative attitude towards inclusive education in general due to lack of preparedness. Stanovitch and Jordan (2001) were more categorical when they stated that when teachers consider inclusion as a burden, time consuming and counterproductive, its success is hampered. .

The focus group is an interested party and a group with a stake in inclusion. Their views are representative of the larger population. Summing up, the group stressed that teacher education curricula (pre-service and in-service) and more generally teachers professional development, must be reviewed to prepare teachers for an inclusive system. In the words of one participant:

For inclusion to be real, the regular class teacher has to be alerted, and trained both psychologically and intellectually to change his/her attitude in order to entice students to learn and build their confidence.

The interviews with various participants brought out one common point, that the attitude of teachers in inclusive schools in Kisumu. County is negative and there is need to address this.

CONCLUSIONS

From the results, it can be concluded that teachers have a negative attitude towards inclusion. Participants in this study, majority of whom were teachers stated, they did not feel they have the knowledge and skills to in inclusive classrooms. The results also indicated that, teachers viewed children with disabilities in their classrooms as 'an impediment to syllabus coverage. Two factors in particular are important in the formation of positive attitude towards inclusion: increased knowledge and information about school inclusion and disabilities. It is therefore recommended that teachers in the general education classroom should attend professional training involving inclusion.. This could improve attitudes and deepen their understanding. A review of pre-service curriculum would be a better way of achieving this professional development.

REFERENCES

- [1] Berry, R. A. (2008). Novice teachers Conceptions fairness in inclusion classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(5), 1149-1159.
- [2] Boiling, J. (2007). *Responsible Inclusion: Key components for success*. Austin: TX Prod Ed.
- [3] Brandon, D. (2006). Botswana Agriculture teacher's attitude towards inclusion of Students with physical disabilities in mainstreaming classes. *The Negro Educational Review*, 57(3-4), 215-231.
- [4] Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2011). *Business Research Methods*. London: Oxford University press.
- [5] Boiling, E. (2007). "Yeah, But I don't want to deal with it. Changes of a teacher Candidates conception of inclusion. *Teaching Education*, 18(3), 217-231.
- [6] Chahbra, S., Srivastava, R., & Srivastava, I. (2010). Inclusive Education in Botswana: Perceptions of School Teachers. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 20(4), 219-228.
- [7] Eskay, M., & Oboegbulem., A. (2013). Designing appropriate curriculum for Special Education in Urban School in Nigeria: *Implication for Administrators*. *US- China education Review A*, 3(4), 252-258. Erlbaum.
- [8] Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2008). *Design and evaluate research in education* (Sixth Edition). New York: Mc Graw-Hill.
- [9] Liedman, J. R., & Thomas, D. S. (2007). *Curriculum Modification*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. <http://www.jiacam.org/01o1jiacam>
- [10] Motitswe, J. (2014). The role of Institute Level Support Teams on Addressing Barriers To learning and Provide Support in Schools. Are They Functional? *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 5, 259-264. **doi:105901/mjss.2014.v5n8p529**
- [11] Mugenda, O., & Mugenda, A. (2003). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi: ACTS Press.
- [12] Gallagher, J. J., Anastasiow., N. J. & Coleman, M. R. (2006). *Educating Exceptional children*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- [13] Hallaghan, D., & Kirk, S. A. (2002). *Learning Disabilities*. Historical Perspective. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- [14] UNESCO (2000). *Dakar framework for Action*. Paris: UNESCO.
- [15] _____ (2008). *US statistics in brief*. Retrieved July 14, (2013) from <http://uis.UNESCO/table viewer/ document.aspx?> Image Publishers Limited.
- [16] _____ (2009). Functions of KIE. Retrieved July 2009 from <http://www.Kkie.ac.ke/>
- [17] Kirk, S.A., Anastasiow, N., Gallagher, J.J., & Coleman, M. R. (2006). *Exceptional Children*. New York: Mafflin Company.
- [18] Kothari, C.R. (2009). Research Methodology. *Methods and Techniques*. (2nd Edition). New Delhi: New Age International (p) Limited Publishers http://www.eent.uk/rsources/bonn_i.php
- [19] _____. (2014). *Data on Regular Primary Schools Staffing and Enrollment in Kisumu County*. Kisumu: Staffing Department.
- [20] _____. (2013). Data showing number of Schools, Staffing and enrollment in Kisumu County. Retrieved at www.education.org

- [21] _____ (2013). *Introduction to Inclusive Education*. Nairobi: KIE.
- [22] Mugenda, O., & Mugenda, A. (2008). *Research Methods. Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Nairobi: Kenya CTS Press.
- [23] Ndurumo, M. (2001). Rights of persons With Disabilities. *A paper presented to the Constitution of Kenya Review Commission at the Beach hotel*. Retrieved August 10, 2013 from www.Kenyaconstitution.org/docs/09ed002.html
- [24] Ntarangwi, P. J. (2001). *Diversity in the classroom. Managing Learners with specific Learning Behaviours*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- [25] Nkinge, S. (2009). *Social cultural perception of teachers and parents on inclusive Education In four selected Special and integrated schools in Kenya*. Unpublished M.Ed thesis. Kenyatta University.
- [26] Ochieng, P.A. (2010). *Effectiveness of Inclusive Education for Visually Impaired Students in Kenya. A case of Aumbi, Machakos and Mosoriot Teachers Colleges*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Eldoret,. Moi University.
- [27] Segal, J., & Kemp, M. A. (2010). *Parenting Children with Learning Disabilities. Tips for Helping your Child*. Retrieved February 11, 2014, from www.Idoline.org/Parents
- [28] Simpson, R., Myles, B., & Simpson, J. (2005). *Inclusion of students with Disabilities In General Education Settings: structuring for successful management*. In P. Zions (Ed.), *Inclusion strategies for students learning Disabilities and Behaviour Problems*. Colombia: Delta Press.
- [29] Stanovich, & Jordan (2001). *Challenges of Inclusive education*. Boulder, CO: West View Press.
- [30] Turnbull, S. M., & Turnbull, M. C. (2001). *Exceptional Children In Today's Schools*. Englewood Cliff: NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [31] Uche I., Mezieobi. D., & Eke, C. (2014). Teacher's attitude to Curriculum Change: Implications for Inclusive Education in Nigeria. *Research on humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(11), 92-99.
- [32] Polyzopoulou, K. (2014). Greek teachers Attitudes toward the Inclusion of Students Special Educational Needs. *American Journal of educational Research*, 2(4), 208-218.
- [33] UNESCO (2011). *Policy guidelines on inclusion in Education*. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved August 22, 2014, from www.Unesdoc.org/images/0017/001778/177849e.pdf
- [34] UNESCO. (2001). *Dakar framework for action*. Paris: UNESCO.
- [35] UNESCO. (2005). *Guidelines for Inclusion: Ensuring Access to Education for All*. Paris: UNESCO.
- [36] UNESCO. (2007). *Inclusive Education*. Paris: UNESCO Workshop Printers. Retrieved August 12, 2014, from www.UNESCO.org/education/inclusion
- [37] UNESCO. (2008). *US statistics in brief*. Paris: Retrieved July 10, 2014, from www.stats.Uis.UNESCO/tableviewer/document.aspx?
- [38] IEA. (2013). The development of a care and support model in KwaZulu Nata. Retrieved September 07, 2014, from <http://www.inclusive-education-in-action.org/iea/index.php?menuid=25&reporeid=123>