Suitability of the Regular School Curriculum to learners with Disabilities in Inclusive Classrooms in Primary Schools in Kisumu County, Kenya

[*]Willis Acholla Ogadho, Jack Ajowi and Ruth Otienoh

School of Education
Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology
Bondo, Kenya

[*]*Corresponding author's email: waogadho [AT] yahoo.com*

ABSTRACT---- *This research was carried out to examine suitability of the regular school curriculum to learners with disabilities in inclusive classrooms in Kisumu County in Kenya. It has been observed that teachers teaching in inclusive classrooms encounter problems in trying to adapt the curriculum content to accommodate all learners since they respond differently. Although education systems the world over have for long provided special education and related services to students with disabilities in segregated settings, reforms in education have embraced inclusive education as a more appropriate system to educate learners with disabilities. The research used descriptive survey design which utilized more direct methods like questionnaires, interviews, observation and focus group discussion to collect data. The study population included 250 teachers in 25 schools, 25 Head teachers, 8 County Quality Assurance and standards Officers and 6 Educational Assessment and resource Coordinators. Both purposive and saturated sampling were employed to select the units of analysis. Findings of the study showed that the regular primary school curriculum presents serious challenges to teachers in the process of implementation and recommend a review of the pre- service teachers curriculum to equip them with skills and knowledge to lucidly respond to the challenges appropriately.*

Keywords--- Curriculum, adaptation, disability, inclusive.

---

1. INTRODUCTION

The development of inclusive education practices have led to worldwide discussion of how best to deliver a more equal educational opportunity for all. In line with this, the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the Dakar Declaration of Education For All-EFA (2000), Millennium Development Goals and Kenya Children's Act (2001), all state that every child is entitled to the right to education. The Salamanca statement adopted at the World Conference on Special Education Needs regarding 'Access and Quality' called upon all governments and urged them to adopt as a matter of law or policy the principles of inclusive education. The statement emphasized enrolling all children in regular schools, unless there are compelling reasons for doing otherwise (UNESCO, 1994) In this regard, the Kenya government has undertaken a commitment to provide education under the Free Primary Education (FPE) policy in inclusive classrooms without discrimination to those with Special Educational Needs. This, in effect increased pupil enrollment exponentially posing serious challenges to teachers in the implementation of the regular school curriculum. According to the Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MOEST, 2003), the problem is further compounded by overcrowded classrooms thus putting teacher pupil ratio at 1: 80 (UNESCO, 2011)**.** A survey carried out by UNESCO in collaboration with the National Council of persons With Disabilities (NCPWD) in 2008 revealed that out of 667 primary schools in Kisumu County only 25 are practicing inclusive education Programmes but with little success. The survey further established that teachers in these schools encounter serious challenges in the implementation of the curriculum resulting to lack of interest in learning by children with disabilities.

In the USA, it is estimated that, 95% of 6-7 yr old students with disabilities were enrolled in public primary schools which offer inclusive education, 3% enrolled in Special schools, 1% were placed in regular private schools and the rest in other educational institutions (UNESCO, 2004). The report further indicates that, 46% dropped out of school, 35% had irregular attendance and only 29% regularly attended classes and moved to higher levels or completed their education. The main reason of the dropout and irregular attendance as cited in the report was difficulties experienced by the

teachers, which adversely affected learners with disabilities. In sub Saharan Africa, only 15% of children with disabilities learn in inclusive classrooms and complete elementary level of education (Klinger, Harry& Henderson, 2006). Some studies carried by UNICEF in Swaziland and in Botswana (UNICEF, 2004) indicated that teachers are ill equipped to teach in inclusive classrooms and as a result develop a feeling of inadequacy, lack preparedness and negative attitude towards inclusion.

Statistical reports from Kisumu County Director of Education's office showed that 37% of learners with disabilities dropped out of schools in Kisumu County between 2010 to 2014 (MOEST, 2013). This was because of serious challenges encountered by teachers in the implementation of the regular school curriculum in inclusive classrooms, which affected progression of learners with disabilities (MOEST, 2012). Fletcher, Couler,Reschlyand Vaughn (2004) argued that in a regular classroom setting, it is difficult for teachers to meet the educational needs of each individual pupil. Turnbull and Turnbull (2004) in concurrence with this view stated that the challenge is even magnanimous in a class of learners with diverse special educational needs.Lai and Ishiyama (2001) studied the role of adaptation of learning material in the implementation of inclusive education and found that most teachers have challenges in adapting the resources to suit the needs of children with disabilities. In a study done by UNESCO in collaboration with MOEST (2011) on the effective implementation of an inclusive curriculum in regular schools in Kenya, it wasrevealed that teachers experience serious challenges in curriculum adaptation in general. However, they did not look into the suitability of the curriculum to students with disabilities in regular classroom.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Inclusive education in Kenya has not been fully implemented in all public primary schools despite the government's policy on inclusive education.(UNESCO, 2006) In Kisumu Sub county, 37% of children with disabilities dropped out of school due to challenges encountered by teachers in the implementation of the regular curriculum (MOEST, 20012). Most studies done in inclusive education did not address challenges that teachers encounter when implementing curriculum in regular schools. In addition, records from the District Assessment Centre showed that 46% of children with disabilities assessed in Kisumu County are not in schools. Findings from the studies conducted by UNESCO (2012) showed that education system which is examination oriented makes it difficult for children with special needs to achieve like their non-disabled peers. Because of this, whenever the national examination results are released, children with disabilities are not among top performers. Their counter parts in Special Educational institutions normally achieve better (Mulama, 2011). This was concern to curriculum developers, policy makers, parents and teachers. The study therefore sought to explore challenges facing primary school teachers in teaching in inclusive classrooms and attempted to suggest some tenable solutions.

1.2 Objective of the Study

The objective of the study was to determine the suitability of the regular school curriculum to learners with disabilities.

1.3 The Scope of the Study

The study was conducted in Kenya in regular primary schools in Kisumu County practicing inclusive education. It focused on challenges faced by teachers in regular classrooms when implementing the curriculum.

1.4 Significance of the Study

In most parts of the world policy has shifted to inclusive education from the traditional special institutions that catered for individual categories of learners with disabilities. However, little or no significant effort has been made develop an all-inclusive curriculum that is responsive to the needs of learners in inclusive setting. Teachers in Kisumu County use their knowledge and skills to manipulate the existing curriculum to suit all learners' inclusive classrooms. There is need to examine the implementation of this curriculum to determine its suitability in an exclusive set up.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

While inclusive education has its benefits, there are enormous challenges hindering the effective implementation of the regular curriculum in inclusive classrooms. In this chapter, the literature review will focus on curriculum suitability to learners with disabilities in inclusive classrooms, the perception of teachers towards inclusion, the barriers within the classroom that impedes learning of such children and some attempts already made to address challenges facing teachers in the implementation of the curriculum..

Inclusion of children with disabilities in the regular classroom describes the process by which a school attempts to respond to the individual needs of all pupils including those with disabilities by flexing the curriculum to accommodate their needs (Naragwi, 2003). It is about the integration approach of learners with special needs in regular schools. It is under this model that learners with special needs spend most or all their time with non-disabled learners (UNESCO, 2000). Through this provision, the school builds its capacity to accept all pupils from the local community who wish to attend school and in so doing reduces the need to exclude pupils with disabilities (Fakolade&Adeniyi, 2009, Berry, 2008).

2.1. Suitability of the Regular School Curriculum in an Inclusive Classroom

The importance of curriculum as the principal pathway to achieving inclusioncannot be understated. MOEST (2011) observed that a separate set of curriculum processes is not required for students with disabilities but rather that the generic curriculum outcomes become a common inspirational goal for all students The curriculum taught in regular classroom is the general school curriculum (Boiling, 2007, Myles, Simpson & Dennis,2005). However, the challenge facing teachers teaching in inclusive schools is how best to adapt the curriculum to suit learners with disabilities and facilitate learning for all the learners (Brick-Har, (2005). Okello and Kogoire (2006)stated that implementation of the regular curriculum requires the services of knowledgeable skilled and experienced teachers. Curriculum suitability as demonstrated by (Learner, 2006) depends on the teachers ability to create flexibility to suit every learner.

The passage of the 1970 Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) as well the increased numbers of students with Disabilities being educated part or full time in general education classes create significant guidelines on how to make the regular school curriculum accommodative (US Department of Education, 2002) The act emphasizes the need to evaluate the regular school curriculum to adapt it to the needs of learners with disabilities. Specifically, the 1997 Amendments to IDEA require that special educators are knowledgeable and skilled in the general education curriculum standards and the use of accountability assessment systems in order to educate students with disabilities in general education settings (UNESCO, 2004). The IDEA amendments also suggest that general educators must develop the knowledge and skills necessary to teach the number of students with disabilities in their classes. In addition, the No Child Left Behind legislation (NCLB, 2001) mandates curriculum appropriateness for all students, including those with special educational needs. As observed by Mulama(2004), making the regular school curriculum flexible to all learners in an inclusive classroom involves enhancing the quality of education by improving the effectiveness of the teachers, promoting learning centered methodologies, developing appropriate textbooks and learning materials. In concurrence, Shapiro (2003), adds that a suitable curriculum addresses the child's individual learning needs and in particular the very special educational needs. Hoover and Patton (2007), Klinger and Harry (2006) argued that curriculum suitability is determined by the teachers training, experience and practice.

Mutisya and Njoki (2014), Badugela (2012) all observed that, general education teachers lack adequate training in modification of the general education curriculum thus making it unsuitable to learners with disabilities in the regular classroom. They further observed that there is need to equip teachers with skills that would enable them to evaluate the sequence of the topics in the syllabus and make appropriate realignments**.** This view is shared by the United Disabled Persons of Kenya (UDPK), (2010) when referring to the national curriculum as saturated with exam-oriented content that suits only learners racing against time. The organization dismisses the regular school curriculum as biased and only tailored for the so-called 'normal' child and recommended that teachers need in- depth training to cascade the content to the level of learners with disabilities. A thorough examination of the curriculum for the pre-service teachers reveals that there is very little emphasis on the teaching of children with special needs (UNESCO, 2008) This negates the very noble assertion of the same organization that states that efforts to expand enrolment must be accompanied by policies to enhance educational quality at all levels, in inclusive and regular settings (MOEST, 2010). There is absolute need to work on access to success continuum by promoting policies to ensure that the excluded children get into school coupled with programmes and practices that ensure that they succeed there (UNESCO, 2008). This process involves addressing and responding to the diverse needs of learners. In totality, this has implications for teaching the curriculum and making it suitable to all learners in inclusive setting.

Noting that the bulk of teachers in primary schools train in government teacher training colleges and only a small percentage are trained at the only Institute for Special teachers- KISE- skilled work force for teaching in inclusive in inclusive classroom is inadequate. This means that there are fewer teachers trained who are capable of modifying the curriculum to suit learners with disabilities in regular classrooms. Mackleskey and Stainback (2002),Thomas, and McLaughlin (2001) observed that the challenges facing the teachers in implementing curriculum in inclusive classrooms the world over devolves not on the appropriateness of the curriculum but on he a ability of the teachers to cascade the content to the level of learners with disabilities. This calls for curriculum adaptation to make the general curriculum suitable to learners in inclusive classroom.

There has been no documented research that has addressed the issue of curriculum suitability to facilitate its implementation by the teachers in Kenya.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The study employed descriptive survey design because it describes the state of affairs, as they exist. The descriptive survey design helps to collect data from members of a population in order to determine the status of that population (Bogdam&Bilken, 1992). In this study the researcher attempted to explore the challenges encountered by teachers teaching in inclusive classrooms, which are already existing.

3.2 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 Km^2. with a total population of 112,000 people. There are 667 public primary schools out 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.

3.3 Study Population

 The study targeted 25 primary schools practicing inclusive education, 25 head teachers, 250 teachers, 6 Education Assessment and Resource Centre Coordinators and 8County Quality Assurance and standards officers. They were targeted as participants in this study because they supervise the teachers, conducting in-service courses for the teachers and give advisory services. Kisumu County has seven sub counties with 8 CQASO, 7 for the sub counties and one for the County. Each of the inclusive school had 10 teachers giving a total of 250 teachers and 25 head teachers. Although some schools had more than 10 teachers particularly those in the urban areas, most schools had between 8 and 10 teachers.

3.4 Sample size and Sampling Procedure

Table 4.3 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 3.1 Study population and Sample size

Category	Population (N)	Sample (n)	Percentages %
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 simple random sampling technique 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 probability of participating in the study.

3.4.1 Research Instruments
Research instruments were questionnaires, Focus Group Discussion, interview and observation schedules.

3.4.2 Questionnaire
There were questionnaires for teachers, Head teachers and CQASO Each. Questionnaire comprised of open-ended and

closed or structured questions. Open-ended questionnaires gives 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)

3.4.3 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.

3.4.4 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.

3.5.5 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). 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.

3.5.6 Interview for Educational Assessment and Resource Centre Coordinators
Interview for Educational assessment and resource Centre Cordinators 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 behaviour 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.

3.5.7 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. It gave the researcher opportunity to assess the curriculum suitability

3.6 Validity of the Instruments

To ensure validity, three experts from the School of Education of Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology examined the instruments and advised on content validity. Improvements were made in light of their recommendations.

3.6.1Reliability of the Instruments

To test reliability, the instruments were piloted in 5 schools outside the sample schools. Ambiguities, misunderstandings or other inadequacies noted in the responses from the pilot study were corrected in the final instruments. Test-retest was used to determine the reliability of Questionnaire and Pearson product moment correlation coefficient of 0.81 was achieved. This reliability coefficient was considered appropriate as recommended by Kothari (2004) Who indicated that a reliability coefficient of 0.6 and a above for a questionnaire is appropriate?

3.7Methods of Data Collection

The questionnaires were given out to the teachers and researcher requested them to fill the questionnaires. Arrangements were later made with CQASO, EARCs and focus groups separately for the interview which was conducted later.

3.8 Data Analysis

Quantitative data from questionnaires was transformed, computed and categorized for analysis using inferential statistics such as regression and correlation. Qualitative data from the interview document analysis was coded and categorized into themes from which generalizations were formulated (Mugenda&Mugenda, 2008). A quick impressionist summary was used where key findings were summarized, explanations recorded, interpretations and conclusions made from the respondents. A narrative report was written and enriched with quotations from key in formats and other respondents and inscribed in the report. However, it is important to point out that analysis does not take place in a linear form and that one part of the process overlaps another (Ritchie & Spencer, 1994). The analysis reflected the research objectives.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

In this research the participants were teachers and education officers. The researcher obtained their consent by explaining to them what the research was all about and assuring them of strictly observing confidentiality and privacy (Morreim, 1995). This was achieved with the use of forms designed by the university were signed by the participants and the researcher. In this, study the questions to respond to devolved on the teacher's perception of the challenges they experience during their teaching in inclusive classroom. This touched on the mental ability of children with disabilities and their behaviour. Consequently, the participants were assured of confidentiality through the principle of anonymity (Trochim, 2006). The principle of anonymity as explained by Bhopal (2009) essentially means that the participants will remain anonymous throughout the study even to the researcher. However, it is important to note that clearly, the anonymity standard is a stronger guarantee of privacy, but it is sometimes difficult to accomplish, especially in situations where participants have to be measured at multiple time points (Trochim, 2006). This was not the case with this study hence confidentiality was achieved.

4. DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the data analysis and interpretation of the findings. The first section describes the response return rate, followed by the second section which involves result presentation, interpretation of the findings and discussions as per the objectives of the study. Finally the third sections describes the state of inclusive education in Kisumu County.

4.2 Response Return

In order to establish the response return of the respondents, they were asked to indicate their demographic data and also to give desirable information. Both teachers and head teachers responses were established through questionnaire, while Education Assessment and Resource Coordinators and County Quality Assurance and Standards Officers responses were established through interview guides and focus group discussions. The researcher also carried out observation as a way of data collection. The results were tabulated and presented using frequency counts and percentages as shown in table 4.1

Table 4.1: Participants Response Return Rate.

Respondents	Actual sample	N	%
Teachers	245	239	98.0
Head Teachers	20	18	90
EARCs	4	4	100
CQASO	6	6	100
Total	275	267	97

KEY :EARCs- Educational Assessment and Resource Coordinators
  CQASO- County Quality Assurance and Standards Officers

From table 4.1, the results indicate that the response return rate for teachers was**,** 239(98%),head teachers was 18(90%), EARCs was 4(100%) and CQASOs sample return was also well achieved, which was 6(100%). The overall response return was 267(97%). This implies that the research instruments were probably well constructed and the sample response was maximally achieved.

4.2.1 Suitability of the Regular School Curriculum to Learners with Disabilities.
The researcher sought to explore the suitability of the regular school curriculum to learners with disabilities. The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which the existing challenges negate the implementation of the curriculum. The responses are presented in table 4.2

Table 4.2: Curriculum suitability

Curriculum Challenges	SD F(%)	D f(%)	SWAD f(%)	A f(%)	SA f(%)	MEAN	STD
Teachers lack of skills	35(13.7)	26(10.2)	48(18.8)	86(33.3)	61(23.9)	3.44	1.33
No of learners in a class	45(17.6)	0(0.0)	16(6.3)	113(43.9)	83(32.2)	3.73	1.38
Learning barriers.	5(2.0)	15(5.9)	40(15.7)	111(43.1)	86(33.3)	4.00	.95
Content difficulty	4(1.6)	9(3.5)	37(14.5)	116(45.1)	91(35.3)	4.09	.88
Learning resources are not adapted	11(4.3)	21(8.2)	26(10.2)	88(34.1)	111(43.1)	4.04	1.12
Learning activities are not adapted	14(5.5)	16(6.3)	62(24.3)	94(36.5)	71(27.5)	3.74	1.09
Tests are not accommodative	33(12.9)	38(14.9)	45(17.6)	77(29.8)	63(24.7)	3.38	1.34
Teachers lack the required.	20(7.8)	38(14.9)	63(24.7)	102(39.6)	33(12.9)	3.35	1.12
Inappropriate topic sequence	30(11.8)	31(12.2)	41(16.1)	93(36.1)	61(23.9)	3.48	1.29
Level of content difficulty	35(13.7)	75(29.0)	49(19.2)	58(22.7)	39(15.3)	3.40	1.18
Teachers lack of content mastery	18(7.1)	48(18.8)	46(18.0)	100(38.8)	44(17.3)	2.97	1.29
Total						4.0	1.2

KKEY: SD-Strongly Disagree D-Disagree   SWAD-Somewhat Agree or Disagree
A-Agree   SA-Strongly Agree

From table 4.2 the results clearly show that 86 (33.3%) agreed that teachers lack skills to adapt the curriculum, 61(23.9%) strongly agreed, 26(10.2%) disagree and 48(18.8) somewhat agree and disagree. 35(13.7%). This gives a mean of 3.44 and a standard deviation of 1.33. Lack of skills by the teachers to adapt the curriculum to suit learners with disabilities was pointed out by several researchers. Mutisya and Njoki (2014), Badugela (2012 observed that majority of teachers teaching in general education classroom lack adequate training in curriculum modification thus making the regular school curriculum unsuitable to learners with disabilities. Shade and Stewart (2013) also attests that regular primary school teachers are ill prepared in terms of skills and knowledge to teach in inclusive classrooms.This was also echoed by CQASO during their interview where they pointed out that most teachers in inclusive school lack basic training in handling learners with disabilities.

The challenge of the number of learners in classroom making it difficult for the teachers to adapt the curriculum is strongly disagreed by 45(17.6%) somewhat agreed and disagreed by 16(6.3%)teachers, agreed by 112(43.1%) and strongly agreed by 82(32.2%) respondents. The study also revealed that barriers within the learning environment contribute greatly to difficulties in curriculum implementation as agreed strongly by 110(43.1%) and 85(33.3%) agreed. In addition learners with disability find it difficult to cope with curriculum content as supported by 115(45.1%) respondents who agrees and 90(35.3%) who strongly agrees. The learning resources have not been adapted to accommodate learners with disabilities as agreed by 87(34.1%) and strongly agreed by 110(43.1%) respondents.

The results further indicates that 62(24.3%) respondents somewhat agrees or disagrees that learning activities given by the teachers are not adapted to suit all learners, 93(36.5%) agrees and 70(27.5%) strongly agrees that the challenge exists. Tests given do not take into consideration the diverse abilities of learners as agreed by 76(29.8%) and strongly agreed by 63(24.7%) of the respondents.101 (39.6%) agree that teachers lack the skill to teach inclusive education,92(36.1%) agree that the regular curriculum is not inclusive while 61(23,9%) strongly agree to this. Teachers allow learners with special needs to participate in all class activities as supported by 74(29.0%) respondents. Teachers rarely adopt teaching methods to benefit all learners as indicated by 99(38.8%).The results confirms that teachers are faced with challenges thus making them not able to implement the inclusive curriculum. The overall mean of (M=4.0, SD=1.2) indicate that participants are in agreement that the regular school curriculum is not suitable to learners with disabilities.

An independent-sample t-test was conducted to compare the views of the teachers and the head teachers concerning the curriculum. The variables were computed into an 11-response curriculum scale with scores ranging from 1-5 after their means had been obtained. A score of 1 indicated that the curriculum was suitable while high scores indicated that the curriculum was not suitable. There was significant difference in the scores between teachers (*M*=3.6, *SD*=.77) and head teachers [*M*=3.99, *SD*=0.60;*t* (253) =2.47, p=.014]. This indicates that head teachers reported rare adaptation to curriculum while the teachers defended that they were somewhat adapting to the curriculum. The magnitude of the differences in the means was very small (eta squared=.02).

An interview with the County Quality Assurance and Standards Officers on curriculum suitability revealed that it was not suitable for learners with disabilities .A County Quality Assurance and Standards Officer who had 14 years working experience in all category of learners when asked about the suitability of regular curriculum to all learners noted that generally;

> *The curriculum is not suitable .It requires a lot of adaptation to suit learners with special needs.*

An Education Assessment Coordinator who had specialized in visual impairment and had 10 years teaching experience noted

> *The curriculum is not suitable for inclusion, as it requires a lot of adaptation to enhance concept conceptualization for learners with special needs particularly those with visual impairments*

Further interviews with EARCs revealed negative views on the suitability of the regular curriculum to learners with disabilities. Most of them pointed out that parents and head teachers were not willing to support the implement inclusive education policies.

These findings are similar to the findings in Zambia and South Africa, where a joint research conducted by UNESCO and UNICEF in 2009 supported the view that the regular primary school curriculum presents extreme difficulties to curriculum implementers due to lack of flexibility and elasticity that requires teachers with skills, knowledge and experience to unlock the intricacies (Mumba, 2002).Mutungi and Nderitu (2014) suggested that it is becoming difficult for teachers to teach inclusive classes because of the ever swelling classroom population due to free primary education hence the curriculum is no responsive to learners with disabilities. Odongo (2014) added that not only the number of learners impede teaching but it impacts adversely on teaching resources thus negating its suitability The results thus indicate that teachers in kisumu. County experience extreme challenges while in the implementation the regular school curriculum. The implication is that inclusion is not succeeding and this calls for teachers exposure to in-service training, workshops and conferences to equip them foe challenges of inclusion. Special education should also be a core subject in all teacher training colleges, colleges of education and Faculties of education in Universities in Kenya.

5. FINDINGS

The summary of the findings was reported as per the objectives of the study. The researcher sought to determine the suitability of the regular school curriculum to learners with disabilities in inclusive classroom.

The challenge facing teachers teaching in inclusive schools was how best to facilitate learning for all the learners including those with disabilities. The researcher therefore applied his efforts in determining how suitable the regular school curriculum was to learners with disabilities. An overall mean of 4.0 oncurriculum suitability scale implied unsuitability of the regular school curriculum. The study revealed that teachers lacked the skills, knowledge and experience to adapt the regular school curriculum to accommodate learners with disabilities as was strongly agreed a majority of respondents 148 (57.6%. 110(43.1%) of the respondents also strongly agreed that learning resources are not adapted to accommodate learners with disabilities. Another aspect of concern is the fact that learners with disabilities find it difficult to cope with curriculum content, as agreed by 115(43%) of the respondents and strongly agreed by 90(33.7%) of the respondents. The views of CQASO and EARCs are not different either. The question of suitability of the regular school curriculum is again addressed in the questions that sought the views of respondents on availability of resources and services. The respondents strongly indicated that the resources and the services pertinent to curriculum suitability are not adapted, adequate or available. These are aspects of the curriculum that are indicators suitability. If the study found out that teachers lacked the skills and knowledge to modify the curriculum, learners with disabilities find the content difficult, teachers do not use the teaching strategies recommended and education officers involved in inclusive education are also of similar opinion, then it can be concluded that the regular school curriculum is not suitable for learners with disabilities.

6. RFERENCES

- Bain, S. (2005). Social interaction interventions in an inclusive era: Attitudes of Teachers in early Childhood self contained and inclusive settings*Psychology to the schools,* 42,(1), 53-61.
- Berry, R.A. (2008). Novice teachers Conceptions fairness in inclusion classrooms *Teaching and teacher Education,* 24, 1149-1159.
- Bick-Har, L (2005). Inclusion or Exclusion? Astudy of Hong Kong Students affective And social outcomes in a mainstream classroom. *EducationalResearch for Policy and Practice, 4, 145-167.*
- Boiling, J. (2007). *Responsible Inclusion: Key components for success*. Austin: TXProd Ed
- Brandon, D. (2006). Botswanas Agriculture teachers attitude towards inclusion of Students with physical disabilities in mainstreaming classes. *The NegroEducational Review, 57*(3-4), 215-231.
- 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.
- Chahbra, S., Srivastava, R., Srivastava, I. (2010). Inclusive Education in Botswana:Perceptions of School teachers. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies March 2010 vol. 20 no.4219-228*
- D'Alonzo, B., Giordano, G., & Vanleeuwen, D. (2007). Perceptions by teachers about the benefits and liabilities of inclusion. *Preventing school f*
- Deshle, D. (2006). A time for Modern Day pioneers. *Learning Disabilities Association News*, 38(8): 3-24.Inc.
- Fakolade, O.A., & Adeniyi, S.O (2009). Attitude of teachers towards the inclusion of Children with special needs in the general educational classroom: The case of In selected schools in Nigeria. *The Journal of International Association of Special Education,* 27(2), 77-94
- Fieldman, R. (2004). *Understanding Psychology*. Massachussets. McGraw- hill.
- Fletcher, J., Couler, W., Reschly, D & Vaughn. S. (2004) *Alternative approachers To the definition and identification of Learning Disabilities.* New York:Marcel Dekkar
- Foulger,D. (2010). *Steps towards an information based theory of attitudes*. http://Davis.foulger.info/papers/informationaAndAttitudeChange.htm Retrieved:12/9/2013.
- Gaylord, V., Lieberman, L., Abery. B. & Lais, G. (2003). *Impact: Feature Issue on Social Inclusion Through Recreation for Pearson's with Disabilities.*Minneapolis:: University of Minnesota,Institute on community intergration Retried from http://ici.umn.edu/products/impact/162.
- Hawkers, N. (2007). *How to inspire and develop values in your classroom*. Cambridge LDA http://www.coe/wayne.edu/Community Building/RC Press,Html. Retrieved 23RDJune, 2015.
- Hope, R. G. (2009). *IDEA and NCLB Is there a fix to make it compatible. Retrieved August 2009, from http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=rebekah-hope*
- Holdsworth, J & Thepphavongsa, P. (2006). *Experiences in Provision for Children With disabilities using the kindergarten sector in First steps* Paris:UNESCO.
- Hoover, J.J & Patton. J.R. 2007). *Curriculum adaptation for Students with Learning And Behaviour Problems: Principles and practices.* Austin TX PRO-ED. Kelly., J. M.

- Kern, L., & Sokol, N. G (2008). Further Examining the triangle tip: Improving support for students with emotional And behavioral needs. *Psychology in the schools, 46(1), 18-32*
- KIE (2009). Functions of KIE. Retrieved May 10, 2009 from http://www.KIE.a.ac.ke/ About/functions.php
- _____ (2009). Functions of KIE: Retrieved July 2009 from http://www. Kkie.ac.ke/
- King-Sears, M.E. (2001). Three steps in getting access to the general education curriculum for learners with disabilities. *Intervention in School and clinic,* 37 (2), 67-76.
- Kinuthia, W. (2009). "Education development in Kenya and the Role of ICT"*International Journal of Education and Development Using ICT.* Vol. 5, No, 2(2009)
- Kirk, S.A., Anastasiow, N., Gallaghar,J.J & Coleman, M. R. (2006). *Exceptional Children.* New York: Mafflin Company.
- Klinger, J., & Harry, B. (2006). *The Special Education referral and decision makingProcess for English Language Learners.* Boston: MacGraw-Hill.
- Koga, N., & Hall, T. (2004). *Curriculum modification.* Wakefield, A.M: National Center on Accessing the genral curriculum p//aim.cast.org/learn/history Arhievebackgroundpapers.
- Kothari, C.R. (2009). Research Methodology. *Methods and Techniques.* (2nd ed.). New Delhi: New Age International (p) Limited Publishers.
- Kombo, D.K., & Tromp, D.L.A (2006). *Proposal and Thesis writing.* Nairobi: Pauline Publications Africa.
- Lai., Y., & Ishiyama, F. I (2004). *Involvement of Immigrant Chinese Canadian Mothers of Children with Disabilities.* JExceptional Children. Journal Vol.II 71(1) 97- 108.
- Leyser, S.P., & tappendorf, E.S. (2001). Reading Problems. Assessment Reading Strategies. Boston: Prentice-hall.
- Learner, J. (2006). *Preschool Children With Special Needs.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- McLeskey, J., & Waldron, N. I. (2002). *School Change and Inclusive Schools:Lessons Learned From Practice.* Phi Delta Kappan 84(1), 65-73. Retrieved May 18, 2014 from: http:/web14:epnet.com/citation:asp
- Liedman, J. R., & Thomas, D.S. (2007). *Curriculum Modification.* Mahwa, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Malhotra, A. (2008). *Pschosocial treatment of substance use disorders in Adolescents Retrieved september 8, 2014, from* http://www.jiacam.org/01o1jiacam *05-1-2.pdf*
- 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 vol 5, 259-264.* Dol:10 5901/mjss.2014.v5n8p529
- Mugenda, A. (2008). *Social Science Research. Theory and Principle.* Nairobi: Applied Research And Training Services.
- Mugenda, O. & Mugenda, A (2003). *Research mehods: Qualitative and Quantitative*
- *Approaches.* Nairobi: ACTS Press.
- Muller,R., Norma N. (2014). Support Services within inclusive education in Gauteng: The necessity and efficiency of support. *Meviana International Journal of education (*MIJE) Vol. 1(1),pp.38-53 30 August, 2011
- Mutua, N.K., & Dimiltrov, D.M. (2001). Parents expectations about future outcomes Of children with MR in Kenya: Differential effects of gender and severity of MR. *Journal of special Education.* 35. 172-180.
- Mutungi, N.P., & Nderitu., M.N (2014. Perceptions of Teachers and Head Teachers The effectiveness of Inclusive education in public Schools in Yatta Division Machakos County. *Journal of Education and Social Research* Vol. 4 No.1,91-105.
- Miles., S. (2000). Overcoming resource Barriers: The challenge of implementing inclusive education in rural ares. Retrieved at *http://www,eent.uk/rsources/bonn_i.php*
- Ministry of Education Science and Technology (2012). Monthly Statistical Report on Assessment services in Kenya. Government Printers.
- Mitchell, D. (2005). Contextualizing Inclusive Education *Evaluating Old and NewInternational Paradigms.* London: Routledge.
- Mulama., J.(2003). 'Schooling for All'. an empty slogan for disabled children.Retrieved November 1, 20013 from http:wwwpsnews.net/africaintern.asp?
- Mugenda,O, & Mugenda,A. (2003). *Research Methods: Qualitative and QuantitativApproaches. Nairobibi: ACTS Press*
- Mugenda, O. & Mugenda, A. (2008) Research Methods. *Qualitative and Quntitative Approaches.* Nairobi: Kenya CTS Press.
- Mutisya.,S.M. (2014). Factors influencing inclusion of Learners with Special needs in Regular primary Schools in Rachuonyo District Kenya. Unpublished thesis Kenyatta University.
- Mutungi, N.P., & Nderitu., M.N (2014). Perceptions of Teachers and Head TeachersOn the Effectiveness of Inclusive Education in Publicprimary schools in Yatta Division Machakos County. *Journal of Educational and Social Research* Vol. 4 No. 1, 91-105.

- National Council on Disability, (2000). *Back to School on civil Rights: Advancing the Federal commitment to leave no child behind. Retrieved at http://www.ncd* Gov/newsroom/publications/backrochool-1.html.
- Ntarangwi, P. J. (2001). *Diversity in the classroom. Managing Learners with specific Learning Behaviours.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Ndeezi, A (2000). Focus on policy: *Universal primary Education in Uganda in*
- *Enabling Education*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Njoki.,W.M. (2014). Challenges of Implementing Inclusive education For Urban Refugees in Primary Shools Within Eastleigh, Nairobi Kenya, Retrieved from http://eap.uonbi.ac.ke/node/1536 on 7th September, 2014
- 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.
- Obidoa. M.A (2013) *Remedial Help in Inclusive Classrooms. Gender differences in*
- *The Enhancement of Mathematics Achievement of Student Through PAL*
- (Peer- Assisted Learning). US China Education Review, Vol. 3, No. 3, 172-180
- Odongo, O.O. (2012). *Examining the Attitudes, Perceptions and Concerns of Kenyan Teachers towards the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities in General educational Classroom.* Published PhD thesis of texas Tech university.
- Okello., V & Kogoiren., M.A. (1996). *Makerere University Curriculum Studies Module*: Bazatel Design Studies
- Onuigbo., S., Liziana., N 7 UzeUche., N (2012). Reagular schools needs for Ceating An Inclusive Learning-Friendly- Environment, *Global Voice of Educators*. Voll. 1 No.1, June 2012, 1-17
- Orodho, A.J, & Kombo, D.K. (2000.). Research Methods. Nairobi: Kenyatta University Institute of Open Learning.
- Omutsani., J.A. (2012). Factors Affecting KCPE Performance of Learners with Hearing Impairments in Special Schools in Selected Counties in Kenya Published MeD Thesis, Kenyatta University.
- Polyzopoulou, K. (2014) Greek teachers Attitdes Toward the Inclusion of Students Special Educational Needs. *American Journal of educational Research,* 2014 2(4), pp 208-218,
- Riddell, S. (2006). Approaches to Inclusive Education in Scotland: Challenges and   Opportunities. Retrieved from *http://www.education.nic/htmlweb/ INCLUSIVE.html*
- Rieser, R. (2008). Implementing inclusive education. *A commonwealth Guide in Implementing Article 24 of the UN Convention on the on the Rights of People with Disabilities*. Commonwealth secretariat. London.
- Richardson, C.A & Abiee, F. (2011)' A question of Acess'- an exploration of the factors Influencing the health of young disabled Pewrsons. Health Education Journal 60, 3-6
- Ritchie, J., &Spence, L (2004). *Qualitative data analysis for Applied Policy Research.* London:Routledge.
- *Giangreco (Ed.). Quick Guides to Inclusion 2: Ideas for educating students With Disabilities* (pp. 85-111). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookers publishing. Co.
- Shade,R.A., & Stewart, R. (2001). General education and special education preserviceTeachers' attitudes toward inclusion. *Preventing School failure.* 46 (1).Retrieved October, 2013 from: http:/web9.epnet.com/citation.asp.
- Shapiro, A. (2003). Inclusive Education. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
- Simpson,R.. Myles, B., & Simpson, J. (2005). Inclusion of students with Disabilities In General Education Settings: structuring for successful management. In P. Zionts (Ed.), *Inclusion strategies for students learning Disabilities and Behaviour Problems.* Colombia. Delta Press.
- Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (2004). Inclusion. *A guide for Educators*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes. Robinson. C. (1995) The real World Research- *Research for Social Scientist an Practitioner researchers.* Oxford: Blackwell Publications.
- Turnbull., S.M & Turnbull., M.C. (2001). *Exceptional Children In Today's Schools* Englewood Cliff: N. J Prentice-Hall.S
- Tomlinson, C.A., Brighton, C., Hertbrg, H., Callahan, C & Reynolds, T. (2003).Differentiating instruction in response to student, readiness, interest and Learning profile in academically diverse classrooms: A review of literature *Journal f*or the education of the gifted, 27(2-3), 119-145.
- Trochim, M. K. (2006). Research Methods Knowledge Base. Colombia: Delta Press
- Uche l., Mezieobi.; D., & Eke C. (2014). Teachers attitude to Curriculum Change: Implications for Inclusive Education in Nigeria. *Reseach on humanities And Social Sciences,* Vol, 4., No.11, 92-99.
- UNESCO (2013). *Thoughts on inaction plan for the development of an inclusive* Education in Africa. *Council for Exceptional children:* Division of International Special education and services. Retrieved July 15, 2014 from http://ici.umn.edu/products/impact/162.
- UNESCO (2011). *Policy guidelines on inclusion in Education*: UNESCO: Paris. http//Unesdoc.org/images/0017/001778/177849epdf. Retrieved on 22 August 2014. UNESCO (2000). *Dakar framework for Action. Paris*: UNESCO.

- _____ (2008). *US statistics in brief.* Retrieved July 14, (2013) from http:uis UNESCO/table viewer/ document aspx?
- _____ (2001). Dakar framework for action. Paris: UNESCO.
- _____(1994). The Salamanca statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. Paris: UNESCO.
- _____ UNESCO (200). *Inclusive Education.* Retrieved at http://portal.unesc.org /education/en/ev/.php-URI ID
- _____(2005). Guidelines for Inclusion: Ensuring Access to Education for All. _____ (2006).*The Development of Education in Zambia. Lusaka*: Image Publishers Limited.
- _____ (2006). Guidelines for Inclusion. Ensuring access to education for All. Paris.UNESCO Workshop Printers *http//www. UNESCO. Org/education/inclusion*.Retrieved on 12 August 2014.
- _____(2007). *Inclusive Education.* Paris: UNESCO Workshop Printers.*http//*
- *www.UNESCO.org/education/inclusion.* Retrieved on 12 August 2014.
- _____(2008). Us statistics in brief. Retrieved July 10, 2014 from http::stats.Uis.UNESCO/tableviewer/documentaspx?
- _____(2013). The development of a care and support model in KwaZulu Natal Retrieved from http://www.inclusive-education-inaction.org/iea/index.Php?menuid=25&repreid=122 on 7th sep.20
- Waterman, S.R, & Valdes, F.H. (2006). Prediction of School Enrolment of Children Intellectual Disabilities in Kenya: The role of Parents Expectations beliefs and Education. *International Journal of Disability.* 48.171-179. Retrieved on 1-4-13. Orodho & Okombo