

# Assessing Inclusive Education Implementation Practice, Diffusion and Policy Issues in Benchi Maji Zone, South West Ethiopia

Mintesnot Fentahun

College of social science and Humanities, Department of psychology  
Mizan Tepi University, P.O. Box: 260, Mizan Teferi, Ethiopia

## Abstract

The Purpose of this study is to assess the Inclusive Education Practice, diffusion and policy Implementation status in Mizan - Aman, Biftu and Shebenchi high schools in Benchi Maji zone, south Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Region. The study had used a mixed methods research design to address its objectives to both qualitative and quantitative data were collected and analyzed, partnerships with teachers and students. The Participants of this study were 73 teachers and 167 students from all sites. The study was conducted using quantitative and qualitative methods employing questionnaire, interview and observation to collect data. The data were analyzed by using descriptive and inferential statistics method. T-test and one way ANOVA were employed in among variables. The result revealed that Inclusive education practice, diffusion and policy issue implemented in medium level. T-test result revealed that there is no statistical significance difference in both male and female students in Inclusive Education diffusion and policy issue, but there is statistical significance difference in Inclusive Education practice. Similarly, in between both male and female teachers there is no statistical significance difference in Inclusive Education diffusion, practice and policy issues. The one way ANOVA result shows that there is no statistical significance difference in teachers service year, teaching load and class size in Inclusive education practice, diffusion and policy issue.

**Keywords:** Inclusive Education, practice, diffusion, policy issue, Implementation

## Introduction

Poverty and other factors contributing to exclusion seriously affect education. While progress is being made towards the Education for All goals and the Millennium Development Goals as demonstrated by the drop in numbers of out-of-school children and increasing enrolment rates, there is now a stronger focus on those learners who are still out of school or are hard to reach. More attention is also being paid to the many children and young people who attend school but who are excluded from learning, who may not complete the full cycle of primary education or who do not receive an education of good quality. Today, 75 million children of primary school age are not enrolled in school; more than half of these are girls. Seven out of ten live in sub-Saharan Africa and in South and West Asia. Poverty and marginalization are the major causes of exclusion in most parts of the world. Households in rural or remote communities and children in urban slums have less access to education than others (Lewis, 2009).

Children with disabilities are still combating blatant educational exclusion – they account for one third of all out-of school children. Working children, those belonging to indigenous groups, rural populations and linguistic minorities, nomadic children and those affected by HIV/AIDS are among other vulnerable groups. In all cases, the issue of gender plays a significant role (Lewis, 2009).

Ethiopia has an estimated 691,765 disabled children; of these, only about 2,300 are enrolled in school (Lewis, 2009), with a high risk of dropping out (MoE and UNESCO, 2012). These numbers are concerning in the context of a country which has committed itself to international proclamations advocating for the rights of children with disabilities to educational access, included ideals of supporting people with disabilities in its constitution, and developed national plans for special needs education (International Labor Organization (ILO), 2013).

However, when one looks beyond these policies and declarations and views the realities of primary school classrooms and their surrounding communities, it becomes clear that achieving Education for All, most specifically children with disabilities, involves much more than establishing policies and placing students in classrooms. Achieving true inclusion in Ethiopia will require action that is rooted in the conviction that inclusive education is not merely about access, but about changes in society and systems (Lewis, 2009).

Development of Concepts ‘Inclusion’ and ‘Disability’ there is a myriad of definitions for inclusive education, integrated education and special needs education, leading to different interpretations in policy language and implementation (Lewis, 2009).

According to a UNESCO-commissioned report on Education for All, Ethiopia utilizes the terms ‘special needs education’ and ‘inclusive education’ as one concept, defined as ‘focus on children and students who are at risk of repetition and dropout due to learning difficulties, disabilities, socio-emotional problems, or are excluded from education’ importantly, this statement recognizes children with disabilities as a group at risk of drop out,

echoed in Ethiopia's Study on Situation of Out of School Children (2012); however, further clarification is needed to understand the core of the term inclusion.

This definition illuminates the idea that when people with disabilities are excluded from education, it is this exclusion that limits them, not the impairment itself (Peters, 2009: 149). The Ministry of Education has asserted that Ethiopia 'cannot attain MDG ignoring the marginalized and those with learning difficulties and impairments' (Lewis, 2009).

The connection between poverty and disability is widely acknowledged (Singal, 2009), with disability being both a cause and a result of poverty. Thus, this issue is critical not only to individuals but also to Ethiopia's development. It is therefore urgent that changes are made in the education system and society that allow for equal participation of people with disabilities in education so they will have the opportunity to contribute to Ethiopia's progress (Handicap International, 2013).

### Materials and Methods

This section presents detailed design of the study and including the methods of data collection and the variables to be studied. It describes how the research was conducted, statistical analysis of descriptive methods for the quantitative data and also analyzes the qualitative methods of data collection that allow respondents give their opinions and reflections.

Mixed methods research was selected for this study because of a number of reasons. First, the problem under the investigation of this study requires the use of mixed methods. This enables the researchers to have some insight into the constructs in this area of study to conduct quantitative study. It is known that both the quantitative and the qualitative methods have their own limitations. The quantitative method fails to address subjective aspects of the issue while the qualitative method fails to address the objective dimension. Therefore, conducting mixed methods research enables the researchers to have the advantage of using the strengths of each method and to compensate for the weaknesses of each method.

**Study area:** The study was conducted in four public secondary schools (for teachers and students) had been selected from Bench Maji zone which is found in Ethiopia.

**Population:** The populations of this study were Mizan, Aman, Biftu and Shebenchi public high school students and class room teachers. The totals were estimated to be 8,021 students and 413 teachers respectively.

**Participants:** The participants of this study were 180 students and 73 class room teachers selected from all the study sites by simple random sampling method.

**Tools:** self-administered questionnaire, in-depth interviews, and observations were utilized.

### Findings

This chapter is devoted to present and analyze the data obtained through different instruments designed depending on their relevance to the study. It reports on and discusses the findings of the study in the light of the set of objectives and research questions so as to arrive to conclusions and forward recommendations. The chapter also discusses findings by substantiating with theoretical issues and previous findings reflected in the review of related literature of this study.

Then after this section presents about the background information of participants and analyzing the findings with corresponding the variables and data given. To understand well this finding the reader must critically observe and concentrate with the given tables below.

**Table 1. General Background of participants**

Representatives	Sex	Frequencies	percentage
<b>Students</b>	Male	85	50.9 %
	Female	82	49.1 %
	Total	167	100 %
<b>Teachers</b>	Male	57	78.1 %
	Female	16	21.9 %
	Total	73	100 %

As illustrated from the table (1), among the participant demographic characteristics were students out of total number 167 (50.9 % were male and 49.1 % Female) and teachers that were out of 73 (78.1 % were male and 21.9 % female). Fortunately the researcher wants to equalize the sex proportion of gender, but especially female teachers were unavailable in each school case comparing with male teacher.

**Table. 2 General Background of Participants' Academic Status**

Representatives	Educational status	Frequencies	percentage
Students	Grade 9 <sup>th</sup>	94	56.3 %
	Grade 10 <sup>th</sup>	70	41.9 %
	Total	167	100 %
Teachers	Certificate	1	1.4 %
	Diploma	5	6.8 %
	Degree	65	89 %
	Masters	2	2.7 %
	Total	73	100 %

As illustrated on table 2, the total number of student respondents (N=167) 56.3% were grade 9<sup>th</sup> and 41.9 % were grade 10<sup>th</sup>. As well as teacher respondents' (N=73) as we can see from the above table 2, the respondents' academic status were certificate in number 1(1.4 %), Diploma 5(6.8 %), First Degree 65(89 %) and Master degree 2(2.7 %).

To generalize this report majority of the respondents 65(89 %) were degree holders. As a whole, the researcher expects that these majority degree holder teachers had been taken special needs education/Inclusive Education/ as common course or Post Graduate Degree in Teaching (PGDT) during they had been at university.

**Table .3: General Background of Teachers work Experience in Teaching**

Category	Year	Frequency	Percent
Teachers Experience	1-3yrs	6	8.2 %
	3-5 yrs	12	16.4 %
	5-8 yrs	9	12.3 %
	above 8 yrs	46	63 %
	Total	73	100 %

As we have seen from the above descriptive table (3), Participant teachers work experience, 1-3 years were 6(8.2 %), 3-5 years were 12(16.4 %), 5-8 years were 9(12.3 %) and above 8 years were 46(63%). Here we can generalize that most teachers have greater work experience in teaching that is above eight years (8 years) 63% of the total participants.

In teaching, we expect that when teachers teaching experience increased a lot the way teachers teach and handling students is very high too. Here most teachers are rich in teaching experience and then they can manage and help students in diversity of needs. For that matter, let's see the Ministry of Education (MoE) teachers leveling category related with service year such like: Beginner (0-2years), Junior (2-4years), teacher (5-7years), senior teacher (8-10 years), associate teacher (11-13 years), senior lead teacher (14-16 years), lead teacher1 (17-19 years), lead teacher2 (20-22 years) and lead teacher3 (above 25 years). Then in all schools averagely there were senior teachers (above 8 service years) so we expect good teaching experience and practicing best if there is an opportunity of providing necessary accommodations inside there.

**Table 4. General Background of Study Sites and Number of Students in Class**

Category	Frequency	Percent	
School Name	Mizan high school	51	30.5 %
	Aman high school	42	25.1 %
	Biftu high school	52	31.1 %
	Shebench high school	22	13.2 %
	Total	167	100 %
Class size	Below 60 students	7	4.2 %
	60-70 students	61	36.5 %
	70-80 students	46	27.5 %
	80-90 students	43	25.7 %
	90-100 students	1	0.6 %
	above 100 students	9	5.4 %
	Total	167	100 %

As illustrated in table (4) we can understand that the background information of participants' total number in each site /school/ and number of students in each class /class size /. Hence participants in Mizan high school were 51(30.5 %), Aman high school 42(25.1 %), Biftu high school 52(31 %) and Shebench high school 22(13.2%).

And again the number of students in a single class size were averagely in all sites /schools/ below 60 students were 7(4.2 %), 60-70 students were 61(36.5%), 70-80 students were 46(27.5 %), 80-90 students were 43(25.7 %), 90-100 students were 1( 0.6 %), and above 100 students were 9(5.4 %). Here most students exist in one class were 60-70 although this number is too much large and out of standard. This implies that when

students' number increase in a single class the quality education diminished and inclusive education practice also too, because of the teachers cannot manage each students need at a time plus cannot provide Individual Education program (IEP) model. Inclusive education is not students' placement issue in class rather it is supporting students what they need and accessing educational needs for all people with disability, diversities, normal and exceptional pupil.

**Table 5: Students with Special Needs and Number of Sections Teachers Teach**

Variables	Category	Frequency	Percent
Number of Students with special needs that teachers teach	None	44	60.3 %
	1-2	6	8.2 %
	3-5	9	12.3 %
	above 5	14	19.2 %
	Total	73	100 %
Number of sections individual teachers teach	2-4	7	9.6 %
	4-6	18	24 %
	6-8	33	45 %
	above 8	15	20.5 %
	Total	73	100 %

Table (5) shows that the number of students considering with special needs in a class and number of sections that individual teachers teach per semester or annually. Thus, teacher respondents replied that the number of students with special needs 1-2 in number were 6(8.2%), 3-5 in number 9(12.3%), above 5 in number 14(19.2%) and no one of in number 44(60.3%) these all were not physically disabled whereas invisible disabilities like behavioral and conduct problems, learning difficulties, vulnerable children etc. The truth is whether it is greater or less in number there are students with special needs category in all target schools. And again also the teachers teach 2-4 sections were 7(9.6%), 4-6 sections were 18(24%), 6-8 sections were 33(45%) and above 8 sections were 15(20.5%). Here most teachers have teaching many sections per week/semester/ and as we have remembered in table (4) most respondents replied that in a single class there were around 60-70 students per class. How it could be there are many students in single class and does the teachers load can accommodate students need? It is impossible to manage them well because to give individual monitoring and evaluation or to provide Individual Education Program (IEP) students' number is too much huge and sections were unmanageable.

**Table 6: Special Needs Professionals' Availability in Sample Schools**

Variables	Respondents	Frequency	Percent	
Are their teachers can sign language and brail in your school?	Teacher respondents	No	73	100 %
		Yes	0	0 %
		Total	73	100 %
	Student respondents	No	167	100 %
		Yes	0	0 %
		Total	167	100 %
Do you believe that Inclusive Education practice is well done in your school?	Teacher respondents	No	73	100 %
		Yes	0	0 %
		Total	73	100 %
	Student respondents	No	27	16 %
		Yes	140	84 %
		Total	167	100 %

Look over the descriptive table (6) inculcated that the general view of professionals in special needs and practice of special needs education in the target study sites in zonal level. All teacher respondents were (N=73) and student respondents (N=167), these all were responded that there is no professional teachers who can write and read Brail as well as sign language. Connecting with this issue all teacher respondents replied that they don't believe the practice of Inclusive Education well done inside their school especially welcoming peoples with disabilities like visual impairment, hearing impairment, physical disabilities were not even getting access to learn in high schools, similarly out of total (167) student respondents 140(84 %) were replied that Inclusive Education practice done well inside their school, the rest 27(16 %) were similar with teacher respondents. Even though, here the researcher more likely focus on teachers response result because they know more the concept of Special Needs Education /Inclusive Education/ than that of student respondents because of they are simply don't knew well the term and concept of Inclusive education as general.

**Table 7: To Assess the Status of Inclusive Education Implementation in Benchi Maji zone**

Level	Students		Teachers		
	Frequency	percent	Frequency	percent	
1. Inclusive Diffusion	1*	12	7.2 %	0	0 %
	2**	98	58.7 %	56	76.7 %
	3***	55	32.9 %	17	23.3 %
	Total	167	100 %	73	100 %
2. Inclusive education practice	1*	5	3	1	1.4 %
	2**	107	64.1	53	72.6 %
	3***	54	32.3	19	26 %
	Total	167	100%	73	100 %
3. Inclusive Education policy	1*	42	25.1	15	20.5 %
	2**	92	55.1	49	67.1 %
	3***	33	19.8	9	12.3 %
	Total	167	100%	73	100 %

\* 1=Low \*\*2=medium \*\*\* 3=high

The assessment of Inclusive education implementation by both students and teachers as we have seen the table (7) shown that the diffusion on inclusive education were 58.7% and 76.7% respectively. In other hand inclusive education practice implementation was 64.1% and 72.65 respectively. Finally, Inclusive education implementation in policy issue has shown 55.1% and 67.1% respectively. In all cases inclusive education implementation in accepting diversities, teacher student interaction, parent teacher cooperation, independent learning etc were somehow good in diffusion, practice and policy issue implementation have gotten medium level in Benchi Maji zone. We have give emphasis to this status is over all concepts of inclusive education implementation like accepting diversities, teachers and students approach, male female student ratio, somehow over all school facility accessibilities.

**Table 8: Independent sample t-test for comparing teachers and students Inclusive Education Implementation by sex**

Category	Variables	Groups	N	Mean	SD	Mean-diff	DF	F	T.	Sig.
students	Inclusive Education Diffusion	Male	85	18.9	8.4					
		Female	82	19.1	6.0	-.18	165	1.23	-.159	.26
	Inclusive Education practice	Male	85	28.8	7.3					
		Female	82	29.4	6.0	-.66	165	3.9	-.639	.048
	Inclusive Education policy	Male	85	16.7	5.3					
		Female	82	16.3	4.5	.411	165	3.5	.534	.062
Teachers	Inclusive Education Diffusion	Male	57	30.2	4.3					
		Female	16	32.6	3.6	-2.4	171	.60	-2.02	.43
	Inclusive Education practice	Male	57	30.07	5.4					
		Female	16	33.18	4.0	-3.1	171	.64	-2.11	.42
	Inclusive Education policy	Male	57	15.59	5.1					
		Female	16	18.81	2.8	-3.2	171	2.8	-2.4	.09

P\* < .05

The t-test results in table (8) indicates that though both male and female students had no statistical significance difference in the inclusive education diffusion implementation that is (P = .26 greater than P < .05). In Inclusive education practice there is statistically significance difference between female (29.4) and male (28.8) students at (t= -.639, df 165 P= .048, p<0.05). In inclusive education policy issue implementation there is no statistical significance difference between male (16.7) and female (16.3) at P = .062, p<0.05.

In teachers case the t-test result shows that in inclusive education diffusion implementation there is no significance difference between male mean value (30.07) and female mean value (32.6), P= .43, p<0.05. Plus in Inclusive education practice there is no statistically significance difference between male mean value (30.2) and female mean value (33.18), P= .42, p<0.05. Finally, Inclusive Education policy there is no statistical significance difference between male mean value (15.59) and female mean value (18.81), P= .09, p<0.05.

**Table 9: Inclusive Education Implementation practices, diffusions and policy issues across service years**

Variables	service years	N	Mean	SD	DF	F	Sig.
1. Inclusive education Diffusion	1-3	6	31.5000	5.89067	69	1.48	.22
	3-5	12	31.4167	6.80185			
	5-8	9	33.7778	5.76146			
	above 8	46	29.8913	4.67727			
	Total	73	30.7534	5.34577			
2. Inclusive education practice Implementation	1-3	6	31.5000	5.08920	69	1.41	.24
	3-5	12	32.8333	4.72582			
	5-8	9	30.8889	2.42097			
	above 8	46	30.0652	4.30711			
	Total	73	30.7397	4.30448			
3. Inclusive education Policy issue implementation	1-3	6	15.1667	5.87934	69	.433	.73
	3-5	12	16.3333	5.22813			
	5-8	9	17.8889	6.17342			
	above 8	46	16.1304	4.49003			
	Total	73	16.3014	4.88389			

P\* < .05

To determine the differences regarding teachers work experience one way ANOVA was employed.

As can be seen from the above table (9) inclusive education diffusion implementation by teachers service year there is no statistical significance difference level of 1-3 service years mean value (33.7), 3-5 service years mean value (31.4), 5-8 years mean value (33.7) and above 8 service years mean value (29.8), (df 69, F 1.48, P=.22, p<0.05).

As shown in the above table (9) inclusive education practice implementation by teachers service year there is no statistical significance difference was observed in level of 1-3 service years mean value (31.5), 3-5 service years mean value (32.8), 5-8 service years mean value (30.8) and above 8 service years mean value (30.06), (df 69, F 1.41, P=.24, p<0.05).

Regarding Inclusive education policy issue implementation by teachers service year there is no statistical significance difference in level of 1-3 years mean value (15.16), 3-5 years mean value (16.33), 5-8 years mean value (17.88) and above 8 years mean value (16.13), (df 69, F .433, P=.73, p<0.05).

**Table 10: One way ANOVA Inclusive Education Implementation by number of Sections across Practices, Diffusions and Policy issues**

Variables	No. of sections	N	Mean	SD	DF	F	Sig.
1. Inclusive education Diffusion	2-4	7	29.7143	4.30946	69	.49	.68
	4-6	33	30.3939	5.32646			
	6-8	18	30.6111	4.18876			
	above 8	15	32.2000	7.05286			
	Total	73	30.7534	5.34577			
2. Inclusive education practice Implementation	2-4	7	30.2857	3.45033	69	1.25	.29
	4-6	33	30.0606	4.14532			
	6-8	18	30.6111	3.83695			
	above 8	15	32.6000	5.30229			
	Total	73	30.7397	4.30448			
3. Inclusive education Policy issue implementation	2-4	7	15.4286	2.93582	69	2.35	.08
	4-6	33	15.2121	4.37862			
	6-8	18	16.3333	4.83857			
	above 8	15	19.0667	5.94579			
	Total	73	16.3014	4.88389			

P\* < .05

To determine the differences regarding teachers teaching load or number of sections that teachers teach one way ANOVA was employed. As shown in table (10) inclusive education diffusion implementation in that of by teachers teaching load there is no statistical significance difference observed in level of 2-4 sections mean value (29.7), 4-6 sections mean value (30.03), 6-8 sections mean value (33.7) and above 8 sections mean value (32.2), (df 69, F 4.9, P=.68, p<0.05).

Concerning Inclusive Education practice implementation by teachers teaching load there is no statistical



significance difference in level of 2-4 sections mean value (30.2), 4-6 sections mean value (30.06), 6-8 sections mean value (33.6) and above 8 sections mean value (32.6), (df 69, F 1.25, P=.29, p<0.05).

By Inclusive Education policy issue implementation by teachers teaching load there is no statistical significance difference level of 2-4 sections mean value (15.4), 4-6 sections mean value (15.21), 6-8 sections mean value (16.33) and above 8 sections mean value (19.06), (df 69, F 2.35, P=.08, p<0.05).

**Table .11: Inclusive Education Implementation by class size across Practices, Diffusions and Policy issues**

Variables	Class size	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	DF	F	Sig
1. Inclusive education Diffusion	40-60	11	30.9091	6.67015	69	.135	.939
	60-80	38	30.5263	5.05503			
	80-100	15	30.6000	5.98570			
	above 100	9	31.7778	4.38115			
	Total	73	30.7534	5.34577			
2. Inclusive education practice Implementation	40-60	11	32.1818	4.04520	69	1.494	.224
	60-80	38	30.3947	4.01712			
	80-100	15	29.4667	4.98378			
	above 100	9	32.5556	4.24591			
	Total	73	30.7397	4.30448			
3. Inclusive education Policy issue implementation	40-60	11	17.0909	4.96899	69	.120	.948
	60-80	38	16.1053	5.15589			
	80-100	15	16.1333	4.91160			
	above 100	9	16.4444	4.18662			
	Total	73	16.3014	4.88389			

P\* < .05

To determine the differences regarding class size or number of students in class one way ANOVA was employed. As shown in table (11) inclusive education diffusion implementation by class size there is no statistical significance difference in level of 40-60 students mean value (30.9), 60-80 students mean value (30.5), 80-100 students mean value (30.6) and above 100 students mean value (31.7), (df 69, F.135, P=.939, p<0.05).

Inclusive education practice implementation by class size there is no statistical significance difference in level of 40-60 students mean value (32.18), 60-80 students mean value (30.39), 80-100 students mean value (29.46) and above 100 students mean value (32.55), (df 69, F 1.49, P=.224, p<0.05).

Inclusive education policy issue implementation by class size there is no statistical significance difference level of 40-60 students mean value (17.09), 60-80 students mean value (16.10), 80-100 students mean value (16.13) and above 100 students mean value (16.44), (df 69, F .120, P=.948, p<0.05).

### Findings of the Qualitative Data Analysis

From the open ended responses of both teachers and students the following major points were listed out

#### Q1. List out what are the Challenges and Obstacles to Implement Inclusive Education?

- Less emphasis on the issue and lack of trained man power in schools even in woreda and zonal level
- Lack of resources to improve inclusive education practices
- Lack of training on SNE/ IE and there is no organized plan on the issue
- Attitudinal problems and lack of mobilizations in outreach side
- Narrow Class room size with un proportional number of pupils

#### Q2. For better implementation of Inclusive Education please suggest or forward the best strategy you believe on -----

- Must be given trainings for teachers, students and parents
- mobilize the society to send their special children to school
- Setting strategies, trained professionals, recourses and making assessments are crucial
- Zonal education departments and woreda education offices must support cluster schools and collaborate with NGO's
- Making essential the classroom and school environment conducive for teaching learning.
- Government must give scholarships for teachers to train SNE/IE
- The buildings must consider disabled children and take part intensive care or accessibility chain must be flourished.
- Well designed plan and assessment must be provide
- The motivation and support must linked with countryside areas for better improvement of inclusive education

### **Interview Responses from teachers and school Directors**

In order to investigate how inclusive education practice is going well in the high schools, open ended questions were adjusted and given to school directors and teachers, because they are immediate responsible bodies to progress the program. Both four Directors and teachers from four high schools were asked to explain their views on each question; the questions are analyzed as follows.

#### **Q1. What is the status of Inclusive Education and how is Inclusive Education (IE) run in your school?**

Based on the question here school directors and teachers said that since there is no trained professional person in special needs education / Inclusive Education/ regarding disability the status of it is empty null, but the inclusive teaching environment is somehow achievable in medium level means that the proportion of male female student ratio, accepting diversities or multi racial identities etc . Theoretically they know about special needs education, but practically they don't know about it and terminologically they think that special needs education is for only physically disable, Visually Impaired, Hearing Impaired, and mentally challenged students. In all target schools they said that such kinds of students were not allowed to admit, because of which do not have unit of special needs classes and professionals additionally the societal attitude were also too much fragile.

In this zone people reject and hide children with disabilities at home, since these people were the most primitive ones. The ongoing of inclusive education practice were not run in good manner because of many constraints affect its worthiness such like Student – teacher ratio (1: 200), class size (1:70), text book ratio (1:3) were very under the standard, and there is no professional manpower at all, if so these implementation of Inclusive Education is under question.

#### **Q2. What is the resources that avail in your school to support Inclusive Education (IE)?**

School directors devote much able to guide and support Inclusive Education, but the budget allocation, knowledge gap of teachers and students as well as the society that alleviate the problem of Inclusive Education implementation. Resources are limited like the Black boards, class room size, the school toilets, trained teachers are very critical issues in all schools. Trainings were not given for all staffs about special needs education except they were in university and college course. Short term trainings were never given in all schools in this zone, because of lack of budget allocation on this issue. Only in one school (Aman secondary school) there is one professional person in psychology first she become serving as guidance and counseling after awhile, but she (counselor) is now serving as a Librarian.

#### **Q3. What are the Challenges and Opportunities to Implement IE in your school?**

##### **A) Policy and SNE program strategy**

The Ethiopian constitution accepts the international declaration and conventions and states education as a human right. To reduce the existing gap in providing access to all children and actualizing SNE and education for all, Ministry of education has developed SNE program strategy (MoE, 2006:63). It is also further noted that this strategy shows the direction for development of Inclusive Education and special needs education services that are open to all learners. In general, it is intended to improve the provision of educational services to children with special needs based on the principle of inclusion. However, schools were tried to implement the policy but not the most.

##### **B) Training**

The class room teachers are considered the primary recourses in facilitating conditions for inclusive education. This requires continually refining their skills and knowledge in this case training teachers considering their roles is highly important. According to the training policy of Ethiopia (MoE, 2008) there are different modalities of training for teachers, this include short term or long-term trainings. Unable to take the chance to train is the key problems in all target sites. All interviewees respond that they need to have training sessions regarding special needs education/ Inclusive education/.

### **Findings of Observation**

This part includes the findings of class room and school environment observation which was conducted with the intension of assessing the practice of Inclusive Education. From five schools around seven (7) teachers were observed based on their willingness. Teachers in the class room they had to appreciate only the high scorers ignoring or highly concentrated with higher ones rather the lower achievers.

Inclusive Education is a philosophy of attempting each students need and managing them equally without any restrictions. In this zone there are around six ethnicities living together while teachers teach in class they did not consider ethnic diversities as well and putting instructions as subject matter fulfillment completing the time given either it is semester or annual program. In all schools limited concept in the philosophy and knowhow of Inclusive Education, but somehow they know special needs education means that this is the way of teaching considering the disabled children putting exceptional children aside.

This part includes the findings of classroom observation which was conducted with the intension of assessing the practice of inclusive education. According to the information obtained through various sources all target schools were under resourced to fulfill the requirements of inclusive education. With in limited resources target schools also varied in the way they generate resources. In most real cases schools which were running



SNE and inclusive education were relatively better experienced in establishing contact with NGO's and individual donors.

### **Discussion**

This chapter is devoted to present and analyze the data obtained through different tools/ instruments designed depending on their relevance to the study. This reports on and discusses the findings of the study in the light of the set of objectives and research questions so as to lead to conclusions and recommendations forward. The chapter also discusses findings reflected and comparing within the review of related literature of the study.

#### **The status of inclusive education implementation in diffusion, practice and policy issues**

From the analyzed data and the result revealed us the statuses of inclusive education practice implementation in both students and teachers have medium level of implementing in diffusion, practice and policy issues in Benchi Maji zone, south west Ethiopia.

#### **Sex and Inclusive Education Implementation in Diffusion, Practice and Policy issue**

The t-test result shows us or indicates both male and female students had no statistical significance difference in the inclusive education diffusion and policy issue implementation, but there is significance difference in inclusive education practice.

In other ways the teachers t-test result show us that there is no statistical significance sex difference in the inclusive education diffusion, practice and policy issues implementation. Studies conducted in Dubai by Alghago & Gaad (2004) and in Kenya by Mutungi & Nderitu (20014) states that gender has its own effect on inclusive education i.e. female teachers were more positive than male counter parts. But studies conducted in India and United Arab Emirates almost similar with this study that is sex has no significant effect on inclusive education practice implementation

#### **Service years /work experience/ of Inclusive Education Implementation in Diffusion, Practice and Policy issues**

The one way ANOVA result shows that there is no statistical significance difference in service years /work experience/ in implementing inclusive education diffusion, practice and policy issues. From research conducted by Mackay (2012) in Florida , Tamar (2008) in Georgia and Mashiya (2003) in South Africa revealed that teachers' age has an effect on to influence the status of inclusive education practice implementation i.e. older teachers were more negative than younger teachers towards inclusive education practice. Contradict with this, studies conducted by Kilimo (2004) & Nyaigoti (2013) in Tanzania & Kenya teachers' where older teachers were found to implement inclusive education better than younger teachers. Antagonistically studies conducted by Dukmak (2013) in United Arab Emirates states that age did not influence inclusive education practice implementation.

Studies shown in USA experienced teachers were have more knowledge to handle students with their divers needs than less experienced ones (Brownell et al, 2007) and similar with studies in Ireland. In Kenya teachers who have high experience in teaching were confident in handling inclusive classes (Mutisya, 2010)

#### **Number of sections of Inclusive Education Implementation in Diffusion, Practice and Policy issues**

Again the one way ANOVA result indicates that there is statistical significance difference by number of sections that teachers teach in implementing inclusive education diffusion, practice and policy issues.

#### **Class size of Inclusive Education Implementation in Diffusion, Practice and Policy issues**

Similarly with the above statements, the one way ANOVA result point out there is no statistical significance difference in class size in implementing inclusive education diffusion, practice and policy issues. That means the number of students in a class does not affect the inclusive education practice. This study is' inconsistent with according to Tshifura (2012), teachers accept inclusive education if learners are few. Research by Avmaridis (2000) found out that 35 percent of educators in England agree that less than 20 learners are ideal if students with disabilities will be included in regular classrooms. Teachers experience and exposure to learners with special needs of varying severity was found to increase their capacity to handle inclusion (Mambo, 2011).

#### **School Resources**

As can be seen from the interview session of respondents, in all schools there is no conducive teaching environment to practice the inclusive education. According to the information obtained through various sources all target schools were under resourced to fulfill the requirements of inclusive education practice. Within limited resources, target schools also varied in the way they generate resources. In some cases schools which were running Inclusive Education were relatively better experienced in establishing contact with NGOs and individual donors, but it is rare in number. This implies that schools which ran inclusive education were not in a position to satisfy the needs of people / students and this could have an adverse effect on teachers' and teaching activities. This is compatible with Tirusew (2005) the intake capacity of children with special needs in schools are very few and they cannot reaching high schools rather they leave school early because scarcity of materials, facilities as well as trained professionals were the major challenges.

### **Policy and SNE Program Strategy**

The Ethiopian constitution accepts the international declaration and conventions, and states education as a human right. To reduce the existing gap, i.e., in providing access to all children and actualizing SNE and Education For All, the Ministry of Education has developed SNE Program Strategy. This strategy, according to the document (MoE, 2006:63)

- provides an overview of the current situation of SNE,
- defines national objectives, strategic priorities and division of responsibilities,
- identifies resources and possibilities for cooperation,
- proposes key elements for inclusive education system development, and
- Analyzes favorable factors, constraints, risks and possible solutions.

It is also further noted that this strategy “shows the direction for development of inclusive education and special needs education services that are open to all learners.

In general, it is intended to improve the provision of educational services to children with special needs based on the principle of inclusion.

### **Challenges in Implementing Inclusive Education**

In order to implement inclusive education successfully, all necessary conditions need to be fulfilled as much as possible. These requirements are not, of course, expected to be achieved overnight because it depends on the economic condition of the country. But the basic ones need special attention to meet the goal of inclusive education. From this point of view respondents were asked to express challenges which they frequently face in the process of teaching students in inclusive settings in the context of the study site.

Hence, the following were thought to be prominent ones.

1. No clear guidelines which clarify the concept of inclusive education and its implementation.
2. Lack of resources for teachers and students- such as teaching aids, supplementary materials and text books which are Braille transformed.
3. Scarcity or lack of budget to accommodate the needs of people with special needs in the inclusive program. Among the external factors which affect daily school practice, funding (budget) provides the framework within which schools can operate, (Pijil et al, 1997)
4. Lack of training on SNE in general and IE context: Teachers need knowledge and understanding of disabilities (divers’ needs of pupil) and SPN in general. But teachers were not found to be confident in fulfilling their duties and responsibilities in teaching in inclusive settings. In this case they seemed incapable of identifying and understanding the needs of people with special needs, unable to adapt the syllabus, materials, and methods in the process of teaching, and adjust their mode of assessments.
5. Ineffective use of the available resources due to lack of coordination

### **Conclusion**

As mentioned earlier this study examined that assessing inclusive education practice implementation in Benchi Maji Zone. Based on the findings of the study the following conclusions were drawn. Based on the findings, the following conclusions could be forwarded.

- The status of inclusive education practice implementation in Benchi Maji zone seems in medium level in accepting diversities, student cooperation, teacher harmony of students etc.
- The result shown that there is no statistical significance difference in implementing inclusive education practice, diffusion and policy issues.
- There is no professional man power(special needs professional) in each study site

### **Recommendation**

Based on the findings, the researcher got and identified to address the practice of Inclusive Education practice the following recommendations forwarded.

- All schools which were selected for this study should organized and manage resources to meet the needs of all students. When the schools design to make something new should have to consider all students need such as; the class size, number of toilets, books and so on.
- Since schools are less efficient in budget special attention should be given to conjugate other bodies. This requires joint efforts from government bodies, donors which are NGOs targeting in Special Needs Education and schools which run Inclusive Education program.
- Without training either short term or long term we never practice it what they are supposed to do. Trainings must be given for school teachers collaboratively with stake holders.
- By providing and organizing school clubs, must have to adjust Special Needs school club and give trainings for students as well as teachers. This is help full to change plus add some concepts regarding Special Needs as well as Inclusive Education

- Government education officials must give attention for this golden and modern philosophy of teaching. The society also needs awareness about Inclusive Education and then sent their children therefore getting it as new fashion.

## References

- Alghazo, E., & Gaad, E. (2004). General education teachers in the UAE and their acceptance of the inclusion of students with disabilities. *British Journal of Special Education*, 31 (2), 94-99.
- Avmaridis, E., & Norwich, B. (2010). Teacher attitudes towards integration: A review of literature, *European Journal of special education*, 1:2129-147, 7.
- Chataika, Tsitsi, Judith Anne Mckenzie, Estelle Swart, and Marcia Lyner-Cleophas (2012) 'Access to education in Africa: Responding to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities', *Disability & Society*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 385-398.
- Dagnew, Asrat (2013). Factors affecting the implementation of inclusive education in primary schools of Bahir Dar town administration', *Education Research Journal*, vol. 3, no.3, pp. 59- 67.
- Handicap International (2013) Disability Rights.
- International Labor Organization (2013), Inclusion of People with Disabilities in Ethiopia.
- Kangwa, Patrick and Grazyna Bonati (2003) Learning together in the Mpika Inclusive Education Project [Electronic].
- Lambe, J., & Bones, R. (2006). Students' perception about inclusive classroom teaching in Northern Ireland prior to teaching practice experience. University of Ulster: Routledge.
- Lewis, I. (2009). Education for Disabled People in Ethiopia and Rwanda: Background Paper Prepared for EFA Global Monitoring Report 2010. UNESCO.
- Miles, S. (2002). *Schools for All: Including Disabled Children in Schools*, Save the Children, London.
- Miles, Susie, Lorraine Wapling, and Julia Beart (2011) 'including deaf children in primary schools in Bushenyi, Uganda: A community-based initiative', *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 8, pp. 1515-1525.
- Ministry of Education (MoE) (2012) *Special Needs/Inclusive Education Strategy*, Addis Ababa.
- Ministry of Education (MoE) and UNICEF (2012) Study on situation of out of school children (OOSC) in Ethiopia, <http://www.unicef.org/ethiopia/OSCStudyReport2012>.
- Mutungi, N., & Nderitu, M. (2014). Perception of teachers and head teachers on effectiveness of inclusive education in public primary schools in Yatta division: *Journal of education and social research. Volume 4. Number 1 January 2014*.
- Mwaimba A. (2014). Implementation of inclusive education in public primary schools in taita taveta county Kenya MA thesis, university of Nairobi.
- Ocloo, Subbey (2008) 'Perception of basic education school teachers towards inclusive education in the Hohoe District of Ghana', *International Journal of Inclusive Education* vol. 12, no. 5-6, pp. 639-50.
- Peters, S. (2003). *Inclusive Education: Achieving Education for All by Including those with Disabilities and Special Education Needs: Prepared for the disability*
- Singal, Nidhi (2010) 'Including 'children with special needs' in the Indian education system', In Rochard Rose (ed) *Confronting Obstacles to Inclusion: International Responses to Developing Inclusive Education*, New York: Routledge.
- Tamar, T. (2008). Regular teachers' attitudes towards inclusion of learners with special needs in Tibilis. Norway: published thesis, University of Oslo.
- UNESCO (1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education* Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education*. Paris, UNESCO/Ministry of Education, Spain
- WHO (2011). *World Report on Disability*. Malta: World Bank, WHO.
- World Health Organization (2013) *Disabilities*, [Online], Available: [http:// www.who.int /topics/ disabilities/en/](http://www.who.int/topics/disabilities/en/)
- World Health Organization (2013) *Document on Disabilities*.