Wanjiru Jane MUGAI
School of Education
Mount Kenya University
Kenya

ANALYSIS OF THE BARRIERS INFLUENCING THE MANAGEMENT OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN EMBU COUNTY, KENYA

Abstract

Introduction of Inclusive Education (IE) was expected to change its methods of leadership and management which were viewed to be discriminative, segregated, allowed stigmatization to continue, did not change people's behavior, did not offer quality education, and never removed inequality of all forms, and allowed exclusion from meaningful participation in the economic, social, political and cultural lives of their communities. The practice for better management and subsequently better improved services for CWSN was found to be still problem. The critics of Inclusion and those who are resistance to change make the practice and implementation of inclusive education very difficult to manage, and this has been the biggest barrier to the effective management of inclusive education. One constrain beyond the managers of inclusive schools is whether the current practices and policies of implementing inclusion could really assist in the running of Inclusive Education effectively. Another gap noted is that of management issues themselves such as unclear management policies some of which emerge from the regular education and have to be implemented to the latter in inclusive schools. Learners with special needs in inclusive schools are still being over-retained by the management in certain instances because of failure to meet the mean score.   This paper therefore set out to analyze the barriers influencing management of inclusive education in primary schools.
Key Words: *Education, Learners, Special Needs, Disability, Inclusive Education*

1.INTRODUCTION

In reviewing the literature on the historical development of Special Needs education (SNE), which was being practiced before the introduction of Inclusive education (IE), it is observed that, the concept of persons with special needs, particularly those with disabilities has undergone significant changes (Gargiulo; 2005). For instance, during the era of extermination, the Greeks and the Romans killed newly born infants who were found to have physical deformities and severe forms of mental retardation (Ndurumo*; 993)*. This was followed by the era of ridicule. The provision and management of special education were out of efforts of some individuals. For example Didymus (AD309-395) is reported by Gargiulo, (2005) as the first person to have devised touch-reading materials for the visually impaired learners. St John of Bervery attempted to teach the handicapped in AD 685. Another outstanding person who did the ground work of teaching and training a young boy with special needs was the French physician called JeanMarc-Gaspard Itard, (1775-1838)*.*   Itard attempted to educate a 12 year old boy called Victor, who was commonly referred as the 'wild boy of Aveyron' (Gargiulo; 2005). Itard taught Victor through multi-sensory training programme, what we would today call behaviour modification techniques. This is a part of the process of management. Kenya Institute of Special Education (KISE 2000), state that the care, and treatment (which is

management) of Persons with Special Needs (PWSN) has been through five historical eras.

The first period of offering SNE as we have noted was the "Neglect period". People with disabilities all over the world were considered socially and physically less-capable. They were called derogatory and dehumanizing names and suffered rejection. The second period that followed was known as the 'Seclusion period' (KISE; 2000). The third period was known as the" Private tuition". This was in the 18th century. Here, individuals mostly from rich families and churches who saw potential in children with disabilities started to give them education (KISE; 2002) continues to cite that, Institutionalization period" followed in 19th century. Children with disabilities were put in residential facilities to protect them from neglect. The institution's services were poor and they became sort of asylums. In the early 20th century up to 1960's children with special needs (CWSN) were segregated and placed in special programs such as units, juvenile homes, small homes, approved schools, or hidden in the family house. Later, parents complained of the way their children were treated and managed, and a change of moving away from institutions was advocated for. This brought in the normalization period in the early 1960s when institutionalization was phased out. (Kithure; 2000), observes that CWSN in the institutions could not learn alongside the non-disabled children due to their special educational needs. Afterwards, deinstitutionalization was advocated for and CWSN

started being withdrawn from institutions back into their local community for better management (Radiki; 2000).

This was the start of Integration Period which is still being practiced in many schools in Kenya today. Currently some schools practice both inclusion and mainstreaming which is a provision of educational services to children with special needs within the regular school system. Types of integrated programs include: functional, locational and social integration. Examples of such programs in Kenya include, Kilimani Integrated Program, Kitui Integrated Programme among others (KISE; 2007).

Special needs education has been offered in different educational programs. These include; ordinary class, ordinary class/ regular school with ancillary support, special unit in regular school, special class, special school, (Day and Boarding), integrated program, sheltered workshop, and rehabilitation centers/schools (Kithure; 2000). Each of these programs is managed differently so as to achieve their intended goals of helping or educating learners with special needs (LWSN). The methods used by the program managers to attain their targets may however differ due to the type of program and the type and diversities of learners in those programs. Integration was later changed and the philosophy of inclusion was recommended.

2.HISTORY OF INCLUSION

Since the mid- 1980s there has been a call for dismantling the dual education system (general and special) in favor of a unified system that attempts to meet the needs of all students. Torreno (2012) argues that educators held debates to determine the best ways to teach students with disabilities. This was because children with physical, intellectual, emotional and other impairments were found capable of learning alongside typical children. Teachers continued to discover how to include these students in their classrooms. Challenges and benefits of inclusion continued to emerge for educators, children with disabilities, and their non-disabled peers. Some obvious barriers to inclusive education presented at that time were; the ill-preparedness of the managers and curriculum implementers, absence of theories of inclusion, lack of policies on inclusion were unclear and un available for implementers, disagreement between parents and professionals and the factors of resistance to change where some members of management board of inclusion resisted change, (Sudesh & Prakash; 2005).

Proponents of the new change of education system for Persons with Special Needs (PWSN) agreed from the onset to educate all learners from one common setting which was called an inclusive setting, and the education to be called inclusive education (Torreno; 2012). In the early 1980s Renzuli and Reis (1985) which has been reviewed by Kangethe (2005), advocated for inclusion of gifted and talented students' program services through what they called school-wide enrichment, to all students without merit to

restrictive eligibility. The program for full inclusion of students with special needs in general education was originally called the *Regular Education Initiative (REI)* (Ainscow; 2005). The term full inclusion was originally used to suggest that all students with special needs and disabilities, regardless of severity of disability, be included in greater deal without criticism and skepticism. As debates about best way of managing education for learners with special needs went on, two methods were developed; these were Inclusion and Responsible Inclusion (Torreno; 2012).   The terms were used to identify the movement to provide services to learners with disabilities in general education settings. Currently, there are two types of inclusion, that is, two sub-types, where the first is sometimes called Regular Inclusion or Partial Inclusion, and the other is Full Inclusion. However, Torren (2011) notes that a number of schools today practice both full integration and half integration. Embu county schools practice the two types of inclusion which are also mixed with integration.

3.INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

According to UNESCO (1997, 2004), inclusive Education (IE) is the process of addressing the learner's needs within the mainstream of education using all available resources, thus creating opportunities for learning and preparing them for life. It is further viewed as a philosophy of ensuring that schools or centers of learning and educational systems are open to all children. This also means that the management is responsible for identifying, reducing or removing barriers within and around the school that may hinder learning. This calls for collaborated and

coordinated efforts from head teachers, teachers, and parents and other interested parties.Ngugi and Kimanthi (2008), further explain that inclusion simply means adjusting everything so that everybody can participate. It also means welcoming all learners who may risk exclusion and marginalization, and can only be meaningful and successful with correct application of models of inclusion and theories of management on inclusive education.

UNESCO (2007), points out that inclusive education (IE) reflects the value, ethos, and culture of an education system committed to excellence by promoting education opportunities for all learners. IE is about building a more just society and ensuring the right to education for all learners regardless of their individual characteristics or difficulties. EENT (2004) explains that inclusion means recognizing individual differences; there by enabling those individuals obtain a good quality of life in their natural environment. UNESCO (2006) expounds on this definition and notes that inclusion means adjusting the home, the school and the society at large so that all individuals can have the feeling of belonging and in accordance with their potential and circumstances within their environment. Inclusion in education is referred to as Inclusive Education (Atlas; 2006).

 UNESCO, (2000) explains that inclusion was clearly thought of after the International Year of the Disabled in 1981. This was after the dissatisfaction of parents and the persons with disabilities themselves over, mistreatment, segregation, ridicule and

mismanagement of the segregated special schools and small homes. The idea was embraced by many countries and Kenya was one of them. Any discussion about the explanation and management of IE needs to use the Salamanca statement and Framework for Action, as a reference point, (UNESCO, 2004). The statement re-affirms the rights to education of every individual as enshrined in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and renew the pledge made by the world community at the 1990 World Conference on Education for *All (EFA),*to ensure the rights for all, regardless of individual differences. The statement also mentions the 1993 UN Standard Rules on the equalization of opportunities which states that education of disabled children should be an integral part of the education system, (EENT 2000). All the convention papers stress that every child has a fundamental right to education and must be given the opportunity to achieve and maintain the acceptable level of learning. Unfortunately, details on how to manage the IE were and are not included in the Salamanca Statement as reference points or guidelines on the management of Inclusive Education (IE), (Sudesh & Prakash; 2005).

Today, inclusive education is being practiced in about fifty schools but some practice both integration and inclusions, while others practice full integration. Inclusion maximizes the potential of the vast majority of students, ensures their rights, and is the preferred educational approach for the 21st century. Freire, Dewy, Giroux,

Mclaren, Kincheloe, and Steinberg (2013) in their latest publication on the Theories of Inclusion and Pedagogy of Inclusion argue that, unfortunately, the philosophy of inclusion has not been widely held and approved by all parents and professionals who manage special children and their programmes. The accelerated pace of change globally, technologically, politically, and economically places tremendous pressure on the managers of the institutions and programmes for persons with special needs. The challenges become barriers which in turn make their leadership and management difficult to even deploy the appropriate leadership, management styles, designs and strategies to achieve vision and mission of the schools successfully (Zimba; 2011).

Under these circumstances, school managers not only need to initiate alternative organizational systems, curriculum development and in-service training but they have to formulate strategies for improving staff performance on management. The prime business of any school manager as a supervisor is to institute change, not to maintain status quo, so as to improve performance for quality Inclusive Education (Gillies, 2004). Although a number of studies have shown that commissions, conferences held, change of policies and even change of curriculum, the running of inclusive primary schools are still registering constraints to their management. Previous studies have mostly dwelt on changing the programme, the venue, the name of the programme alone; but not the strategies or methods to be adopted for better management on

the total performance by inclusive primary schools (Sudesh & Prakash 2005).

4.THEORETICAL REVIEWS

There are three major theories that support the dimensions of Inclusive Education and on management of inclusion and therefore useful for this study. These are: the Ecological systems theory, the Theory of Practice 'theory,' Managing for process and Managing for practice theory. The former theories of managing inclusion have also been referred to show why they were not found working for the practice of inclusive education.

4.1 Ecological Systems Theory

 The current conditions of Inclusive Education might be discussed in terms of a variety of models such as those suggested by Clough and Courbette (2011). These models include: Psycho-medical model; Sociological Response model; curricular approaches model; School improvement Strategies and Disability Studies critique model. Later, the models were combined and proposed for use and in an integrated and in a multi-disciplinary way, which Peter et al (2006) called 'Bio-Psycho- Social Model. This was in reference to the 'Social' Model' and the Ecological Systems Theory which was developed by (Urie; 1992).

This study was based on Ecological Systems theory or the Biological Model. The theory was found to suit this study because

of its assumptions that disability is as a result of a child's interactions with the environment. And because of the way it uses other disciplines such as psychology, philosophy, sociology and medical aspects. It also uses multidisciplinary models of teaching and assessing children.   The theory is concerned with the relationship between the child and his environment. It is believed that environmental systems have great influence how children develop. Urie (1992) and reported by Lumumba and Mwathe, (2007) proposed this theory of Ecological Systems Theory (EST), also referred to as "Biological Theory'. The biological systems are a combination of the child's biological dispositions and environmental forces coming together to shape his behavior. The theory uses the same principles of social constructionist' and perspective for researching on disabilities.

Currently, this theory is being used as one of the learning theories, also on the study of child growth and development and on management of Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR).   The theory does not see the child with special needs as the problem as it was the trend of the former models such as the medical model and educational model or curricular approaches model. The model does not advocate changing the child but the environment is changed to fit to the needs of the child. This was unlike the medical model which had viewed the child as the problem and was used to change the child in terms of curing the disability. Further, this theory was used in this study because of the way it agrees with

the aims of inclusion. Ecological model's purpose is to remove the blame on the child, remove barriers to learning and the society and bring in inclusion in all circles of a child's life. The practice and management of the former models were discriminative and stigmatizing. Barriers to effective management as regards this model can be attributed to home environment, school and other social settings such as the community environment, culture and its demands, and change overtime. This also includes the emerging issues (Booth 2005).

4.2 The Theory of Practice 'Theory'

Thomas and Loxley (2001), proposed this theory in which its assumption is that of 'Deconstructing Special Education and Constructing Inclusion'. Their argument is based on much critique which has focused on the place of special education in the wider social system. This theory was used in this study because of the critics of inclusion who argued that inclusion was started without any formal preparation or theories to guide it. It was viewed by its critics as program without practice. Therefore the theory was proposed just in time to be used by supporters of inclusion and to save the situation. Inclusion was also taken by critics to act as a kind of service industry to the mainstream acting in that role, it is discriminatory and oppressive. This was not the aim of starting inclusive education. The theory examines the arguments for inclusion and the evidence for success of inclusion. The intention

behind the series in this theory is to fuse a discussion on the ideas behind inclusion with strategies of practice and management. Another aim is to straddle the theory and practice keeping in mind the strong social, political, practice principles behind the move to inclusion while noting the practical barriers to inclusion. This theory suits this study because of the practicability it offers in the practice and management of inclusion and the way it notes that factors such as politics, socio-economic issues and sociological factors can be barriers to inclusive education.

Another reason for this model is its way of integrating other models which studied special education and inclusive education. Thomas and Loxley (2001) note that people only talk of inclusive education merely but add up nothing progressive to it. The aim is to develop and enhance the already existing education which is accommodative, has tolerance, looks at diversities, and equity and lacks discriminative ideas in the whole of education system. This is the reason it was also called a theory of '*Deconstructing Special Education and Constructing Inclusion*'. It gives practical methods of dealing with inclusive education.

4.3 Managing for Process and Managing for Result Theory

The third theory that was reviewed to form the base of this study was one on management of inclusive education. The theory is known as 'Managing for Process and Managing for Result theory.

Management for process and result theory becomes relevant to this study because of its process of participation with all those concerned that is the relevant stakeholders. Its assumption is that all the collective participation of the members becomes part of the administrative arena by effectively decentralizing authority, power and leadership in the organization to all who are supposed to benefit. This positive decentralization form of management is equated the collective comprehensive model of Community Based rehabilitation (CBR) model. It is also called the model for managing inclusion. It was developed by Martha, Feldman, Anne and Khademaian, (2000), the model fits this study because of its effort on management prerogatives as training people, rewarding them for participation and asking them to account for their behaviors.

When the theory is used on inclusive education it yields better results, better understanding of inclusion and for improvement of assistive devices to improve quality of education and management by itself. One of its aims is to remove barriers to learning imposed by the other employees or staff or by the management itself. Other aims are –to share local practices where social issues and inclusive education, and resources are concerned. It's beneficial to resource centers attached to mainstream and CBR programs. It also develops recommendations on how to improve and support inclusiveness with emphasis on the action changes which are necessary to develop the inclusive school as the building block for

inclusive education. It also gives recommendation for implementation focused on classroom and school environments supported by assistive technologies which can be sourced or developed locally (Hayward and Lynch, 2003; 2007).   Martha, (2000), proposed other models of public management and control which can be joined to support this theory of Managing for Process and Managing for Result Theory. One of the theories proposed by Martha is called 'The traditional model; Managing for process'. And the other is model three which is known as, 'the model of Inclusion''.

5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopted purposive sampling and simple random sampling techniques for collecting data. Questionnaires and interviews were used as tools for data collection. Validity was ascertained through the checking of the instruments by supervisors and by conducting of a pilot study of a test-retest method which also tested the reliability.This study adopted the triangulation method for data presentation and analysis. Descriptive statistics, frequency distribution, measures of central tendency, standard deviations, graphs like pie charts and bar charts were also used to present and describe the data. A three point likert scale was used to compare the relationships. Data analysis was facilitated by use of SPSS 17.0 (Statistical Package for Social Science) Computer package. Study ethical issues were observed.

The sample size for this study was composed of three groups which are mandated to manage inclusive education in their schools by their employing bodies. These groups of respondents were assumed to possess rich information on the management of inclusive education. It was also assumed that they would provide information required to the researcher on the barriers they faced as they managed inclusive education in their schools for analysis later.

Sample Size

Focus Group	Population Size. n=40	Sample Size. n=40	Percentage	Instrument used
Group One **Headteachers**	40	40	100%	Questionnaires
Group Two **Contact Teachers**	40	40	100%	Questionnaires
Group Three **Chairmen**	40	40	100%	Interviews
Total	**120**	**120**	**100**	

Forty schools were considered for this study because they were specific schools practising both inclusive education and integration. The study was only interested in inclusive schools and schools that had both integration and inclusion.

6.FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The study indicated that there existed several barriers among the head teachers, teachers and chairmen of schools that influenced effective and efficient management of inclusive education. The barriers to inclusion were viewed to hamper the achievement of the principles of the philosophy of inclusive education and the principles of management which are; the p r i n c i p l e of non-discrimination, principle of full and effective participation, inclusion and accessibility. The study identified that the Head teacher's competency and experience were important tools in managing inclusive education in primary schools. It was determined that factors such as age of the head teachers, the number of years he/she has served in the position and also the level of education were very necessary in inclusive management. It also found out those women would make good leaders as they were found to be good in multi-tasking but they were considered to be emotional and that would affect their decision making, although they were considered to be the most effective teachers of learners with special needs.

The study reviewed various problems which resulted from poor and in effective management in inclusive primary schools and found out that factors such as poor policy commitments, practice and its implementation , socio-economic factors, resistance to change from managers and some parents, disagreement between parents and professionals over the labeling and the program the

child should attend, political factors, technological challenges, diversities of learners and the cultures and the present curriculum not catering for special learners with special needs in inclusive schools, inclusion as an expensive system, demotivated teachers, school cultures and other factors resulted to poor managerial problems and they were then viewed problems in inclusive schools.

The researcher also identified that the socio-economic factors had a great impact on the management of inclusive education in primary school. Poverty factors and their effects were identified as the main factors that hindered implementation of inclusive education. In addition to this the study identified some barriers of implementation processes drawn drawing of school plans and frequent meeting that if dealt with would improve management in inclusive schools.   Other hindrances include; uncooperative parents and community, unsupportive and uncooperative education officers, inadequate teachers, people who are always critical, negative altitude of teachers and some community members towards children with special needs and inclusive education, disagreement of parents and professionals on what to offer and also failure to understand the philosophy of inclusion and the principles of management and studies that don't relate to Kenyan situation.

The study findings also indicated that social cultural factors had some effects on the management of inclusive education in primary schools. The main factors were diversified cultures and religious

issues. On cultural and religious factors, the researcher identified that religious beliefs values, norms and doctrines contributed in determining the nature of management in the inclusive school.

7.CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, study concludes that head teachers, teachers and chairmen required enough competence and experience in management of inclusive school education. According to the study in terms of level of education, the head teachers, teachers and chairmen had not fully met the requirements for managing inclusion; therefore they need more skills and training on issues of inclusive education. The study further concluded that there existed problems that needed much attention and that resulted to failure to meet the aims of inclusion and these problems had not been fully addressed by head teachers, teachers and chairmen of different schools and other stakeholders like education offices. The study findings indicated that the issues of socio-economic factors such as poverty need more attention as they had been neglected. Also social cultural factors had effects on the management of inclusive education in primary. While analyzing the data it was found that approaches to policy commitments, implementation and practice were a big problem to the management of inclusive education. This interpreted into differing methods of implementing and managing inclusion in schools. Finally the study concluded that the management of inclusive education in primary schools appreciated the social economic factors and cultural factors but they needed more attention, too as they can be very effective tools on management.

REFERENCES

Ainscow.M. (2005).*Developing inclusive education: what are the Levels for Change*? Journal of educational change, 6 vol- 109-124 UNESCO Paris. UNESCO.

Ainscow, M. (2005). Salamanca 10 years on: What has been the impact internationally?   Keynote address.*IN: Final Report: Regional   Workshop   on   Inclusive Getting*[OnlinAvailablefrom:UNESCO

Ainscow, M. (2004). What are the Levers for Change to Develop Inclusive Education   Systems? *IN: Final Report: Regional Workshop on Inclusive Education: Children into School and Helping Them Learn* [Online]. Available from: http://www2.unescobkk.org/elib/publications/Inclusive_Edu/> [Accessed 15

Ainscow, M. & Booth T. Booth (2003). The Index for Inclusion: *Developing Learning & Participation in Schools:* Centre for Studies in Inclusive Education.

Atlas, A. (2006). *Inclusion in Action*: Report of an inclusive Education Workshop in Zanzibar 7-10,   [Accessed February 2006].

Clough, P. Corbelt, J (2012). *Theories of inclusive education: students Guide*.   University of Virginia.Sage Publications.

EENT--- Enabling Education Network (2004).EnkhtSeg, N. issue 8, 4—5.   EPPI (2002) *A systematic review of the effectiveness of school-levelactions for promotion of participation by all students*. London: IoE

Feldman, M. & Khademian, A. M. (2000).*Managing Inclusion*: *balance Control and participation*. Washington D.C. The Brooking Institution

Freire, P. Dewy,J. Giroux, H. Mclaren ,P. Kincheloe, J. and Steinberg, S.(2013).   *Pedagogy of the oppressed: Inclusion and practice*. Wikipedia.Modified 15th. march 2013.

Gargiulo, M. R. (2005).   Special Education in Contemporary society. An Introduction   To Exceptionality. Canada. Wadsworth.

Gillies, R.M. (2004).The effects of cooperative learning on junior high   School students during small group learning.*Learning and Instruction*,14(2), 197-213.

 Kangethe K. (2005). *Introduction to Psychology and education for Gifted and   Talented Children.* Nairobi. Kenyatta University.

KISE, (2007).*Introduction to Psychological disorder*. Nairobi. KISE

KISE, (2004).Introduction to Inclusive Education. Nairobi. KISE

KISE, (2000).*Introduction to children with special Needs*. Nairobi. KISE

KISE, (2007).*Introduction to Inclusive Education.*Nairobi. KISE.

KISE, (2004, 2010).*Management for special Needs Education:* Module 28 - KISE.

Kithure, M. (2002).*The Whole School approach to Special Education*: *Is management   Training necessary for principals in Kenya*? ME.D Dissertation.   University of Manchester UK.

Kithure and Karanja (2003).*Management of special needs Education*. Nairobi. KISE.

Lumumba, O. M. & Mwathe, G. (2007).*Theories of Learning: Implications for   Learning Disabilities*. Nairobi. KISE.

MOE, (2009).*The National Special Needs Education Policy Framework*: Nairobi.

MOEST, (2007).*Education for all (EFA) in Kenya: a National Handbook for 2002   and beyond.* Nairobi. Government Printers.

MOEST, (2001).*Education for all (EFA) in Kenya: a National handbook for 2002   and beyond.* Nairobi. Government Printers.

MOEST, (2007).*Gender Policy in Education*. Nairobi. MOEST.Government Printers.
MOEST, (2005, September).*Education Statistical Booklet,* Nairobi.Government Printers.

MOEST, (2003).*A report on task force on Special needs education appraisalsExercise*. MOEST.Government Printers.

Ndurumo, M. N. (1993). *Exceptional Children; developmental Consequencesand Intervention*. Nairobi. Longman Publishers.

Ngugi,W. M.& Kimanthi, C. (2008). *Introduction to inclusive education*. Nairobi. KISE.

Torreno, S. (2012).*History of Inclusion: Educating Students with Special needs*.   New York. Amanda Grove USA.
Thomas, G., & Loxley, A. (2007).*Deconstructing Special Education and   Constructing Inclusion* (2nd Edition). Maidenhead: Open University Press.

UN, (2006).*Convention on Rights of People with Disabilities*. New York: UN.

UNDP, (2007).*Human development report 2007*.NY: Oxford University Press.
UNESCO (2000 & 2001a).*Understanding and Responding to Children's needs in Inclusive   Classrooms: A Guide for Teachers*   [Online].   Available   from: UNESCO http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001243/124394e.pdf [Accessed 17 July 2007] UNESCO 2004a. *Embracing Diversity: Toolkit for   CreatingInclusive, Learner-Friendl Environments* [Online].Available   from: UNESC http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images /0013/001375/137522e.pdf [Accessed 17 July 2007]

UNESCO (2004b).*Final Report: Regional Workshop on Inclusive Education: Getting All Children into School and Helping Them Learn* [Online].   Available   from: UNESCO http://www2.unescobkk.org/elib/publications/InclusiveEdu/ [Accessed 15 July 20.

UNESCO(2006).*EFA Global Monitoring Report: Literacy for life*. UNESCO, Paris.
UNESCO,(2007). EFA Global Monitoring Report: *Strong foundation.Early childhood care and education*, UNESCO, Paris.

UNESCO, Paper ED/BIE(2008*). InternationalConference on Education:Inclusive Education*: The way of the Future. Reference document, Geneva.

UNESCO, (2007) Policy Guidelines on Inclusion in Education. UNESCO: Paris. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0017/001778/177849e.pdf http://www.bps.org.uk/downloadfile.cfm?file_uuid= CE1DCB9D-1143-DFD0-7EA9-5C1B82EA4596&ext=doc   *British Psychological Society position statement on inclusive education*

UNESCO, (2006).*Policy Guidelines on Inclusion in Education*. UNESCO: Paris. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0017/001778/177849e.pdf

UNESCO, (2009) Policy Guidelines on Inclusion in Education. UNESCO: Paris. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0017/001778/177849e.pdf http://www.bps.org.uk/downloadfile.cfm?file_uuid=CE1DCB9D-1143-DFD0-   7EA9-5C1B82EA4596&ext=doc *British Psychological Society positionStatement on inclusive education.*