



Full Length Research Article

DETERMINE THE LEVEL OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING IN FINANCING SPECIAL NEEDS EDUCATION PROGRAMMES

***¹Dr. Benson Charles Odongo and ²Dr. Henry Nyabuto Onderi**

¹Department of Special Needs Education and Early Childhood Development Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology

²Department of Curriculum and Educational Management, Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology, Moses Ochieng Naya, Shanzu Teachers Training College

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 11th January, 2016
Received in revised form
21st February, 2016
Accepted 09th March, 2016
Published online 27th April, 2016

Key Words:

Level of Community Involvement,
Decision Making,
Financing Special Needs Education.

ABSTRACT

Community participation is a key ingredient for education intervention and socio-economic development. Education access, retention and participation are achieved through emphasis on inclusive education in regular schools for learners with special needs and disabilities and community participation through financing. In Kenya the financing of SNE is the constitutional obligation of both the government and the community. The occurrence of low accessibility to SNE in spite of increased government financing to the programmes suggests that the community may be supplementing less than the obligated deficit left by the Free Primary Education (FPE) initiative funding. The purpose of this study was to determine the level of community involvement in decision making in financing SNE programmes. The study adopted descriptive survey research design and utilized Community participation theory proposed by Wilcox (1999). Random sampling technique was used to select the 11 participating schools out of 32 public primary schools undertaking SNE programmes and purposive sampling to select the participants which included a population of 22 teachers and 1438 parents. Then purposive and simple random sampling techniques were used in selecting a sub-sample of 11 head teachers and 10% of the accessible population of 144 parents in the 32 special public primary schools in Mombasa County. Questionnaire and interview guide format were utilized in the data collection. Validity and reliability were ensured through face validity and application of split-half during piloting respectively. Data was analyzed by both quantitative and qualitative techniques. In quantitative data analysis, statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) was applied to generate descriptive statistics then presented using percentages and frequency distribution tables while qualitative data analysis used thematic approach. Key findings suggest that first; the level of community involvement in decision making in financing SNE programmes was low as most parents rarely attended school meetings and were less involved in financial discussions, monitoring and evaluation.

Copyright © 2016, Dr. Benson Charles Odongo and Dr. Henry Nyabuto Onderi. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

The overall education sector goal is to achieve Education for All (EFA) and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015, in tandem with national and international conventions and commitments, notably the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), (RoK, 2008, p.1). The adoption of these laudable initiatives by the international community aims at fighting poverty, accelerating human development, and facilitating the

gradual, but more effective integration of the developing world, especially Africa, into the global economy, (GoK, 2005). Although both developed and developing countries have been trying to implement the objectives of education in line with MDGs, successes, failures and challenges have been met. Achieving EFA goals is tough and challenging especially for most of the developing countries, which are constrained by poor economy. Therefore, stakeholders involved in the implementation of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) are seeking ways to utilize limited resources at their disposal in order to identify and solve problems in the education sector and provide quality education for all children (Olatunbosun, Segun, Amoran and Bayode, 2014). Although many countries

***Corresponding author: Dr. Benson Charles Odongo**

Department of Special Needs Education and Early Childhood Development Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology

have achieved increased enrolment in basic education, this occurs in the backdrop of noting that 8% of the estimated 140 million out-of-school children in the world, the majority of whom are girls and/or children with disabilities and live in Africa (ACPF, 2011). Estimates suggest that in all of Africa, only 10% of children with disabilities attend school (UNESCO, 2007) and this figure is exclusive of the disadvantaged group. Perhaps an important factor that distinguishes disability in Africa from disability in other contexts is the fact that a lot of disabilities can be traced to poverty, poor nutrition and restricted access to basic services, (Able Child Africa, 2014). More worse, those few disabled children in Africa who do attend school face multiple challenges; a lack of specialized equipment, lack of parent and community involvement, inaccessible school facilities and learning environments, poorly trained teachers without the awareness of the needs of children with disabilities and negative attitudes amongst their peers (ACPF, 2011).

The concept of inclusive education was meant to make SNE better and improve on education access for all irrespective of the child's background. In recent years, the practice of inclusive education has been widely embraced as an ideal model for education, both in South Africa and internationally (Maher, 2009). The philosophy of inclusive education is a worldwide advocacy of provision of education to children with special needs in the mainstream schools, regardless of their abilities. The concept of inclusive education and community participation in funding education are important if educational goals were to be achieved. The issue of financing Special Needs Education (SNE) is a crucial matter today in all countries of the world. Meanwhile implementation of inclusive education has met financing challenges in most countries. These include inadequate funding, lack of clarity in the policy, and low levels of community participation (Sheikh, 2010). Contemporary development scholars have been advocating the inclusion of people's participation in development projects as they believe the avowed objectives of any project cannot be fully achieved unless people meaningfully participate in it (Sheikh, 2010). Indeed parents and pupils themselves have important contributions to make to shape the implementation of inclusion (Lindsay, 2007) and therefore removing barriers to participation in learning for all learners is at the core of inclusive education systems (UNESCO, 2005).

Effective and clear legislation has been a primary means by which other countries (e.g. the United States) have established and supported inclusive practices (Frankel *et al.*, 2010). In USA Special education the community bears negligible direct major financial involvement in SNE and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (2013), entitles children with special needs to derive SNE services financed by the federal, states, and the local districts. However in France the state finances schooling of all pupils regardless of their disabilities. The latest reform in the SNE under the General Policy Act for the disable is the inclusion of medico-educational issues in the state financing and the provision of Special Education Allowance (SEA) to parents of children with special needs to cater for the expenses incurred in providing education to the child, (Meijer, 1999). However in South Africa, up to 70% of children of school-going age with

disabilities are out of school. Dana and Bornman (2014) state that hindrance to inclusive practices are; apparent lack of clarity in the policy as well as issues pertaining to the poor implementation of this policy. This is reflected in the inadequate funding provided by the South African Department of Education to the provincial education departments, as well as the vague guidelines and ambiguous incentives and directives they provide to educator.

Community participation is not something new in the education delivery (Olatunbosun *et al.*, 2014). Community participation itself is not a goal in educational delivery, nor a tool to solve complicated issues contributing to poor educational quality in both developing and developed countries but it is a process that facilitates the realization of improving educational quality and the promotion of democracy within society (Mitsue, 1999). People's participation is regarded as one of the cornerstones of good governance as it helps to enhance accountability, transparency and ensure sustainability of development initiatives. Community financing of SNE is crucial not only because both Constitution and the Children's Act in most countries places it as the next alternative source of funds to close the public funding gap to the sub-sector but also creates a sense of ownership, fostering local participation. The community is better placed to identify and react to immediate shortages and constraints, better able to judge the benefits of education including its private and social benefits. The benefits may only be realized if the community is empowered to actively participate in the financing of SNE. Community financing do promote cost-effectiveness as communities have incentive to minimize costs that states bureaucracies may lack, (Cornia, 1989).

Despite the importance, community participation in financing education has been facing challenges in terms of Government policies, school management and socioeconomic factors. In line with inclusive education there may be important differences in the objectives of various countries and some states. Given that the characteristics of the community differ from one country to another, it is important to expose how they handle the financing of SNE. In Africa the community financing involvement in SNE display a burdensome scenario on the part of the community as expressed by low accessibility to the SNE programmes. It is estimated that only 5% of African children with special needs who need SNE go to school, where as 70% could attend if the schools had the right facilities. Kenya is one of the countries with such a population characteristic, (Hillman and Jenkner, 2004). In Bangladesh, participation of community people, particularly the poor and the marginalized, in decision-making process has been historically very limited (Sheikh, 2010). In Senegal parents are obligated to covering indirect costs of schooling and several organized bodies to facilitate parental participation exist but none has access to policy-making spaces (Action Aid Senegal, 2009). Citing the case of Burundi, since 2009, there has been a new policy of transferring funds directly to schools and it stipulates that any fees asked by head teachers of parents should be reimbursed. At the same time parents are still expected to make financial and in-kind contributions for school building, maintenance and to support personnel salaries but parents have a larger role in school management and

oversight of funds, (Action Aid Burundi, 2009). According to National Education Policy in Malawi, primary education is free and mandatory but advocates for sustainable participation beyond provision of bricks, towards whole school development and management of children's education. It also aims to create enabling environment and coordinated support mechanisms for parental involvement in provision and management of educational services but creates no forum for interaction with district and national-level policy-makers (Action Aid Malawi, 2009).

In the neighboring Uganda, education is a public service, free and mandatory at the primary and secondary levels; financial and in-kind contributions for school improvement permitted but monitor, hold schools accountable for income and expenditure (Action Aid Uganda, 2009). In many countries depending on the development level category, educational reforms in the area of financing is on course, with the aim of either reducing or increasing direct community involvement in financing SNE, Ngugi (2008). According to UNICEF Kenya (2008a), 1.2 million children are still out of school. These include the most disadvantaged groups (OVCs, children with special needs, children in slums and those in the geographically challenging areas). Furthermore, Kenya still faces low rates of primary completion and transition to secondary schooling. In Kenya, since the colonial era, the financing of SNE had solely been borne by the donors, however, there existed a paradigm shift in financing of the same in 2003 as it started attracting significant public funding from the government through the Free Primary Education (FPE) initiative. Republic of Kenya, (2005b pp. 49) indicates that under FPE, additional capitation grants were provided to special education institutions and units attached to regular primary schools, and each public primary school received support to uplift it to compliant status. The special education institutions have also been given a grant to facilitate procurement of learning materials and equipment. If the government is providing all these, why should access to SNE programmes remain limited? Could the parents' involvement in financing SNE be the cause?

The revelation that children with special needs find it difficult to access SNE and the government having been regular in meeting its obligation points out to the need to audit both its adequacy and the level of participation of the community, being the next alternative partner expected to supplement government efforts in funding SNE programmes. At the moment there is diminished community support having misconstrued the FPE to cover all aspects of SNE, (Republic of Kenya, and 2005b). Additionally, the community's belief on the nature of child disability has led to the hiding and wrong placement of such children due to stigmatization. As a result of this, the children are sneaked into the regular schools where they not only remain undetected, but also statistics on the financial contribution of their parents towards SNE remain unknown, (Republic of Kenya, 2001a). This trend given a chance can negatively affect the achievement of the Universal Primary Education (UPE). UPE, one of the fruits of the year 2000 Millennium Development Goals agreement, is expected to provide all children of primary school age with free schooling of acceptable quality, (Republic of Kenya, 2007b). However, children with SNE remain the largest group out of

school and given that the most recent commission on education, Totally Integrated, Quality Education and Training (TIQET), heaped the financing of SNE on the government and left the community to decide on its own through Schools' Board of Management on aspects of SNE to finance, it is necessary to gauge the level at which the community is participating in financing SNE with the intention of making appropriate adjustments to improve its quality hence enhance the attainment of Kenya Vision 2030. Monitoring and evaluation procedures and data are presently inadequate as a basis for planning. The Kenya Vision 2030, new long-term development blueprint for the country, aimed at transforming Kenya into a globally competitive and prosperous country with a high quality of life by 2030, recognizes education of all Kenyans as fundamental to its success. This would require that all children with special needs access SNE to gain the various educational and training competences required in leading independent life and competing favorably with the non-disabled group. The provision of this requires both the hands of the government and the community.

Research Design and Methodology

This study was conducted through descriptive survey research design following the qualitative and quantitative research approaches to gather the data to answer the research questions. Creswell (2009) advocates for the mixed methods approach arguing that all methods have limitations and by using the mixed methods approach, biases in any single method will be neutralized. The target population of the study were all the 32 public primary schools offering SNE in, 32 head teachers, 1521 parents and 12 education officers in Mombasa County. The 2012 statistics at the Mombasa EARC indicated that there are 32 public primary schools handling a pupil population of 1521 and manned by 143 teachers. The parents were estimated to be 1521 in number, (Republic of Kenya, 2012a). The study employed purposive and simple random sampling techniques. From the study area, 11 schools were purposely selected as they were offering SNE programme. The composite sample consisting of two sub-samples were drawn from 32 head teachers and 1521 parents in the sampled schools. Further being the accounting officers of the SNE programmes in the schools, out of the 32 head teachers, 11 respondents were selected as the study sub-sample and this represented 30% of the target population which was according to Gay's (1992) recommendation. The key informants, the 152 parents were sampled as 10% of the total 1521 parents in 32 schools while 10% of 12 education officers were also included as part of study sample.

Table 3. 2. Sample Size

Category of Respondents	Population(N)	Ratio (%)
Primary school Head teachers	32	30
Parents	1521	10
Education Officers	12	10
Total	1565	166

The main instruments of the study included for data collection the parent's questionnaire and the head teacher's interview schedule. Semi-structured interviews and questionnaires that were formatted on a-1 to 5 point Likert scale was used for data collection. Finally, the researcher examined all available

county and school documents which were related to this study. These documents included County office education records, school registers and other relevant written documents. These documents were used as a source of information pertaining school enrolments, and efforts made by head teachers and their staff to encourage parent participation in financing SNE programmes.

Validity and Reliability of Instruments

Therefore, to establish the validity in this study, the prepared two sets of the questionnaire were given to the two supervisors, as experts, to evaluate the relevance of each item in the instruments to the objectives. The experts rated each item on the scale; very relevant (4), quite relevant (3), somewhat relevant (2), and not relevant (1). Validity was then determined using Content Validity Index (C.V.I). C.V.I= Items rated 3 or 4 by both the judges divided by the total number of the items in the questionnaire. Items with validity coefficient of at least 0.70 were accepted as valid, (Oso and Onen, 2008). To determine the reliability of the research instruments the preliminary survey or pilot study was conducted before the research study. The pilot study was carried out in three schools undertaking SNE in Mombasa County to determine the reliability of the instruments of data collection. These number of schools formed 10% of the accessible population of the schools in the study area, as required in descriptive studies. In addition, the data elicited from the questionnaires and interview after the single testing session was subjected to split half technique to establish the reliability of the research instruments. The technique involve grouping all the odd numbered items together and all the even numbered items together to give two groups of scored items, compute each subject's total score from the two groups of items, correlate the scores from the two groups of items for all the subjects (respondents) using the Spearman-Brown correlation Prophecy formula to produce a more accurate estimate of reliability for the true length of the instrument, (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003).

Data Collection Procedures

Clearance for the study was obtained from relevant authorities, beginning with Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology, NACOSTI, Ministry of Education, local Administration and heads of the selected schools. To gain access to data on the specific setting and groups being studied, permission was sought from the Mombasa County education office and the copies of the research permit disseminated to the head teachers of the sampled schools. The schools were visited prior to the actual research to make interest known, and create a rapport with the head teachers and parents, who were the main respondents in the study. After this, the researcher moved into all the sampled schools to gather the data. The questionnaires used in collecting data were administered directly to the sampled head teachers and guided interview used to obtain data from the parents of the sampled schools. The activities involved in the administration of data collection tools in each school was carried out in the morning, when the parents brought their children to school, and in the afternoon, when coming to take them back home.

Data Analysis Techniques

The data analysis for this study involved using a multi-method, triangulation approach and occurred throughout the data collection period. Triangulation involved checking the findings from questionnaire, interviews and documents for consistency. The study also used both quantitative and qualitative techniques for data analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The objective of the study was to determine the level of community involvement in decision making in financing SNE programmes in public primary schools in Mombasa County. In order to achieve this objective the researcher analyzed the opinion responses from head teachers and parents on how often they attended/called school meetings and involvement in financial decision making, consultations, negotiations with school management and involvement in monitoring and evaluating of financial use in SNE.

Table 4.7. How often parents attend school meetings

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative %
All meetings	36	25	25
Not all meetings	74	51.4	76.4
None of the meetings	34	23.6	100
Total	144		

Regarding how often parents did attend school meetings, the findings are shown in Table 4.7 and indicated that a small percentage of 25% were attending all meetings while a majority of upto 75 % were either not attending all meetings or none of the meetings. This therefore show that majority of the parents were not attending all the meetings. The implication is that most parents were not very much involved in the education of their children. The findings concurs with The National Taxpayers Association's Report,(2012) ,which found that across the 10 SRC categories, parental responsibility received the lowest ratings, suggesting that most parents are detached from their children's education and further, 20 per cent of parents who attended the initial meeting failed to show up for the second one to discuss the SRC. The report also emphasized that parental responsibility was fundamental, as evidenced by the findings in counties which recorded high ratings in parental responsibility as well as good performance in the 2011 KCPE examination. Although Shaeffer (1994) stresses that involvement through 'attendance' (e.g. attending parents' meetings at school), connote largely passive collaboration and is ranked as low level of participation in this study, the small percentage (25%) of all meeting attendance by parents could be implying passive acceptance of decisions made by others. Responses from interview indicate that most of the head teachers reported that parents were reluctant to attend their meetings. For example a respondent reported that, "When we invite parents for meetings only half attend" (HT, 9)

Such statement was also confirmed by an education officer who noted that most parents complain of the many meetings they are called to attend .A representative was that,

“The parents often complain to me that head teachers call them for too many meetings which interfere with their routine programmes” (Officer B).

A casual observation of the parents' attendance list from the documents also revealed that out of the 23 parents who were expected to attend a meeting, only 10 reported.

Parents opinion on decision making on financing of SNE in your school

The researcher also wanted to find out the opinion of the parents regarding their involvement in decision making on financing of SNE in public primary schools in Mombasa County.

Table 4.8. Parents opinion on decision making on financing of SNE in your school (as %)

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Community deciding on their own through BOM on SNE aspects to fund	11	21	05	34	29
Parents are consulted before being involved in financing deficits in SNE budget.	10	12	04	53	21
Parent allowed negotiate with school management on areas I have difficulty in financing.	03	21	04	34	38
School involves parent in monitoring and evaluating financial use in SNE.	07	03	05	49	36

Regarding parents' opinion on decision making and financing of SNE in their school the findings were as shown in Table 4.8. On community deciding on their own through BOM on SNE aspects to fund, a greater percentage (63%) disagreed that community decide on its own through BOM on SNE aspects to fund, while 32% agreed that community decide on its own through BOM on SNE aspects to fund, while a significant 5% remained neutral on whether community decide on its own through BOM on SNE aspects to fund. The trends show that majority of the parents thought that community did not decide on their own through BOM on SNE aspects to fund. This indicates that parents are only given what has been decided upon to act on. The finding concurs with UNICEF Kenya (2008c) that also noted that one of the most apparent disjunctions between policy and practice is the area of devolution and active community participation in decisions affecting them and their children. Dunne *et al.* (2007) in a study on decentralization policy and practice confirms the findings by stating that decisions are hardly decentralized in a way that encourages community participation in decision making.

On whether parents are consulted before being involved in financing deficits in SNE budget a large percentage (74%) was not being consulted. A minority (22%) responded in agreement that they were consulted before involvement in financing deficits in SNE budget. Meanwhile a significant percentage (4%) remained neutral. It indicates that either the parents were not consulted or involved in discussions on financing the deficits in SNE budget, alternatively the few who attended the meetings gave out ideas but were not taken. Hence poor participation in financing deficits in SNE budget. Even though Wilcox (1999) regards consultation as offering some options, listening to feedback, but not allowing new ideas in terms of level of participation as degree of tokenism, the low level of consultation with parents could be making them less involved. (UNICEF/GoK, 2006d) also stated that

lack of participation and consultation with communities means budgets, and budget priorities, are not open, and this hinders genuine participation in design, implementation and monitoring of activities which are funded at the local level. Although Shaeffer (1994) saw community involvement through consultation on a particular issue as a passive collaboration, most respondents in this opinioned low participation in the consultation and deciding together with the school management. Qualitative data analysis was done using responses from head teachers and education officers. Findings on how the parents are consulted before being involved in financing SNE programmes showed that the school management relied more on irregular annual school meetings to engage parents in decision making. Two respondents said that,

“We usually convene PTA meetings whereby financial issues are floated and then parents vote for or against certain recommendations.”(HT,3)

“The PTA leaders are with the school management and discuss areas where parents need to finance but during these meetings, they are supposed to note many other demanding issues raised by the parents and follow up” (DQASA,C)

This shows that the parents are consulted before involvement in SNE budget during the poorly attended, irregular meetings. It implies that due to none involvement in the meeting process, the parents lack knowledge on the financing of SNE hence feel left out in the financing of the programme. On negotiation, a majority of parents (72%) responded in disagreement that they were allowed to negotiate with school management on areas they had difficulty in financing, while a small percentage (24%) responded in agreement that parents negotiate with school management on areas of difficulty. A significant percentage of parents (4%) remained neutral. The trend shows that the school management holds on the decision of the BOM giving the parents no room for negotiation on areas they have difficulty in financing. This means that parents with challenges of meeting the costs end up dropping out. Based on Wilson and Wilde (2003) benchmarks of community participation such as, influence, inclusivity, the study findings indicate low community influence i.e the community is not recognized and valued as an equal partner at all stages of the process ,there is no meaningful community representation on all decision making bodies at implementation level. Not all community members have the opportunity to access to and control resources, and the partnership does not incorporate community agenda. These findings concur with UNICEF/GoK Social Budgeting Report (2006d) which provides a critique of current weaknesses at local level which include lack of participation and consultation with communities. On challenges encountered in the process of involving parents in financing

SNE programmes difficulties in reaching consensus, time factor, lack of quorum and poor meeting attendance by parents were some of the challenges cited. One head teacher noted that,

"When it comes to discussion of financial matters, there are numerous arguments and it is not usually easy to agree on the best approach to financing and sometimes meetings are poorly attended." (HT,2)

This indicates that parents get a chance to negotiate during the meetings but hardly does any agreement occur. It implies that the parents are not given room to negotiate with the school management on areas of difficulty in financing after the meetings. These findings contradict, Wilcox (1999) who identifies deciding together in an organization as a key area in promoting participation and community involvement. The occurrence of few scheduled, and poorly attended meetings with parents could be denying them opportunities for joint decision making. Concerning involvement in monitoring and evaluation of financial usage in SNE, a majority of parents (85%) responded in disagreement that they are involved in monitoring and evaluating financial use in SNE, while a minority (10%) responded in agreement that the schools involve parents in monitoring and evaluating financial use in SNE, and a significant percentage of parents (5%) remained neutral. This shows that the parents were not involved in monitoring and evaluating financial use in SNE, hence hindered from accessing budgetary information.

The findings concurs with CRECO Baseline survey report (2012) on for seven counties in Kenya which showed that there is low level of community knowledge, involvement and participation which portends a high risk of misappropriation of funds at national and devolved levels. The same lack of involvement in governance is confirmed by Kingdon *et al.* (2014) and (Chen, 2011) that several studies in different contexts, such as Indonesia, show that when accountability systems are weak at both the school and district level and there is little information shared with parents, or parent awareness about how to hold schools responsible and decentralization measures through SBM are ineffective as a means to involving parents in improving the management and quality of schools.

Conclusions

First, level of community involvement in decision making in financing SNE programmes on various aspects in the SNE programmes in public primary schools in Mombasa County was low, as most parents were not involved in decision making as most rarely attended school meetings, therefore the headteachers rely on irregular annual meetings to engage in decision making. It was found out that the community doesn't decide on their own through BOM on SNE aspects to fund as parents were only given what has been decided upon to act on. In addition it emerged that parents were not consulted before being involved in financing deficits in SNE budget and were less involved in financial discussions, monitoring and evaluation. On negotiation, the findings revealed that the parents were not allowed to negotiate with school management on areas they had difficulty in financing. Qualitative data analysis was done using responses from head teachers and

education officers. Findings on how head teachers ensured community participation in decision making in financing SNE programmes showed that the school management relied more on irregular annual school meetings to engage parents in decision making. On challenges encountered in the process of involving parents in financing SNE programmes, difficulties in reaching consensus, time factor, lack of quorum and poor meeting attendance by parents were encountered.

REFERENCES

- Abagi, O. 1997. *Status of Education in Kenya: Indicator for Plan and Policy formulation (IPAR Special report)*. Nairobi, Institute of Policy Analysis and Research.
- Able ChildAfrica, 2014. *Disabled children in Africa and the right to an inclusive education*.
- ACPF, 2011. *Educating children with disabilities in Africa: towards a policy of inclusion*. Addis Ababa: The African child Policy forum.
- Action Aid, 2010. *Politics of participation: parental support for children's learning and school governance in Burundi, Malawi, Senegal and Uganda*. http://www.actionaid.org/sites/files/actionaid/ilops_parents_final.pdf.
- Adekola, G. 2008: *"Psychological Relevance of Participation in Community Development"* Education for Millennium Development Vol. 1 Spectrum Books Limited.
- Adeyemi, T.O. 2011. *Financing of Education in Nigeria: An analytical review*. Retrieved September 20, 2013, from <http://www.scihub.Org/AJSMS/PDF/2011/3/AJSMS-2-3-295-303.pdf>
- Arnstein, S. R. 1969. 'A Ladder of Citizen Participation' in *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 35, No. 4, July, pp. 216-224
- Atkinson, R and Cope, S. 1997. 'Community participation and urban regeneration in Britain' in Hoggett, P (ed) *Contested communities*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 201-221
- Booth, T. et al 2002. *The Index for Inclusion*. Bristol: The Centre for Studies in Inclusive Education.
- Bray M. and Lillis, K. 1988. *Community Financing of Education: Issues and Policy Implication in Less Developed Countries*. New York: Pegamon Press.
- Burns, D and Taylor, M. 2000 *Auditing community participation – an assessment handbook*, Bristol: Policy Press
- Constitution and Reform Education (CRECO) 2012. *A baseline Survey Report for seven counties on state of service delivery in health and education in Kenya*
- Cornia, G. 1989. Investing in human resources: health, nutrition and development for the 1990s. *Journal of Development Planning* 19:159-87
- Creswell, J.W. 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 3rd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Dana, D and Juan, B. 2014. *The challenges of realizing inclusive education in South Africa*. South African Journal of Education 34(2) 1, University of Pretoria, South Africa. <http://www.sajournalofeducation.co.za>
- Day, C, Sammons, P, Hopkins, D, Harris, A, Leithwood, K, Gu, Q & Brown, E, 2010. *Ten strong claims about successful school leadership*, Nottingham, National College for School Leadership.

- Dunne, M, Akyeampong, K and S Humphreys, 2007. *School Processes, Local Governance and Community Participation: Understanding Access*. CREATE, Research Monograph, No.6 London: University of London. <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/1836/1/PTA6.pdf>
- Emerging Academy Resources. 2014. (ISSN: 2276-8475) www.emergingresource.org
- European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education, 2009. Key Principles for Promoting Quality in Inclusive Education Recommendations Matrix. Expectations and Involvement. The University of Leeds School of Education.
- Florian, L. 2008. Special or Inclusive Education: Future trends. *British Journal of Special Education*, 35(4), 202-208.
- Frankel, E.B, Gold S and Ajodhia, M. A. 2010. *International preschool inclusion: Bridging the gap between vision and practice*. *Young Exceptional Children*, 13(5):2-16. doi: 10.1177/1096250610379983
- Government of Kenya 2005. *Millenium Development Goals In Kenya Needs & Costs*
- Government of Kenya, 2005. MDGs Status Report for Kenya. Nairobi
- Harvey, A. 2010. *Public Participation 'Theory and Practice'*. The Heritage Council
- Hillman, A. L. and Jenkner, E. 2004. *Educating children in poor countries*. New York, International Monetary Fund.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2013. Retrieved October 26, 2013, from http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/individuals_with_disabilities_Education_Act
- Ingrid L. and Little D. 2007 *Report to NORAD on desk review of inclusive education policies and plans in Nepal, Tanzania, Vietnam and Zambia on acceptance of children with special educational needs*.
- Jensen, B, Hunter, A, Sonnemann, J and Burns, T, 2012. *Catching Up: Learning from the best school systems in East Asia*, Victoria, Australia, Grattan Institute.
- Jorun, B.H, Sven, N. and Kjell, S, 2014. *Inclusive and individually adapted education in Norway results from a survey study in two municipalities focusing the roles of headteachers, teachers and curriculum planning*. University of Oslo
- Kendall, N. 2007. Parental and Community Participation in Improving educational Quality in Africa: Current Practices and Future Possibilities. *International Review of Education*, November 2007, Vol. 53, issue 5-6, pp.701-708.
- KENPRO, 2010. *Challenges Facing Inclusive Education in Regular Primary Schools in Kenya*. KENPRO. Online Papers Portal. Available online at www.kenpro.org/papers
- Kenya, 1998. Master plan on education and training 1997-2010. Nairobi, Government printer.
- Kingdon, G.G., Little, A., Aslam, M., Rawal, S., Moe, T., Patrinos, H., Beteille, T., Banerji, R., Parton, B. and Sharma, S.K. 2014. *A rigorous review of the political economy of education systems in developing countries*. Final Report. Education
- Kithure, M. 2003. *Management of Special Needs Education Programmes*. Nairobi, KISE.
- Kombo, D.K. and Tromp, D.L.A. 2009. *Proposal and Thesis Writing: An Introduction*. Nairobi, Pauline's Publications Africa.
- Kothari, C. R. 2009. *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques* (Second Revised Edition). Delhi, New Age International (P) Limited Publishers.
- Lindsay, G. 2007. *Inclusive education: a critical perspective*. *British Journal of Special Education*
- Maher, M. 2009. *Information and advocacy: Forgotten components in the strategies for achieving inclusive education in South Africa*. *Africa Education Review*, 6(1):19-36. doi: 10.1080/18146620902857251
- Mberia A. W. 2009. *Challenges Facing Head Teacher's In Administration Of Inclusive Education In Public Primary Schools In Nairobi West District, Kenya*. Research Project Report. University Of Nairobi
- Meijer, C. J. W. 1999. *A seventeen country Study of the relationship between financing of SNE and Inclusion*. Denmark, European Agency for Development in SNE.
- Ministry of Education 2009. *The National Special Needs Education Policy Framework*. Government Printing Press. Nairobi, Kenya
- Ministry of Education, Kenya Education Sector Support Programme 2007b. Joint Annual Budget Review Aide Memoire. Nairobi
- Mitsue, U. 1999. *Community Participation in Education: The World Bank Research Journal in Organizational Psychology & Educational Studies* 3(1) 28-31 ©
- Momina A, Stephen A. and Karen M. 2014. *Parent and Community Involvement in Education: A Rapid Review of the Literature*. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education University of Toronto
- Mugenda, M.O. and Mugenda, A.G. 2003. *Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Nairobi, ACTS Press.
- Nachmias, C. F. and Nachmias, D. 2003. *Research methods in the social sciences* (5th Edition). London: Arnold.
- Nadyne G. 1997. "Leadership for successful inclusive schools: A study of principal behaviours", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 35 Iss: 5, pp.439 - 450 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09578239710184583>
- Neilson, H.D. 2007. Empowering Communities for Improved Educational Outcomes: Some Evaluation Findings from the World Bank. *Prospects*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp.81-93 <http://www.springerlink.com/content/181h1249r725m356/?MUD=MP>
- Ngugi, M.W. 2008. *Introduction to Inclusive Education*. Nairobi, KISE.
- Obadiah N. N. 2012. *Constraints facing inclusive education for children with special needs in public primary schools in Embu East District, Embu County, Kenya*
- OECD 2006. Chapter 4: Parent and Community Voice in Schools. In *Demand Sensitive schooling: Evidence and Issues*. <http://www.oecd.org/site/schoolingfortomorrowknowledgebase/themes/demand/parentandcommunityvoicein schools.htm>
- Okekea C. I. O and Mazibuko G. F 2014. *Mainstreaming Needs in Primary Schools a University of Fort Hare, East London Campus and Inclusion: Challenges Faced by Swazi Parents of School Children with Special Education*, South Africa.

- Oketch, S.A, 2009. *Special Education in Kenya Evolution or Revolution: comparison with the British System of Special Education* (Unpublished master's thesis), Wichita State University.
- Olatunbosun B, Segun M. and Amoran O. 2014. *Community Participation For Sustainable Educational Development: The Nigerian Experience*. Department of Curriculum Studies Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti.
- Onderi, H. and Makori, A. 2012. Differential Perceptions, Challenges, Conflicts and Tensions in the role of Board of Governors (BOG) and Parents-Teacher Association (PTA) in Sub-Saharan Africa: A case of Kenyan Secondary Schools. *Educational Research* (ISSN: 2141-5161) Vol.3 (1) pp 017-029.
- Opiata, O. 2010. "Education Financing: The introduction of "Free" Primary Education". *Kenya Education Rights Update pp. 1-16*.
- Orodho, A. J. 2004. *Techniques of Writing Research Proposals and Reports in Education and Social Sciences*. Nairobi, Masola Publishers.
- Oso, W.Y. and Onen, D. 2008. *A General Guide to Writing Research Proposal and Report: A Handbook for Beginning Researchers: Second Edition*. Kampala, Makerere University Press.
- Parsuramen, A. 2003. "Education must get proper funding in Africa" *Education & Manpower*, Lagos: *Vanguard* 19, (5162).
- Patrikakou, E. N 2008. *The Power of Parent Involvement: Evidence, Ideas, and Tools for Student Success*. DePaul University Academic Development Institute
- Republic of Ethiopia, 2005. *Education Sector Development Programme III: 2005/2006-2010/2011: Programme Action Plan*. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education. Republic of
- Republic of Kenya 1999. *Totally Integrated, Quality Education and Training (TIQET): Report of Commission of Inquiry into the Education System of Kenya*. Nairobi, Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya 2001a. Government Printer. *Reduction Strategy Paper for the Period 2001-2004*. Nairobi, Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya 2001b. *The Children Act*. Nairobi, Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya 2003. *Ministry of Education: Education Statistical Booklet 2003-2007*. Nairobi, Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya, 2005b. *Sessional Paper Number 1 2005 on A Policy Framework for Education Training and Research*. Nairobi, Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya, 2007a. *A report of the Task Force on an Affordable Secondary Education*. Nairobi, Shrend Publishers Ltd.
- Republic of Kenya, 2007b. *Kenya National Commission for UNESCO*. Nairobi, UNESCO.
- Republic of Kenya, 2012a. *Ministry of Education: Mombasa EARC: Statistics of Children Assessed and Placement*. (Unpublished).
- Republic of Kenya, 2012b. *Report of the Task force on the realignment of the education Sector to the constitution of Kenya 2010: towards a globally competitive Quality Education for Sustainable Development*. Nairobi, Government Printers.
- Republic of Kenya, Ministry of Education, 2008. *Education Sector Report 2008: Realizing Vision 2030 Goals through Effective and Efficient Public Spending*. Nairobi.
- Republic of Kenya. 2004. *Economic Survey*. Nairobi: Government Printer
- Republic of Kenya. 2005a, *Mombasa District Strategic Plan*. Nairobi, Government Printers.
- Retrieved on 4th October 2013 from <http://www.interestjournals.org/ER>
- Rigorous Literature Review. Department for International Development. <http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=6fGaDXGZLBE%3d&tabid=3437>
- Sava, L.A. and Orodho, J.A. 2014. *Socio-economic factors influencing pupils' access to Education in informal settlements: A case of Kibera, Nairobi County, Kenya International Journal of Education and Research* Vol. 2 No. 3 March 1
- Save the Children 2013. *The right to learn: Community Participation in Improving learning*. http://www.savethechildren.org.uk/sites/default/files/image_s/The_Right_to_Learn.pdf
- Sheikh, N.M. 2010. *People's participation in development projects at grass-root level: a case study of Alampur and Jagannathpur Union Parishad*. North South University, Bangladesh
- Shekarau, I. 2006. *Community Participation in Education in a dwindling economy*. A paper presented at the 4th African Convention of Principal's Conference: Abuja, Nigeria
- Siringi, S. 2009, March. Government runs out of cash for free school. *Daily Nation*, retrieved from <http://www.nation.co.ke/News-1056/543904/-/u33pht/-/index.html>.
- Stoker, G. 1997. 'Local Political Participation' in *Hambleton*. New Perspectives on local governance: reviewing the research evidence, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, pp. 157-196
- Teachernet, 2008. *SEN Code of Practice*. Retrieved March 09, 2009, from The National Taxpayers Association 2012, Kenya School Report Card, Pilot Report 2012 <http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/docbank/index.cfm?Id=3724>
- Twohig B. J. 2000. *Inclusive Practices Used By Principals and Their Staffs to Facilitate the Integration of Students With Disabilities into General Education Classrooms*. Blacksburg, Virginia Published Thesis.
- UNESCO 2009 Policy Guidelines on Inclusion in Education / Paris, France
- UNICEF Kenya 2008c. *Situation Analysis of Education in Kenya*. Nairobi: UNICEF Vanderpuye I. 2013. *Piloting Inclusive Education in Ghana: Parental Perceptions*, UNICEF/Government of Kenya 2006d. *Budgeting Process in Kenya: a Case for Social Budgeting*. Report prepared by Social Budgeting Initiative Project in Kenya
- Wilcox, D. 1999. *Community participation and empowerment: putting theory into practice*.
- Yorkshire, F. 2000 *Active Partners – Benchmarking community participation In regeneration*, Leeds: Yorkshire Forward