Inclusive Education: A Qualitative Approach On The Challenges For Praxis In Nigeria And Fiji

Victor Alasa[1] , Taraivini Raiula[2]

[1]Asst. Prof., Corresponding author, School of Education, Fiji National University, Fiji,
victor.alasa@fnu.ac.fj
[2]Asst., Prof., School of Education, Fiji National University, Fiji,
taraivini.raiula@fnu.ac.fj

Abstract

The purpose of this research was to comparatively evaluate the praxis of inclusive education in Nigeria and Fiji using a qualitative approach. An entrenched qualitative method design and 21 participants were purposively sampled for the study. The participants were people sampled who have connections at some level with the field of disabilities. They were teachers-in-training, teachers, lecturers, persons with disabilities, or employers of persons with disabilities. The study's findings indicate that inclusion of learners with disabilities in Nigeria and Fiji is inundated with numerous challenges. These include negative attitudes of teachers and society, the dearth of infrastructures, access difficulties, non-involvement of persons with disabilities in policy formulation and implementation and many more. The findings have implications for policy formulation and implementation, both at National level and institutional based policy on disabilities, and a viable teacher education and development programme. The study recommends a new perspective to teacher education programme, heightened public awareness campaign to foster inclusive culture in the society; and suggests further research themes to incorporate ICT and inclusion.

Keywords: Praxis, Special Education, Pre-service teacher, Teacher education, Learners with Special Educational Needs, Inclusive environment, Inclusive schools, Inclusive education.

INTRODUCTION

The growing concern about the dearth of appropriate resources that could facilitate access for children with disabilities to educational opportunities, and continuous view of disability through the prism of the deficit and medical model paradigm are challenges of inclusive education in

developing countries. More of those challenges are the restrictive, inflexible and category dependency of the school system; the lack of emphasis on the "inclusiveness" of the teacher education curriculum of inclusion education; and the impact of the current economic realities world over. Other outcomes that have implications for inclusive education in Nigeria and Fiji are the greater involvement of parents and guardians in decision making and the less attention paid to variables like class size and other extraneous contextual issues peculiar to developing countries (EASPD, 2009).

The issues raised by the outcomes either posed challenges or identified progress made thus far. The case can vary from country to country. The Nigerian and Fijian contexts are not without its numerous challenges in legislative and policy implementation. As more countries gravitate towards a wider definition of inclusive education, diversity is gradually being recognised as 'natural' in any group of learners. Inclusive education can be seen as a means of raising achievement through access to quality education, participation in learning experiences, and outcomes-based performance of all learners. This gives credence to Wilkinson and Pickett's (2010) asserted that "greater equality, as well as improving the wellbeing of the whole population, is also the key to national standards of achievement" (p. 29). They emphasised that inequality is

a powerful social divider, affecting people's ability to identify and empathize with others. They stressed that if, "a country wants higher average levels of educational achievement among its school children; it must address the underlying inequality which creates a steeper social gradient in educational achievement" (Wilkinson & Pickett, 2011:30). Furthermore, they underpinned those societal inequalities can mar social cohesion and national standards of performance in education. Wilkinson and Pickett (2011:9) argued that:

> the achievement of higher national standards of educational performance may actually depend on reducing the social gradient in educational achievement in each country.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2011) also argued for the improvement of the lowest performing students, indicating that it does not have to be at the expense of higher performers. The findings of a UNESCO Report (Willms, 2006) also provided evidence that strong school performance and equity can go together and countries with the highest levels of performance tend to be those that are successfully raising the achievement of all learners.

Over the past 30 years, studies related to the performance of pupils in schools where learners with special educational needs were placed, suggest that there they did not experience negative impacts either at the primary or the secondary levels (see Affleck et al. 1988; Hunt et al. 1994; Sharpe, York, & Knight, 1994; Block & Zeman, 1996; Rankin, et al. 1999; Tapasak & Walther-Thomas, 1999; Obrusnikova, Valkova, & Block, 2003). These studies depicted high performance records in a vast range of curricula areas including numeracy, literacy, science, and physical education. Farrell et al. (2007) also found a small body of research to suggest that placing LwSENs in general schools raise no major adverse concerns for all children's academic achievement, behaviour, and attitudes.

Furthermore, some studies suggested that learners without special educational needs educated alongside peers with disabilities slightly outperform other peers who have not had this experience, in numeracy and literacy (Saint-Laurent, et al., 1998; Schleien, Hornfeldt, & McAvoy, 1994). Huber, Rosenfeld, and Fiorello (2001) also found a similar result in respect of lower achieving pupils who are not classified as having special educational needs. Progress in academic achievements by lower achieving pupils learning alongside "diagnosed" special educational needs pupils was significantly better than the

progress by a control group of "low-achieving" pupils alongside non-special educational needs pupils. This shows that including LwSENs in regular education classrooms/schools can have a positive impact on other low-achieving, learners not diagnosed as having special educational needs.

Although, it is equally important to note that a contrary study in the United Kingdom by Lunt and Norman (1999) found that schools with higher percentages of LwSENs also had lower performance levels in the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE). Almost all pupils in Year 11 (16 years old) in England and Wales according to this study took this examination. Nevertheless, Farrell, et al. (2008) provided an explanation for this outcome in the above research finding. They explained that the work of Lunt and Norman (1999) was limited because they did not consider the other variables that could affect academic achievement. These include socio-economic conditions, ethnicity and the pupils' first or native language.

Farrell et al (2008) concluded that owing to these influencing variables, it cannot be agreed that the findings of Lunt and Norman were reliable. They further argued that:

> … it is impossible to determine whether low average academic achievement scores of Year 11 pupils in a

school reflect the high level of pupils with SEN in the school or whether these scores are simply the consequence of the school having a disadvantaged (and probably low attaining) intake. Furthermore, it is not possible to say much about the impact of inclusion on the educational achievements
for all pupils
in all schools simply by examining GCSE pass rates.

(p. 337)

A literature review commissioned by the Evidence for Policy and Practice Initiative (EPPI) (Kalambouka et al., 2005) also found, in general, there are no adverse effects on learners without disabilities when LwSENs are included in regular schools (European Agency, 2012). Numerous studies go on to outline the benefits of inclusion as, "increased appreciation and acceptance of individual differences and diversity, respect for all people, preparation for adult life in an inclusive society and opportunities to master activities by practising and teaching others" (European Agency, 2012, p. 8). For instance, Bennett and Gallagher (2012)

underscored the positive influence of inclusive placements of LwSENs. They produced a snapshot of successful inclusionary practices using a special education service delivery for students who have an intellectual disability in Ontario, Canada. They stated that:

> …the challenge of developing truly inclusive practice starts with…the realization that every student in a school is entitled to opportunity and access.

(p. 22)

They further argued that educators need to reflect on their behaviours and unpack some of the discriminatory practices that are underpinned by less than inclusive assumptions.

The Salamanca Statement argued that regular schools underpinned by an inclusive philosophy are, "the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, building an inclusive society and achieving education for all" (UNESCO, 1994: ix). Erevelles (2011) has argued that sometimes studies in disability could romanticize the notion of disability. Often, scholars decontextualize world economic systems which create as well as devalue and obliterate disability all

at the same time. This poses great challenge when trying to understand disability because such notion is clouded by understanding of ableism within the global economy. Therefore, according to Erevelles, this form of fetishization of "disability" into the category matrix fundamentally upsets the dominant forms of social integration. Efforts have been made towards the provision of access to education and closing the opportunity gap at various levels in many developing nations of the world, Nigeria and Fiji included. Braswell (2012:1) in his review of Erevelles' (2011) work, argued that she provided an interesting insight where she perceived that some well-known scholars in the field of disability studies "…ignore the world economic system that creates, devalues, and even obliterates disability en masse."

Erevelles' (2011:26) view is that disability is not just another category of identification. Rather, disabled peoples' lives need to be understood in the context of their social and economic conditions as it is "mediated by politics of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, and nation. Also, being disabled and therefore being different has had a long term associated with deviance, deficit and exclusion" (p. 26).

The rationale to adopt inclusive education in Nigeria and Fiji could be explained against the backdrop of three levels of argument. Firstly, many educators, policy makers, parents and educational stakeholders sympathetic to this cause have indicated that inclusive education is a fundamental human right issue (Engelbrecht, 2006; García-Huidobro & Corvalán, 2009). To this end, Mitchell (2010) and others sympathetic to this way of thinking, attested to the strengths of the above paradigm and according to these researchers and stakeholders is based on the principle of equity. They argued that the exclusion of students with various exceptionalities is a violation of their human rights and represents an unfair distribution of educational resources and consider exclusion as a negation of the pursuit of social justice (Artiles, Harris-Murri & Rostenberg, 2006; Moberg & Savolainen, 2003; Slee, 2001).

Oliver (1996), an academic with disability, advocated strongly in support of a social model of inclusion education and argued that the education system had failed students with disabilities by not equipping them to exercise their rights and responsibilities as citizens. In the same vein, he equally noted that the special education system has functioned to exclude them from both the education process and wider social life. This argument strongly resonates with the experiences of people in different locations. This is the case in developing countries like Fiji

and Nigeria. Oliver (1996) concluded by establishing that inclusive education is a confluence of both political and educational ideology that will pave the way for LwSENs for both educational and social inclusion. Similarly, Forlin (2006) perceived that inclusion should be understood from an equity and social justice perspective that is underpinned by a rights-based philosophy. She suggested that education systems have a broad-based obligation to provide support to overcome the difficulties faced by learners in the process of facilitating equality of access for all learners including LwSENs. This, according to Forlin (2006), requires a coordinated effort among all members of society, supported by adequate financing if successfully desired outcomes are to be achieved. The underlying essence of it all is a commitment to the valuing of diversity.

The inclusive policy in Nigeria has not been without some challenges. Michael and Oboegbulem (2013) identified the following deficiencies in Nigeria quest at policy implementation: identification and referral, unbiased assessment, least restrictive environments, funding, IEP (Individualized Education Programming), and legal mandates. The following are the challenges noted by Michael and Oboegbulem:

    i.   Inadequate plans for the identifications of children with special learning disabilities.

ii.   Most special needs schools are located in urban centres.

iii.   Parents lack adequate information and guidance on available special education services.

iv.   Begging for alms seems to be a lucrative business among adults with disabilities and children with special needs as they even run away from rehabilitation centres to pursue this activity.

v.   Lack of adequate provision for the maintenance and education centres.

vi.   Parents are not able to provide for the education of non-disabled children even under the universal basic education in Nigeria; and

vii.   Government has no definite strategy to search for and identify children not attending school whether disabled or non-disabled.

Apart from the similarities of Fiji and Nigeria hinging on their colonial past, regional positioning and generally being developing countries, as established earlier in chapter one, this comparative study is justifiable on four other dynamics. These four variables were well captured by Denholm, McGowan and Tatham (1996) cited in Pilay et al (2015). They are the geography and demographics of both countries, historical and political influences, cultural backgrounds, and religion. Therefore, the impetus for this comparative study of Nigeria and Fiji is predicated on these four variables.

Nigeria and Fiji have some levels of similarities in their geographical locations and demographics. Both are strategically located in their regions, from where they exact huge influences across their continent and region. The constituent demographics of both countries are diverse in nature. The two countries are equally rooted in deep historical trends especially with the advent of the special education of persons with disabilities. They both share a common thread of history with the establishment of special schools by missionaries and philanthropists; and a transition from segregation of LwSENs to mainstreaming and the recent clamour for inclusive educational services delivery. Nigeria and Fiji have a volatile political environment with their nascent democracy after years characterised by military rules and coups. All these factors have

impacted on policies and implementation of service provisions for persons with disabilities at different levels. Instability of the political environments have set the two countries backwards on their developmental pathways.

Objectives of the study

This study has the following objectives:

Investigate the challenges and issues associated with the inclusion of learners with special educational needs into the general education framework in Nigeria and Fiji.

Research question

The singular research question for this research was:

What are the issues and challenges related to the inclusion of learners with special educational needs in both countries at school, community and national levels?

Methodology

Research Design

The study's research design is a descriptive and interpretive case study analysed through a qualitative method. Participants' face-to-face interviews, and in some cases, call-interviews, were used as data collection methods. The analysis of the 21 participants who took part in the interview, of which 12 were from Nigeria and 9 were from Fiji is presented below. These samples had

some level of contact with persons with disabilities either as teachers in special schools, resource persons in disabilities centres, persons with disabilities themselves, employers, head of special school, and lecturers in faculties of education, students and graduates of special education, and early childhood education programmes and administrators. These consisted of five qualitative oral questions.

The qualitative questions are as follows:

    i. What are your views about inclusion?
    ii. What challenges are associated with inclusion?
    iii. What experiences, contacts, stories, etc. have influenced your opinions about inclusion?
    iv. What knowledge and skills are needed to be effective in inclusive teaching?
    v. Do you feel you have these?
    vi. Is there anything else you would like to say?

Findings of the study

It is imperative to note that most participants of the study have a fair knowledge of the concept of inclusion, its relevance and importance in the education of LwSENs in both Fiji and Nigeria. Nevertheless, some participants from Nigeria were quick to voice their concerns regarding inclusive education. Some subscribed to the human rights understanding of inclusion while others argued for the social constructivist approach. Others gravitated towards the "charity" model and the moral obligation of society to educate all its members, as it is believed to end societal prejudices and discriminations against LwSENs population. One respondent from Nigeria defined inclusion as:

> Inclusion is about valuing all individuals by availing them the opportunities for equality of access and abrogating all forms of barriers and obvious discriminations. It speaks of involvement, participation, engagement, and accommodation.

This position resonates with another participant's perception. She is from Fiji and by the nature of her job description has a daily interface with various students with special educational needs in a university setting. This participant explained the whole concept of inclusion of student with disability significantly from the human fundamental right standpoint. She stated:

> From the right-based perspective, inclusion, as we subscribed to,

postulate strongly that none should be denied opportunities to access education, nor discriminated because of their disabilities. It entails leveraging an appropriate support base that guarantees a greater turnover in the productivity mould of society and enhancing these individual collective contributions to the common good. But it must be by the principle of "nothing for us, without us!"

Another participant defined inclusion as:

…about the respect for human dignity, human rights, regardless of our abilities, disabilities; that everyone needs equal treatment and access to services.

A participant described this within the general educational framework. He stated:

In essence they are equally human like everyone else except probably the physiological and anatomical differentials in configuration. Therefore, having said

that as it may, they deserve to be given every opportunity to be situated in the same geographical location with their equivalents within the same educational setting. Inclusion has wholesome implications for a positive self-esteem and image of the child and communicates a message of what value the society place on human dignity.

A pre-service teacher elaborated on the expected positive influence of inclusion:

My backing of inclusion is because it will make learners with special needs feel confident in their abilities and gracious in their inabilities with every sense of self–accommodation. A sense of equity will ensue and become the natural tendency among these students. This will guarantee acquiring skills that makes for life applications and adaptability in the obvious face of life challenges as they navigate the course of life.

Some participants understood inclusion differently; this may be because of their own individual disabilities. Their experiences mean they can relate to the issues and challenges of disabilities and inclusion. One participant referred to deaf students, explaining what he considered a disservice to his community of persons with disabilities in Nigeria. He stated:

> Inclusion is a misplaced priority. It is rather more political and theoretical than practical. It is bound to not make any impact on the education of the deaf …

He further stated:

> Inclusion as practiced in Nigeria or is attempted to be practiced does not recognise the role to be played by deaf teachers and the development of the sign language in the education of the deaf. Inclusion is nothing more than putting an interpreter in front of the class to interpret for students with deafness that may or may not fully grasp what is being taught in the classroom situation. So, what good will this be to deaf children?

Another participant, also from Nigeria, who is deaf gives his experience and explained:

> I didn't go to any deaf school. My first coeducation with deaf people was at Federal College of Special Education, Oyo, Nigeria. I lost my hearing at 16 years old, so my views are diametrically at odd with those proposed by many deaf people. I am convinced that if the deaf person has the aptitude, inclusion can help. For pre-lingual deaf people, inclusion can be difficult. I belong to the school of thought that subscribes to the understanding that Deaf education solely geared towards preparing a solid foundation for the deaf child in later learning processes at secondary and even tertiary education…

From the interview session, it is obvious that different perspectives are expected depending on who is asked, their understanding of the concept and what their experiences with or without a disability or persons with disability. Concerns and questions are raised over the practice of inclusion in Nigeria and

Fiji as well as other developing countries. One respondent explained:

> I am not opposed to mainstreaming students with disabilities in the mainstay of the regular system of our educational platforms…but we all know that inclusion is far beyond and more than just mere "dumping" of these learners in the regular classrooms all in the name joining the leagues of nations that are inclusion-compliance…what about the fundamentals that must be put in place before inclusion becomes a success story? Most of these nations where which inclusion blaze the trail have in place accessible architectural designed facilities to accommodate the various needs of persons with disabilities. They adequately trained teachers in pedagogical best practices suitable for functional and productive teaching and learning. What of policy and strategies for implementation? What about a supportive and effective leadership? Positive teacher attitudes or ownership and acceptance? What of the important place of education assistants and other personnel? And the involvement of parents in decision making? What about the engagement of these learners and flexible curriculum that ought to respond appropriately to individual needs?... so, it's a whole lot to inclusion than just mainstreaming them in regular classrooms… most of the developing nations have not got it right with these basics…

The concern of a respondent was laid out during the interview session as to what he considers the issues surrounding the praxis of inclusive education as an educational policy in Nigeria. The concerns were particular with reference to learners with hearing impairment. The respondent reiterated:

> It is a challenge making deaf teacher part of the inclusive education policy. Our role as stakeholders is not recognized in the scheme of things. We have always emphasised that for it to work, child-

centred approach should be more appropriate because of the different onset of deafness itself…Sign language is not English. It is difficult making educators here in Nigeria, realise this. Sign Language has its peculiarities completely different from that of English. For example, America has recognised America Sign language (ASL) as a distinct language of the deaf but not Nigeria.

In the same vein, another respondent reiterates Cohen's (1994) concern for the communication difficulty with children deafness that could be disadvantaged in the regular school/classroom. Cohen explained:

Communication among peers is crucially important to the cognitive and social development of all children. But most deaf children cannot and will not lip-read or speak effectively in regular classroom settings…, full access to communication- includes the use of sign language. Deaf children, who are integrated, then, are deprived of the means to communicate with their peers. Research shows significant gains (measured by performance tests) of deaf children who attend separate schools for deaf (p. 35).

Another respondent stresses the need to consider the special school placement for severe cases of deaf students with additional disabilities, they explained:

…deafness is not a disability in isolation but might be accompanied, in many cases, by other disabilities like learning disability, emotional and behavioural disorder, and intellectual disorders. This has severe implications for meaningful placement. That is why the option of special school placement rather than inclusion should be the first approach to rehabilitate…

Other major challenges identified from the qualitative data are as follows:

i. negative attitude of teachers, parents and students toward person with disabilities.

ii. curricula stereotype in general education setting.

iii.   inadequate policy framework.

iv.   adaptation and adoption in both curricula variabilities that is incompatible with disabilities.

v.   cost intensiveness.

vi.   lack of access to information and knowledge.

vii.   stigmatization, and.

viii.   ineptitude of personnel and a dearth of facilities.

Other challenges are the non-inclusion of students with disabilities in the decision-making process regarding issues that have a direct impact on LwSENs and policy formulation. The lack of understanding of the appropriate identification and screening facilities for these students with disabilities in the regular classroom by the general education teacher. The non-disclosure of disabilities by the disabled, lack of support from both society and government, unwillingness on the part of the government and institution to budget for this kind of education, and appropriate legislation to back up policies formulated also cited as challenges and issues raised by the respondents interviewed in both Fiji and Nigeria.

Additionally, one participant with a post-lingual deafness identified more of these challenges. She posited that "there is certainly an elephant in the room- it is called money." She equally contended that:

> …all the arguments about inclusive education and integration in the classroom boils down to the fact that the school boards and Ministries of Education want to save more money, or so they think.

The respondent above explains that, in essence, segregated education is more expensive, as that entails the purchase of specialised equipment, the hiring of trained special education teachers, and the building of specialised classrooms. She argues another challenge of inclusion of children with disabilities is many have come to take on inclusion as a mere ideological notion, which has been oversimplified. It also exists with gross distortions of the tenets of the debate; especially with deliberate attempts to equate it with segregation and apartheid like in South Africa. She further explains inclusion has been reduced to some kind of fanaticism about special education; a type of philosophical knot-tying that has become dangerous because of its domino effect with predetermined answers. He quoted Kavale and Forness (2000:289) saying, "by ignoring (empirical) evidence, the inclusion debate has elevated the discussion to the ideological level,

where competing conflicts of vision are difficult to resolve."

This respondent points out the plethora of testing imposed on the process currently as another problem of inclusion. He complains that with this increased environment of testing and so-called "accountability," teachers are expected to also adapt the classroom to students with disabilities. He concludes this is simply asking the impossible of already overworked teachers. Another dimension expressed by this respondent is that many parents feel that students with disabilities have never been well-served in regular education. He further expresses there is nothing to indicate that teachers are any more able to deal with them now than they were previously. The barrage of curriculum materials, syllabi, grade-level expectations for performance, standardized achievement tests, competency tests and so on continue to overwhelm even the most flexible teachers. This respondent agrees with some parents who believe that the "special education system emerged precisely because of the non-adaptability of regular classrooms and that, since nothing has happened to make contemporary classrooms any more adaptable…inclusion most likely will lead to rediscovering the need for a separate system in the future" (Skrtic, 2010:206). Also, disruptive behaviours by some students with disabilities can cause distractions to other students and the tendency for an inferiority complex is likely to emerge in children with disabilities who had to academically compete with those without.

On the issue of support another respondent explained:

> Students with special needs do not have the required support in the regular classroom. Having been a classroom teacher and administrator myself, I can confidently say that the regular classroom dynamics does not afford such luxury. They often have much more targeted support in a self-contained classroom designed to meet their needs. The ratio of teachers to students in the regular classroom makes individual help almost impossible (especially in developing nations). Students are basically being told to sink or swim and, sadly, they sometimes sink in a regular classroom.

Themes such as dearth of resources, appropriate strategies to keep students meaningfully engaged in inclusive classrooms, assistance in scaffolding or differentiating instruction and strategies for dealing with behavioural patterns; were dominant issues raised by respondents. Most respondents also expressed concerns with time constraints for class teachers to adequately plan for their students with disabilities. Against this background,

the respondent quoted above concluded his responses with a rhetorical question that contends with the dispersal of resources. In the words of this above respondent, he commented and asked:

> Dispersing students across classrooms, schools will deplete the resources available to these students. If there are several students who need specific resources for their success, why would we divide these resources among several schools in different locations when the students could be better served by centrally located resources?

A summary of the overarching themes is the discrepancy that often emerges from the polarisation elicited by the choice and equity debates. The amplified pressure to validate improvement in academic produce consequences, acceptance of social and political changes in the school community. There must be an alignment of teacher education programmes with inclusive education policy for pre-service teachers' as professional learning. The resourcing of the programme of inclusion adequately and all-encompassing inclusion of persons with disabilities as part of policy and praxis mechanism process for better outputs is a necessary responsibility for policy makers.

DISCUSSION

From the data of this study and in agreement with other findings is the conclusion that the implementation of the inclusion policy in Nigeria and Fiji is inundated with many challenges and issues of concern. This discourse underpinned the research question, "what are the issues and challenges about the inclusion of learners with disabilities in Nigeria and Fiji?"

The following issues were raised from the conducted interviews: The first issue is the concept of inclusion. A participant from Nigeria defines it as being:

> About the respect for human dignity, human rights, regardless of our abilities, disabilities; that everyone needs equal treatment and access to services.

Another saw it as about:

> Valuing all individuals by availing them the opportunities for equality of access and abrogating all forms of barriers and obvious discriminations. It speaks of involvement, participation, engagement and accommodation.

A participant from Fiji explained the concept of inclusion from the right-based perspective. She opined that it:

> Predisposes strongly that none should be denied opportunities to access education, nor discriminated because of their disabilities. It entails leveraging appropriate support base that

guarantee a greater turnover in the productivity mould of society and enhancing these individual collective contributions to the common good. But it must be by the principle of "nothing for us without us!"

One participant attempted to merge all classes of disadvantages or unserved persons within the spectrum of inclusivity: the minority, financially disadvantaged, those of linguistic diversity, those of diverse sexual orientation, gender, and many more. Nigeria's phenomenon has been the superficiality of its conceptualization, as most see inclusive education as parallel to special education and merely constitute "dumping" these students in the regular classrooms/schools. This confusion or lack of specificity in conceptualization is consistent with the work of researchers earlier reviewed. To this end, Norwich's (2013) observation agrees with the dilemmas of this study's conceptual findings. Norwich rightly observed that inclusive education's definition and its usage are seriously problematic. According to the same observation, the term has been used to exclusively refer to inclusive schools as well as society is seen through the definitions above.

Another aspect of the dilemma from the findings of this study is the understanding that inclusive schools should run differently to the special education schools. According to these participants in the study from both countries, there could be students who cannot be exclusively educated in the regular classroom but in special schools. This finding is supported by Hornby (2012) who referred to advancing inclusive education as aggregating the numbers of mainstream schools while maintaining special schools for those who need them. Hornby, by extension explained that some use the term "inclusion" to describe a situation in which all children are educated in mainstream classes/schools with only a temporary withdrawal from these classroom arrangements, which is a case in point in the practice of what some understand to be inclusive education in Nigeria according to this study. In Nigeria, special classes, refers to resource rooms and in most cases are attached to regular schools with special educators. Learners with special educational needs are from time to time withdrawn to these rooms for an interaction/learning session with the special educator and subsequently returned to the regular classroom. This is in fact, an integrated approach and does not constitute inclusion.

The confusion in defining inclusion by some participants in this study, from the narrow perspective of merely getting LwSENs into the regular classrooms/schools thereby complying with international protocols and benchmarks, mirror Hornby's (2012) position. Hornby held that there is a

fusion of "social inclusion" with "inclusive education" for children with special needs. Accordingly, social inclusion is archetypally used to explain the sole objective of achieving an all-inclusive culture/society. Such society where which every person's value is acknowledged and significant to the common good of everyone and each having important roles to play. Whereas, in education jargon, social inclusion refers to the inclusion in mainstream schools of children with a wide diversity of differences, difficulties, and needs. This has a much broader focus than inclusive education for LwSENs but is often used by proponents of inclusion as if it meant the same. Admittedly, much of the confusion over inclusion stems from the negligent usage of several related terms and attempts to use these interchangeably when differences in meaning exist. This is especially among the more commonly used terms: mainstreaming, integration, partial and full inclusion.

The participants in this study described above may have established their perspective of inclusive education for learners with disabilities based on the common understanding of mainstreaming and other older terms. These terms are sometimes mostly associated with the physical accommodation of LwSENs with their non-disabled peers. This may be more a matter of connotative baggage rather than intent. Nevertheless,

mainstreaming assumes that students with disabilities may share the same physical space (classroom, playground, etc.) with those who have no disabilities only when they are able to do the same activities as everyone else with minimal modifications. Furthermore, some of the participants interviewed for this study think the primary responsibility for these students' education remains with their special education teacher. This is the situation in Nigeria and Fiji as shown by the qualitative instruments administered in this study. This is supported by Rogers (1993) who argued that mainstreaming has generally been used to refer to the selective placement of special education students in one or more regular education classes. Roger further explains that mainstreaming generally assumes that a student must earn his or her opportunity to be mainstreamed through the ability to keep up with the work assigned by the teacher to the other students in the class.

It is prevalent from the finding that the complexities in the definitions provided could reflect a people's dispositions to persons with disabilities. This therefore has implications for the pre-service teachers' formation of perceptions generally towards learners with disabilities, and it shows in the contents of the teacher development curriculum in Fiji and Nigeria. For example, discussing the conceptualizations of

inclusive education in South Africa and bearing in mind the historical realities of the country, Walton and Nel (2012) noted that South Africa's understanding of inclusive education is:

> constructed by a discourse community through theory, practice, and research, and is influenced by the socio-historical and cultural contexts in which the discourse takes place.

(p. 4)

Also expected from Nigeria and Fiji, South Africa will decide on its own understanding of inclusion and inclusive education for learners with disabilities and will use this within a context of their history, educational realities and the influences of the international community.

In connection to this "meaning" dilemma espoused by this study and corroborating the situation in Fiji vis-à-vis the Pacific, Sharma et al. (2015) explained that despite the show of commitment from Pacific Island States Governments through the Pacific Education Development Framework (PEDF) and various other policies, there is little indication of much drive around inclusive education in practice. This, according to them, may be because externally imposed policy is not enough and has to be contextualized within the

circumstances in each country to make any significant impact. McDonald and Tufue-Dolgoy (2013) reasoned that "inclusive education is consistent with the cultural imperatives and policy developments but has placed demands upon a system with limited resources and teacher skills" (p. 272). These plethora of misrepresentations and over-generalization in the definitions of inclusion by some of the participants in this study are a reminder of the attempt to oversimplify or over-generalize the educational processes and practices for learners with special educational needs. Hence, the problem of interpretation and translation of this concept without the consideration of cultural imperatives of a people in mind could be an effort in futility.

The context for any definition exercise of the concept of inclusion concerning the quagmire described above could be resolved with a look at Spandagou's (2002) description of this. She explained that

> inclusion as a new territory [at least, at the time she wrote that, but still the reality for most developing countries like Nigeria and Fiji] for which a complete map has not yet been produced of the possible categorization of the facets of the inclusion polyhedron.

(p. 95)

Spandagou's submission then, can be said to be Nigeria and Fiji's reality today. She describes these facets as three-dimensional, which can be seen from different angles giving different hierarchies. The first dimension is the categorisation of inclusion as a discourse with reference to the academic, discipline/expertise, policymaking, practice, advocacy, and "in-site' discourses. This is what can take place in classrooms, schools, schoolyards, and neighbourhoods. A second dimension Spandagou refers to is "inclusion according to location." These are levels as the international, groups of countries (for example, sharing common characteristics, belonging to specific organisations, existence of lack of inclusive policies and/or practices, language or culture), national, local, institutional (e.g., schools), and relationships amongst individuals. Her final categorisation is the "inclusion as a notion" of some theoretical, research (analytical), advocacy, policy, practice, pedagogical, and financial/resources paradigm. A viewpoint from a combination of these categorisations may have been leveraged in those definitions of the concept of inclusion.

The implication of the above conceptualisation could be a dilemma for most students with severe disabilities and their opportunities to be around non-disabled peers are limited to (at most) lunch and recess. Others may also be integrated into physical education, music, art, and/or vocational programmes. Typically, however, only students with mild disabilities have been allowed to participate in the traditional core academic content areas (for example, mathematics, language arts, science, and history). Erwin (1993, p. 1) affirmed that "the true essence of inclusion is based on the premise that all individuals with disabilities have a right to be included in naturally occurring settings and activities with their neighbourhood peers, siblings, and friends." Therefore, Roger (1993) in the light of all discussed above explained that inclusion of children with disabilities ought to be a commitment to educating each child, to the appropriate maximum extent, in the school and classroom they ought to attend. This involves bringing support services to the child and requires that the child benefit from being in the class, rather than them "keeping up" with the other students.

A key challenge highlighted by those interviewed during the research study concerns the funding of children with special educational needs and those included in mainstream schools. This was regarded by most participants as "the elephant in the room," especially in Nigeria and Fiji. An interviewee specifically noted:

> All the arguments about inclusive education and integration in the classroom boils down to… more

money…and so much more money, or so they think.

That is corroborated by one of the conclusions of a report published in 2016 by the International Disability and Development Consortium (IDDC). The report notes that despite numerous global commitments, global funding for inclusive education is declining, and the report further reveals "severe funding deficiencies impact disproportionately on children with disabilities" (IDDC, 2016:11). Most developing countries, Nigeria and Fiji in particular, have erroneously surmised that the education of persons with special educational needs in inclusive classroom are costly. The budgetary allocation for education for both countries continues to fall short of the UNESCO's benchmark for educational allocation.

A look at the budgetary allocation for the education system and the percentage of that allocation voted for the education of LwSENs of any country is a direct reflection of that country's willingness to educate her disabled citizens properly and adequately. Therefore, the general attitude or perception of a country is effectively captured or gauged by the allocation of funds in their order of priorities. As seen from the literature review in this study, there are no financial policies that exist for the funding of inclusive education for LwSENs in both Nigeria and Fiji yet. As reviewed earlier in this study, while

Fiji may have shown some financial commitment towards the education of persons with disabilities and their general welfare, Nigeria, on the other hand from reviewed documents and interviews, they have not made such specific indications of those commitments. In the light of the budgetary situation, Fiji and Nigeria may need to consider the IDDC report that calls for a disability responsive budgeting and advised that the government of each country need to formulate policy that encompasses a financial funding formula that is geared towards underwriting the high cost of educating learners with additional needs in classroom situations. The policy must also involve the removal of barriers that hinder the implementation of the inclusion of LwSENs.

It is clearer from the literature reviewed and the participants interviewed in this study that inclusive education is a human right and an end within itself. However, Nigeria and Fiji government respectively as well as other developing countries must realise that there is a broader profiting for the economy and society by including all students despite their disabilities. Lamichhane (2014) even explained that evidence from developing countries such as, Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Nepal, and the Philippines show that the returns on investing in education for people with disabilities are two to three times higher than that of persons without disabilities. UNESCO (2012)

explained the appropriateness of educating LwSENs with a good quality education that is characterised by adequate and appropriate trained teachers with a robust peer support system. UNESCO even categorically stated that as many as 80–90% of LwSENs could be educated in inclusive schools with only minor additional support.

The impact of the inadequacies in budgetary allocations which was an emphasis in the findings, for the education sector generally as seen in Nigeria in particular, could be devastating for the education for learners with disabilities. Aligning to this challenge, Thomas and Burnett (2013), argued that in Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Gambia, Lesotho, Liberia, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, and Yemen the cost of out-of-school children (many of whom will have disabilities) is estimated to be "greater than the value of an entire year of GDP growth." There seems to be an overwhelming attachment to special schools in both Nigeria and Fiji due to their historical backgrounds from the findings of this study. This also informs the investments made in that direction: the financing of special or segregated educational settings. These special schools have traditionally been the only provision for LwSENs in many countries like Nigeria and Fiji (except in Fiji where there are a few pilot inclusive schools) and are continuing to be seen as a safer option,

even though they cost more. By contrast, Mitchell (2010) and Acedo et al. (2011) also pointed out that the outcome of a child-friendly, inclusive education can leverage better social and academic results for all learners. Concerning cost, which was an issue raised by the participants, UNESCO (2014) found in Pakistan that special schools are 15 times more expensive per pupil than educating children in inclusive schools. In South Africa, the average cost in 2012 to build a special school was ZAR9,000,000 and to upgrade the infrastructure of a mainstream school to accommodate children with disabilities can cost around ZAR366,337 (Human Rights Watch, 2015).

Giving another perspective to the issue of cost/funding, Warnock and Norwich (2010) made a case for funding issues of special education. Hornby (2012) also claimed that special schools and units seem more expensive but says this can only be true in the short term if the education system does not provide young people with special education and the knowledge, skills, and attitudes they need. To be independent and successful beyond school, the capital and social cost to society will be far greater in the end in areas such as, unemployment benefits, welfare payments (not particularly available in Nigeria) and the cost to the criminal justice system. Hornby (2012) argued special provision for a small number of children with disabilities could have

high financial implications, nevertheless, likely to be much less in comparison to the consequences of a lack of such financial investment for the person with disability, society and the nation at large.

Curricula issues were raised as another challenge evident from the qualitative data. One of the respondents from Fiji was concerned with the drastic changes pushed by the mainstream education system, to include children with disabilities with no consideration for the warranted curricula adaptations to accommodate the transition. This is the case for many developing countries who are quick to ratify any protocol that paves the way for policy changes without taking care of the intricacies that makes for their successful implementation. Many times, policies become wholesale importation without the necessary modifications to suit the country's needs vis-à-vis its culture, financial situation, teacher preparedness, physical accommodation and so on, as alluded to by Garuba (2003) in the case of Nigeria, and as well as Fiji by extension. Hornby (2010) maintained that inclusion with an unsuitable curriculum, directly contributes to the development of emotional or behavioural difficulties for many children. This can lead to children being disruptive and eventually result to the exclusion of some from schools. Farrell (2010) also added the priority for children with special educational needs is to have

access to appropriate curricula and not fitted into a non-modified national curriculum designed for the mainstream population. Sapon-Shevin (1994), on the other hand, pointed out that students identified as "gifted' or as "disabled' do not need to be segregated from others to have their needs met or dumped with others without differentiation or appropriate treatment via curriculum change or adaptations.

Perhaps the greatest concern and opposition to inclusive education comes from those with disabilities themselves, especially many in the deaf community of Nigeria. This opposition can also be traced to the United States during the 1990s. Their concerns were based on a perception of inclusion of children with deafness as a threat to the deaf language, culture, and community. This position resonates with Cohen's (1994) position, suggesting inclusion is inappropriate for most students with hearing impairment. He noted that communication among peers is crucially important to the cognitive and social development for all children. Conversely, Cohen (1994) explained that most deaf children have limited speech and choose not to lip-read nor are they able to speak clearly in regular classroom settings. For many deaf students, full access to communication and therefore full cognitive and social development, includes the use of sign language.

Cohen pointed to supportive research suggesting greater intellectual gains are

made by deaf students enrolled in schools for the hearing impaired where there is a strong deaf culture, where a common language and culture may be shared. Cohen contends that hearing-impaired students would miss out on many of the experiences targeted at inclusive environments by inclusion advocates even when there is an educational sign-language interpreter. For example, a sense of belonging and opportunities to interact with peers could be difficult. Cohen (1994) believed that social, emotional, and academic development could be difficult when communication must be facilitated through an interpreter or even when there is no facilitator. For the hearing impaired, informal communications and friendships with peers, participation in extracurricular activities, dating, and so on are also not well facilitated when a third-party interpreter is needed to communicate. Consequently, many researchers argued like Cohen, that the more appropriate educational placement option for the hearing impaired is a residential school with a "community" of other hearing-impaired students especially if there is a strong deaf culture in that educational location.

On the contrary, Lewis (1994) stated that students with disabilities in inclusive environments improve their social interaction, language development, behaviour, and self-esteem. Observing the inclusion of persons with disabilities, it will be appropriate to submit that when the regular and special education faculty work cooperatively together in an inclusive setting, their coordinated work tend to raise their own expectations for all students. This also will include their students with disabilities, the students' self-esteem, and their sense of belonging is improved. One argument by whom frequently proposes that the further integration of those with disabilities into mainstream classes tends to undermine the deaf community's opposition. By interacting with their disabled peers, students will have opportunities to develop positive attitudes toward, tolerance of, understanding of, and true friendships with those who are different from themselves. Indeed, studies show the general student population is more accepting, understanding, and socially aware of differences when they are incorporated into integrated classroom settings (Staub & Peck, 1995; McGregor, 1993). Stainback, Stainback, and Bunch (1992) suggested this dual system does not adequately prepare students with disabilities for the "real world" because it is not divided into "regular" and "special." Consequently, segregated placements with limited interactions between those with disabilities and those without, further handicap students with special educational needs.

An effective inclusive education programme should be located at the

core of teachers' training, the preparation of conducive learning environments in schools, the empowerment of parents, the education of community members and professionals in allied service systems. It is also important to keep the policy makers well informed by running professional development and giving progress reports on a regular basis. The more policy makers can understand about inclusion, the more supportive they could become in this regard. When policy makers understand issues of different abilities, their causes, rights, and inclusiveness, issues of inclusive policy can be better co-ordinated.

Implications

Prioritising the findings of the study has implications for the provision of a platform for reviewing the policy context, at the system base and school level in Fiji and Nigeria. This is to ensure an appropriate practice of inclusive policy, especially as prescribed within the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) framework. The validity and strength of any educational programme is determined by its policy. Nigeria and Fiji need to strengthen or formulate a policy that seeks to establish an educational reform that promotes inclusive practices to enhance appropriate knowledge, skills, competencies, attitudes and values that create. Therefore, any policy of inclusive education in Nigeria and Fiji

that is intended to yield results should be processed through every stakeholder in that value change.

An enabling environment must be created to support the implementation of inclusive education ideology, including cross-sectoral policies and strategies to reduce exclusion. The essentials of hands-on data on disability and education cannot be overemphasised and the need to build accountability for action. For children with disabilities in particular, the dearth of data is a substantial problem faced in realising the rights of disabled people.

Recommendations

Based on this study's findings the following recommendations are offered:

i.   Developing flexible and creative approaches to facilitate the participation of all stakeholders and students with disabilities in the development of policy and practice that will impact their learning and personal experiences at all levels of the system. This procedure needs to include the input from people with disabilities or through meetings with partners and stakeholder at all levels.

ii. Teacher preparation programmes must share knowledge from an inclusive perspective, not the disability medical paradigm. The programmes will need to emphasise the acquisition of the right skill sets, development of

belief efficacy through practice, by providing teaching practice/practicum opportunities, fieldtrips, and other avenues of deliberate social contacts with people with disabilities. There is a need for a paradigm shift from the "disability" to the "personhood" of the LwSENs, and the teacher education institutions in Nigeria and Fiji should reflect this change in their curriculum design in this era of the SDGs.

iii.   Nigeria can follow the examples of Fiji for policy formulation. Also, The University of the South Pacific Disability Policy from 2013 should be replicated by institutions of higher learning in Nigeria. Fiji needs to more widely adopt inclusion (specifically for LwSENs) policies to pave the way for a continuum of programmes and services at all levels of learning and teaching.

iv.   Teacher training institutions in Fiji and Nigeria should lead the way for inclusivity by becoming more proactive in disability/inclusive studies through re-evaluating course contents to be reflective of current realities in the field of education for persons with disabilities. All students studying to teach in the faculty/schools of education should take mandatory courses in inclusive education to ground them in the realities of classroom/community situations. This could be completed at the

entry point as well as another general course at the end of their programme. For instance, courses that incorporate cognate aspects of teacher education curriculum should replace those currently offered and are taught from a medical paradigm. Such courses should consist of four core activities: (a) reading and discussion; (b) field-based experiences; (c) assignments in adapting instruction and developing accommodations for individual students, and (d) classmate interviews. Also, redesigning existing courses to reflect the new dimensions in inclusivity.

v.   Awareness campaign and sensitizing programmes should be held across constant with stakeholder on best practices in the education of persons with disabilities.

Conclusion

Inclusion should be implemented with the understanding that decisions to be made vary from classroom to classroom, school to school, and year-to-year all within a cultural context. From this study and other various studies reviewed, it is obvious that the best practices for creating inclusive classrooms are ones that are contextualised for the group of individuals. Reiterating the findings, the study highlighted many challenges and issues raised from the qualitative

data surrounding the inclusion of LwSENs in a regular educational system. Among those considered were negative perceptions of teachers, parents and students towards person with disabilities, inappropriate curriculum and stigmatisation in the general education setting. Moreover, the inadequate policy frameworks, adaptation and adoption of curricula inconsistencies are incompatible with the need of learners. Other challenges highlighted in this chapter are the cost of funding the education, lack of access to information and knowledge and ineptness of personnel and a dearth of facilities.

REFERENCES

1. Acedo, C., Opertti, R., Brady, J. & Duncombe, L. (Eds.) (2011). Interregional and regional perspectives on inclusive education. Paris/Geneva UNESCO/IBE. Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002147/214724e.pdf

2. Affleck, J., Madge, S., Adams, A., & Lowenbraun, S. (1988). Effects of integrated classroom and resource room placement on academic achievement of mildly handicapped and regular education students. Exceptional Children, 54, 339–348.

3. Artiles, A.J., Harris-Murri, N & Rostenberg, D. (2006). Inclusion as social justice: Critical notes on discourses, assumptions, and the road ahead. Theory into Practice, 45:260-268. doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4503_8.

4. Bennett, S. & Gallagher, T.L., (2012). The delivery of education services for students who have an intellectual disability in the Province of Ontario. Toronto: Community Living Ontario.

5. Engelbrecht, P. (2006). The implementation of inclusive education in South Africa after ten years of democracy. European Journal of Psychology of Education, 21, 3, 253-264. Available at http://download.springer.com/static/pdf/.

6. Engelbrecht, P., Nel, M., Nel, N., & Tlale, D. (2015). Enacting understanding of inclusion in complex contexts: Classroom practices of South African teachers. South African Journal of Education, 35, 3, 1-10.

7. Erevelles, N. (2011). "Coming out crip" in inclusive education. Teachers College Record, 113, 2155- 2185.

8. Erwin, E. J. (1993). The philosophy and status of inclusion. Envision: A publication of The Lighthouse National Center for Vision and Child Development, 1, 3-4.

9. European Association of Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities (EASPD) (2009). EASPD-Barometer of inclusive education in selected European Countries: Dissemination executive summary paper. http://www.includ-ed.eu/sites/default/files/good-pratice/files/dissemination-paper-english-web_0.pdf

10. Forlin, C. (2006). Inclusive education in Australia ten years after Salamanca. European Journal of Psychology of Education, XXI, 3, 265 – 277.

11. Garcia-Huidobro, J. (2009). Barriers that prevent the achievement of inclusive democratic education. Prospects, 39, 239–250. doi: 10.1007/s11125-099-9128-8.

12. Garuba, A. (2003). Inclusive education in the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities for Nigeria. Asia-Pacific Disability Rehabilitation Journal, 14, 191-200.

13. Hornby, G. (2012). Inclusive education for children with special educational needs: A critique of policy and practice of New Zealand. Journal of International and Comparative Education, 1, 1, 52-60. file:///D:/Users/s11115942/Downloads/2595-901-7799-1-10-20170530.pdf

14. Hornby, G. & Witte, C. (2010). Parent involvement in inclusive primary schools in New Zealand: Implications for improving practice and for teacher education. International Journal of Whole schooling, 6, 1, 27-38.

15. Kavale, K. A., & Forness, S. R. (2000). History, rhetoric, and reality: Analysis of the inclusion debate. Remedial and Special Education, 21, 5, 279-296.

16. Lunt, I. & Norwich, B. (1999). Can Effective Schools Be Inclusive Schools? London: Institute of Education

17. McDonald, L., & Tufue-Dolgoy, R. (2013). Moving forwards, sideways or backwards? Inclusive education in Samoa. International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 60, 270–284.

18. Mitchell, D. (2010). Education that fits: Review of international trends in the education of students with special educational needs. Wellington: New Zealand Ministry of Education.

19. Moberg, S. & Savolainen, H. (2003). Struggling for inclusive education in the North and the South: Educators perceptions on inclusive education in Finland and Zambia. International Journal of Rehabilitation Research, 26, 21–31.

20. Norwich, B. (2013). Addressing tensions and dilemmas in inclusive education: Living with uncertainty. London: Routledge.

21. Obrusnikova, I., Block, M.E., & Válková, H. (2003). Impact of inclusion in GPE on students without disabilities. Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly, 20, 230-245.

22. Oliver, M. (1996). Understanding disability: From theory to practice. Basingstoke: MacMillan**.**

23. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2011). PISA in focus: Improving Performance – Leading from the Bottom. Paris: OECD.

24. Pillay, H., Carrington, S., Duke, J., Chandra, S., Heeraman, J., Tones, M., & Mani, R. (2015). National Profiles of In-Country Capacity to Support Disability-Inclusive Education; Fiji, Samoa, Soloman Islands and Vanuatu. Brisbane, Qld: Queensland University of Technology.

25. Rogers, J. (1993). The inclusion revolution. Phi Delta Kappan Research Bulletin, 11, 1-6.

26. Sharma, A. N., Coombs, S. J., Chandra, S. & Sagaitu, M. (2015). Fiji: Evolution of education from colonial to modern times. In M. Crossley, G. Hancock & T. Sprague, (Eds.). Education around the world: Education in Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific. Bloomsbury: London.

27. Sharpe, M.N., Yorke, J.L., & Knight, J. (1994). Effects of inclusion on the academic performance of classmates without disabilities: A preliminary study, Remedial and special education, 15, 5, 281-287. Doi: 10.1177/07419325940150050 3.

28. Slee, R. (2001). 'Inclusion in practice:' Does practice make perfect? Educational Review, 53, 2, 113-123.

29. Spandagou, I. (12002). Comparative and ethnographic research on inclusion: The case of English and Greek secondary education. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sheffield.

30. Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1996). Controversial issues confronting special education: Divergent perspectives (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

31. Stainback, W., Stainback, S., & Bunch, G. (1989). A rationale for the merger of regular and special education. In S. Stainback, W. Stainback, & Forest, M. (Eds.), Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

32. Staub, D., & Peck, C.A. (1995). What are the outcomes for non-disabled students? Educational Leadership, 52, 4, 36-40.

33. Tapasak, R.C., & Walther-Thomas, C.S. (1999). Evaluation of a first-year inclusion program. Remedial and Special Education, 20, 4, 216-225.

34. Thomas, M. & Burnett, N. (2013). Exclusion from Education: The Economic Cost of Out of School Children in 20 Countries. Washington, DC: Results for Development and Educate a Child.

35. Thomas, G., Walker, D., & Webb, J. (1998). The making of the inclusive school. London: Routledge/Falmer.

36. UNESCO. (1994).The world conference on special needs education: Access and quality. Final report. Salamanca, Spain: Ministry of Education and Science, Madrid; UNESCO.

37. UNESCO (2012). Education: Addressing exclusion. http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/strengthening-education systems

38. UNESCO (2013). Schooling for Millions of Children Jeopardized by Reductions in Aid. Policy Paper 09. Paris: UNESCO Education for All Global Monitoring Report. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002211/221129E.pdf.

39. UNESCO (2017). Inclusion from the start: Guidelines on

inclusive early childhood care and education for Roma children. UNESCO, Council of Europe. Retrieved from http://en.unesco.org/inclusive policylab/sites/default/files/publication/document/2017/1/227503e.pdf

40. Walton, E & N. Nel (2012): What counts as inclusion? Africa Education Review, 9:1, 1-2.

41. Warnock, M., & Norwich, B. (2010). Special educational needs: A new look. London: Continuum

42. Welch, T. & Gultig, J. (2002). Becoming competent: Initiatives for the improvement of teacher education in South Africa 1995 to 2002. Paper presented to Pan-Commonwealth Conference, Durban, South Africa July 2002.

43. Werning, R., Artiles, A.J., Engelbrecht, P., Hummel, M., Caballeros, M. & Rothe, A. (Eds.) (2016). Keeping the promise? Contextualizing inclusive education in developing countries. Germany: Druck und Bindung: AZ Druck und Datentechnik, Kempten.

44. Willms, D. J. (2006). Learning divides: Ten policy questions about the performance and equity of schools and schooling systems. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.