



EdQual

A Research Programme Consortium on
Implementing Education Quality in Low Income Countries

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

A Step Towards Social Justice

EdQual Working Paper

Inclusion No.1

By

Filiz Polat

with

Joseph Kisanji

September 2009



EdQual

A Research Programme Consortium on
Implementing Education Quality in Low Income Countries

EdQual RPC is a Research Consortium led by the University of Bristol UK and sponsored by the Department for International Development, UK. 

The Consortium comprises:

- The Graduate School of Education, University of Bristol, UK
 - The Department of Education, University of Bath, UK
 - The Institute for Educational Planning and Administration, University of Cape Coast, Ghana
 - The Faculty of Education, University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
 - The Kigali Institute of Education, Rwanda
 - The Education Policy Unit, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.
- EdQual also collaborates with the Institute for Educational Development, The Aga Khan University, Pakistan and the Instituto de Informática Educativa, Universidad de La Frontera, Chile.

EdQual runs research projects mainly in Africa, aimed at improving the quality of formal basic education for disadvantaged groups. Our projects include:

- Implementing Curriculum Change to Reduce Poverty and to Increase Gender Equity
- Leadership and Management of Change for Quality Improvement
- Literacy and Language Development through Primary Education
- School Effectiveness and Education Quality in Southern and Eastern Africa
- The Use of ICT to Support Basic Education in Disadvantaged Schools and Communities in Low Income Countries.

For more information and other papers in this series, visit www.edqual.org.

This paper was first presented at the 10th UKFIET International Conference, University of Oxford, 15-17 September 2009.

This Paper has been published by EdQual RPC and funded by the UK Department for International Development, although the views expressed are those of the Author[s].

Extracts from this Working Paper may only be reproduced with the permission of the Author[s].
©EdQual 2008

ISBN: 978-1-906675-18-9

Abstract

This paper approaches inclusive education as one of the means towards social justice and social inclusion. Based on this approach, the paper, drawn from an ongoing participatory action research project on developing an index for inclusion in Tanzania, attempts to situate inclusive education within the ongoing debate of social justice. The literature review and emerging findings of the project suggest that there has been considerable progress towards including *all* however the march towards inclusive, just and quality education remains to be far reached.

Abbreviations

CSO	Civil Society Organisations
DEO	District Education Officer
EFA	Education for All
ETP	Education and Training Policy
IE	Inclusive Education
MoEVT	Ministry of Education and Vocational Training
PAR	Participatory Action Research
PEDP	Primary Education Development Programme
PSDP	Participatory School Development Planning
PSLE	Primary School Leaving Examinations
SPD	School Planning Development
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
TCQ	Timeline of Change Questionnaire
WSDP	Whole School Development Planning

CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Abbreviations	iii
CONTENTS	iv
A Brief Historical Account of the Journey from Integration to Inclusion.....	1
Inclusive Education and Education for All and Equality	1
Significance of Inclusive Education and Education for All in Countries of the South	3
Need for further research for just societies in low-income countries.....	5
Research Design and Methodology.....	6
Emerging Findings	7
<i>Table 1: The SWOT Analysis barriers to inclusion as identified by the participating</i>	8
Discussion and Conclusions.....	9
References.....	12

Author for Correspondence: Filiz Polat at filiz.polat@hku.hk

A Brief Historical Account of the Journey from Integration to Inclusion

There has been a significant shift from special education to inclusive education (IE) around the globe including both low-income and income-rich countries¹. Following long standing segregation of disabled learners in special schools, integration was an alternative placement for such learners up until 1980s. Historically disabled learners were 'integrated' into mainstream schools alongside with their non-disabled peers and oftentimes this integration was physical in nature (presence) where the necessary accommodations were not made to enable their participation. The integration took many forms ranging from occasional presence of disabled students from segregated special schools to mainstream schools to full placement in mainstream school and occasional withdrawal from mainstream classes by placing them in 'special classes' and segregated group activities at times outside of mainstream class and/or school. Indeed, total isolation of some disabled learners in integrated settings was evident, which can be considered as another form of segregation. Although there seems to be confusion in terminology concerning integration and inclusion as they can be used interchangeably (eg. Mittler, 2000), there are substantial conceptual differences in values and practices of the two. As was noted earlier, integration is about partial or full physical placement of disabled learners in mainstream schools, while inclusion is much more than presence, which involves process of changing values, attitudes, policies and practices within a school setting and beyond. Although inclusion has been a mainstream terminology for more than two decades, the struggle for achieving education for all has been a long standing battle for more than five decades, as stated in Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations (UN, 1948). The ongoing journey towards securing basic education and including *all* starting with Article 26 followed by number of key declarations, such as: The World Programme Action Concerning Disabled Persons (UN, 1983); Convention on the Right of the Children (UN, 1989); Salamanca Statement and Framework of Action on Special Needs Education (UNESCO, 1994); Dakar Framework for Action (UNESCO, 2000); Millennium Development Goals (UN, 2000); **EFA Flagship: Education for Persons with Disabilities: Towards Inclusion (2001)**; and, Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN, 2006) However, the longstanding battle towards a more equitable, fair and inclusive society and education systems seems to be at its crawling stage.

Inclusive Education and Education for All and Equality

Inclusion is a philosophy that is based on values aiming to maximise participation of *all* in society and education by minimising exclusionary and discriminatory practices (Booth, 2005). However, the definition and practice of IE can vary significantly between and within cultures and educational systems (Dyson, 1999; Booth, 2005). The field of special and IE is one of the most contested and controversial area of educational research, policy and practice. Norwich's (2008) latest book, *Dilemmas of Difference, Inclusion and Disability*, drawing from international research and perspectives, debates different and often times conflicting values and approaches of educational policies by uncovering dilemmas of recognition, identification, placement and curriculum. There is no universally agreed definition of inclusion. Definitional variations of IE, as well as its varying practices, are well evidenced in the related literature, and a discussion on this, somehow, rather

¹ The phrases 'low-income' and 'income-rich' countries refers to what is commonly used as 'developing' and 'developed' countries, respectively. This terminology is preferred since the terminology of 'developing countries', somehow, undermines the richness of such 'economically developing' cultures. Another alternative terminology that will be used referring to 'developing' and 'developed' countries is 'countries of the South' and 'countries of the North', respectively, which reflects the current trend of terminology in the literature.

controversial area is well beyond the scope of this paper. It is, therefore, important to clarify what we mean by IE. The authors of this paper do not perceive IE as limited to inclusion of those children and young people with disabilities². Our understanding of inclusion is inclusion of *all* regardless of peoples' race, ethnicity, disability, gender, sexual orientation, language, socio economic status and any other aspect of what composes person's identity that might be perceived as *diverse*. As powerfully articulated by Booth (2005):

"For 'disabled' only describes one aspect of a person's identity and one set of discriminatory pressures. Disabled people are male and female, Hutus and Tutsis and Inuit and gays and lesbians, Muslims, Sikhs and Hindus, Brahmins and Dalits, and people living with HIV and AIDS. Pressures to include disabled people will have limited success if it is not also concerned with issues such as gender, caste, class, religion, ethnicity, background, poverty and sexual orientation." (p.151-152)

Education for All (EFA), as a means towards inclusive and equitable society, needs to take into account of diversity, which is by no means limited to disability. The mission of EFA/IE is to address issues of social justice, inequality, human rights and participatory democracy. Booth further argues that failure of crossing boundaries towards a broader spectrum of inclusion by disability advocates 'leaves them in alliance with special education system that serves to limit the participation of disabled children in education and to segregate them in special settings' (2005, p.152). In a similar vein, Barton (1995) argues that EFA, as part of a human rights approach, necessitates engagement with issues of 'social justice, equity and participatory democracy' (p.157). Unterhalter and Brighouse (2007), pointing out the goal of EFA as 'universal inclusion in *quality* primary education' (p.72), acknowledge considerable debate on the definition of 'quality in education' in literature, which seems to fail, relating such debate to equality in a society. Unterhalter and Brighouse's (2007) critical analysis of current approaches used to measure EFA (i.e. gross enrolment rate, net enrolment rate and the gender gap) and concludes that such approaches are problematic as they fail to address further multilayered forms social divisions. There is an emerging literature that adopts Sen and Nussbaum's capability approach, which is argued to situate equity and quality in education within the social justice framework;³

The capability approach alerts us to the need to describe not only access to, and very narrowly defined achievement in, education but also to assess aspects of education deemed valuable and hence issues about the distribution of resources, given complex class, gender, race and ethnic inequalities. (Unterhalter and Brighouse, 2007: p.73)

For a long time, discussions on social justice focused on social class, arguing that social justice can be achieved through more equal distribution of resources (social and economic) (Goodlad & Riddell, 2005). However, in the last couple of decades more comprehensive perspectives of social justice have developed acknowledging plural aspect of social justice such as gender and race. Although disability has been a neglected aspect of the social justice debate, this has been changing in recent years with a growing disabled people's movement. In this vein, this paper is focusing on Nussbaum's version of the capabilities approach, which develops further insights addressing issues of social justice including disabled people (Nussbaum, 2006). The basis of the approach presented enlist ten central entitlements (ie. life; bodily health; bodily integrity; senses, imagination and thought; emotions; practical reason; affiliation; other species; play; and, control over one's environment)⁴, which, Nussbaum characterises as the central human capabilities. These capabilities, according to Nussbaum:

² Our use of disability or people with disabilities is inclusive of a range of terminology referring to people with impairments, difficulties and disabilities. There is wealth of literature on terminology, labelling and stigmatisation of disabled people which is beyond the scope of this paper. (see, for example, Norwich, 2008; Farrell, 2001; Dyson, 2001)

³ The entire edition of Melanie Walker & Elaine Unterhalter's (2007) book, for example, is devoted to the capability approach and social justice in education.

⁴ It is not possible to define the ten entitlements due to space limit.

..should be respected and implemented by the governments of all nations, as a bare minimum of what respect for human dignity requires. The best approach to this idea of basic social minimum is provided by an approach that focuses on human capabilities, that is what people are actually able to do and to be, in a way informed by an intuitive idea of life that is worthy of dignity of the human being. (2006: 71)

In a sense, Nussbaum's approach perceives capabilities as a variety of the international human rights approach, which provides universality, and she further states "a life without capability in question would not be a life worthy of human dignity," (2006:78). Nussbaum further defines an idea of a threshold level of each capability and argues that "no human beneath the threshold which the list represents, regarded as the ultimate goal to obtain social justice," (2006:70). Nussbaum, regarding disabled people, asserts that wealth as a single indicator cannot be an adequate capability if it still makes them dependent upon others. Inclusion of disabled people into public spaces, according to Nussbaum, is a public responsibility so that they will be able to function up to an appropriate capabilities threshold level. In a sense, such public responsibility to enable functioning of disabled people can be viewed as one of the indicators of social justice.

The purpose of this very basic and incomplete introduction of Nussbaum's account of the capability approach is to situate disability/disabled people within the social justice debate as this diverse group has been excluded from other philosophical/political formulations of social justice⁵.

Significance of Inclusive Education and Education for All in Countries of the South

It is estimated that there are 750 million disabled people in the world, approximately 10% of the world's population, 150 million of whom are children, 80% of whom live in low-income countries with little or no access to services, and only 2-3% of disabled children in poor countries go to school (World Bank, 2009). The 2007 UNESCO EFA Global Monitoring Report (UNESCO, 2006) estimates that more than one third of the 77 million children still out of school are disabled, and that in Africa fewer than 10% of disabled children are in school. On the other hand, the World Bank (2003) reports that only 5% of disabled have limited or no access to support services and of these children less than 2% receive an education. Peters (2008) further argues that "only 1-2% of disabled people in the countries of the South experience equity in terms of access," (p.167). These figures and their very nature of what is meant by 'education' do not seem to go beyond pure access, and raise important questions regarding 'quality education' and inclusion.

Tanzania is one of the world's poorest countries, according to Human Development Index, ranked 164th out of 177 countries (UNDP, 2007). More than one-third of Tanzanians (36%) live below the basic poverty line which is set to approximately one US dollar per day⁶ (GoURT, 2009) and almost one in five (18.7%) Tanzanians below the national food poverty line with women and children, especially the girls being the worst affected (United Republic of Tanzania, 2005). The link between poverty and disability is oftentimes stated without much evidence. According to Elwan (1999) there

⁵ See Terzi (2008) for detailed account of capability perspective on disability and justice.

⁶ The 'international poverty line (IPL)' introduced by the World Bank (1990) has been criticised by a range of authors questioning its definitional and functional value (eg., Reddy & Pogge 2005; Kanbur & Squire, 1999). The United Nation's definition of poverty seems to be much more value oriented where the definition goes beyond monetary indicator: "The denial of opportunities and choices most basic to human development - to lead a long, healthy, creative life to enjoy a decent standard of living, freedom, dignity, self-esteem and the respect for other," (UNDP, 1997). Influenced from Sen's ideas, this definition seems to be in line with basic principles of the capability approach addressing poverty and social justice.

is a probabilistic link where poor people have more chances of becoming disabled and disability furthers the risk of poverty. Van Kampen and colleagues (2008) on the other hand, argue that cultural variables are the highest impact factor in the process of disability leading to poverty, and they define this relationship as *vicious circle*. Elwan's (1999) systemic review highlights some key issues pointing towards why countries of the South would significantly benefit from IE, as its principal premises are based on values such as respect, equity, justice and fairness. Both Elwan (1999) and Thomas's (2005) reviews revealed higher prevalence of disability in income-rich countries than low-income countries due to range of factors such as definitional variations of disability, approaches used to collect information, and better health/education structures to diagnose some disabilities, to name a few. These reviews, unavoidably, lead one to question the stated prevalence rates of disabilities in low-income countries as published by the key international organisations. Elwan (1999) further explores the relationship between disability and gender, literacy and/or educational qualifications, nutrition, ethnicity, and poor living conditions, which oftentimes result in reduced opportunities for income enrichment and social participation. The need for research in low-income countries to establish basic facts, especially in relation to those who are marginalised and vulnerable, cannot be overemphasized. The figures related to disabled children and young people, for example, are argued to be inaccurate or relying on figures established by international organisations (eg, Charema, 2007; Kisanji, 1995). Access to education is a fundamental human right. The capability approach identifies education as one of the basic capabilities which provides basis to expand further capabilities. Moreover, in addition to the central role of education in individual development, education also plays a key role in the economic growth of a country (Inclusion International, 2006) which is expected to raise the living standard of a population, and as a result, a step towards rectifying poverty.

One of the main premises of education is to create knowledge based societies, enabling people with the power of knowledge and opening up avenues for them to explore their true potentials. The Dakar Framework for Action goal is to ensure that by the year 2015 all children have access to and complete free and compulsory primary education of good quality (UNESCO, 2000). The EFA movement is a global commitment to provide quality basic education for *all*. IE needs to be prioritized in order to achieve EFA goals. Moreover, IE is one of the essential means to sustainable development and stability and can be perceived as an indispensable means for effective participation in a society (Booth et al., 2000). In low-income countries the need for education systems to accommodate *all* learners is essential. However, initiations of IE systems can be particularly challenging in such countries where the range of provisions, particularly education, suffers from limited resources (e.g., financial and human resources) and weak policies that do not recognise inclusion of marginalised and excluded people. Eleweke and Rodda (2002) state that although the countries of the South are positive towards the concept of IE, the application of IE values in practice is not taking place at most schools. IE proposes that redefined school culture, policies and practices can facilitate the school's role in meeting the learning needs of *all* students, aiming to improve the learning outcomes of students in academic achievement, social skills and personal development. At the classroom level, inclusive schooling represents a shift from seeing difficulty in, or barriers to, learning as residing in the child to seeing the difficulty as resulting from the curriculum and teaching methods. Teachers need to develop pedagogies for diversity, effective use of learning support, teachers and other human and material resources for the full participation of all learners (UNESCO, 1998). However, to enable teachers to do so, a quality pre-service/in-service training is an absolute necessity to equip them with essential skills meeting the needs of *all* in their classrooms. In this vein, Kisanji and Saanane (forthcoming) raise their concern regarding shortened Grade A teacher training from two years to one year, in Tanzania, with the idea that the second year of training can take place with the support of school principals and District Education Officers (DEOs). Furthermore, according to TEN/MET (2006) the assertion of a supportive role of school principals and DEOs do not really take place, which Kisanji and Saanane (forthcoming) argue will lead to "compromising the quality of teaching and learning process," (p.18). IE aims to build a society that promotes equal opportunity for all citizens to participate in and contribute to the development of the nation in Tanzania (Tanzania United Republic, 1999). The significance of IE has been recognised at the educational policy level in Tanzania. For example,

Tanzania's "Development Vision 2025" is based on global policy frameworks of EFA. In 2001, the Government launched the Primary Education Development Programme (PEDP), which sought to provide equitable, quality, basic education and vocational skills to all. This is to ensure, among other factors, adequate provision of quality teachers, a conducive environment for stakeholders willing to participate in providing education and vocational skills, efficient management in education delivery, and a conducive learning/teaching environment for students and teachers at all levels. The Tanzanian government has committed to EFA goals, and EFA goals cannot be met unless inclusion is given a priority. The PEDP sought to address the earlier challenges of falling enrolments and education quality key priority areas, such as enrolment expansion, quality improvement, capacity building, and institutional arrangements were identified, each of which had a set of strategies and targets. PEDP I (2002-2006) recorded impressive achievements in the area of enrolment expansion. According to UNESCO a Global Monitoring Report (UNESCO, 2009) the number of out of school children in Tanzania fell by over 3 million to less than 150,000 in Tanzania. The National Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction in Tanzania reported that less than 2% of school age children with disabilities enrol to primary school (United Republic of Tanzania, 2005). The Strategy aims to expand the enrolment of children with disabilities from 0.1% to 20% by 2010. However, according to Rutachwamagyo (2006), a Disability Rights Activist, the target set by the government is redundant as it fails to specify the total number of eligible school age children with disabilities in their calculations. He further argues that 'hypothetically', about 99% of school age children with disabilities are denied basic human right (2006, p.9). This denial of the basic human right to access education, according to Rutachwamagyo, stems from range of factors including government policies, negative attitudes towards disabled people (Dawson et al, 2003), poverty, environmental and communication barriers.

The IE option opens up all schools to all children and seeks to respond to diversity. However, access without quality leaves the education system vulnerable, as this would negatively affect curricular access and achievement as well as meeting the goals of equity and justice. Despite international commitments to provide every child and young people with educational opportunity through EFA, children and young people continue to be marginalized (DfID, 2000a). The placement options available for the majority of students with varying difficulties within the Tanzanian education system are limited to special schools and integrated units; a system that continues to exclude the pupils with SEN. Much of the literature and research on inclusive schooling and school improvement focuses on income-rich countries, and as a result it has limited relevance to the African context. IE in a low-income country implies the equal right of all children to the 'educational package', however basic that package may be (DfID, 2000b). Relatively recent research conducted by Mmbaga (2002) has shown that schools in Tanzania are experiencing low teacher morale and motivation, shortage of classrooms and associated overcrowding, shortage of textbooks and other teaching materials, and high dropout rates due to inability of parents to contribute towards their child's education. Mmbaga's study, exploring education system; home and community; school organisation; and classroom factors that influence classroom interaction, revealed lack of dynamism expected of schools that continuously seek to improve pupil participation and achievement and the need for establishing school improvement processes that will ensure that all children in the neighbourhood are included and receive quality education.

Need for further research for just societies in low-income countries

There is an acute need for education research in low-income countries as there seems to be a lack of reliable data on disability related issues (e.g., Peters, 2008). There is a need to establish extent and scope of potential issues first, before being able to produce solutions. However, such research needs to include, if not be run by, local people since any developmental research that fails to

include the grassroots is deemed to suffer. The need for capacity-building⁷ for sustainable development has been well established by international organisations. As one of the main aims of EdQual is capacity-building, the present research is not only about including the voices of grassroots and key stakeholders *per se* but also about grassroots' identification of, and solutions to, removing barriers to participation, and learning of those who are marginalised and vulnerable to exclusion from mainstream education. This goal, as explained in detail in the forthcoming section, is enabled through a participatory action research approach.

Research Design and Methodology

This participatory action research (PAR) project is inspired from the Index for Inclusion developed in England (Booth et al., 2000). The Index is a set of materials developed to guide schools through a process of inclusive school development by reducing barriers to learning and participation for all. The Index has been translated and adapted in 27 countries across the world, signifying its use and functionality. However, the present study is not about adaptation or translation of the Index, as neither translation nor adaptation of any material that is developed within a different culture can reflect or account for socio-economic, politics, policies, and cultural context of another culture. Moreover, considering that the Index was developed in an income-rich country poses further warnings in terms of its relevance to a low-income country due to substantial contextual and cultural differences. As a result, the present research is inspired by the research design of development process of the Index.

This ongoing PAR project seeks to develop ways in which participating schools can include *all* learners in their community and improve quality of education hence learner outcomes. The overall purpose of the research project is to investigate how schools can be supported in developing more inclusive school cultures and practices. This project seeks to address the challenges of access to, and quality of, education at the school level through whole school planning for inclusion. The PAR approach is used in this project as it embraces tenets of participation and reflection, and emancipation and empowerment, of participants searching for improvement of social situations by emphasising the role of knowledge as a significant instrument of power, change and control (e.g, Kemmis & McTaggart, 2000). PAR is closely linked with the action learning approach that adapts a process of action, reflection on action, and application of new action by the group/community members. As for IE, such a course of action is a never ending cyclical process including progressive plan of change, acting, observing the impact of change, reflection on these processes and outcomes, and planning further action repeating the cycle. The role of local and international researchers throughout the project was defined as being 'critical friends' offering helpful critique and probing questions during the process of the research. The PAR was designed to take place over three year period, consisting of a total of nine stages. Although the project was commissioned to start in January 2007 and scheduled to be completed by January 2010, due to range of complications (such as bureaucracy of granting permission from the Government officials to approve the research project, which took substantially longer than anticipated) the start of the project was delayed significantly. The following section presents emerging findings of the project.

⁷ The UN Development Plan characterises 'capacity' as the ability of individuals, establishments and societies to perform operations, problem-solving, and set and achieve goals in a sustainable manner. Capacity-building refers to the mission of building-up levels of human and institutional capacity (UNDP, 1993).

Emerging Findings

The first stage was to launch the project "Developing an Index for Inclusion in Tanzania" based on a one day seminar aiming information sharing and awareness creation among education stakeholders, as well as seeking collaboration from national and local level stakeholders. For ease of access, a total of 16 schools in Dar es Salaam and Coastal regions were invited to participate in the project. Of those 16 schools that participated in the seminar, the aim was to invite 8 of them to take part in the main project for the duration of the project. Including the representatives (one member of senior management team and a teacher(s)) from all 16 schools, a total of 70 people were invited to the seminar including, government officials, academics and civil society organizations (CSO). The seminar sought expectations of the participants from the seminar, which ranged from widening knowledge of IE, to how to develop IE in schools, and exchanging experiences to understanding roles and functions of stakeholders. The seminar composed of paper presentations from the project team, government officials and a CSO, as well as group discussions. The group discussions, following relevant paper presentations, focused on a range of themes, such as discussion on 'barriers to presence, learning and participation' and 'how school development planning can facilitate inclusion'. Overall barriers were grouped under four key themes by the teachers. These were:

1. Infrastructural barriers (such as, water, sanitation, health, inadequate facilities and school buildings).
2. Classroom learning environment (for example, large class sizes and lack of teaching materials)
3. Policy and human resources(such as, limited number of qualified and trained teachers both in general and special education, limited policy priority towards IE, lack of communication between key stakeholders, and negative attitudes towards students with disabilities), and,
4. Community barriers (such as, cultural barriers, lack of community awareness and negative attitudes towards IE).

Overall, in addition above listed barriers, the majority of participants were in the view that their schools were not inclusive, for example, due to '*lack of resources and ignorance*'. Further group discussions revealed that school development planning and inclusion agenda was closely interrelated and the necessary ingredients for facilitating such agendas very much depended on involving all key stakeholders, based on healthy communication and relationship, and also aiming toward capacity building. Use of abusive language, such as *zeruzeru* (albino), *kipofu* (blind animal), or *kiwete* (cripple), against disabled people by some participants during the presentations was notable. The seminar received some media coverage before and during the event aiming to raise public awareness of IE. A total of eleven schools expressed interest to participate in the research project and a total of eight schools were selected in consultation with the district education offices, based on the set criteria (ie. Rural/urban distribution; District distribution; At least 70% of teachers were required to be Grade A teachers; and non-exposure to any other inclusion related project previously).

The following stage of the project aimed to collect descriptive information on participating schools⁸, by means of the Timeline of Change Questionnaire (TCQ), to provide baseline benchmark

⁸ Due to space limit it is not possible to provide detailed descriptions of each school. As a result, the only descriptors presented are based on TCQ. However, each school had significant infrastructural and resource barriers, including large class sizes (ie. 80 + pupils), limited or lack of qualified staff, extremely limited pit latrines, lack of textbooks, teaching materials, desks, boards, shelves, play area and library, to say the least.

information against which to measure changes likely to be brought about by interventions through participatory school development planning for inclusion over a two-year period. At each school, a member of the senior management team was interviewed on the significant policies, innovations and events that they think had an impact on their school since 1994. This specific year was selected because recent policy changes began to be planned that year with the Education and Training Policy (ETP) published in 1995. The interviews were intended to help researchers to draw specific contexts of the schools. Based on the semi-structured interviews, the researchers compiled lists of policies, innovations and events for TCQ. These lists were presented to those who participated in the interviews to check for accuracy, and if they wished, to omit or add more items. The participants were asked to prioritise the changes so that only between five to eight items that they consider the most significant were included in the TCQ. The key changes, since 1994, identified by the participants were: (1) Education and Training Policy (ETP) 1995; (2) implementation of the PEDP; (3) abolition of school fees and other parental contributions; (4) increased community/parental awareness on the value of education; (5) use of participatory teaching methods; (6) increased pass rate in Primary School Leaving Examinations (PSLE); (7) inclusion of children with special needs; (8) contribution of CSOs to the development of their schools; and (9) frequent curriculum changes.

Participatory school development planning (PSDP) seminars was the next stage of the project. The Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MoEVT) had initiated a Whole School Development Planning (WSDP) policy and that schools had been trained to carry out the planning. Indeed, a guide to WSDP exists. That topic was, therefore, included in the launch seminar programme to remind schools of the importance of WSDP to introduce and develop inclusive practices in their schools. However, both during the launch seminar and school visits, interviews with school staff indicated that most schools were not trained in WSDP. Further investigation revealed that apart from a selected number of primary school head-teachers, most schools had not received such training which necessitated running WSDP training for participating schools in the project as such training is expected to add value to the research process to ensure that everyone in the school community understands PSDPs. Two district-based workshops, facilitated by a consultant, were conducted on PSDPs aimed to take the participants through the planning cycle, step by step, from background information to situational analysis, objectives setting, implementation plan for monitoring and evaluation. The workshops were punctuated with group work. The Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis for each school group identified a number of barriers to inclusion (see Table 1).

Table 1: The SWOT Analysis barriers to inclusion as identified by the participants

Infrastructure	Classroom Learning Environment	Health, Water & Sanitation	Community Barriers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shortage of desks - Shortage of playgrounds and sports facilities - Distance children have to travel to and from school - Barriers to movement in the school for persons with physical impairments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overcrowded classrooms - Lack of a school feeding programme - Shortage of teaching/learning materials - Shortage of teachers - Lack of teacher skills to teach children with special needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of clean and safe water - Poor and unclean environment surrounding schools - Diseases, e.g., cholera, malaria, bilharzia and HIV and AIDS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited value attached to education - Teenage pregnancies - Negative cultural practices - Poverty

Interestingly, none of the schools seemed to perceive policy related issues as creating barriers. At the end of each workshop, participants were requested to form district and school coordinating teams, highlighting the roles of the teams. The schools were encouraged to form co-ordinating teams among teachers and parents to develop clear objectives and to consult and decide on, organise, monitor and keep a record of activities.

Following formation of coordination teams, each school, facilitated by the research team, prioritised objectives for action to be fulfilled by the end of PAR, 2011, as follows:

- **Priority 1:** Improvement of teaching and learning environment (eg. construction and renovation of classrooms, latrines and staff offices and furniture)
- **Priority 2:** Improved academic performance, pupil attendance and pass rates; teacher training in special education; delivery of the curriculum strengthened; HIV counselling and purchase of textbooks.
- **Priority 3:** Stronger campaigns against HIV and AIDS; improved teaching environment for pupils with SEN including accessible buildings and lavatories and teacher training in HIV and AIDS.
- **Priority 4:** Campaign in the community on increased enrolment of children with special needs as well as census of children with special needs carried out in the community.

The PAR is ongoing and expected to be completed by 2011. The ongoing and forthcoming stages of the PAR won't be discussed here due to space limit.

Discussion and Conclusions

The emerging findings of the present research echo the relevant literature. There were numerous barriers to inclusion at national, community and school levels (eg. Mmbaga, 2002, Kisanji & Saanane (forthcoming); Eleweke & Rodda, 2002). These included: shortage of trained/competent teachers; overcrowded classrooms; limited resources (such as, lack of and/or limited number of qualified teachers, teaching/learning materials and equipment); limited social/community support; negative attitudes towards pupils with disabilities; cultural barriers; unsupportive policies; inappropriate teaching methods; and limited community and school awareness of children with diverse needs experiencing difficulty in learning. Schools did not practice IE to an expected level due to lack of facilities and ignorance. To some participants, the research project served as a springboard to systematic development of IE in Tanzania. School Planning Development (SPD) was identified as an area for capacity building and that it should involve all stakeholders for ownership and effective implementation. All project schools were located in poor communities. Children in some schools walked barefoot and wore torn uniforms. Some schools were in communities which do not, as yet, value education, as they preferred to send their children to traditional dances and initiation ceremonies or to marry girls off, instead of sending them to school. These cultural practices are rampant in the Mkuranga district where truancy, dropout, early marriages and pregnancies are high. Low value being placed on education seems to be a factor related to poverty and cultural practices (United Republic of Tanzania, 2003).

We needed to establish a baseline in order to measure progress in improving IE practices in the project schools and to develop a set of indicators for measuring the progress. Without doubt, the schools have benefited from the PEDP, the first phase of which began in 2002. Most schools mentioned PEDP as a significant change in the life of their schools. The data gathered via TCQ and school strengths in the SWOT analyses, in addition to published national data, suggest that the number of schools and classrooms increased, leading to an increase in net enrolment ratio reaching

97.3% in 2007 (United Republic of Tanzania, 2007), compared with 65.5% in 2001 (United Republic of Tanzania, 2006). Total teacher recruitment number (2002-2006) exceeded target by 10% (target set was 45,796; total recruitment was 50,509 (United Republic of Tanzania, 2007). Some attention was also paid to quality improvement through increased provision of teaching/learning materials through transfer of capitation grant to schools, and some college tutors trained in participatory teaching methods. However, despite these impressive achievements, especially in **enrolment expansion**, many challenges and gaps exist. For example, HakiElimu's (2007) analysis points to: (1) relatively high rates of repetition (5.9%), drop-out (3.4%), and non-completion rates (20.2%); (2) children with disabilities continue to be seriously under-enrolled (estimated as less than 1%); (3) only 2% of orphans and vulnerable children are being reached. Although there seems to be significant quantitative improvements in student enrolment rates, the issue of quality, not to mention access of those marginalised and excluded groups of children in the education system, seems to be staggering. Such findings raise question of government's commitment to inclusive education. Although Tanzanian government is a signatory of a range of international policy documents, such as EFA, at the national level the government does not seem to invest much, both at policy level and financially, in inclusive education. Some may argue that low-income countries have more important priorities than investing in inclusive education, such as saving people's lives establishing/providing better health services, sanitation and clean water. According to the capability approach, education as well bodily health are two of ten the basic human capabilities, and, "a life without capability in question would not be a life worth of human dignity," (Nussbaum, 2006:78). According to Nussbaum, the increasing gap between income-rich and low-income countries in an age of globalisation is morally alarming. There are more disabled in the countries of the South, where poverty seems to be intrinsically linked to disability. Poverty, in countries of the South, is very much linked to globalisation, cost-sharing programmes and structural adjustments, which affect disabled people the most, resulting in poorer living conditions (DfID, 2007). This calls for a global institutional reform, changing global capitalism (Sen, 2002) and restructuring a fairer global economy to poor and countries of the South (Nussbaum, 2006).

Global capitalism is much more concerned with expanding the domain of market relations than with, say, establishing democracy, expanding elementary education, or enhancing the social opportunities of society's underdogs. .. There is an urgent need for reforming institutional arrangements ... in order to overcome both the errors of omission and those of commission that tend to give the poor across the world such limited opportunities. (Sen, 2002)

Most of the schools claimed that they enrolled children with disabilities and orphans. There is a need for caution as local/cultural understanding and definition of concepts, such as disability, special needs and marginalised groups may have different meanings. Due to historical reasons, schools were referring to special needs when they meant disabilities. This is not surprising. Disabilities have been associated with special schools. The context for the underlying focus on disability can best be understood by analysing the dominant models of disability, public and community attitudes towards persons with disabilities, and historical developments of education for children and adults with disabilities. Models of disability have been widely covered in literature, from both the North and South. These describe the way people think about disability. The ideas tend to differ from person to person and from community to community and may be influenced by their belief systems or culture (e.g, Coleridge, 1993; Possi, 1996; Van Kampen at al., 2008). In Tanzania, disabilities refer to physical, intellectual and health impairments. Albinism is also a disability. However, as was discussed in detailed in the previous sections, the prevalence rates of disability is hampered not only due to assessment issues but definitional issues of disability. What constitutes as 'disability' may differ from culture to culture. During one of the school visits, an informal talk about 'types' of difficulties experienced by the students, the headteacher noted that, "Difficulties such as ADHD and autism do not exist in Africa. They are Western problems." Avoiding overgeneralisations, what constitutes as disability seems to be 'visible' physical difficulties (e.g. hearing-impairment, visual-impairment, physical disabilities and learning disabilities/learning difficulties- UK and US definitions respectively), which can have serious implications for inclusion of

other marginalised groups of children and young people. Kisanji (1995) emphasises the importance of understanding contextual factors in shaping and interpreting ideas as well as analysing indigenous understandings of fundamental concepts in order to construct new knowledge. This is particularly important in this era of accelerated cross-cultural learning based on international policy frameworks, which impinge on national policy processes. In such circumstances, there is the danger of generalising and adopting concepts without analysing local contexts and perceptions. Such a situation would render subsequent policies and strategies ineffective (Booth, 2005).

Barriers to inclusion have been grouped into five categories, namely: infrastructure; classroom learning environment; health, water and sanitation; and negative community/cultural practices. So far, schools have placed infrastructure highest on the list of priorities, followed by supply of books, identification of children with special needs in the community and HIV/AIDS. Infrastructure is likely to improve access to education. However, given negative cultural practices and poverty, infrastructure improvement may not lead to improved access, equity and inclusion of hitherto marginalised and vulnerable children (Raynor et al., 2007). Eleweke and Rodda (2002), summarising findings or research from number of low-income countries, conclude that inadequate and lack of services, large class sizes, and poor infrastructure are some of the major barriers to inclusion in low-income countries. Does this mean that unless resource related issues are resolved IE would be an irrelevant, out-of-context philosophy in countries of the South? Resources matter, however so do attitudes, values, and culture. Negative attitudes can be as much of a barrier to participation and learning as a lack of some basic resources (materials and financing). However, drawing from range of case studies based in countries of the South, Stubbs (2002) eloquently demonstrated that "when there is a will there is a way". There is no quick fix, 'cook book' recipe on 'how to make IE' as IE is very much culture specific, where countries of the North and South can learn a great deal from each other. Success stories of some of the countries of the South, in spite of lack of basic resources, can provide invaluable inspiration, guidance and lessons to the countries of the North. Kisanji and Saanane (forthcoming), addressing marginalisation and exclusion, conclude that capitalising traditional local community, informal, formal and non-formal education practices can serve towards actualisation of IE where, for example, traditional stories, adapting today's characters, can help children develop notions of tolerance and right to education. Poverty reduction is one of the key factors to promoting equity and inclusion (Inclusion International, 2006) as poverty seems to be linked with some of the cultural practices (eg. child marriages). Changing attitudinal barriers among school professional and in wider community is an essential aspect of making IE happen in low-income countries, and projects, as this one, seem to serve this purpose, enabling school and wider communities to engage in ongoing self-reflection through participatory action research.

References

- Barton, L. (1995) The politics of education for all. *Support for Learning*, 10(4), 156-160.
- Booth, T. (2005) Keeping the Future Alive: putting inclusive values into action, *Forum*, 47(2) 151-158.
- Booth, T., Ainscow, N., Black-Hawkins, K., Vaughan, M., and Shaw, L. (2000) *Index for Inclusion: Developing learning and participation in Schools*. Bristol: CSIE.
- Charema, J. (2007). From Special Schools to Inclusive Education: The Way Forward for Developing Countries South of the Sahara. *The Journal of the International Association of Special Education*, 8 (1), 88-97.
- Coleridge, P. (1993) *Disability, Liberation and Development*. Oxford: Oxfam.
- Dawson, E., Hollins, S., Mukongolwa, M., and Witchalls, A. (2003) Including disabled children in Africa. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 47 (3), 153-154.
- DfID (2000a) Education for All. The Challenge of Universal Primary Education. London: DfID.
- DfID (2000b) Disability, Poverty and Development: An Issue Paper. London: DfID.
- DfID (2007) Educating out of Poverty: A synthesis report on Ghana, India, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and South Africa. London: DfID.
- Dyson, A. (1999) Inclusion and Inclusions: Theories and discourses in inclusive education. In H. Daniels and P. Garner (eds.) *World Yearbook of Education*. (pp. 36-53). London: Kogan Page.
- Dyson, A. (2001). Special needs in the twenty-first century: where we've been and where we're going. *British Journal of Special Education*, 28(1), 24-29.
- Eleweke, C. J., and Rodda, M. (2002) The challenge of enhancing inclusive education in developing countries. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 6(2), 113-126.
- Elwan, A. (1999) Poverty and Disability: A Survey of the Literature. World Bank Social Protection Unit Discussion Paper Series, No 9932.
- Farrell, P. (2001) Special Education in the Last Twenty Years: Have things really got better? *British Journal of Special Education*, 28(1), 3-9.
- Goodlad, R. and Riddell, S. (2005). Introduction: Disabled people and social justice. *Social Policy & Society*, 4(1), 43-44.
- GoURT (2009) Tanzanian National Website. www.tanzania.gov.tz/poverty [accessed on 15th January 2009].
- HakiElimu (2007). Five Years (2002-2006) of PEDP implementation: Key findings from Government Reviews. [online] Dar es Salaam: HakiElimu. http://www.hakielimu.org/index.php?option=com_wrapper&Itemid=103
- Inclusion International (2006) "Presentation to President Putin by Diane Richler" [online] <http://www.inclusion-international.org/en/news/56.html> [accessed on 15th January 2009].
- Kemmis, S. and McTaggart, R. (2000) Participatory Action Research. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed., pp.567-605)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Kanbur, R. & Squire, L. (1999). *The Evolution of Thinking about Poverty Exploring the Interaction*. [online]http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/Poverty/evolution_of_thinking_about_poverty%20Kanbur%20Sept%201999.pdf
- Kisanji, J. (1995). Attitudes and Beliefs about Disability in Tanzania. In B. O'Toole & R. McConkey (eds.), *Innovations in Developing Countries for People with Disabilities* (pp. 227-241). Chorley: Lisieux Hall.
- Kisanji, J. and Saanane, C. B. (forthcoming) *Responding to Marginalisation and Exclusion in Tanzania*. Chapter prepared for the Research Forum, Institute for Inclusive Education, Arizona State University.
- Mittler, P. (2000) *Working towards Inclusive Education: Social Contexts*. London: David Fulton.
- Mmbaga, D.R. (2002) *The Inclusive Classroom in Tanzania: Dream or Reality?* Stockholm: Institute of International Education, University of Stockholm.
- Norwich, B. (2008) *Dilemmas of Difference, Inclusion and Disability: International Perspectives and Future Direction*. London: Routledge.

- Nussbaum, M. (2006). *Frontiers for Justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership*. The Tanner Lectures on Human Values. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Peters, S. (2008). Inequalities in education for people with disabilities. In D. B. Holsinger & W. J. Jacob (Eds.) *Inequality in Education: Comparative and International Perspectives* (pp. 149-171). Hong Kong: Springer & CERC.
- Possi, M.K. (1996) Culture and disability superstitious behaviour towards people with disabilities in coastal Tanzania. *African Journal of Special Education*, 1(1) 25-31.
- Raynor, J., Sumra, S., and Unterhalter, E. (2007) *Promoting Equity and Inclusion in Education within a Budget Support Context*. A Study Commissioned by DfID Tanzania on behalf of the Development Partner Group (Education), Dar es Salaam.
- Reddy, S. G., & Pogge, T. W. (2005). *How not to Count the Poor*. [online] Unpublished working paper. www.socialanalysis.org
- Rutachwamagyo, K. (2006) *Inclusive Education Concept: Disability and Education Rights in Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam: Information Centre on Disability.
- Sen, A. (2002) How to Judge Globalism. [online] The American Prospect, January 1 http://www.prospect.org/cs/articles?article=how_to_judge_globalism (accessed 17 March 2009).
- Stubbs, S. (2002). *Inclusive Education: Where there are few Resources*. Norway: Atlas Alliance.
- Tanzania United Republic (1999) *The Tanzania Development Vision 2025*. Dar es Salaam: The President's Office and Planning Commission, Government Printer.
- TEN/MET (2006) *Strengthening the Education in Tanzania: CSO Contribution to Education Sector review*. Dar es Salaam: TEN/MET.
- Terzi, L. (2008). *Justice and Equality: A Capability Perspective on Disability and Special Educational Needs*. London: Continuum.
- Thomas, P. (2005). Disability, Poverty and the Millennium Development Goals: Relevance, Challenges and Opportunities for DFID. Disability, Knowledge and Research (KaR). London: DFID.
- United Nations (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Geneva and New York: United Nations.
- United Nations (1983). *World Programme Action Concerning Disabled Persons*. Vienna and New York: United Nations.
- United Nations (1989). *Conventions on the Rights of the Child*. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations (2000). *United Nations Millennium Declaration Document*. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations (2006) *Convention on Rights of People with Disabilities*. New York: United Nations.
- UNDP (1993). *Report of the UN Conference on Environment and Development: Volume 1- Resolutions Adapted by the Conference*. Rio de Janeiro, 13-14 June. New York: UN.
- UNDP (1997). *Human development Report 1997: Human Development to Eradicate Poverty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- UNDP (2007) *Human Development Report 2007*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- UNESCO (1994). *World Conference on Special Needs Education: Access and Quality* (Includes Salamanca Declaration and Framework for Action). Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (1998). *Inclusive Education on the Agenda*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2000) *Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments: Dakar Framework for Action*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2006) *2006 EFA Global Monitoring Report-Literacy for Life*. Paris: UNESCO
- UNESCO (2009) *2009 EFA Global Monitoring Report - Overcoming Inequality: why governance matters*. Paris: UNESCO.
- United Republic of Tanzania (2005) *National Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction*. Dar es Salaam: URT.
- United Republic of Tanzania (2003) *Whole School Development Planning*. Dar es Salaam: URT.
- United Republic of Tanzania (URT) (2006) *Primary Education Development Programme II*. Dar es Salaam: URT.
- United Republic of Tanzania (2007). *Basic Education Statistics in Tanzania 2003 – 2007*. Dar es Salaam: Printing Press 'A'.

- United Republic of Tanzania (2007) *Basic Education Statistics in Tanzania 2003 – 2007*. Dar es Salaam: Printing Press 'A'.
- Unterhalter, E. & Brighouse, H. (2007) Distribution of what for social justice in education? The case of Education for All by 2015? In M Walker and E Unterhalter (Eds) *Amartya Sen's Capability Approach and Social Justice* (pp. 67-86). New York: Pelgrave Macmillan.
- Van Kampen, M., van Zijverden, I.M. and Emmett, T. (2008) Reflections on poverty and disability: A review of literature. *Asia Pacific Disability Rehabilitation Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp.19-37.
- Walker, M. and Unterhalter, E. (Eds)(2007). *Amartya Sen's Capability Approach and Social Justice*. New York: Pelgrave Macmillan.
- World Bank (1990) *World Bank development Report 1990: Poverty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank (2003). *Education for All. Including Children with Disabilities*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank (2009). *You Think but Do You know? Issues: Disabilities*. Retrieved from: <http://youthink.worldbank.org/issues/disabilities/>

**EdQual RPC
- Implementing Education Quality
in Low Income Countries**

Contact:

EdQual RPC
Graduate School of Education
35 Berkley Square
BRISTOL BS8 1JA
T 0044 (0)117 331 4288
F 0044 (0)117 925 7584

www.edqual.org

