



Navigating the Path to inclusive Education in Primary Schools in Arusha Region, Tanzania: A Descriptive-Correlational Study on Key Implementation Factors

***Elias Elisha Mbuti**

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5840-3684>

Department of Postgraduate Studies, Institute of Accountancy Arusha, Tanzania

Email: eliasmbuti@gmail.com

Prof. Vencie B. Allida, PhD

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5623-2730>

Department of Graduate Education and Leadership, Northern Caribbean University, Jamaica

Email: vencie.allida@ncu.edu.jm

Prof. Catherine Amimo, PhD

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-4292-1472>

School of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Eastern Africa, Baraton, Kenya

Email: amimoc@ueab.ac.ke

***Corresponding Author:** eliasmbuti@gmail.com

Copyright resides with the author(s) in terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY-NC 4.0.

The users may copy, distribute, transmit and adapt the work, but must recognize the author(s) and the

East African Journal of Education and Social Sciences

Abstract: This study navigated the path to inclusive education in primary schools in Arusha Region, Tanzania. The study used the descriptive correlational design. Out of the population of 14,881 stakeholders, the study had the sample size was 1,163 subject including 370 mainstream pupils, 278 mainstream teachers, 346 special needs learners and 169 special needs teachers. Sources of data were a questionnaire, an interview schedule, an observation schedule and Focus Group Discussions. Data analysis involved the thematic approach, descriptive statistics and regression analysis. While the running of inclusive education requires supporting tools and infrastructure, the schools did not have sufficient infrastructure and science and technology facilities to support the inclusive learning atmosphere. While primary schools had suitable classrooms, toilets, and playing grounds, the lighting, ventilation, and sound system were limited in quality. Based on the conclusions, the established shortcomings in infrastructure and technological equipment call for the school budget to include special education requirements. Finally, there is a need for schools to propagate appropriate cultural norms that cherish the value of humanity for both teachers and learners to respect special needs learners, providing necessary support for special needs learners to study comfortably without any discrimination.

Keywords: Inclusive education; school funding; cultural beliefs; infrastructural support; effectiveness.

How to cite: Mbuti, E. E. Amimo, C. and Allida, V. B. (2024). Navigating the Path to inclusive Education in Primary Schools in Arusha Region, Tanzania: A Descriptive-Correlational Study on Key Implementation Factors. *East African Journal of Education and Social Sciences* 5(2)123-131. **Doi:** <https://doi.org/10.46606/eajess2024v05i02.0375>.

Introduction

Inclusive education is of concern to education stakeholders. According to Department of Education and Training (2015), schools need to maximize the learning outcomes and wellbeing of all learners, regardless of their backgrounds. Furthermore, school systems have to provide access to a high-

quality education that is free from discrimination. This implies that all children have the right to attend quality education experiences, and they have to feel that they are included in an environment of high expectation where they are both able and enabled to learn.

While implementation of inclusive educating cannot take place in a vacuum, this study sought to establish factors associated with effective implementation of inclusive education. Previous studies (Umar, 2019; Mulovhedzi et al., 2023; Opini & Onditi, 2016; Mapunda, 2017; UNESCO, 2014; Bourdieu, 1989; Akram, 2023; Weininger & Lareau, 2018) indicate some factors that determine the effective implementation of inclusive education. Such factors include infrastructural support, availability of funds and cultural beliefs and expressions. Below are findings from previous studies regarding school infrastructure, school funding and cultural beliefs and expressions.

School Infrastructural Support

Previous studies have reported the role of school infrastructure toward effective inclusion in education systems. The study of Umar (2019) investigated the influence of infrastructures in the implementation of inclusive education on skills acquisition among students with learning disability in Agricultural Science Subjects. The study reported that while school infrastructure is a key base for effective teaching and learning in schools, the goal of school infrastructure in secondary school education is to increase school attendance of students, enhance staff motivation and improve academic achievements of students.

The study of Umar (2019) further investigated the influence of infrastructures in the implementation of inclusive education on skills acquisition among students with learning disability in Agricultural Science Subjects. The study reported that school infrastructure systems include school buildings, classroom furniture, laboratories and school size. The study requires those responsible with school systems to make sure that schools have conducive buildings, improved classroom furniture that meets the demands of various types of learners, equipped laboratories and sizable school compounds that allow learners to perform curricular and extracurricular activities.

In the African context, the study of Mulovhedzi and Luhlima (2023) investigated the role of school resources on the delivery of inclusive education. The findings were that resources play a crucial role in inclusive learning by enabling learners to navigate all levels of education. Furthermore, resources scaffold the learners' understanding of objects, making it possible for them to enjoy the lesson. The study of Valère (2018) revealed that planning, the

construction and continuity of school infrastructures affect the cognitive performances of primary school learners in a positive manner.

School Funding

School Funds are an essential prerequisite for effective implementation of the inclusive education especially in developing countries such as Tanzania. According to Opini and Onditi (2016), poverty is a key factor that hinders the realization of education for all children, including those with disabilities. These authors argued that the reality of education challenges in Tanzania is that most communities live in abject poverty, and there are inadequate resources that meet the educational demands of the population. With funding to education being far below average among other East African states, the government of Tanzania continues to perform dismally, especially in the supply of materials and resources essential for teaching children with handicaps and even those without handicaps.

The UNESCO findings also affirm poverty's impact on the success of inclusive education, arguing that, like other low-income countries, Tanzania relies partly on donor funds to bridge the budget gaps (UNESCO, 2014). Although Tanzania has advanced in preparing special needs teachers, deficits persist due to limited funds. According to Mapunda *et al.* (2017), while teachers in inclusive schools need more skills to work with children with special needs, most teachers trained only to work with mainstream children due to limited funds to support the training of inclusive teachers.

Cultural Beliefs and Expressions

Beliefs and expressions of people can affect the inclusion initiatives in school systems. Cultural beliefs and expressions involve an internalized and embodied social structure, including the cultural unconscious, mental habits or internalized principal characteristics and temperaments defining social functioning (Bourdieu, 1989). These include individuals' beliefs, values, norms and attitudes informed by their contextualized world. Social contexts reflect teachers' and children's temperaments and character outlooks (Akram, 2023). Consequently, cultural beliefs influence the relationship between teachers and pupils in learning activities. Furthermore, they inform the mental structures and dispositions from which teachers choose the teaching approaches, how they teach and how they include or exclude children from

active involvement in learning activities (Weininger & Lareau, 2018).

Bourdieu affirms habitus is visible through teachers' values, beliefs, and dispositions in classroom teaching practices. Additionally, habitus is a transforming machine that reproduces the social conditions of our production (Bourdieu, 1989). The application of this understanding to inclusive education practices intimates that the composition of teachers' internalized master dispositions determines the ways they select teaching strategies and classroom management approaches. Thus, in actual teaching contexts, teachers use their habitus to categorize and pigeonhole the members of their classrooms into various categories. For example, children may be categorized as crippled, blind, mentally retarded, autistic, deaf, and dumb. This classification system affects classroom interactions between teachers and students. It further restricts students' ability to engage in the learning process.

Methodology

Design

This study employed the mixed approach in the sense that both qualitative and quantitative aspects

of research contributed toward the collection, analysis and reporting of the findings. The study used the descriptive-correlational research design, which combines descriptive and correlation statistics. Data was collected using an interview schedule, an observation schedule and a questionnaire. The analysis of data involved the thematic approach, descriptive statistics and regression analysis.

Population and Sampling

The targeted population of this study consisted of 3,680 special needs pupils, 317 special needs teachers, 9,865 mainstream pupils and 1,019 mainstream teachers from six districts of the Arusha Region, as appears in Table 1.

This study applied stratified sampling procedures to select respondents. Chaudhuri (2014) defines stratified sampling as a method that involves dividing a population into subgroups or strata. Furthermore, Dhivyadeepa (2015) points out that, strata are grouped based on certain characteristics, such as age, occupation, education, gender and income. Then, the researchers select samples from each stratum.

Table 1: Target Population of the Study

SN	DISTRICT	SPECIAL NEEDS		MAINSTREAM		TOTAL
		Pupils	Teachers	Pupils	Teachers	
1	Arusha City	1,111	52	2,109	240	3,512
2	Arumeru	910	43	1,768	211	2,932
3	Meru	547	56	1,521	132	2,256
4	Monduli	326	54	1,434	126	1,940
5	Longido	430	58	1,332	188	2,008
6	Karatu	356	54	1,701	122	2,233
	TOTAL	3,680	317	9,865	1,019	14,881

Table 2: Population and Sample Size of the Study

Sn	Group	Population	Sample
1	Mainstream Pupils	9,865	370
2	Mainstream Teachers	1,019	278
3	Special needs Pupils	3,680	346
4	Special Needs Teachers	317	169
	TOTAL	14,881	1,163

First, the researchers had to identify characteristics in the wider population that also appear in the sample. Secondly, the researchers had to conduct sampling within those groups. Since the total population was 14,881, the resultant sample size was 1,163 individuals, according to the Krejcie and Cohen Statistical formula (Cohen et al. 2000).

Validity and Reliability

The researchers conducted the face Validity by pre-testing the interview protocol and the

questionnaire. The questionnaire was pretested to 60 participants comprising 30 teachers and 30 pupils selected from two public primary schools in Arusha City. The two schools were not part of the sample. Five experts in educational research from the University of Arusha in Tanzania and the University of Eastern Africa Baraton, Kenya measured the content validity by carefully going through the instruments against research questions, giving comments for improvement.

The researchers established the reliability of items in the questionnaire tool using the internal consistency reliability method through Cronbach's Alpha. They administered the questionnaire to 30 teachers and 30 pupils and assessed each questionnaire section to determine an alpha value of no less than 0.7. The reliability test results appear in table 3.

Ethical Considerations

This study adhered to research ethics, including informed consent, confidentiality, voluntary participation, and integrity. The researchers obtained permission from the Arusha Regional Administrative Secretary (RAS) to access research sites. Secondly, the researcher obtained written consent from participants before data collection. Each respondent received a consent form to

complete and indicate his or her willingness to participate in the study. Participants were encouraged to express their opinions as freely as they feel or wish. Finally, the researchers sought permission from parents to allow their children to participate in the study.

Findings and Discussion

Research Question 1: What is the effectiveness of infrastructural support towards inclusive education among primary schools in Arusha?

This research question sought to establish the effectiveness of infrastructural support towards inclusive education among primary schools in Arusha. To fulfill this goal, teachers and pupils responded to eleven items in the questionnaire as it appears in table 4.

Table 3: Reliability Test Results

SN	Variable	Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Deleted Items	Comments
1	Effectiveness	17	.825	None	Reliable
2	Infrastructure	11	.910	None	Reliable
3	Funds	13	.710	None	Reliable
4	Culture	14	.717	None	Reliable

Table 4. Infrastructural Support

SN	Infrastructure	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1	My school has good classes which support inclusive education	3.6763	1.32677	Good
2	The school provides clean classrooms, toilets, and play grounds.	3.6691	1.28678	Good
3	The government supports the improved school environment	3.6282	1.22970	Good
4	Children with disabilities are positive with the school environment	3.5767	1.23565	Good
5	Schools have classes that suit inclusive education	3.5242	1.33822	Good
6	The school environment is conducive to inclusive education	3.5216	1.32844	Good
7	My school repairs pavements, ramps, and walkways	3.5026	1.33381	Good
8	All classes in my school are suitable for inclusive education.	3.4193	1.29375	Moderate
9	Lighting, ventilation, and sound are ideal for leaning	3.3515	1.34018	Moderate
10	The use of modern technology motivates inclusive education	3.3340	1.33736	Moderate
11	The classes are designed to use modern technology	3.2117	1.38198	Moderate
OVERALL SCORE		3.4923	1.29383	MODERATE

Table 4 shows respondents' agreement or disagreement with items in the questionnaire. The questionnaire had five options for respondents to indicate their agreement or disagreement where 1 = strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=undecided, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree. The researcher interpreted the mean scores as follows: 1.00-1.49 = strongly disagree (very poor), 1.50-2.49 = disagree (poor), 2.50-3.49 = undecided (moderate), 3.50-4.49 = agree (good) and 4.50-5.0= strongly agree (very good). The overall mean score for infrastructural support was 3.4923, which is in the range of undecidedness, suggesting that respondents registered their undecided feedback. The overall standard deviation of 1.29383 indicates that the

scores were highly scattered from the mean. Therefore, some of the respondents might have agreed while some might have disagreed with the items in the table that measured the effectiveness of infrastructural support.

The interview schedule captured teachers' views about the limitations of the infrastructure support as indicated by one of the teachers who reported, "We only have four classrooms. They are not sufficient. We need classrooms for vocational skills." Another teacher added,

Limited access to electricity is a major hindrance to fulfilling the inclusion of special needs learners in the mainstream

classrooms. For instance, some of our classrooms are disconnected from electricity while others do not have sockets for connecting devices that require the use of power.

During the observation schedule, the researchers witnessed some classrooms with no electricity and some with electricity but without sockets for teachers and learners to be able to connect the devices. Therefore, the extremely high standard deviations above suggested scattered responses with some of the respondents disagreeing while others agreeing that the effectiveness of infrastructure support is realistic. This is evidence of data triangulation whereby data from the questionnaire, the interview and the observation schedule spoke the same language.

The findings in Table 4 further show that the schools did not have sufficient infrastructure to convince the respondents of their suitability to meet the demands for inclusive education. The least scored infrastructure items include lighting, ventilation and sound (M=3.3515; SD= 1.34018), modern technology (M=3.3340; SD=1.33736) and inappropriate classrooms to support technology use in the teaching and learning processes (M=3.2117; SD=1.38198). Therefore, the infrastructure effectiveness was not ideal. Previous studies established similar limited infrastructure. For instance, studies of Welwel and Otieno (2022) and Tungaraza (2015) revealed inadequate and inaccessible sanitation facilities. Furthermore, children using wheelchairs found it hard to navigate the spaces due to limited infrastructure. Against

these results, literature requires sufficient infrastructure for realizing effective inclusive education. Yasin et al. (2010), for instance, required specific infrastructure such as barrier-free facilities, wheelchair access, a comfortable classroom and improved safety for learners to realize the quality of inclusive education. However, the mean score for the first seven items was between 3.5026 and 3.6763, which is within the effective range (good), based on the interpretation scale. The indicators for the infrastructural effectiveness include good classes, which support inclusive education (3.6763), clean classrooms, toilets, and playing grounds (3.6691), and repaired pavements, ramps, and walkways (3.5026). This suggests that even though the overall mean score did not support the effectiveness of the school infrastructure, the schools did well in limited infrastructural areas, which require recognition.

Research Question 2: What is the effectiveness of funds availability towards inclusive education among primary schools in Arusha?

To determine the availability of funds, teachers and pupils responded to 13 items as seen in Table 5 to indicate their agreement or disagreement. The questionnaire had five options for respondents to indicate their agreement or disagreement, where 1 = strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=undecided, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree. The researcher interpreted the mean scores as follows: 1.00-1.49 = strongly disagree (highly limited), 1.50-2.49 = disagree (limited), 2.50-3.49 = undecided (moderately available), 3.50-4.49 = agree (available) and 4.50-5.0= strongly agree (highly available).

Table 5: Availability of Funds

SN	Funds	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1	Teachers provide moral and material support	3.7513	.24443	Available
2	The school gets support from donors to improve infrastructure	3.5670	.27051	Available
3	There are funds to support children with disabilities	3.4777	.16962	Moderate
4	Parents usually provide moral and material support to the school	3.3807	.26675	Moderate
5	Non-government organizations give funds to improve learning	3.3705	.15619	Moderate
6	Personnel from different places give support to the school	3.3546	.24998	Moderate
7	The government gives support by supplying needed materials	3.2508	.19055	Moderate
8	Diverse individuals support inclusive education materially	3.2456	.22423	Moderate
9	Some private sponsors support the schools financially	3.0866	.08785	Moderate
10	Schools depend on funds from donors to run the programs	2.9821	.15926	Moderate
11	There is adequate support to address the unique needs of pupils	2.9349	.38050	Moderate
12	Personnel from outside the school support special needs	2.8658	.32825	Moderate
13	There is a fund from abroad to support school operations	2.8346	.24379	Moderate
OVERALL SCORE		3.2383	.32635	MODERATE

The overall mean score for availability of funds was 3.2383 (SD=.32635) which, according to mean score interpretation, suggests moderate availability of funds. The overall standard deviation is 32635,

which indicates that the scores did not deviate from the mean. This suggests that schools under investigation somewhat had access to funds for running the inclusive requirements. However, the availability of funds was twofold: available and moderately available. The first two items were agreed upon with mean scores of 3.7513 (SD=.24443 and 3.5670 (SD=.27051). The items falling under this category were more accessible than the rest in the table. These include teachers' provision of material and moral support and support from donors.

The mean scores of specific items express moderate availability of funds. For instance, table 4.11 shows neutrality regarding funds to support children with disabilities (M=3.4777; SD=.16962), parents' provision of moral and material support to the school (M=3.3807; SD=.26675), and non-government organizations giving funds to improve learning (M=3.3705; SD=.15619). Other items that showed neutrality include different personnel from different places providing support to schools (M=3.3546; SD=.24998), the government giving support by supplying needed materials (M=3.2508; SD=.19055), diverse individuals supporting inclusive education through materials (M=3.2456; SD=.22423) and private sponsors supporting the schools financially (M=3.0866; SD=.08785).

The rest of the items that show neutrality include donors (M=2.9821; SD=.15926), adequate support

to address unique needs (M=2.9349; SD= .38050), support from school outsiders (M=2.8658; SD= .32825 and finally funds from abroad (M=2.8346; SD= .24379). These findings show moderate availability of funds to run the schools. This suggests that the schools experienced limited funds to address the inclusive demands. The support from donors, and possibly other stakeholders, is worthy of recognition since literature shows that poor funding and a host of related factors hinder the implementation of inclusive education, causing a low level of inclusiveness in developing nations (Sijuola & Davidova, 2022).

Research Question 3: What is the effectiveness of cultural norms towards inclusive education among primary schools in Arusha?

The purpose of this section was to assess whether cultural beliefs and expressions supported inclusive education as appears in Table 4.12. The questionnaire had five options for respondents to indicate their agreement or disagreement, where 1 = strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=undecided, 4= agree, and 5=strongly agree. The researcher interpreted the mean scores as follows: 1.00-1.49 = strongly disagree (highly ineffective), 1.50-2.49 = disagree (ineffective), 2.50-3.49 = undecided (moderately effective), 3.50-4.49 = agree (effective) and 4.50-5.0= strongly agree (highly effective).

Table 6: Cultural Beliefs and Expressions

SN	Cultural Beliefs and Expressions	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1	The community is educated on eradication of cultural barriers	4.2343	.92922	Effective
2	There is acceptance of children with special needs	4.0400	.93874	Effective
3	Children have a positive attitude toward inclusive education	4.0339	.07378	Effective
4	Inclusive education facilitates socially appropriate behavior	3.8454	.01932	Effective
5	Inclusive education fosters acceptance of individual differences	3.8145	.09497	Effective
6	Diversity within the classroom enriches the learning environment	3.8119	.98414	Effective
7	No need to segregate children with disabilities in an inclusive class	3.7567	.26594	Effective
8	There is neglect of children with special needs in an inclusive class	3.6800	.23774	Effective
9	It is difficult to run an inclusive education	3.5175	.17756	Effective
10	Inclusive education fosters acceptance of individual differences	3.5129	.21886	Effective
11	Studying with special needs learners is discouraged	3.3179	.39206	Moderate
12	Inclusive education represents a negative change	3.1815	.33307	Moderate
OVERALL SCORE		3.7128	.52955	EFFECTIVE

The overall mean score is 3.7128 with a standard deviation of .53955. This shows that teachers considered cultural beliefs, norms, and expressions as ideal in supporting inclusive education. However, some of the standard deviations tended to be closer to one, suggesting scattered mean scores with some respondents agreeing and some disagreeing. The

items with scattered mean scores include community awareness about the need to eradicate cultural barriers (M=4.2343; SD=.92922), acceptance of children with special needs (M=4.0400, SD=.93874), acceptance of individual differences (M=3.8145; SD=.09497), diversity within the

classrooms (M=3.8119; SD=.98414 and difficulty to run inclusive education (M=3.5175; SD=.17756).

Furthermore, the last two items in Table 4.12 show neutrality, meaning cultural beliefs and expressions were somewhat a barrier to the success of inclusive education. The interview schedule in one of the schools supported the limitation of cultural beliefs and norms where one of the teachers had this to report: "I believe inclusive education for autistic children is a good idea. However, inclusive education should consider children's intellectual, physical, and cognitive needs. Children with multiple intellectual disabilities cannot learn in regular classes." These findings concur with previous findings of a study of reverse inclusion of the deaf

and hearing where attitudes towards inclusion was a major hindrance (Amimo, 2023). As observed by Yu (2022), a culturally relevant pedagogy significantly enhances the student's attitude toward math and science; and this could apply to other areas of the curriculum.

Research Question 4: To what extent do infrastructural support, funding and cultural norms affect the inclusive education in Arusha Region?

The research question called for testing of the following null hypothesis: *infrastructural support, funding, and cultural norms do not affect the inclusive education.*

Table 7: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.483 ^a	.234	.233	.53169
2	.569 ^b	.324	.322	.49974
3	.592 ^c	.350	.348	.49008

a. Predictors: (Constant), FUND

b. Predictors: (Constant), FUND, CULTURE

c. Predictors: (Constant), FUND, CULTURE, INFRUSTRUCTURE

Table 8 ANOVA^a

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	83.427	1	83.427	295.111	.000 ^b
	Residual	273.651	968	.283		
	Total	357.078	969			
2	Regression	115.576	2	57.788	231.390	.000 ^c
	Residual	241.502	967	.250		
	Total	357.078	969			
3	Regression	125.062	3	41.687	173.565	.000 ^d
	Residual	232.016	966	.240		
	Total	357.078	969			

a. Dependent Variable: EFFECTIVENESS

b. Predictors: (Constant), FUND

c. Predictors: (Constant), FUND, CULTURE

d. Predictors: (Constant), FUND, CULTURE, INFRUSTRUCTURE

Since the independent variables were multiple (infrastructural support, funding and cultural norms) against one dependent variable (effectiveness of inclusive education), this research question with its subsequent hypothesis was treated through the multiple linear regression analysis as appears in table 7 to table 9.

In Table 7, the results show that all three independent variables (infrastructural support,

funding, and cultural norms) appear to be contributing toward inclusive education effectiveness, to different extents. The multiple correlation coefficient, which is the relationship between the dependent variable (effectiveness of inclusive education) and the independent variables is .592, which is a moderate correlation.

The R square column in Table 7 shows that the coefficient of multiple determination is .348, which

has the following implications: 34.8% of the variance in the effectiveness of inclusive education is accounted for by infrastructural support, funding and cultural norms. This implies that the remaining 65.2 of the variance in the effectiveness of inclusive education is accounted for by other factors apart from the independent variables in this model.

The extent of contribution for each of the independent variables appears in the following descending order: Funding accounts for 23.3%, Culture 9% and Infrastructure 2.6%. This means that

funding is the most important factor that contributes toward effective inclusive education. The results of the regression using the stepwise method as seen in Table 7 indicate that the model explained 34.8%. In table 8, the model was a significant predictor of inclusive education effectiveness ($p < .000$).

With the p-values of .000 in Table 8, we reject the null hypothesis and we maintain that infrastructural support, funding and cultural norms significantly contribute towards effective inclusive education.

Table 9: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.877	.104		18.119	.000
	FUND	.542	.032	.483	17.179	.000
2	(Constant)	.958	.127		7.555	.000
	FUND	.398	.032	.354	12.313	.000
	CULTURE	.374	.033	.327	11.346	.000
3	(Constant)	.907	.125		7.286	.000
	FUND	.281	.037	.250	7.640	.000
	CULTURE	.362	.032	.317	11.199	.000
	INFRASTRUCTURE	.135	.021	.196	6.284	.000

a. Dependent Variable: EFFECTIVENESS

From Table 9, funding ($\beta = .281, p < .000$), cultural norms ($\beta = .362, p < .000$) and infrastructure ($\beta = .135, p < .000$) contributed significantly to the model. The final predictive model for the effectiveness of inclusive education was $Y = .281X_1 + .362X_2 + .135X_3 + 1.877$ where X_1 is funding, X_2 is cultural norms, X_3 is infrastructural support.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, this section presents conclusions and recommendations:

Conclusions

While the running of inclusive education requires supporting tools and infrastructure, the schools did not have sufficient infrastructure and science and technology facilities to support the inclusive learning atmosphere effectively. While primary schools in the Arusha region had suitable classrooms, toilets, and playing grounds, the lighting, ventilation, and sound system were limited in quality. Existing cultural norms did not support inclusive education. Effective implementation of inclusive education depends on infrastructural support, sustainable funding and appropriate cultural norms.

Recommendations

Based on the foregoing findings, for effectiveness of inclusive education, the Ministry of education should ensure that the school budget caters for an infrastructure and other technological equipment that supports inclusive education. Furthermore, school leaders need to come up with ways of raising funds to support inclusive education in their respective schools. There is a need for school leaders to ensure appropriate lighting in the classrooms, quality and accessible toilets for learners with specific challenges to study comfortably while enjoying basic needs requirements. Finally, there is a need for schools to propagate appropriate cultural norms that cherish the value of humanity for both teachers and learners to respect special needs learners, providing necessary support for special needs learners to study comfortably without any discrimination.

References

Amimo, C. (2023). Implementation and Challenges of Reverse Inclusion At Kapsabet Vocational Training School For The Deaf In Nandi County, Kenya. *Baraton Interdisciplinary Research Journal, Special Issue*,1-22.

- Akram, S. (2023). *Bourdieu, Habitus and Field*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social Space and Symbolic Power. *Sociological Theory*, 14–25.
- Chaudhuri, A. 2014. *Modern Survey Sampling*. New York. CRC Press.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. (2000). *Research Methods in Education*, 5th ed (London ; New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Department of Education and Training. (2015, July 16). *Planning for Personalised Learning and Support: A National Resource*. Australian Government. Department of Education. Retrieved March 14, 2024, from The Department of Education: <https://www.education.gov.au/swd/resources/planning-personalised-learning-and-support-national-resource-0>.
- Dhivyadeepa, E. (2015). *Sampling Techniques in Educational Research*. Lulu Press.
- Mapunda, P. H., Omollo, A. D and Bali, T. A. (2017). Challenges in identifying and serving students with special needs in Dodoma, Tanzania. *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy* 17(11). DOI 10.1186/s40723-017-0036-8
- Mulovhedzi, S.A., Luhailima, T.R. (2023). Impact of Resources on the Delivery of Inclusive Education in the African Context. In: Maguvhe, M.O., Masuku, M.M. (eds) *Using African Epistemologies in Shaping Inclusive Education Knowledge*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-31115-4_17.
- Opini, B. & Onditi, H. (2016). Education for all and students with disability in Tanzanian primary schools: Challenges and Success. *Int. J. Educ. Stud.* 03, 65-76.
- Umar, M.A. (2019). Influence of Infrastructures in the Implementation of Inclusive Education on Skills Acquisition among Students with Learning Disability in Agricultural Science Subjects. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science* 24(9), 2 33-34.
- UNESCO. (2014). *EFA global monitoring report 2013-2014 Teaching and learning: achieving quality*. France: UNESCO.
- Valère, N. K. (2018). Management of School Infrastructures and Learner’s Intellectual Performances of Basic Education of Far - North Region, Cameroon. *Journal of Education and Practice* 9(24).
- Weininger, E.B., & Lareau, A. (2018). '11 Pierre Bourdieu’s Sociology of Education: Institutional Form and Social Inequality. In Medvetz, T & Sallaz, J.J. *The Oxford Handbook of Pierre Bourdieu*, pp. 253-272. Oxford University Press.