CHALLENGES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION AT ELULAKENI CLUSTER PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN SHISELWENI DISTRICT OF SWAZILAND

Awoniyi Samuel Adebayo, PhD
Professor and Director Quality Assurance, Solusi University, Zimbabwe
Karen Ngwenya
Engudzeni Primary School, Hlathikhulu, Swaziland

Abstract
 The purpose of the study was to find out the challenges in the implementation of Inclusive education at Elulakeni Cluster primary schools in the Shiselweni District of Swaziland. The research employed the descriptive or survey research design. The population of the study consisted of 14 primary schools with 14 head teachers and seventy grades one to five teachers all of which were used for the study. A questionnaire of 33 items of the five point Likert scale was used to collect data. The instrument was face and content validated and the reliability determined using the Cronbach's Alpha reliability method. An Alpha reliability coefficient of 0.655 was obtained for the instrument. The collected data was coded and analyzed using the descriptive statistics and factor analysis. The study revealed that eleven factors accounted for 76.426% variance in challenges in the implementation of Inclusive education. These are: teachers' competency; material and financial resources; teachers' friendliness, efficacy of administration; classroom environment; human resources; collaboration, productive responses to classroom challenges, fairness to all students; playing materials and spacious classrooms. Of these, teachers' competency; material and financial resources; teachers' friendliness, efficacy of administration were major challenges in the implementation of Inclusive education at Elulakeni Cluster primary schools in the Shiselweni District of Swaziland and these were either often or sometimes challenges as indicated by the overall means. Based on the findings, it was therefore recommended that the Ministry of Education (MOE) should consider training of administrators and teachers on Special Education needs and that the Government review the allocation of funds for Inclusive Education by

increasing budgetary provisions to cater for the required resources in all schools.

Keywords: Challenges, Implementation, Inclusive Education

Introduction
        Inclusive Education is a concept that allows students with special needs to be placed and receive instruction in the mainstream class and taught by mainstream teachers. The teaching approach focuses on children, youth, or adults who are more vulnerable to marginalization and exclusion in a classroom setting. Inclusive Education is a programme that was adopted in the International Conference on Special needs education in Salamanca on the 10th June 1994. The International Declaration advocated for access and equity in education, (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO, 1994). It was seen as a massive drive to reduce worldwide illiteracy. Education for All, according to Miles and Singal (2010) followed the basic principles that all children must learn, and Inclusive Education added to that statement. During the conference, Pather and Nxumalo (2013) stated that all governments were urged to give the highest policy and budgetary priorities to improve their education systems to enable all disabled children to be included in the mainstream regardless of individual differences or difficulties.
        The principle of Inclusion recognised the need to work towards 'schools for all'. Children with disabilities should have access to regular schools which would accommodate them within child centred pedagogy capable to meeting their needs. With regard to Inclusive Education in the Sub-Saharan African countries like Lesotho, Malawi, Botswana, Namibia, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe, it was evident that the educational opportunities for all, including learners with Special Educational Needs (LSEN) remained at a policy statement level within general education policies (Booth & Pather, 2010; UNESCO, 2002).
        Swaziland as a developing country had been keen on following international trends in order to boost her human resources. In respecting the rights of her marginalised members, Swaziland embraced the International Declaration that set the basis of Education for All (EFA) which specified the desire to attain access to basic Education for All; (Booth & Pather 2010). The Swaziland government adopted the Inclusive Education policy (IE) in 2008. The aim of adopting the policy was to divert from the principle of exclusion of the persons with disabilities through special schools that were in place several years after independence, to 'inclusion' into the mainstream. The disabled persons included learners with physical disabilities, mild

hearing and visual impairment, intellectual disabilities, and communication and sensory impairments (Ministry of Education Policy Statement, 1998).

Eight schools were designated as 'Models of Inclusion', two in each region with a rural and urban focus (EDSE, 2010). In each school, four teachers were trained vigorously and designated as resource teachers for special inclusive education issues. The eight schools were purposively chosen on the basic of geographical location for accessibility and availability of resources to serve neighbouring schools in the implementation of Inclusive Education programme (Pather & Nxumalo, 2013). The duo also pointed out that the model schools had a narrow geographical location which provided limited access to support and assistance.

However, there had been outcries from the teachers in the local cluster schools on how Inclusive Education could be implemented effectively. The outcries were mainly on overcrowding and non-effectiveness of the programme as it seemed to benefit little on the side of the disabled learner. Apparently, there was no local research that had been carried out to investigate the challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education as far as the researcher knew. Booth and Pather (2013) stated that the implementation of the Inclusive Education programme was never evaluated in primary schools. Thus, the researcher's interest was triggered to find out the challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education at Elulakeni Cluster Primary Schools in the Shiselweni District of Swaziland.

Statement of the problem

Enrolment increased in most schools in Swaziland since the introduction of the Inclusive Education Programme (IE) by the government in 2010. Disabled and out- of- school children gained access to most schools. However, reports attained through the researchers' attachment to one of the schools in the cluster, had shown that the number of disabled learners enrolled each year was declining in each school. According to Booth and Pather (2013), and as far as the researcher knew, there had not been any local research carried out on the implementation of Inclusive Education in Swaziland. The study therefore, sought to find out challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education at Elulakeni Cluster Primary Schools in the Shiselweni District of Swaziland.

Research questions

The study sought to answer the following questions:
1. What were the challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education at Elulakeni Cluster Primary schools in the Shiselweni District of Swaziland in terms of:
    (i)   The supply of level of teaching /learning resources,

(ii)   Friendliness of learners' environment,
(iii) Human capital in schools and
(iv)   Efficacy of administration as responded to by the respondents.
2. What were the dimensions of challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education at Elulakeni Cluster Primary Schools in the Shiselweni District of Swaziland as extracted by factor analysis?

Literature Review
        Challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education were reviewed under supply level of teaching-learning resources, friendliness of learners' environment, human capital and efficacy of the administration.
        The supply level of teaching-learning resources was a challenge toward the implementation of Inclusive Education. Wanjohi (2014) reported that in most schools especially in the developing countries, there were no adequate educational facilities. These ranged from lack of adequate reading materials, to desk and classrooms among others. He also mentioned that inclusive education had led to an increased number of learners in the learning institutions which led to the decrement in the available resources in the schools.
        Oakes and Saunders (2002) as quoted by Wanjohi (2014) stated that the shortage of teaching and learning materials had a negative impact on learners especially the disabled ones with less knowledge about a subject. They further indicated that lack of adequate resources to meet the educational needs of the disabled learners in the regular schools caused most of the parents to have doubt as to whether the needs of their children were adequately met in these schools and consequently some of these disabled children were withdrawn to special schools with more facilities. They suggested that resources must be allocated to support services for the running of the schools. Appropriate technical aids should also be provided to ensure the successful operation of an integrated education system. The distribution of resources to schools should take realistic account of the differences required to provide appropriate education for all (Wanjohi, 2014).
        Additionally, Wanjohi maintained that many schools in the developing countries were characterised by inadequacy in basic facilities such as; properly ventilated classrooms, furniture suitable for the disabled and non- disabled learners, kitchens safe clean water, play grounds, toilets and play materials among others. They limited the enrolment of the disabled learners in the regular schools hence affecting the success of the Inclusive Education.
        Friendliness of learners' environment is another challenge in the implementation of Inclusive Education. Sugiharto (2008) stated that in most developing countries, most parents of the disabled learners were cautious

about placing their children in an inclusion programme because of fear that the children would be ridiculed by other children, or be unable to develop regular life in an academic classroom. In his study, he mentioned that the education policy, in some countries was exclusively one-sided and failed to meet the needs of the challenged learners in Inclusive Education arrangement. One case he pointed out was the endlessly controversial national examination, which failed to capture learners' diverse backgrounds and needs. That created an environment that was not conducive for practice.

According to Msango, Mumba and Sikwebele, (2000), the first barrier of inclusion was the traditional attitudes to disability which led to the exclusion of disabled learners from their local schools and therefore suggested that classroom environments should be democratic in practice. They further mentioned that involving children in lesson planning made learning more learner-centred. The role of the teacher would change to become a facilitator of the children's learning in a learner-centred environment. Attendance improved when children were more interested in lessons.

Furthermore, Bogale and Haile (1999) indicated that once the disabled children had experienced full inclusion, they refused to return to partial integration and withdrawal in the unit. They emphasised that by including the disabled children in the class all the time, the overall performance of the pupils improved. According to Ofsted (2004), inclusive schools helped to develop learner-friendly environment. Pupils made good progress in relation to their starting points and as a result inclusive environments should include elements of good classroom practices, for example, it should be comfortable, welcoming, well lit, friendly not stifling, spacious, calm and well organized. Additionally, in inclusive environments, children gained confidence and had high self- esteem. With friendly learning environment, inclusive learners will be able to work independently and develop creativity, thus benefiting the learners across the curriculum.

Human capital is an important aspect that needs to be considered for successful inclusion in schools. Gwala (2006) revealed that educators did not show an understanding of Inclusive Education and were uncertain of their roles. The educators' lacked knowledge and had little or no experience towards Inclusive Education. The uncertainty about roles and inadequate training in teaching learners with barriers in learning, developed results in a high percentage of educators holding negative attitudes toward inclusion of learners with barriers in the mainstream. He further explained that a remarkable number of educators were uncertain about inclusion of learners with barriers in regular classrooms and this had led to some parents withdrawing their children from the system. According him teachers needed quality comprehensive pre-service and in-service training.

In a similar study, Wanjohi (2014) disclosed that teacher training was equally important in the teaching and learning process. Most of the teachers did not have adequate training on handling both the disabled and non-disabled learners in one class. He also stated that it affected understanding of some of the learners of which it was reflected in their performance. Worth mentioning was that continued poor performance among the disabled learners due to the poor teaching skills and abilities of the teachers, triggered by their poor enrolment in the regular schools.

Angrist and Lavy (2001) in Wanjohi (2014) observed that lack of adequate teacher training to handle both the disabled and non-disabled learners in the same class negatively affects the success of Inclusive Education. Miles (2000) explained that, human capital was perceived as a barrier to inclusion across cultural, geographical and economical boundaries.

Efficacy of the administration is another factor in the implementation of Inclusive Education. McCollum, Kajs, and Minter (2006) stated that efficacy referred to peoples' beliefs and confidence to execute actions to attain a specific goal. The trio mentioned that although knowledge of efficacy was well developed regarding students' learning and teachers' success, there was almost no research on efficacy of administrators. However, through a well-developed model and measure of school administrators' efficacy, they managed to derive eight dimensions of school administrator efficacy which were Instructional Leadership and Staff Development; School Climate Development; Community Collaboration; Data-based Decision Making Aligned with Legal and Ethical Principles; Resources and Facility Management; Use of Community Resources; Communication in a diverse Environment and Development of School Vision. As a matter of fact, Findley and Findley (1992) stated that if a school was to be an effective one, it would be because of the instructional leadership of the administrator.

Research Methodology

The research employed the descriptive or survey research design. The population for the study consisted of all 14 primary schools in Elulakeni Cluster Primary Schools in Shiselweni District of Swaziland with 14 head teachers and seventy grades one to five teachers all of which were used for the study. A questionnaire of 33 items of the five point Likert scale was used to collect data. The instrument was face and content validated and the reliability determined using the Cronbach's Alpha reliability method. An Alpha reliability coefficient of 0.655 was obtained for the instrument. The collected data was coded and analysed using the descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation and factor analysis. It should be noted that the higher the mean score the greater is the challenge.

Results

The results of the analysis are presented in line with the research questions as follows:

Research Question 1
What were the challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education in terms of:
  (i) The supply level of teaching /learning resources,
  (ii) Friendliness of learners' environment,
  (iii) Human capital in schools and
  (iv) Efficacy of administration.

The results of the analysis for research question 1 are presented on Table 1.

Table 1: Overall means and Standard Deviations on Challenges in the Implementation of Inclusive Education

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
Teaching /learning resources	3.9833	.49597
Friendliness of learners' environment	2.8811	.75900
Human capital in schools	3.7306	.92128
Efficacy of administration	3.4623	.70261

Table 1 below shows the overall means and standard deviations on the challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education in terms of the supply level of teaching/learning resources.

The overall mean of 3.9833 for teaching /learning resources showed that teaching /learning resources are often challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education and respondents were homogeneous in their responses with the standard deviation of 0.49597. This finding is in agreement with the study by Wanjohi (2014) which reflected that in most of the schools especially in the developing countries, there were no adequate educational facilities. The finding was further echoed by the study of Oakes and Saundrers (2002) quoted by Wanjohi (2014) that the shortage of teaching and learning materials had a negative impact on learners' especially disabled ones with less knowledge about a subject.

The overall mean of 2.8811 for the friendliness of learners' environment showed that friendliness of learners' environment is sometimes a challenge in the implementation of Inclusive Education and the respondents were homogeneous in their responses with the standard deviation of 0.75900. According to Ofsted (2004), inclusive environments should include elements of good classroom practices, for example, be comfortable, welcoming, well lit, friendly not stifling, spacious, calm and well organized.

On human capital, the overall mean of 3.7306 showed that human capital is often a challenge in the implementation of Inclusive Education and respondents were homogeneous in their responses with standard deviation of 0.92128. Gwala (2006) revealed that educators did not show an understanding of Inclusive Education and were uncertain of their roles. The educators lacked knowledge and had little or no experience toward Inclusive Education. The uncertainty about roles and inadequate training in teaching learners with barriers in learning, developed results in a high percentage of educators holding negative attitudes toward inclusion of learners with barriers in learning into regular classrooms.

In the same vein, the overall mean of 3.4623 for efficacy of administration showed that efficacy of administration is sometimes a challenge in the implementation of Inclusive Education and the respondents were homogeneous in their responses with the standard deviation of 0.70261. According to Villas & Thousand, (2003) administrators must take action to publicly articulate the new vision of inclusion, building consensus for the vision and lead all stakeholders to active collaboration for successful implementation of Inclusive Education.

Research Question 2
What were the dimensions of challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education at Elulakeni Cluster Primary Schools as extracted by the factor analysis?

The items on the questionnaire were subjected to factor analysis in order to determine the underlying dimensions of challenges in the implementation of inclusive education. The results of the factor analysis are presented on tables 2 to 12.

Tables 2 to 12 below show the eleven underlying factors responsible for the challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education at Elulakeni Cluster Primary Schools in the Shiselweni District as extracted by factor analysis. The results of the factor analysis indicated that the eleven factors accounted for 76.426% of variance in the challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education. These factors are: (a) Teachers' competency (b) Material and financial resources (c) Teachers' friendliness (d) Efficacy of Administration (e) Classroom environment (f) Human resources (g) Collaboration (h) Productive responses to classroom challenges (i) Fairness to all students (j) Playing materials (k) spacious classrooms.

The factors are discussed in succession as follows:

Table 2: Teachers Competency

Items	Factor Loading	Mean	SD
Teachers' experienced in the management of inclusive classrooms.	.885	3.6627	1.34597
Adequately trained teachers to teach learners with barriers.	.863	3.7262	1.47551
Positive attitude of teachers towards inclusion of learners with barriers in the mainstream.	.783	3.6429	1.37659
Quality pre-service and in-service training on Inclusive Education for teachers.	.678	3.7024	1.37779
Clear understanding of Inclusive Education.	.505	3.5904	1.33468
Teachers with good teaching skills and ability that could enhance the performance of learners with barriers.	.493	3.7500	1.21114
Average		**3.6809**	**.99835**

Variance Accounted for =18.859 %

Table 2 shows that teachers' competency accounted for 18.859 % of variance on the challenges of Inclusive Education. The factor loading of six items under the teachers' competency had high correlation an indication that all the items belonged to the theme. The overall mean of 3.6809 showed that teachers' competency in handling learners with disabilities is often a challenge in the implementation of Inclusive Education in the Elulakeni Cluster Primary Schools in the Shiselweni District. The low standard deviation of 0.99835 shows that respondents are homogeneous in their responses. Agbenyega (2006) in his study stated that teachers who expressed fear and concern about teaching students with disabilities in regular schools did not have the required knowledge and expertise to teach students with disabilities. They felt it contributed to the dwindling of academic success of their schools.

Table 3: Material and Financial Resources

Items	Factor Loading	Mean	SD
Alignment of material resources to support the implementation of Inclusive Education by school administrators.	.885	3.3810	1.18123
Provision of adequate resources for teaching students with disabilities by school management.	.772	3.3571	1.45323
Alignment of financial resources to support the implementation of Inclusive Education by school administrators.	.634	3.2771	1.26214
Average		**3.3454**	**1.03783**
Variance Accounted for =13.321 %			

Table 3 shows that material and financial resources accounted for 13.321 % of variance in challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education. The factor loading of three items under material and financial resources had high correlation an indication that all the items belonged to the theme. The overall mean of 3.3454 showed that materials and financial resources are sometimes challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education. The high standard deviation of 1.03783 shows that respondents were heterogeneous in their responses. The finding is in agreement with that of Kasambira (1998) who stated that for a programme to be implemented effectively, administrators should supply all necessary resources on time and should cater for all the diverse needs of learners

Table 4: Teachers' Friendliness

Items	Factor Loading	Mean	SD
Teachers friendly to all students	.840	2.5610	1.54038
Answers given to questions by students irrespective of disability valued by teachers without any form of ridicule	.639	3.1325	1.39486
Ventilated Classrooms	.632	2.1190	1.32087
Good classroom practice	.423	2.6190	1.25059
Average		**2.6265**	**1.00943**
Variance Accounted for =9.383 %			

Table 4 shows that teachers' friendliness accounted for 9.383 % of variance in the challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education. The factor loading of the four items under teachers' friendliness had high correlation an indication that all the items belonged to the same theme. The overall mean of 2.6265 showed that teachers' friendliness in handling learners with disabilities is sometimes a challenge in the implementation of Inclusive Education. The high standard deviation of 1.00943 shows that respondents were heterogeneous in their responses. Ofsted (2004) stated that in inclusive environments, children gained confidence and had high self-esteem. They were able to work independently and develop creativity, which benefited the learning across the curriculum. They were able to ask for help. Their attempts produced work and answered questions were valued and were not ridiculed by teachers.

Table 5 showed that efficacy of administrators accounted for 5.926 % of variance in the implementation of Inclusive Education. The factor loading for the two items indicate high correlation.

Table 5: Efficacy of Administration

Items	Factor Loading	Mean	SD
Priorities based upon needs for the success of Inclusive Education by school administrators.	.790	3.6190	1.18123
Comprehensive and coordinated learning support for all students by school administrators.	.769	3.6548	1.22714
Average		**3.6369**	**1.04522**
Variance Accounted for =5.926 %			

The overall mean of 3.6369 shows that efficacy of administration in working with learners with disabilities is often a challenge in the implementation of Inclusive Education. The high standard deviation of 1.04522 shows heterogeneity of responses. According to Baskett and Miklos (1992), staff climate development provided leadership and ensured access to adequate resources explicitly and systematically provided positive school climate and to provide comprehensive and coordinated learning support for all students. Moreover, they should assess the perception of staff, students, and families, by setting priorities based upon needs, and incorporating specific evidences based practices and programmes to address those needs within the school improvement plan.

Table 6 below indicates that classroom environment accounted for 5.417% of variance in the implementation of Inclusive Education.

Table 6: Classroom Environment

Items	Factor Loading	Mean	SD
All students comfortable in the classroom irrespective of disability.	.773	3.0120	1.23460
High expectations of all learners in the classroom by teachers.	.712	3.8765	1.13339
Frustration and anger by teachers while working with learners with disabilities	.534	3.3902	1.18380
Students free to ask for help irrespective of disability.	.490	3.2317	1.39043
Average		**3.3831**	**.87320**
Variance Accounted for =5.417 %			

The factor loading of four items under indicate high correlation an indication that all the items belonged to the theme. The overall mean of 3.3831 shows that classroom environment is sometimes a challenge. The low standard deviation of .87320 shows homogeneity of responses. According to Agbenyega (2006) many regular education teachers who felt unprepared and fearful to work with learners with disabilities in regular classes displayed frustration, anger and negative attitude toward Inclusive Education because they believed it could lead to lower academic standards.

Table 7: Material and Human Resources

Items	Factor Loading	Mean	SD
Furniture (desks and chairs)	-.713	3.0476	1.42190
Reading materials	-.635	2.6071	1.45634
Alignment of human resources to support the implementation of Inclusive Education by school administrators.	.565	3.6548	1.10305
Average		**3.1032**	**.79822**
Variance Accounted for =4.638 %			

Table 7 shows that material and human resources accounted for 4.638 % of variance in the challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education. The factor loading for the three items under material and human resources had high correlation. However, the negative factor loadings for furniture and reading materials indicated that these two items did not really belong to the theme. The average mean of 3.1032 showed that human resources are sometimes a challenge in the implementation of Inclusive Education while the low standard deviation of 0.79822 indicates that respondents are homogeneous in their responses. According to Kidder-Rushworth (2014), administrators should align financial, human and material resources to support the implementation of a programme. He further stated that the distribution of resources to schools should take realistic account of the differences.

Table 8: Collaboration

Items	Factor Loading	Mean	SD
Collaboration among school staff for the success of Inclusive Education encouraged by school administrators.	.721	3.5714	1.15420
Provision of collaborative and team driven decision making that is focused on intervention of all students by the school administrators.	.647	3.4048	1.30909
Provision of professional development and training for all staff members on Inclusive Education by school administrators.	.617	3.4167	1.36398
Average		**3.4643**	**.99263**
Variance Accounted for =4.289 %			

From Table 8 above, collaboration accounted for 4.289 % of variance in the implementation of Inclusive Education. The overall mean of 3.4643 indicates that collaboration among school staff and students is sometimes a challenge in the implementation of Inclusive Education. The low standard deviation of .99263 shows homogeneity of responses. According to Villas & Thousands (2003), collaboration was a problematic area that needed to become focus of the school system. Fullan (1991) also emphasised that

effective principals worked with teachers to shape the school as a workplace in relation to shared goals, teacher collaboration, teacher/ learning opportunities, teacher commitment and students learning.

Table 9: Productive responses to Classroom Challenges

Items	Factor Loading	Mean	SD
Well lit classrooms.	.738	2.4217	1.47434
Productive responses to challenges in educating learners with disabilities by school administrators	.664	3.5301	1.01618
Average		**2.9878**	**.98123**
Variance Accounted for =3.980 %			

Table 9 indicates that productive responses to classroom challenge accounted for 3.980 % of variance in the challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education. The overall mean of 2.9878 shows that productive responses to classroom challenges are sometimes challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education. The low standard deviation of .98123 showed that respondents were homogeneous in their responses.

Table 10: Fairness to the Students

Items	Factor Loading	Mean	SD
Promotion of success of all students by school administrators acting with integrity and fairness in an ethical manner.	.806	3.3452	1.23692
Well organised classrooms.	-.490	2.9639	1.18369
Average		**3.1506**	**.82542**
Variance Accounted for =3.686 %			

From Table 10 above fairness to all students accounted for 3.686 % of variance in the challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education. The negative factor loading for well organised classroom indicated that the item do not really belong to the theme. The overall mean of 3.1506 shows that fairness to all students is sometimes a challenge in the implementation of Inclusive Education while the low standard deviation of .82542 showed that respondents were homogeneous in the responses

Table 11: Playing Materials

Items	Factor Loading	Mean	SD
Play materials	.902	4.2738	1.18577
Variance Accounted for =3.551 %			

Playing materials accounted for 3.551 % of variance in the challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education. The only item under playing materials had high factor loading. The mean of 4.2738 shows that playing materials are often challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education. The high standard deviation of 1.18577 shows homogeneity of responses.

Table 12: Spacious Classrooms

Items	Factor Loading	Mean	SD
Spacious classroom to allow free movement	.843	3.1707	1.42988
Variance Accounted for =3.370 %			

Spacious classrooms accounted for 3.370 % of variance in the challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education. The mean of 3.1707 shows that spacious classrooms are sometimes challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education. The high standard deviation shows that respondents were heterogeneous in the responses.

Findings

Following are the findings of the study:
1. Teaching/ learning materials and human capital are often challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education while friendliness of learners' environment and efficacy of administration are sometimes challenges.
2. The results of the factor analysis indicated that eleven factors accounted for 76.426% of variance in the challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education in Elulakeni Cluster Primary Schools in the Shiselweni District.
3. The eleven factors in the implementation of Inclusive Education as extracted by factor analysis are: (a) Teachers' competency (b) Material and financial resources (c) Teachers' friendliness (d) Efficacy of Administration (e) Classroom environment (f) Human resources (g) Collaboration (h) Productive responses to classroom challenges (i) Fairness to all students (j) Playing materials (k) spacious classrooms.

Conclusion

It is evident from the study that the major challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education are teachers' competency, material and financial resources, teachers' friendliness and efficacy of administration. The study also revealed that competency and efficacy of administration are often challenges while material and financial resources and teachers' friendliness are sometimes challenges.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, it is therefore recommended that in order to reduce the number of challenges in the implementation of Inclusive Education, the Ministry of Education (MOE) should consider training of administrators and teachers on Special Education needs through in-service

while the Government should review the allocation of funds for Inclusive Education by increasing budgetary provisions to cater for the required resources in all schools. All participants, Government, NGOs, teachers, students, parents and the communities should take serious actions and join their efforts in the promotion of open debates on how best to achieve quality goals, access and opportunities for children with disabilities in all schools in Swaziland.

References:
Agbenyega, J. (2006*). Examining Teachers' Concerns and Attitudes to Inclusive   Education.* Ghana.
Angrist, J. D., & Lavy,V. (2001). Does Teacher Training Affects Pupils learning?   Evidence from Comparisons in Jerusalem Public Schools. *Journal of Labour   Economics,* 19 (2), 343-369
Baskett, S., & Miklos, E. (1992) *Perspectives of Effective Principal*. Canadian Administration. 32(1) 1-10.
Booth & Pather (2010).   *Principal Lecture in Special and Inclusive Education*.
Borgale, T & Haile, G. (1999*) From exclusion to Inclusion: a case study of children   with mental retardation in Kokebe Tsebah Primary School in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.* Save the Children Sweden: Eastern and Central Africa Office.
Education and Sector Policy of Swaziland, (2011)
Findley, B. & Findley, D. (1992*).Effective Schools: The Role of The Principal. Contemporary Education* 63 (2), 102-104. Retrieved 18 June 2014 from   http:/effective.schools;role-of-theprincipal-contemporary-education. 62(2),102-   104
Fullan, M. (1991) *The new meaning of Educational Change.* New York: Teacher   College Press.
Gwala, Q.V. (2006) *Challenges facing the Implementation of inclusive education*   Retrieved;   15.6   2014   from http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/bom-1.php
Kasambira, D. (1998). *What D Adult Learners Experience in a Teaching Certificate   on   Program?* Retrieved   on   18   June   2014   from http//www.com/org/adult-   learners+ experience-in-a-teaching-certificate-program.
KidderRushworth (2014). *Ethical Dilemmas. Community Resources Center.* Retrieved   20 June 2014 from http// www.nytimes.com/2012/rushworth-m-kidder-ethics.
Msango, H.J., Mumba, E.C., Sikwebela, A.C.,(2000), Philosophy and Education.   UNZA. Zambia.

Oakes, J. & Saunders, M.(2002). *Access to Textbooks, Instrumental Materials, Equipment, and Technology: Inadequacy and Inequality in California's Public Schools.* Los Angeles: UCLA's Institute for Democracy, Education, and   Access..

Ofsted, P. (2004). Improving Participatory. Retrieved 18 June 2014 from Books.google.co.zw/books?id=eiBfwe9isL&pg=PA107&lpg=ofsted=2004+ w   hy=college+succeed.

Pather, S. & Nxumalo, C.P.(2013).Challenging understanding of Inclusive Education   Policy Developmentin Southern Africa through Comparative Reflection.   *International Journal of Inclusive Education.*

Sugiharto, S. (2008). Challenges in Implementing Inclusive Education. Retrieved 19 June   2014   from   http//   www.thejakartapost, com/news/2008/06/07challenges-   implementating-inclusive-education.htm.

The Education and Sector Policy (2011).*The Ministry of Education and Training.   Mbabane, Swaziland.*

UNESCO. (1994).*The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special   Needs Education*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2002). Inclusive Education in Southern Africa. Responding to Diversity in   Education.

Villa, R. & Thousand, J.S. (2003).Making Inclusive Education Work. *Educational   Leadership.* Retrieved 19 June 2014.