

**FINANCING OF SPECIAL EDUCATION IN ZAMBIA: AN  
EXPLORATION OF THE CURRENT PRACTICE IN  
SOUTHERN PROVINCE**

**BY**

**FERDINAND CHINDOLO MAINZA**

A Dissertation submitted to the University of Zambia in partial fulfilment of  
the requirements for the award of the Degree of Master of Education in  
Special Education

**THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA**

**LUSAKA**

**2017**

## **COPYRIGHT**

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in any retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means of photocopying, recording or otherwise without prior permission of the author or the University of Zambia.

©2017: Ferdinand Chindolo Mainza

## DECLARATION

I, **Ferdinand Chindolo Mainza**, do hereby declare that this piece of work; *Financing of Special Education in Zambia: An exploration of the current practice in Southern Province*, represents my own work and that this copy had never been previously submitted for a degree at the University of Zambia or any other University or institution. Acknowledgements on the work of other scholars have been made.

..... (Sign) Date: .....

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL**

This Dissertation by **Ferdinand Chindolo Mainza** is approved as a partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the Degree of Master of Education in Special Education at the University of Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia.

**Examiners**

Name ..... Sign:..... Date:.....

Name ..... Sign:..... Date:.....

Name ..... Sign:..... Date:.....

## **DEDICATION**

This Dissertation is dedicated to my late parents: Annah and Basilio Chindolo who sacrificed and forced me to go to school even though I cried in refusing. It is also dedicated to my elder brothers; Charles, Christopher and Bennie, who at appropriate times inspired me with education. Finally, to my dear wife; Mercy Siacheendo Mainza for her support in my academic and professional experiences.

## ABSTRACT

This study was an exploration of the current practice in financing Special Education in Zambia, with special focus on Southern Province involving five districts with either a Special School or Special Unit in public Secondary Schools. The study explored the available financing practices in Special Education. It also identified factors that influenced the current financing practice in Special Education. The study also ascertained the implication of the current financing practices on the provision of quality education to Learners with Special Education Needs (LSEs).

A descriptive survey design was employed which involved both qualitative and quantitative techniques in data collection, analysis and presentation. The data collection instruments were: semi-structured questionnaires, Interview Guide, Observation Checklist and Desk Review. The sample size was 77 participants composing 35 parents, 26 teachers, 9 school administrators and 7 District Officials as participants, selected using purposive sampling techniques. Data obtained from closed ended questions were analysed using descriptive statistics in SPSS where frequencies tables were produced. Qualitative data were classified and thematically analysed.

The study findings were; the current financing practice in Special Education had the following sources of funding: the government through GRZ education grants, Parents Teachers Association (PTA) through user fees, parents of children with Special Education needs, direct cooperating partners with schools or with individual children such as British Council, Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR), Spar Choma, Catholic sisters, and other well-wishers in adherence to Educating our Future-National Policy of 1996. The study established that for the years 2015 and 2016 government funding to the education sector was above the 4.2 % of GDP Sub-Sahara Africa benchmark but Special Education received between K263 (\$26.3) and K1,212 (\$121.2) at school level. The study further revealed that the budgeting process in Special Education did not recognise the needs of LSEs, it lacked financing models for Special Education, and also lacked collaboration as well as harmonisation among funders. The study found out that: the attitude of parents and teachers did not influence allocation of funds in Special Education. Further, the parents' level of education, the occupation of parents and sources of income of parents did not influence financing of Special Education. Furthermore, the study findings confirmed that the current financing practice had implications on the provision of quality education by restricting infrastructure expansion, available teaching and learning materials as well as restricting improved staffing levels of specialised and assisting Special Education personnel.

The study proposes that the government may allocate funding specifically to Special Education at National level. It also proposes financing model to Special Education with guidelines to ensure collaboration among participating funders who were; the government, PTA, parents and other well-wishers. Finally, the government should meaningfully embark on community engagement and reinforce the Public-Private Partnership (PPP) towards Special Education financing.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am sincerely grateful to my *supervisor Dr. Beatrice Matafwali* for providing both academic guidance and supervisory role to me throughout my study. I say thank you for building me up since 2006 to this point in time 2017, you have been my mold.

I also wish to thank the following *Lecturers*: Dr. Daniel Ndhlovu, Dr. Joseph Mandyata, Mr. Kalima Kalima, Dr. Madhaliso Banja and Dr. Bestern Kaani. Many thanks to my *Masters classmates (2015 taught intake)*, namely: Pastor Yohannes G, Ms. Twaambo M. Mulunda, Ms. Alice Kabwe, Ms. Kapansa, Ms. Ruth Msoni, Ms. Charity Busiku, Ms. Maggie Mungalu, Ms. Maureen Chisembe, and Ms. Lutwi Q. Unene.

Further, I would like to thank all the individuals and institutions who provided data and any other forms of support, such as District Education Board Secretaries (DEBS) of Mazabuka, Choma, Kalomo, Livingstone and Kazungula Districts on the Southern Province for allowing me to conduct a study at both district and school levels. I thank the head teachers of Flamboyant Special School, St. Mulumba Special School, Kalomo Secondary School, David Livingstone Secondary School and Mukuni Secondary School together with the members of staff that participated in the study. Others were parents of children with disabilities at any of the above named schools.

Mr. Francis Hafwiti, my head teacher sir, I least expected you to allow me to take leave from work for my studies, for me it's a lesson learnt, thank you sir. My H.O.D Mr. Boris Sikute and the entire Business Studies Department, Linda Secondary School, Livingstone, I thank you.

This acknowledgement can never be complete without expressing my sincere gratefulness to my wife, Mercy, our children: Mainza, Mweemba, Mooya and Muleya for their understanding the absence of care, support and love at the time they much looked for it, Mr Ivan Mainza thanks for driving my children to their school in the entire period of two years. Lastly, but not the least, I am grateful to Dr. Progress Nyanga for his endless inspiration and support, Danny Vumbi Likashi ever astonishing me, Messers. Kaumba Chivunda, Sanny Mulubale I thank them greatly, and Euodia Kapuwamba Nakwenda she is special, I say thank you.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>COPYRIGHT .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>DECLARATION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>DEDICATION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>ABSTRACT.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>LIST OF PICTURES.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>LIST OF APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>15</b>
1.1 Background of the Study .....	15
1.2 Statement of Problem.....	24
1.3 Purpose of the Study.....	25
1.4 Objectives of the Study.....	25
1.5 Study Questions .....	25
1.6 Significance of the Study.....	26
1.7 Theoretical Framework.....	26
1.8 Delimitation .....	27
1.9 Operational Definitions.....	27
1.10 Chapter Summary .....	28
<b>CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .....</b>	<b>30</b>
2.1 Financing of Education in Zambia.....	30
2.2 Financing Practices in Special Education.....	34
2.3 Factors Influencing Current Financing Practice in Special Education.....	40
2.4 The Implications of the Current Financing Practices on the Provision of Quality.....	45

2.5	Chapter Summary .....	48
<b>CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY .....</b>		<b>49</b>
3.1	Research Design .....	49
3.2	Study Site .....	50
3.3	Study Population.....	50
3.4	Study Sample .....	51
3.5	Sampling Procedure.....	51
3.6	Data Collection Instruments .....	52
3.6.1	Questionnaires .....	52
3.6.2	Interview guide.....	53
3.6.3	Observation Checklist .....	53
3.6.4	Document Review .....	54
3.7	Data Collection Procedure .....	54
3.8	Data Analysis.....	55
3.9	Validity and Reliability.....	56
3.10	Limitations of the Study .....	56
3.11	Ethical Considerations .....	57
3.12	Chapter Summary .....	57
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS .....</b>		<b>58</b>
4.1	The Current Financing Practice in Special Education.....	58
4.1.1	Sources of Funding in Special Education.....	58
4.1.1.1	Government funding in Special Education.....	58
4.1.1.2	PTA funding in Special Education.....	66
4.1.1.3	Parents financing in Special Education .....	67
4.1.1.4	Cooperating partners' financing of Special Education.....	70
4.1.2	Identification of Funders in Special Education .....	73
4.1.3	Adequacy of Finances Received by Schools.....	74
4.1.4	Determinants of the Budget for LSENs.....	75
4.1.5	The practice of a needs based budget .....	77

4.1.6	The current status of funding to Special Education.....	78
4.1.7	Satisfaction levels with financial management for Special Education.....	81
4.1.8	School Financial Reports.....	82
4.1.9	Funders Withdrawing.....	83
4.1.10	The Current Strategic Practices in Financing of Special Education.....	84
4.2	Factors Influencing Current Financing Practice in Special Education.....	87
4.2.1	Attitude on Allocation of Funds to Learners.....	87
4.2.2	Factors thought to influence parents' participation in financing Special Educa..	88
4.2.3	Factors associated with funders' level of Satisfaction .....	89
4.3	The implication of the current financing practice on the provision of quality .....	89
4.3.1	The implication on infrastructure expansion for Special Education .....	90
4.3.2	The implication on Provision of Teaching and Learning Resources .....	92
4.3.3	The implication on Staffing for Special Education in Schools .....	94
4.3.4	The implication on Provision of quality education .....	94
4.4	Chapter Summary .....	96
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS .....</b>		<b>98</b>
5.1	The Current Financing Practice in Special Education.....	98
5.1.1	Sources of Funding For Special Education .....	98
5.1.1.1	Government Financing Special Education .....	99
5.1.1.2	PTA Financing Special Education.....	102
5.1.1.3	Parents Financing Special Education .....	102
5.1.1.4	Cooperating Partners in Financing Special Education .....	104
5.1.2	Budgeting in Special Education .....	105
5.1.3	Identification of Funders in Special Education .....	109
5.1.4	Current strategic practice of financing Special Education .....	111
5.2	Factors influencing the current financing practice in Special Education .....	111
5.3	The Implication of the Current Financing Practices on the Provision of Quality E..	117
5.3.1	The implication on infrastructure expansion for Special Education .....	118
5.3.2	The implication on the provision of teaching and learning resources.....	118

5.3.3	The implication on Staffing in Special Education.....	120
5.3.4	The implication on the Quality of Special Education in Schools.....	121
5.4	Chapter Summary .....	122
<b>CHAPTER SIX : CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>		<b>124</b>
6.1	Conclusion .....	124
6.2	Recommendations.....	125
6.3	Suggestions for Future Research .....	126
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>		<b>127</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>		<b>134</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Trends in public expenditure on education (ZmbK Billion).....	59
Table 2:	Government funding to the education sector at National level (\$1=K10).....	60
Table 3:	Government funding Special Education at school level (\$1 = ZMB K10).....	62
Table 4:	Beneficiaries of the GRZ grant for the year 2016.....	63
Table 5:	Views on whether government is funding Special Education in Southern Province.....	64
Table 6:	Existence of Parents Teachers Association.....	66
Table 7:	PTA user fees contributed by parents at school level .....	66
Table 8:	Parents Financing of Child's Education.....	68
Table 9:	Parent's level of financing Special Education against the required amounts per term..	69
Table 10:	Views on whether Schools receives adequate funds.....	74
Table 11:	Responses on Factors That Could Determine the Budget in Special Education.....	75
Table 12:	Responses on the practice of a Needs Based Budget.....	77
Table 13:	Teachers' views on consistence of government grant cash-flow .....	79
Table 14:	Parents' views on Government Financing Special Education .....	79
Table 15:	Views on Non-Government Financing Special Education .....	80
Table 16:	Teachers' views on status of parents financing to Special Education .....	80
Table 17:	Funders thought to be consistent in financing Special Education.....	81
Table 18:	Responses on whether the school required financial reporting.....	82
Table 19:	Whether there were funders who withdraw from financing Special Education.....	83
Table 20:	Responses on factors thought to influence parent Participation in Financing Special ..	88
Table 21:	Views on Increased Infrastructure Expansion.....	90
Table 22:	Views on adequacy of teaching and learning materials .....	92
Table 23:	Views on Increase on Staffing for specialised and Support staff.....	94
Table 24:	Views on Improved Quality of Special Education.....	95

## **LIST OF PICTURES**

Picture 1:	Braziers fabricated by pupils with Special Education needs.....	85
Picture 2:	Crafts works by Learners with SEN.....	85
Picture 3:	Inappropriate bathroom and toilet system for special learners.....	92

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

Appendix A: Respondent’s Consent Form.....	118
Appendix B: Semi-Structured Questionnaire for Teachers.....	119
Appendix C: Semi-Structured Questionnaire for Parents.....	125
Appendix D: Interview Guide for Educational Administrators .....	131
Appendix E: Observation Checklist.....	132
Appendix F: GRZ Funding to the Education Sector 2016.....	133

## **ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

AfDB,	African Development Bank
BESSIP	Basic Educational Sub-sector Investment Program
EU	European Union
FBE	Free Basic Education
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GPE,	global partnership for education
GRZ	Government of the Republic of Zambia
HI	Hearing Impaired
IMF	International Monetary Fund
LD	Learning Disability
LSEnS	Learners with Special Educational Needs
MoE	Ministry of Education
MoESVTEE	Ministry of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MoGE	Ministry of General Education
NIF	National Implementation Framework
PTA	Parents and Teachers Association
SEN	Special Educational Needs
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UPE	Universal Primary Education
VI	Visually Impaired
WB	World Bank

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

This chapter presents the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives, research questions, significance of the study, theoretical foundations and conceptual framework, delimitation of the study, study limitations, ethics and definition of terms, and it ends with the summary of the chapter.

#### **1.1 Background to the Study**

Provision of formal education to individuals with Special Educational Needs (SEN) had been in existence in Zambia since 1905 (Kalabula, 2007) and the sector had witnessed remarkable developments to its current status. Children with SEN were entitled to equal educational opportunities regardless of the financial costs involving educational programs and services. It is becoming widely recognised that educational opportunities for learners with SEN presents unique problems due to continuum of disability conditions and severities, thereby requiring differing amounts of money to meet their needs. Nevertheless, the provision of formal education to learners with Special Education Needs (LSEN) and the determination of program appropriateness and funding remains a fundamental area of concern.

Persons with Special Educational Needs, according to the Educational Reforms of 1977 and Educating our Future of 1996 were described as exceptional individuals that differ from others, in that, for their full development of inherent potential they need a modification of school...or Special Educational services in conjunction with the regular class or in a special class or school (MoE, 1977, and 1996). Additionally, the Education Act of 2011 states that a learner with SEN is one who has physical, hearing, speech, visual or mental impairment; is significantly different from other learners mentally; has social, emotional or behavioural disorders as certified by a medical practitioner or prescribed officer; or is gifted and talented (MoE, 2011). Actually, these individuals differ also in the level of financial requirements towards acquisition of formal education, and that is the reason why this study sought to explore the available practices in financing the education of individuals with SEN.

Martin et al (1996) and Mandyata (2015) show that persons with disabilities have been the target of discrimination across cultures for thousands of years and were often denied equal

access to education...usually they were among the poorest, the most discriminated against in society and probably they receive the most compromised support services that compromise on the provision of quality education in preparation for their socio-economic independence. With such kind of treatment against individuals with disabilities in society, one wonders as how much is society willing to financially invest into the education of persons with disablements. On the other hand, what puzzles the most were some assertions like that of Kelly (1998) describing financing of education for individuals with Special Educational needs as a “*bottomless pit*” meaning, it had no immediate returns to show to the public. This assertion describes wastage of resource-investment towards education of persons with disablements; meanwhile Special Education provision is an ongoing program in Zambia, and as such, it remains unclear as to what financing practices were available in Zambia that can warrant the provision of quality education to Learners with Special Educational Needs (LSEN).

The initial support in the provision of Special Education in Zambia is accredited to Missionaries of the Christian Churches who introduced modern education first. The Brethren Missionary named Frederick Anort opened the first modern education school at Limulunga in the year 1883 (Snelson, 1974) whereas, the government’s first ever step towards provision of modern education was in the year 1925 when the sub-department of native education was established (Kalabula, 1991). The Christian Missions further introduced Special Education and provided all the financial support that was required and the blind were the first beneficiaries of the funded formal education. It is however important to note that, the primary aim of Missionary Education was the spreading of the Gospel (Kaoma, 2007). Kalabula (1989) points out that in the early Special Education schools, the curriculum offered mainly consisted of studying the Bible, Reading and Writing in Braille and basic Handicrafts. Owing to this target, in the year 1905 at Magwero, Eastern part of Zambia, the Visually Impaired individuals were enrolled in a class established by the wife of a missionary, Mrs Issie Hofmeyer. Another missionary named Ms Ella Botes started and supported a class in 1914 at Madzimoyo that expanded to a school at Nyanje in 1923 and then it moved to Magwero in 1930 (Kalabula, 1991 cited Snelson, 1970).

Supply of finances and resources to Special Education was all in the hands of the Christian missionaries.

Development of Special Education in Zambia continued to expand, and Mandyata (2002) points out that more agencies of Christian Church Missionaries joined in the establishment of Special Schools following the success of the Dutch Reformed Church in the Eastern part of Zambia. The Agencies that joined in the provision of Special Education in Zambia were; The Christian Missions in Many Lands (CMML) operated in Luapula Province and, The Roman Catholic Church (RCC) operated in the Northern part of Zambia among others, before the year 1971 when government moved in.

The provision of Special Education in Zambia was regarded as a responsibility of missionaries since it was their initiative and not parents or government; however, in 1971 a Presidential decree was passed by President Kenneth Kaunda mandating the Ministry of Education to take responsibility in the provision of Special Education as a way of enhancing access (Kalabula, 1989). Subsequently, a teachers' training college, Lusaka College for Teachers of the Handicapped (LUCOTEHA) currently known as Zambia Institute of Special Education (ZAMISE) was established in 1971 with the mandate to train Special Education teachers. The goal was to ensure provision of quality education to pupils with disabilities (MoE, 1977 and Munsanje, Kalabula & Nzala, 2006). The Ministry of Education took a proactive role in the provision of Special Education not only through training of teachers but in other dimensions such as infrastructure development, design and development of the curriculum, provision of resources and speciality personnel. To further support mainstreaming and inclusion of learners with SEN, all the teacher training universities and colleges have incorporated Special Education in their respective curricula.

Initially, two categories of disability: the Visually Impaired (VI) and those with Hearing Impairments (HI) received recognition and financial support from the Voluntary Missionaries. The government grants were never received until 1953 onwards when the colonial government provided grants to the institutions. After 1971, the increase in the categories of disability and ability to provide support services resulted into the establishment of units in regular schools and they spread to most schools in the provinces. The government also took a step further by taking control of all schools previously organised and financed by the missionary agencies and turned them into government-aided institutions (Munsanje, Kalabula & Nzala, 2006). Going forward, as the management of education became complex, the Ministry of Education

developed a National Policy on education beginning with the ‘Educational Reform Proposal and Recommendation’ of 1977, followed by ‘Focus on Learning’ of 1992 and the current ‘Educating Our Future’ of 1996.

Education Reform Proposal and Recommendation Policy 1977 by the Ministry of Education became the first major Educational Policy document in Zambia that recognized Special Education. The document stated that all children with disabilities like any other children were entitled to education and should receive basic and further education by full-time study as any other children. It further stated that since children with disabilities were a special case, there should be ‘positive discrimination’ in their favour in the provision of facilities and amenities for educational purposes. It also recognised the need to increase access to education by all children including those with disabilities (MoE, 1977:25). Mandyata (2002) asserts that though the 1977 Education Reform document proposed a set of policies in favour of Special Education, little was done to implement it. Furthermore, the document was silent on the kind of placement whether in ordinary or special institutions though what came into practice was the creation of special classes and Special Units in ordinary schools in line with the integration policies.

Remarkably, on Policy Framework, the end of Zambia’s one party system in 1991 and moving to political pluralism led to vigorous and broad-based reforms in the country’s Economic and Social Sectors in which education is the vehicle to attain the goals. Education in Zambia was repositioned by taking a series of reforms recorded in the 1992 Focus on Learning policy document in education such as the cost-sharing measures requiring the community to join government in supporting educational provision both monetary and non-monetary form. Further, ‘Focus on Learning’ emphasised that financing of education would depend on a partnership between the government, district councils, communities, parents, beneficiaries, and voluntary organisations (MoE, 1992). The third Educational Policy document was the 1996 ‘Educating our Future’ which dealt with issues of access, equity and quality of education to be delivered to all learners and emphasised the mobilisation of resources for the development of school education as well as equal educational opportunities for all (MoE, 1996). Evidently, provisions for the education of learners with Special Education needs were reaffirmed in the Policy.

According to Mandyata (2015) the 1977 Education Reform, the 1992 'Focus on Learning' and 1996 'Educating our Future' documents lacked legislation backing and government commitment to have them implemented even so in meeting the financial support for learners with Special Educational needs. Expectedly, the Ministry of Education needed to provide necessary care and support towards individual needs of learners with Special Educational Needs. To achieve this, the Educating our Future document of 1996 availed the Policy and Strategies to increase access, promote equalization of educational opportunities and the quality of education for all children including those with disabilities. It further ensures equality of educational opportunities as well as the provision of education of particularly good quality to learners with Special Educational Needs. It also got committed to improve and strengthen the supervision and management of Special Education across the country. On the other hand, without adequate financial resource to support the programme, realisation of the documented targets would never be achieved. The Ministry of Education planned to participate in the provision of new Special Schools for the severely impaired as well as decentralization of support. Additionally, the Ministry planned to dispense with all direct educational costs for children with Special Educational Needs together with bursaries at tertiary level for such learners in cooperation with private, religious, community and philanthropic organisations so as to share the financial responsibility in Special Education too (MoE, 1996).

The Education Act of 2011 and the Persons with Disability Act of 2012 were the recent efforts in the development of Special Education in Zambia that were providing the legal framework in Special Education. Though it appears the aspect of financing Special Educational needs is not comprehensively addressed in both documents, the Education Act of 2011 article 23 (3) provides that; in determining the placement of a learner with Special Education Needs, it is significant to take into account the best interest of the learner, the rights and wishes of the learner or the parent of a learner with Special Education needs, provide learners with Special Education needs with quality education in appropriately designed and well-resourced educational institutions, staffed by qualified and dedicated teachers (MoE, 2011).

The Persons with Disability Act of 2012 Part V addresses protection and promotion of Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the right to education is among the rights addressed in sections 22 to 25 of the Act. It points out the type of education system, the facilities and equipment in

educational institutions as well as an allowance that should be paid to learners with disabilities to cover the extra cost likely to be incurred when learning, to date, it is not clearly known whether such funding had been effected. It further talks about accessibility of physical facilities at public institutions (including schools) for LSEs, as well as prohibition or refusals of admission in education on account of disability were also addressed (Persons with Disability Act, 2012). According to the African Disability Rights Yearbook (2015), it shows that the Disabilities Act domesticates some of the provisions of the CRPD ratified by Zambia. The CRPD of 2006 on its Article 24 commits State Parties to recognize the right of persons with disabilities to education without discrimination and on the basis of equal opportunity. Access to quality education that had been addressed in Zambia's Persons with Disabilities Act of 2012 is at the helm of every nation's agenda emanating from the CRPD. Additionally, UNESCO (1994) advocated for the educational system design and programme implementation that take into account the unique characteristics, interests, abilities and learning needs of every child. As such there is need for reliable financial support to enable designing of quality educational programmes suitable for LSEN as well as implementation of the same designed programmes towards acceptable quality of education in States including Zambia.

Furthermore, some International Conventions with focus on disadvantaged children have been held such as; The United Nations Convention against Discrimination in Education (1960) on Article 1 (a) which addresses discrimination against or depriving any person or group of persons of access to education of any type or at any level; United Nations Conventions on the Rights of the Child (1991) which provides for the rights of the disabled child to special treatment and education; More recently, the thrust of the Salamanca Declaration which was reiterated and expanded at the 48<sup>th</sup> Session of the UNESCO International Conference on Education, held in Geneva in 2008, calling on all State Parties to ensure education systems benefit children with disabilities at all levels. on particular groups of children have been held. The focus of the conventions had been children who were denied a chance to participate in the national economy due to the compromised poor quality of resource supply into their education. Some children were educationally disadvantaged by the social, cultural, regional and economic environments in which they live. As a result, the standards of learning activities in formal, informal or non-formal settings have been compromised below meaningful provision of quality education. Zambia, like many other countries is party to a number of international treaties that

oblige governments to put in place process and institutions that improves delivery of education including children with Special Education needs. However, the implementation of the treaties is dependent on a good financial investment or supply towards formal education for all the children regardless of the identified disabilities.

Zambia, had experienced an increase in the number of disabilities being recognised by the year 2016 and these included: the intellectually, visually, hearing, physically challenged and those with specific learning difficulties (African Disability Rights Yearbook, 2015). These learners with identified disabilities were being provided with education from the available placement categories within Zambia. The placement categories include Home based, Hospital Units, Special Units, Special Schools and Inclusive in ordinary primary and secondary schools (Kalabula, 2007). Despite an increase in the identified disability and learning placements categories available, the aspect of funding in the provision of Special Education were not clearly known hence the study, seeking to explore the financing practices available in Special Education particularly in Special Schools and Special Units in Secondary schools.

As earlier mentioned, the initiative of formal education for persons with disablements in Zambia was a Missionary driven agenda. Hence, both the monetary and non-monetary requirements were Missionary supported not until the government moved in formerly and supported Special Education after the presidential decree in 1971. Progressively, the 1977 Education Reforms proposed a 'positive discrimination' in favour of persons with disablements in the provision of facilities and amenities for educational purposes inclusive of financing (MoE, 1977). The 1992 'Focus on Learning' also mentioned of the modalities of education financing in view of educational cost-efficiency and cost-sharing which was intended to raise additional funds for education from the public and the users of educational services. The 1996 National Policy on education, 'Educating our Future' highlighted the Ministry's commitment to providing education of particularly good quality to LSEs. The Ministry's strategies included, cooperating with private, religious, community and philanthropic organisations in meeting the Special Educational needs of exceptional children, as well as dispensing of all direct educational costs for children with SEN (MoE, 1996), such strategies of resource or financial support in Special Education by the Ministry allowed many possible funders to come on board. However, currently in the year 2016 it was not unclear as to which funders had

adhered and were participating in financing Special Education particularly in the Southern Province of Zambia. Furthermore, the handling of Special Education financing, how it is being collaborated and harmonised among the funders that participate in financing it by the year 2015/6 still remained unclear.

Despite the goodwill elaborated by the Ministry in the provision of Special Education, studies have shown that financing in Special Education is inadequate, hence the study. Earlier in 1994, the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) had been introduced to alleviate economic problems by the government and that resulted into a Cost-Sharing Policy in education which required parents to contribute towards the education of children.

Beyani (2013) noted that the introduction of Basic education Sub-Sector Investment Programme (BESSIP) from 1999 to 2002, helped address the needs of primary education and infrastructure expansion in the provision of Special Education. The celebrated increase in enrolment of learners with disabilities led to crowding in limited classrooms without adequate teaching and learning materials, and coupled with teachers without the capacity to handle SEN. One can conclude that this situation defeated plans of improving the provision of quality education for LSENs. Ideally, learners identified with Special Educational needs should have been provided with additional support services in the areas that they experienced challenges other than mere access as it were. The concern here is that access alone in Special Education is not good enough without sufficient financial support that contributes to the quality of education for LSEN.

In the year 2002, the Free Basic Education (FBE) policy in Zambia was announced by the Republican President so as to ensure every child including children with SEN had access to basic education. Funding at the basic education level was to be done through education grants that were determined by the size or grade of the school regardless of whether or not; the school had LSEN who needed additional finances and services for their education. According to MoE (2002) effective February 2002, in response to the presidential announcement, it was planned that grade one schools receive the GRZ grant of unrebased Zambian Kwacha K3,000,000, and K2,600,000 for grade two and three schools per term (K3,800 was equivalent to US\$1, hence GRZ grant translated into \$789 and \$684 respectively). This was regardless of the special needs prevalence per school. These funds were meant to support the Free Education Policy and

to be in place of the income forgone following the elimination of PTA and other user fees in 2002. This was in a bid to procure basic teaching and learning materials like chalk, teachers' notebooks, chart paper, felt pens for the production of teaching aids and paper for printing grade 1 application forms, end of term tests and report forms and any other school needs (MoE, 2002). These expenditure guidelines were given by the Ministry and it can be observed that there was no mention of specialised items for LSENs, as even with FBE in place, it is not clear on how the LSENs benefited from the programme.

Between 2000 and 2014, the overall indication is that Zambia's education sector had experienced noticeable improvements under the Free Primary Education (FPE) Policy (MESVTEE, 2015). The MESVTEE had since registered over 1.2 million more learners, growing Zambia's net enrolment from 71 per cent in 1999 to over 97 per cent in 2013. According to MESVTEE (2014), the educational statistical bulletin show that in the year 2014 children with Special Education needs at primary school level were 89,135 and secondary school level were 7,471. However, Beyani (2013) noted a lack of sufficient resources to support Special Education also Kayuka (2014) hold a similar view. MESVTEE (2015) observed that it was difficult for the government to deliver educational services effectively and this contributed to the need for this study to explore the current situation in financing of Special Education with much focus on the year 2016.

According to Blount (2005), financing in education influences and determines curriculum delivery as well as the outcomes in the provision of quality education. Hence, financing towards curriculum delivery in education and Special Education in particular may never be overlooked due to the roles that the curriculum plays in the full development of human personality. It also strengthens respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms Persons for With Disabilities as well. No wonder governments have the central responsibility to ensure that quality education is provided for all (Kelly, 1991). However, Akingi and Nyanngia (2015) observed that in Zambia there was scarcity of resources and inadequate funding to the Ministry of Education so as to meet national education and training needs for Special Education. Furthermore, government financing of education had been associated with difficulties (Ndhlovu, 2008; Kayuka, 2014). UNICEF Zambia (2016) shows the 2016 education budget with the allocations as follows; Primary education 59 percent of the budget, secondary

education 21 percent, and higher education 13 percent, support services comprised 7 percent, early childhood education got an allocation of 0.51 per cent. One would expect a budgetary allocation for Special Education being an old recognised section of education compared to early childhood section recently transferred from Ministry of Local Government but to no avail.

Mandyata (2016) further observed that financial provisions in the Special Education sector had been too inadequate to influence any significant impact on the quality of education offered to the individuals with disabilities. In order to fill the gap left by the government's inability to fund Special Education, agencies have been helping Special Education institutions from time to time so as to meet some of the financial needs. Though the Ministry's adherence to financing of Special Education in Zambia appears to be in the balance and with observed insufficient fund, provision of Special Education had been an ongoing practice in various placement settings while the available practices in financing Special Education remained unclear.

Despite all these challenges and gaps, education remains crucial in eradication of poverty and improving of human capital (Chituma, 2005). Regrettably, financing of Special Education appear not to correspond with the increase in enrolment (Kayuka, 2014), and as such this study seeks to understand how Special Education is being financed currently, or rather the available financing practices in Special Education for services that carry an additional cost as compared to financing of regular school pupils, this study had to be carried out. The study endeavoured to explore how funding to Special Education was being done and the extent to which the Ministry is committed in practice to ensure that children with Special Educational Needs were attending well-resourced schools, staffed by qualified and dedicated teachers. Furthermore, an exploration of how cooperating partners have responded and were contributing towards provision of quality education to persons with disabilities in Zambia was also paramount in this study.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

Zambia had made strides in the provision of Special Education since independence. This is demonstrated by policy interventions leading to development of teaching and learning materials, decentralisation of service delivery, infrastructure expansion through establishment of Special Schools and Special Units, and strengthening of legal frameworks. Special

Education in Zambia had been evolving for years now from the initial Christian Missionary initiative through to government engagement and adherence to International Instrumentalities like the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights to which Zambia is a signatory. Despite these developments however, provision of quality Special Education is constrained by limited funding. Attainment of quality education relies on financial input and efficient resource supply to education to ensure improved curriculum outcomes (Blount, 2005). Previous studies have revealed inadequate funding to the Special Education sector as a major constraint in the provision of Special Education (Ndhlovu, 2008; Kayuka, 2014, and Mandyata, 2016). Additionally, Martin et al (1996) and Mandyata (2015) observed that persons with disabilities were often denied equal access to quality education and they were usually the most discriminated in as far as equity in the provision of education is concerned. What remained unclear were the financing practices that were available for the Special Education Sector in Zambia with focus on the Southern Province, as such this study sought to fill that knowledge gap.

### **1.3 Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to explore the current financing practices in Special Education in the Southern Province of Zambia involving five (5) districts.

### **1.4 Objectives of the Study**

The objectives that guided the study were as follows:

- i. To explore financing practices in Special Education in Southern Province of Zambia
- ii. To identify factors that influence the current financing practices in Special Education
- iii. To ascertain the implications of the current financing practices in Special Education on the provision of quality education

### **1.5 Study Questions**

The study objectives were addressed by answering the following questions:

- i. What were the financing practices in Special Education in the Southern Province of Zambia?

- ii. What factors influence the current financing practices in Special Education?
- iii. What were the implications of current financing practices in Special Education on the provision of quality education?

### **1.6 Significance of the Study**

It is hoped that the findings from the study may provide a situational analysis of financing needs and successes in Special Education with a view of improved policy formulation and implementation in Zambia. The study may also provide information to stakeholders on the factors that influence the current financing practices in Special Education and an appreciation of the implication of the current financing practices on the provision of quality education to learners with Special Educational Needs.

Additionally, the study may suggest ways through which financing practices in Special Education can be improved. Ultimately, some of the issues generated from the study on financing of Special Education may evoke further research in the field of Special Education.

### **1.7 Theoretical Framework**

The study was supported by the Human Capital Theory by Theodore Schultz (1961). The theory recognizes human capital as one of the factors for national economic growth in the modern economy (Rosen, 1999). Schultz argues that Human Capital Theory approach to investment in education appreciates the cost of education holistically. It included the cost of the services of teachers, librarians, administrators, maintaining, and operating the educational plants as well as the income foregone by students were all an investment (Schultz, 1961; Sidorkin, 2007). Therefore, the growth in output could only be adequately explained by the investment in human capital which is a distinctive feature of a modern economic system. This means that the greater the investment in Special Education, the more likely is the quality of education for learners with Special Education Needs. So both the state and cooperating partners have an investment in Special Education.

The Human Capital Theory was best suited for the present study because evidence from studies around the world had demonstrated that investment in human capital through formal education is a vital engine to national and individual economic growth (Dae-Bong, 2009). Education can reduce social and economic inequality since it is a great equalizer if all children were given

equal opportunities. Children with learning disabilities, whose parents do not take them to school, end up as outcasts in the society and afterwards they live in abject poverty.

In accordance with the theory, in this study, financing of Special Education was viewed as an investment aimed at developing skills, education, health and training of an individual holistically. The investment includes learners with Special Educational Needs towards creation of independent living for all individuals and people. It is believed that every well meaning government and society at large concerns itself with the education of its people including those with disabilities as a prerequisite for national development. The Republic of Kenya's MoE (2009) makes a valid point in favour of the Human Capital Theory by arguing that investment in education is an indispensable means of unlocking and protecting human rights since it provides the environment required for securing good health, liberty, security, economic well-being and participation in social and political activities of society. An adherence to the Human Capital Theory can assure national investment into education for every individual. Predicated on this understanding, this study sought to explore the available financing practices in Zambia.

### **1.8 Delimitation**

The delimitation of the study is meant to show how the study was reduced in geographic location, age, sex, population traits, population size, or other consideration (Msabila and Nalaila, 2013). In this view, the delimitation of this study was an exploration of the current practice in financing Special Education in Southern Province of Zambia. There were five (5) districts involved in the study such that one (1) Special School or Special Unit in a secondary school were selected, namely: Choma district (St. Mulumba Special School), Kalomo district (Kalomo secondary Special Unit), Kazungula district (Mukuni secondary Special Unit), Livingstone district (David Livingstone secondary Special Unit), and Mazubuka district (Flamboyant Special School).

### **1.9 Operational Definitions**

*Children with Special Needs* refers to those that experience conditions, barriers or factors that hinder normal learning and development of individuals.

*Current practice:* for this study; it refers to what was being done in financing of Special Education during the year 2015 and 2016.

**Disability:** long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which, in interaction with various barriers, may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.

**Exploration:** a careful investigation into or a study of data or a particular subject or possible causes of action in line with financing of Special Education in Zambia.

**Financial resources:** money available for acquisition of specialised services and purchase of resources for special needs children

**Financing of Special Education:** refers to the provision and supply of anything of monetary value or resource towards educational programmes of LSEN.

**Special Education (SE):** refers to education exclusively intended for children with disabilities and those with specific learning difficulties.

**Special Educational Needs (SEN):** refers to extra educational resources needed for children with disabilities to receive education effectively

**Special Needs Education (SNE):** refers to appropriate education provision for learners with disabilities which may not ordinarily be met by the regular services of mainstream educational institutions provided in Special Schools and Units in secondary Schools

**Special Schools:** refers to a school specifically for pupils with disabilities only and were in the hands of specialist teachers.

**Special Unit in public secondary school:** refers to an arrangement where Special Education is provided within a main school system with specialised or non-specialised teachers in Special Education.

**Teaching and learning resources:** refers to materials that teachers use to assist students in learning.

## **1.10 Chapter Summary**

In chapter one, the following issues have been discussed: background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives from which research questions that guided the

study emanated, significance of the study, theoretical framework, delimitation and limitations of the study. The chapter ends with operational definitions. The next is chapter two which focuses on literature review in accordance with study objectives and questions of this exploration.

## CHAPTER TWO

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The previous chapter focused on the introduction to the study, and it covered: the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, study questions. Other items covered were; the significance of the study, theoretical framework, delimitation operational definitions and chapter one summary. This chapter presents a review of related literature on financing of Special Education which was done according to the main themes of the study. These included: financing of education in Zambia; financing practices in Special Education; factors that influence the current financing practices in Special Education and the implications of current financing practices on the provision of quality education to persons with Special Educational Needs in Zambia.

#### **2.1 Financing of Education in Zambia**

Education is an accepted public good and a justifiable human right that enables all persons to develop in all aspects of their spiritual, moral, cognitive, emotional, imaginative, aesthetic, social and physical lives (National Council for Special Education, 2014). The education provided must be of accepted quality; as such provision of quality education attracts a financial cost both material and non-material. In Zambia financial support to education had been ongoing since the colonial administration of the British government before independence. The government being the key custodian had been the major supporter in the provision of education. Public expenditure in education is justifiable due to its extensive benefits to the society that private expenditure alone would never achieve, and the provision of quality education is dependent on the available financial resources to support curriculum delivery (Blount, 2005). While these justifiable trends in supporting public education could be obtaining in Zambia, it was not known whether or not the same trends were a true reflection in Special Education particularly in Southern Province, Zambia, hence the study.

Concerning support to education, Msoroka (2010) conducted a study which appreciated the fact that in most countries both developed and less developed, the sources of education revenue involved a combination of public and private financing sources. In Tanzania, there were various sources of education revenue including fiscal sources; user charges including various

forms of cost recovery and cost sharing sources; student loans which constituted a revolving fund generating income out of which loans were offered to students; and various forms of community contributions. The study further revealed that before 2001 the funding of education depended on both sides; parents and government through cost sharing although the contribution of parents in school fees was very minimal. Parents largely contributed costs like school uniforms and stationery facilities, the rest of the costs were carried by the government.

Msoroka's study in Tanzania identified the participating partners to government and parents in financing of education as donor countries and organisations. Among the donor countries which helped the financing of education in Tanzania were: the British, France, Ireland, Japan, Norway, Finland, Canada, Holland, Germany, China, Turkey, Algeria, India, Poland, Egypt, Pakistan, Belgium and European Union (EU). Among the organizations which played great role in Tanzanian education includes the World Bank (WB), WFP, UNICEF, UNESCO, UNDP, African Development Bank (ADB), NORAD, Sida (Sweden), CIDA (Canada), JICA, USAID, JOVC, DANIDA, Barclays Bank, NMB, CRDB, NBC, Book Aid International, Aga Khan Education Foundation, Plan International, UNAIDS, World Vision, Irish Aid, Care International, Oxfam (Budget speech, 2009/010). In Zambia, however, no clear information on who was involved in financing of education, particularly Special Education, hence the current study.

Kelly (1991) in the financing of education in Zambia reported and hinted that the cost of education rested heavily on government to mobilise resources for educational expenditure. The Zambian government's responsibility in education arises from its overall concern to protect the rights of individuals, promote social well-being and achieve a good quality of life for every person through all-embracing, economic development. Education is intended to serve individual, socio- economic well being and to enhance the quality of life for all. The aim is guided by the principle of liberalization, decentralization, equity, partnership, and accountability as the influencing policies. The views in Kelly's report were also shared by Malunga (2007). Furthermore, the Kelly (1991) report showed that even though education was free in both government and aided schools, parents bore a substantial cost arising from the direct educational needs of their children and those that directly relate to educational needs of their children and those that relate directly to education. Parents bore the direct educational costs that included payments for educational supplies, the purchases of educational materials

and examination materials, examination fees. Kelly also indicated that Government was responsible for recurrent expenditure in education, and that financial investment in education goes with the kind of policy to be implemented. It is worthy stating here that Zambia has had policy on educational provision as such public financing of education is justifiable and valuable for it determines education outcome among the citizens. Though the report entrusted from Kelly (1991) on financing of education in Zambia provided pertinent information for this study, with the passage of time from 1991 the report was written up to date, a lot of events could have happened and changed in one way or another and distorted or have overtaken the meaning of this phenomenon by the year 2016. On such grounds, there was a reason good enough to explore the current financing practice in Special Education in the Southern Province, Zambia, in the

The UNESCO (2016) report revealed that following a period of decline in education delivery and performance due to growing poverty and under investment in education between 1980 and 2001, Zambia had undertaken considerable policy development and reform to meet evolving national aspirations and social demands to improve its national education system. Further, the Free Basic Education (FBE) Policy of 2002 gave rise to the Basic Educational Sub-sector Investment Programme (BESSIP) giving increase to equity and access to basic education at primary level. The report further stated that Zambia was close to achieving Universal Primary Education (UPE) and Universal Secondary Education. While the achievements Zambia was making could be appreciated, Mfundo (2007) contends that increased access to education by all groups of individuals including girls and the vulnerable had been one thing, the provision of quality education is also another. Quality education is dependent on the level of resources supplied to the education system, especially specialised materials for LSEN hence the study.

Expenditure on education in most developing countries is said to have reduced by the end of 1970s and one of the main reasons for the reduction in resource allocation to education was the economic decline that had hit many countries. As a result, there were not enough public funds to be spent on social services including education (Meki, 2005; Kelly, 1998). Graham-Brown (1996) portrayed this kind of budgeting as a 'culture of cuts' prompting developing countries to cut down social services expenditure. on the other hand, the World Bank (2016) report show that education in Zambia had steadily developed and had undergone several systemic

restructurings and continuous expansion and it falls in the public financing system, the Output-Based Budgeting (OBB) system was introduced in the education sector for the first time as a pilot programme in 2015.

World Bank (2016) further shows that financing of education in Zambia had over the years experienced mixed economic fortunes since independence. The first early years after independence from 1964 were characterised by massive expansions in all areas of human endeavour including education but years of economic sluggishness up until the mid-1990s followed. Economic growth as measured by GDP growth rate between 1995 and 2000 averaged 3.5 percent while that of the period from 2000 to 2005 averaged 5.8 per cent per annum. By 2011 the annual average economic growth for the previous 5 years stood at 8.7 per cent. The cumulative growth in real GDP since 1994 up to 2013 had been three times more, moving Zambia from a poor income country to a prospering lower middle income country. The lower middle income status should have improved the status of educational provision. However, the question is how Zambians were and the society at large responding to the investment in social services such as education in line with the economic achievements in view of increased access to education by all children. It is not known how the steady development in education had been of benefit to learners with Special Education needs, additionally, the benefit that have come with Output-Based Budgeting (OBB) system particularly in Special Education

Alongside provision of education in general and every support available, the need for Special Education has continued to expand to its current status. Investment in education for all guarantees the desired holistic and all-inclusive quality education fundamental to the improvement of national economic growth, reducing poverty and boosting societal well-being including people with disabilities. What then is the share of Special Education in all this reported achievement in the education sector? This study was necessary so that the financing practice in Special Education currently available in Southern Province could be known and the effectiveness of curriculum delivery to learners with Special Educational Needs in preparation for their socio-economic well-being be ascertained.

Financial investment in education is also argued theoretically from the point of view of the Human Capital Theory founded by Theodore Schultz (1960) upon which the study was

anchored. Schultz (1960) argued for an investment in education of the citizens because they were a critical engine of economic growth. The importance of financial support to education can reduce both social and economic inequality since education is a great equalizer of all people including people with Special Educational Needs. As such, a realization by any national government's effort on financial support towards implementation of educational programmes must be appreciated. Above all, government investment in education must appreciate Special Education aspect and recognise diversity in Educational Needs hence there can never be a uniform budgetary allocation in education for the learners.

## **2.2 Financing Practices in Special Education**

The Ontario Ministry of Education (2015) indicated a renewed vision for education on achieving excellence, closing gaps and meeting goals of Special Education. The guide appreciates Ontario for being recognised as having one of the world's best school grants for Special Education managed under a Board at every school level. The guide show that Ontario operates on Grant System for Special Education financing and the goals were: achieving excellence, ensuring equity, promoting well-being and enhancing public confidence. The country had a funding formula comprising grants for Special Education. The grants were: *Funding for classrooms* grant which focuses on providing classroom resources; *Funding for schools* grant which provides the resources for school leadership, cleaning and maintenance of facilities for learning; Funding a locally managed system for board leadership; and Funding for specific priorities to achieve Excellence and closing gaps in Special Education needs.

The Ontario grant on funding for classrooms covers; *Special Education Per Pupil Amount* (SEPPA) which is the fundamental funding towards the cost of Special Education provision calculated on total enrolment as well as the grade level basis; *High Needs Amount* (HNA) which takes into consideration the variation share of needs per learner, as well as the Board's needs to meet them; *Special Equipment Amount* (SEA) is given to Special Education to buy computers, software as well as related equipment; *Special Incidence* (SI) portion in Ontario caters for learners who required more than two full-time staff for severe disability conditions. Evidently, this financing practice in Ontario gives the true picture of how things were and it appears to be more responsive to the Special Educational needs in that country believed to have the best education system for Special Education in America. This practice in financing of

Special Education in Ontario covers a wide range of care in terms of finance provision to LSEN. It is not known how Zambia's financing of Special Education deviate from the Ontario practice, regarded as being one of the world's best financing practices in Special Education.

Furthermore, the European Agency for Development in Special Education (1999) conducted a study on financing Special Education involving 18 countries in Europe. Austria was one of the countries selected for the study. The findings show the Special Education financing practices in Austria that; calculation of the budget for Special Education at National level was based on the number of pupils in each Special Education placement. This budget consisted of two components calculated for different purposes such as; funds for pupils with certified special needs and funds for pupils in compulsory schools with various non-certified disabilities. A pupil with certified special needs attracted the funds for paying teachers that meet his/her needs in the school that parents had chosen. The study further found out that there were three sources of funds for Special Education in Austria and these were: the provinces tasked to provide resources for employing of Special Education teachers; the community for maintaining of the school, and the social department for employing nursery staff as well as therapists.

The Special Education responsibilities in Austria were shared among funders, who have been assigned to particular aspects where each funder is accountable for each activity, including the provinces tasked to employ teachers in Special Schools, the community tasked for maintenance of both mainstream and Special Education institutions. On the contrary view, the European Commission (2015) conducted a study concerning the support for children with Special Educational needs from the 17 European countries and it criticised the practice of allocating individual budgets to pupils with SEN in that it tends to encourage schools and parents to seek funds allocated hence escalating the number of pupils indentified as having SEN. The study argued that allocating funds to local authorities and school, rather than to individual pupils might be more effective means of promoting honest and curbing escalating special needs budgets. The financing practice in Austria appear to be inclusive in that, the nation, the provinces and community were all involved in Special Education support and that can give better understanding and sense of responsibility by everyone in the country. What is in Austria creates a gap for the current study in Southern Province, Zambia.

Peters (2003) conducted a survey which selected 63 countries globally and applied purely quantitative methods of data collection. The financing practice in Special Education revealed in the study indicated that; 63 percent of Special Education costs were covered by governments, 35 percent by the private sector, and 2 percent by external support; showing a mixture of state, voluntary organizations, and parents. The study findings further show that Fiscal Policies at the government level were guided by formula models categorized in three basic types from which the 63 participating countries reported to have been using at least one type or in combination of two. The three were; child based models, resource-based model. The study also found out that all the participating countries faced some resource constraints and financing challenges in meeting the needs of LSEN in secondary schools to enhance effectiveness of service delivery. However, financing of Special Education practices were never restricted to the three financing models mentioned above since each government uses its own approach hoped to be its best according to the prevailing conditions, hence the current study fits well for the situation in Zambia.

Nusche, et al (2015) conducted a review under Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development in Belgium about the school resources in the Flemish Community of Belgium. The results were that funding for Special Education had some specific standards adopted and used to calculate the working budget for Special Education in Belgium. Support personnel such as; therapists, nurses, pedagogical, psychological and social staff have specific budget in Special Education. The study also made known a conditional financing system for schools which is received as additional funds when a substantial number of pupils that belong to the target group were present in that school. There is 'The Operating grant' a fund intended to overcome the running expenses of a school, another fund for salaries and another one for capital. All schools whether public or private received a grant from the federal government. Notably within France, there was the existence of a French Community of Belgium, where the education of pupils is funded by the government at 68 percent, the provinces at 2 percent, the Cities at 4 percent and 'des allocations familiales' of the Social Ministry at 26 percent.

In Belgium, the largest part of the government grant is spent on mainstream education 82 percent and a 6 percent being allocated to Special Schools. The study further revealed that, the government determines and allocates the financial budget for education based on school head

teacher's estimated expenditure for the coming year guided by the expenses of the current year. The Flemish Minister of Education and Training is responsible to determine the budget for each school based on the number of pupils and the estimates of expenditure per school. The school receives yearly budgeted amounts in four quarters, and every June and December schools submit half year's financial reports. Financial reports signify a practice of accountability by schools in Belgium where a review of costs and Income were sent to the Ministry after all partners have met twice a year in consultation and confirmation of all the financial activities.

Another study on financing of Special Education was carried out in New Jersey by Kolbe, et al (2007), the results were that New Jersey provides districts with aid for Special Education and related services, this aid is separate from state aid for general education instead it is dedicated to supporting the costs for Special Education and related services only. State aid is allocated using a "weighted pupil" formula, which resulted from The Comprehensive Educational Improvement and Financing Act (CEIFA) of 1996. This formula established a four-"tiered" system of funding and specified that an "appropriate education was to be defined in terms of the core curriculum content standards and related assessments". Each of the tiers provides a set dollar amount per student who meets pre-specified eligibility criteria and is meant to provide differential funding based on students' need for services. However, the assessment of Special Educational needs as well as allocation of finances for the special needs too, is not known in Southern Province, Zambia hence this study may make it known.

Similarly, Parrish and Chambers (1996) conducted a study on financing Special Education in the USA and the findings show that approximately 12 percent of public education budgets were allocated to Special Education such that, about 8 percent of Special Education funds come from the federal government, 56 percent from state governments, and the remainder from local school districts. The cost per student with Special Educational needs was about 2 to 3 times the cost of regular education. Parrish and Chambers findings further revealed the average per-pupil expenditure figures for Special Education programmes by individual disability condition and programme type as follows: the cost of programmes for intellectually challenged in a special was US\$ 3,083 while a resource room programmes was US\$ 1,643; the cost of programmes for the Hearing Impaired in a Special School was US\$ 7,988 while in a resource room was US\$

2,620; as for the Visually Impaired, in a Special School it was US\$ 6,181 while US\$ 3,395 was for the resource room; those with physical disabilities US\$ 5,248 was for Special School while US\$ 9,999 was for the resource room per individual learner.

Parrish and Chamber's study also show that, the division of fiscal responsibility between state and local sources varies considerably from state to state. Federal Department of Education had recently recommended a Special Education funding based on census counts of total school populations rather than on the number of students identified for Special Education services. Proponents of census-based funding foresee greater efficiency of services, while opponents fear a loss of services targeted to individualized needs. An additional proposal is that census-based funding be modified to increase funding to jurisdictions with higher rates of poverty. Parrish and Chambers' study established the cost of education at 2 to 3 times more than that of other learners in the USA as well as the actual amounts of estimated cost for Special Education programmes. The information given for Special Education in the USA is good enough but with the lapse of time since 1996 to date, the figures could have gone up, creating a gap for this study in 2017 and in Zambia Southern Province. Hence, the need to carry out a study in Southern Province Zambia and establish the cost of Special Education there, and this study is timely.

The National Council for Special Education (2014) in the USA added that the Department of Education and Skills is responsible to fund some of the support services to children with disabilities that have been enrolled in schools. The services include; school transport to the nearest special class or school available as well as the cost of escorts on school transport. There were also grants available towards sign language tuitions to families of deaf or hard of hearing children, grants for assistive technology such as radio aids, Braille machines and computers, grants for specialized seating and other specialist furniture and also grants for purchase of start-up equipment and materials in special classes. While the trend is as unveiled in the USA, the situation in financing of Special Education in Zambia may have a different approach that this study intended to explore it and make known for Southern Province.

When it comes to legislative aspects on financing Special Education, Parrish (1996) conducted a study in Columbia and it was revealed that the current practice in financing of Special Education is supported by legislative components of offering federal grants. The study shows

that Columbia had to modify and expand existing programs to ensure the provision of a free and appropriate public education to all children with disabilities in the least restrictive setting. The study further show that funds were allocated to districts based on the number of children with disabilities using the formula providing up to 40 percent of the national Average Per Pupil Expenditure (APPE) for each child with a disability. In Zambia too, the legislative component of support to Special Education is available as Education Act of 2011 and Persons with Disability of 2012, however, in practice, it was not known how far this legislation goes in influencing financial support in Special Education.

Beyani (2013) conducted a study that looked at Zambia's effective delivery of public education services, the findings of the study show that enrolment of learners with Special Educational needs in Zambia had increased. Beyani also found out that there was an insufficient budget allocated to the education sector and the education sector experienced yearly budget deficits. Additionally, the study reported shortages of teachers, teaching learning materials and general inadequate school infrastructure. The findings of Beyani were also reported by Ndhlovu (2005) as challenges in Special Education. Furthermore, Kayuka (2014) also conducted a study on management of Special Units in the face of inadequate funding in primary schools in the Copperbelt and North-Western Provinces; one interesting finding of the study was that the central government in Zambia supported Special Education in the named provinces but it only released the educational grants irregularly and inconsistently. Moreover, Ndhlovu and Kayuka applied qualitative techniques of data collection and analysis, and the studies were located in different provinces, for this study now, both quantitative and qualitative techniques were used to collect analyse data and draw conclusion in Southern Province.

MESVTEE (2015) produced a financial report under 'The Ministry of Education Revenue and Expenditure' for the year 2014. The financial report shows that K8.6 billion (\$8.6 Million) was allocated to the education budget for 2014, from which K6.1 billion (\$6.1 Million) representing 76 percent, was allocated to personal emoluments (PEs). Whereas K2.2 billion (\$2.2 Million) representing 24 percent, was for non-personal emoluments (non-PEs) such as infrastructure development, school grants for education materials and free primary and secondary education. The Ministry's total allocation was mostly funded by Government resources, which accounted for 97 per cent, while the main cooperating partners (Irish Aid, UNICEF, JICA, AfDB, DFID,

GPE, and USAID) contributed the remaining three per cent through sector budget support. UNESCO (2016) mentioned of government pronouncements on financing of education at all levels with the target to fulfill the internationally agreed education 2030 agenda. With such a good financial report presented for the year 2014 by MESVTEE, as well as the government pronouncements on education, it still remains unknown how far Special Education had been catered for from the budgetary allocation down to the school level both in personal emoluments for support services and non-personal emoluments towards achieving the 2030 agenda, hence this study.

### **2.3 Factors Influencing Current Financing Practice in Special Education**

The World Bank (2016) study that focused on Education Public Expenditure Review in Zambia whose findings indicated that economic development had raised Zambia to a lower-middle-income status with a Gross National Income (GNI) per capita of US Dollar 1,350 in by the year 2012. Following the development of various economic sectors, poverty rates had been declining since the mid-1990s, falling to just over 60 percent in the year 2010. Important improvements have been observed in social indicators. The findings further show that in 2010, the moderate poverty rate in rural areas was 74 percent, more than double the urban poverty rate of 35 percent. In absolute terms, 5.1 million Zambians were living in extreme Poverty and 7.9 million in moderate poverty in 2010. Therefore, according to the above findings, it can be concluded that a high prevalence of poverty is still being experienced and a significant size of the population is still under poverty especially in rural areas of Zambia. How much then is seen to be investment in educating learners with Special Educational needs in the realisation of educational goals relating to provision of quality education in Southern Province, Zambia?

Furthermore, UNESCO (2016) carried out a study whose findings show the influence of the GDP on financing education. Zambia's share of GDP devoted to the education sector between 2010 and 2013 ranged between 3.7 percent and 4.3 percent and this was lower than the average for the Southern African Region of 4.9 percent and Sub-Saharan Africa at 4.5 percent up to 2013. UNESCO also acknowledged the achievement in Special Education funding Zambia had made since 2000 in response to increased demand for school. The study concludes that Zambia still had some leeway to increase its long-term commitment to financing education. It

can therefore be seen that the DGP had an effect that trickles down to Special Education support in the country hence this study.

A study by The Global Campaign for Education (2014) focused on the IMF policies on Zambia financing education. The study findings show that the IMF policies were believed to be squeezing Zambia's education system. The study observed that the Zambian government is forced to consistently and knowingly under-estimate the spending needs in education and other sectors alike to operate within the IMF agreements before Zambia qualified for debt cancellation early 2000s. According to Jensen (2004), the practice of deliberate under-estimate in budgeting is referred to as a syndrome and called it 'Budgeting with eyes shut'. The study further show that, the IMF guided Zambia to reduce on public sector expenditure to no more than 8 percent of GDP as a result of higher budgetary deficit experiences than the anticipated. As a result, the Ministry of Education had to restrict any recruitment of new teachers. Going by the study findings mentioned above, it can be concluded that the experience of fund freeze policies by IMF appear to have an influence on the current funding practice in Special Education.

The World Bank (2004) conducted a study whose results were reported in the Africa Region Human Development Working Paper Series. It shows that the government of the Republic of Zambia had long recognised the importance of education. It also reported a sharp decline from the mid-1980s onward in Copper prices and that had led to a commensurate decline in GNI per capita, from USD590 in 1975 to USD300 in 2000, a situation that presented several obstacles for the education sector. The government, along with a consortium of donors, had been working closely to improve educational outcomes in Zambia. Similar finds were reflected in the study conducted by Muchindu, (2010) who studied on the impact of social and economic factors on access to free education in basic schools of Zambia. Muchindu also noted the experiences of the decline in resources supplied to education. The World Bank (2014) study further cited an interview with Roy Mwaba the General Secretary of Zambia National Teachers Union who mentioned that 'education sector is mismanaged by the government and its being afforded a relatively low priority, it should have been priority number one but its only number 10, as long as government does not have proper priorities and they lack the skills of prioritising, this crisis is going to continue'. According to this interview, one would conclude

that government priority to manage education is one of the factors that show willingness to allocate funds to education

The factor relating to parental participation in financing Special Education was reported in Beyani (2013). Beyani found out that it was a burden on the side of parents to support education financially through user fees introduced in schools. Parents were made to cover almost every aspect of Special Education from fees to books, shoes, uniforms, food and transport. A Similar view was recorded in UNESCO (2016) findings that indicated an influence on financing education such as family levels of illiteracy, poverty and general low levels of human development in the family. Both studies observed that it becomes increasingly difficult for illiterate parents to support their children in school activities as their children develop more competencies and more in-depth knowledge over the years. Therefore, it can be said that the literacy of parents is important and necessary for the overall development of quality Special Education in Zambia.

Similarly, Akinyi and Nyangia (2015) undertook a case study in Kenya on the challenges facing Special Education in public secondary schools. The study findings indicated a socio-cultural factor in that society exhibited negative attitude towards people with special needs in education due to cultural beliefs and values in the society. The study shows some cultures blaming the causes of disability to ancestral sins and misdeeds, believes that lead to attitudes reported to be unfavourable amongst members of society including teachers, pupils and policy implementers. The study further highlighted parental factors as having an influence on support to Special Education. Parents to learners with disabilities needing Special Education services were faced with stigmatisation from members of the society. Some parents did not know the abilities of their children with disabilities and did not know where to take them for formal education while struggling in abject poverty. An additional view about parents was given in the Northern Rhodesia; African Education Report (1953) cited in Mandyata (2015) shows that; Often parents felt that placing children with disabilities in the school system, was a waste of school places and learning resources which could better be used to support the education of their peers without disabilities who were more likely to succeed than those with disabilities. Akinyi and Nyangia (2015) also mentioned of the school factors associated with the physical facilities that were unsuitable for the special pupils in Kenya; the play field were littered with

objects, stones, grass and pieces of wood exposing the children to great dangers. The study further observed that most families with special children in public schools were mainly from poor economic background and they did not have the very basic education which would make them want their children to be better than themselves in terms of academic attainment. These findings show that the economic background of the parents and the education levels have an influence in financing education of the children in Kenya, a trend that needs to be explored also in the Southern Province in this study.

IDDC (2013) mentioned of negative attitudes in the education of disabled people that continue to present a barrier, mainly in rural areas where some teachers have been empowered to make education for LSEN become a reality in their classrooms but they have not helped in resource mobilization from the communities. Additionally, Mandyata (2015) reported the negative parental and societal attitudes towards education of persons with disabilities. Furthermore, Kelly (1998:118) revealed that many donors in the field of education often viewed Special Education as a '*bottomless pit*' with little or no immediate returns to show to the public on donor inputs in education. Kasoma (2014) noted that the external funding received for execution of Special Education programs had the highest chunk of it spent on management and administration activities leaving less to nothing for meaning infrastructure, teaching learning materials and low educator inspiration. These statements above seem to suggest that the willingness of individuals, communities and donors to invest in the education of all learners including those with Special Education needs appear to remain in the balance in practice and that is one of the reasons this study seek to understand in Southern Province.

On the other hand in reference to Beyani (2013), the study still show that the legal lacuna reflected in persistently poor budget planning and financing of education programs relating to children's welfare more especially the LSEN. Beyani cited the directive principles in part 10 of the Zambian Constitution together with the wording of Article 4 of the UNCRC stating that 'to the maximum extent of their available resources' does not impose a sense of urgency and a binding responsibility on government as the protector of last resort. The directive principles of state policy allows government responsibility to finance Special Education to be at the mercy of political will and laxity on the part of the state in the effective implementation of meaningful financing of Special Education needs. Mayo (1994) had earlier on pointed out that special

needs education could not advance in isolation; it must be part of the overall educational strategy based on laws and legislation. Mayo pointed out that the 1966 education Act was silent on Special Education needs and as such, there was no statutory basis for identifying, assessing and educating children with Special Education needs. However, in 1971, the general education legislation was necessitated after the presidential decree by the then head of state, Kenneth Kaunda. The Education Act of 2011 and the Persons with Disability Act of 2012 have enough legislative provisions but it is not yet clear how much financial influence the provisions have on the ground, hence this study.

The legal provision that governs financing and management of education in Zambia can be traced and contained in the Education Act of 1964 through to the Education Act of 2011. The Act recognises a child's right to compulsory free basic education, and places the burden of responsibility on the parent to ensure that a school-age child attends school. In addition to providing every individual with a right to education, the Act also guides authorities in ensuring equality of access to education for children with Special Educational needs (SEN) and promotes affirmative action in relation to this category of learners, including identification, diagnosis, and assessment for the placement of SEN learners (MoE, 2011). The responsibility of parents to ensure education of children was reaffirmed in the National Education Policy of 1996 where it was strategised to include parents in supporting the education of children (MoE, 1996). However, it is not clear how government and the stakeholders were participating in meeting the educational needs of LSEN financially, this study brings that understanding.

In Zambia, the education of persons with disabilities is traced from the colonial era when Zambia was still under the influence of Great Britain's educational system policies developed before 1964. Missionary pioneers initialised the provision of general education in Zambia and Africa as a whole to the level of reading the Bible and spread the gospel of Christ through Schools, Churches and Clinics located within local communities. The effort was mainly limited to the provision of minimum ever education level and only adequate for the spread of Christianity. This practice resulted into the inclusion of persons with disabilities into Christianity (Kalabula, 1991; Mandyata, 2002; Kaoma, 2005). The Christian Missionary work at the time of this study, was still providing and supporting Special Education as evidenced by the number of grant aided schools in Zambia (MESVTEE, 2015). Going forward, the

constitutional and legal framework on provision of equal and adequate educational opportunities was embedded in the Zambia's constitution of 1964 in the form of directive principles through to the current constitution.

Policy provisions on the other hand tend to influence financing practices in the education system, for instance, in Zambia the publication of the policy document 'Focus on Learning' of 1992, the document that emphasized the need for resource mobilization to develop schools; the Government of Zambia had expressed a commitment to ensure that all learners including those with disabilities were provided with quality education. Additionally the MoE (1996) policy document reaffirmed the Ministry of Education's commitment to uphold the principle that every individual had an equal right to educational opportunities. This means that every individual child, regardless of personal circumstances or capacity, had a right of access to, and participation in, the education system (MoE, 1996). It is important also to appreciate that the Government, through Ministry of Education had developed an equity strategy advocating, promoting fairness and inclusion conditions that equalize learning opportunities and access to education by everyone. Ideally financial or supply of resources for Special Education programs should be observed appropriately hence the introduction of the National Implementation Framework (NIF). The National Implementation Framework (NIF) approach ensures consistency between policies aimed at improving equity among all learners including the LSEN as well as the activities and initiatives undertaken to achieve the equity objective. The equity issues include those concerning gender, orphans and vulnerable children, community schools, adult literacy, Special Educational needs, HIV/AIDS, and school health and nutrition.

#### **2.4 The Implications of the Current Financing Practices on the Provision of Quality Education**

Barbara, et al (1998) conducted a study in Kenya whose findings were that physical infrastructure designed and constructed way before students with disabilities could be integrated into such institutions remained unchanged at the time of the study. Classrooms were not increased and the available ones became overcrowded while toilets remained narrow and unsuitable for special learners. The study shows lack of financial resources to redesign the physical facilities in the institutions, a condition that impacted Special Education to the extent having facilities that were not accommodative. Barbara et al (1998) further described the

impact of inadequate or poor infrastructure as having gone to the extent that even desks were not adapted for use by learners with Special Educational Needs; ramps had not been built making it difficult for learners to use the facilities. This situation arises from the financing practice available in Special Education in Kenya and it is worth carrying out this study in Southern Province here in Zambia and explored the implications of the current financing practices.

In Tanzania, Mmabaga (2002) cited in Musembi (2014) conducted a study whose results show that schools were experiencing shortages of classrooms leading to overcrowding, shortage of textbooks and other essential materials. Another study was conducted by East Africa Standard (2003) in Kenya cited by Ogolloh (2008) and it revealed that the quality of services to learners with Special Educational Needs is adversely affected by an acute shortage of specialised aids and equipment due to the government's laxity to fund Special Education. The study pointed out higher dependency on donors for construction of buildings and for Special Education materials. Similarly, in Botswana a study was conducted by Chhabra (2010) and it revealed a concern by teachers about the inadequacy of equipment, teaching and learning materials and non-availability of paraprofessionals in schools. Meki (2005) in Zambia observed that when the financing levels to education were low, there was a negative impact on the quality of education given to learners because the situation escalates to the extent of shortages of teaching and learning resources and necessary facilities such as toilets, desks, walkways, lumps and playgrounds remain unattended to.

Malunga (2007) conducted a study in Lusaka and found out that teachers did not have enough teaching aids for the Visually Impaired. They lacked teaching aids such as manual alphabets, sign language dictionaries, textbooks with illustrations in sign language, speech mirrors and hearing aids. Malunga further found out that teachers lacked in-service training in Special Education due to inadequate financing being experienced in the Ministry for teachers that needed sponsorship though learners with Special Educational Needs were included in the mainstream. Against this situation, UNESCO (1992) urged that the availability of adequate text books, instructional materials is known to be one of the most positive and consistent determinants of teachers' willingness to teach and of pupils' learning achievements. The study attached great importance to the provision of adequate books and all necessary forms of

teaching learning materials for Special Education. Going by the well illustrated implications above in Tanzania, Kenya and Zambia, it is worth carrying out this study in Southern Province and ascertain the implication of the current financing practices.

Hamusunga (2012) carried out an analysis under the blessing of ZANEC. The analysis was on the performance of the Zambian education system and it was noted that although the Ministry of Education had adopted a number of policies to guide the provision of education equitably, the system currently did not assure quality of education to all categories of learners due to lack of adequate financial investment in education by stakeholders. The study also noted the need for strategies that could specifically address cross cutting issues among them being the children with Special Educational Needs.

A study conducted by Beyani in the year 2013 found out that there was an experience of insufficient budget at all levels of education and that the funds allocated to the sector undermined delivery and quality of education. There had also been a shortage of teachers and teaching and learning materials. The general school infrastructure was inadequate. Additionally, the World Bank (2014) study reported that in Zambia there had been no improvement in the provision of textbooks and shortages were wide spread. The study showed that at primary school level, five students shared one textbook in Mathematics, English and Science. At secondary school three or four students shared one textbook in the subjects. However, the study found that rural schools faced more challenges than urban schools. The student enrollment levels were higher in the towns than in the rural places. The study concluded that this state of affairs had a negative impact on the effectiveness of service delivery at primary, secondary and tertiary levels.

The World Bank (2014) study on global economic prospects had observed that in Zambia, the majority of primary and secondary schools charged school fees despite the Free Education Policy (FEP) as a result of the prevailing inadequate funds in the education sector. It was found that primary schools both government and grant-aided still charged school fees in spite of the government free primary education policy. On average, primary schools charged each student an annual school fee of K31 (\$3.1) and K275 (\$27.5) per student on average in secondary school. The impact of the current financing practice had shown that the government free education policies were not fully in practice.

Teachers and supporting staff levels in Special Education have been constricted to expand since government decided to freeze employment in 2014. The *Lusaka Times* reported Chikwanda the then Minister of Finance to have justified the government's freeze on employment that it was meant to ensure that there were sufficient funds for the provision of basic social services and investment in public infrastructure. The move was also meant to reduce the portion of government revenues spent on the public service wage bill which was projected at more than 52% in the year 2014 budget. To date, there is no room to expand service delivery in Special Education due to the restricted funding.

## **2.5 Chapter Summary**

In this chapter, the literature related to the financing practice in Special Education was reviewed, most of it being derived from other countries. The literature helped clarify the knowledge gap on the current financing of Special Education in Zambia this study sought to explore. Literature reviewed was presented according to the following themes: financing of formal education, financing of Special Education, factors influencing the financing of Special Education, and the extent to which financing practices impact the provision of quality education within the concept of exploring the current financing practices in Special Education. From the literature review above, it had been observed that different nations globally have recognised financing to Special Education and as such each country had adopted a way of financing Special Education according to the prevailing conditions there. The reviewed literature has demonstrated that there was a knowledge gap in financing of Special Education in Southern Province, Zambia where such a study had not been conducted, a gap that this study intended to address. The next chapter presents the research methodology by which, an exploration of the current financing practice in Zambia was done for the purpose of addressing the research questions.

## CHAPTER THREE

### METHODOLOGY

The previous chapter addressed a review of the related literature to the study and it was presented according to themes emanating from the study objectives. This chapter describes the methods that were used to collect and analyse data from the respondents and secondary sources appropriate for answering the research questions of this study. The chapter discusses methodological concerns namely; research design, study population, sample size, sampling techniques as well as data collection instruments, data collection procedure, data analysis procedure, limitation of the study and finally ethical consideration.

#### **3.1 Research Design**

This study employed a descriptive survey design. Orodho (2012) explains that a descriptive survey design is used in preliminary and exploratory studies to allow researchers to gather information, summarize, present and interpret it for the purpose of clarification. Further, Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) also commends a descriptive design in that it helps determine the type of participants, how data is to be collected, analysed and interpreted to harmonize both primary and secondary sources.

The descriptive survey design is appropriate for this study because it allows a range of methods to collect data such as questionnaires, face-to-face interviews, and telephone interviews with breadth of coverage of more people. Hence the study can obtain a large amount of data within a short period of time for a fairly low cost based on representative sample and can therefore be generalised to the population of Southern Province. Additionally, a descriptive design is applied here because its ability to determine the type of participants, how data need to be collected, analysed and interpreted to support the findings. In support of the attributes of a descriptive, Kalabula (2001) states that the design can be used in the collection of information about people's attitudes, opinions, feelings, and in addressing various social and educational related problems since the researcher was interested in the opinions, attitudes and feelings of the participants. It was also thought to be helpful in the formulation of important principles of knowledge and solution to significant hindrances related to resource supply to Special Education as highlighted by Kerlinger (1969) quoted in Kombo and Tromp (2014).

The study applied both qualitative and quantitative techniques in data collection, analysis and presentation concurrently as can be learnt from Cresswell (2009) cited in Mbewe (2015). Qualitative data were desired to enable participants share their person experiences and feelings thereby providing detailed information in financing of Special Education (Leedy and Ormrod 2005) while the Quantitative data provided numerical confirmation of verbal expressions with a view to further triangulate of the findings as well as to ensure objectivity to the study. However, the qualitative techniques carried more weight than the quantitative so as to study phenomena in relation to the meaning attached to things or experiences of the participants (Mandyata, 2016), and it helped to explore the practices in financing of Special Education interactively between participants and the researcher.

### **3.2 Study Site**

The study site for this was Southern Province of Zambia. According to Msabila and Nalaila (2013), there were many motivating factors that could influence the researcher's choice of the study site, such as; the nature and incidence of the problem, research time frame, and data accessibility, clients' interest and instructions, resource availability, goals and objectives of the study. The study involved five districts of Southern Province namely: Choma, Livingstone, Kalomo, Kazungula, and Mazabuka. From each of the five districts one school participated by virtue of being either a Special School or Special Unit within a public secondary school. Southern Province was chosen because the researcher was sure that data were accessible there as well as consideration of resources available for the research that they would be enough for the Southern Province institutions due to easy connectivity of one institution to another. It was also possible to capture almost all the districts that were running Special Education programs in the whole province. Lastly, Southern Province was a chosen because it appeared that a study on financing of Special Education in Southern Province had not been conducted at the time of this study; as such the knowledge gap for the Southern Province clearly appeared to have existed.

### **3.3 Study Population**

As regards to the study population as described by Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) quoted in Hamainza (2015) refers to a complete set of individuals, cases or objects with some observable characteristics. Furthermore, White (2003) defined a population as the universe of units from

which the sample is to be selected. For this study, the study population comprised of officials at the Education District Office such as: all the Education Standard Officers-Special Education (SEO-Sp.Ed), District Education Planning Officers, Head teachers of Special School and public Secondary School with Special Education Units, school Accounts Assistants, teachers in Special Schools and Special Education Units. Additionally, parents of learners with Special Educational Needs (LSEN) attending school at any of the identified educational setups they also added to the study population. The Provincial Education Staff as well as the Ministry Headquarters staff attached to Special Education administration were part of the population because they were hoped to have a direct experience of the current financing practice in Special Education in the Southern Province of Zambia.

### **3.4 Study Sample**

The sample for this study had a total of 77 participants. According to Kothari (2004) a sample size of the study refers to the number of items to be selected from the universe to constitute a sample that should fulfil the requirements of efficiency, representativeness, reliability and flexibility. Furthermore, Orodho (2002), a sample is a small portion of a target population. The 77 participants in this study were distributed as follows: 9 school administrators, from either Special School or Special Education Unit in Secondary Schools (5 Head teachers and 4 Accounts Assistants), 6 District Officers (3 ESO-Special Education and 3 District Planning Officers), 1 officer from the office of the Provincial Education Office, 1 from the Ministry Headquarters, and 35 parents of children with Special Education Needs enrolled from the selected schools as well as 26 class teachers.

### **3.5 Sampling Procedure**

This study applied two sampling techniques to select participants and these were purposive and simple random. According to Msabila and Nalaila (2013), sampling procedure is a plan that explains how the participants for the study were to be selected from the population. A sampling procedure simply helps the researcher in selecting those to participate in the study. In this study, the researcher utilised purposive sampling procedure to select educational administrators by virtue of their respective offices and also parents of LSEN into the sample. Parents in this were sampled because of their leaved experience in cost-sharing system of general education in Zambia. The purposive sampling techniques were supported by Achola and Bless (1988) who stated that it is based on the judgement of the researcher regarding the characteristics of a

representative sample”. The researcher used this non-probability type of sampling because it allows biasness towards certain individuals within the population who have unique desired characteristics for the study as was the case for the mentioned participants above.

As for the class teachers they were selected using simple random procedure of probability sampling for the reason of allowing an equal chance of participating in the study. Class teachers were subjected to simple random sampling with a view of balancing the total representation of teacher participants in schools that had large number of teachers. This step was supported by Kombo and Tromp (2014) who observed that simple random sampling permits the researcher to provide equal opportunity for selection of each element in the population to constitute the sample. However, some public secondary schools lacked enough Special Education teachers to meet the desired number of participants in the school as such all the teachers in the Special Education Units participated as compared to those in Special Schools.

### **3.6 Data Collection Instruments**

Kothari (1997) and Seaman (1991) have indicated that a research instrument is a tool or device chosen by the researcher to collect required information such as questionnaires, tests, structured interview schedules and checklists. For this study, three instruments were utilized to collect the required information from respondents and these were: Sem-structure Questionnaires, Interview Guides and an observation checklist.

A semi-structured questionnaire was designed to collect data from parents and another from class teachers. These questionnaires were well tailored for the respondents in the same way so as to minimise the role and influence of the researcher and to make a more objective comparison of the results. The interview guide enabled collection of in-depth subjective information from the Head teachers, school Account Assistants and district administrators (DESOs, ESO-SPs and planning officers). The observation checklist was necessary to collect information from the physical environment as it was from each of the participating schools.

#### **3.6.1 Questionnaires**

A questionnaire is described by Brown (2001) as “any written instrument that presents respondents with a series of questions or statements to which they were to react either by

writing out their answers or selecting from among existing answers.” Questionnaires were presented for data collection as closed-ended (structured), or as open-ended (unstructured), or as a combination of both (semi-structured) depending on the nature of information required (Dawson, 2002; Brown, 2001). In this study, semi-structured questionnaires were presented to the respondents to provide evidence of current practice in financing of Special Education. Information from the structured questions was used for the quantitative aspect of the study and the unstructured questions provided information for qualitative aspect. Questionnaires were used to collect information from the school educators.

### **3.6.2 Interview guide**

Interview as pointed out by Kombo and Tromp (2014) allows the researcher to get more in-depth information from the key informants about an issue under investigation. Further Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) have also shown that interviews were preferred due to their flexibility in data collection and that they provide room for probing which yield in-depth answers about opinions, observations, perceptions, experiences, knowledge, descriptions of activities and actors.

Therefore, in this study unstructured interview guides were used to collect data from the 16 key informants. This was done in order to get more in-depth information so as to adequately answer all the research questions in an effort to explore the current practice in financing of Special Education in Zambia as well as obtaining objective information in detail. Furthermore, the researcher used an interview guide because it is flexible in that it provides room for probing in order to get opinions, perceptions, knowledge and descriptions from these key informants (Mungenda and Mungenda. 1999). The participants in the interviews were: Head Teachers, school Account Assistants, administrators at the District level (District Education Standard Officers, the Education Standard Officers for Special Education and District Planning Officers) and one member of staff in Special Education from the Ministry of Education Headquarters.

### **3.6.3 Observation Checklist**

As regards to observation, Elmusharaf (2012) says that it is a technique that involves systematically selecting, watching and recording behaviour and characteristics of living beings, objects or phenomena with focus of interest to the study. Checklist is a data collection instrument usually applied to collect data that could not be captured through interviews and

questionnaires whose data were analysed using both quantitative and qualitative data analysis methods. Observation of objects around or the physical facilities that were present in the school environment was done where the deputy head teacher or the HOD facilitated to ascertain the true status of items listed on the checklist.

#### **3.6.4 Document Review**

Burns (2000) states that a variety of documents were likely to be used in a study and these would include policy documents; letters; agendas; minutes; administrative reports; files; books; journals; diaries; budgets; news clippings; photographs; lists of employees/pupils; syllabi. Some of these sources of document data may be published or unpublished. Document review is employed in the study to provide a behind the scenes data that participants would obstruct because of being sensitive in nature, as well as its ability to provide a good source of background information (Russ-Eft & Preskill, 2001). Hence, the technique was suitably used in this study to explore the current financing practice in Special Education. Data from the review process were triangulated with data from the semi-structured questionnaires, face interviews and observation checklist.

#### **3.7 Data Collection Procedure**

As indicated by Bloomberg and Volpe (2008) data collection procedure describes and justifies all data collection methods, tools, instruments, and procedures, including how, when, where and by whom data will be collected with proof of facts. In line with such guidance, the researcher obtained an introductory letter from Directorate of Research and Graduate Studies (DRGS) to the institutions where research participants were to be found.

In this study, data collection was done in the third term of 2016 (third week of September to first week of December) school calendar year and a systematic procedure was carefully followed. Semi-structured questionnaires were administered to 35 selected parents, 25 Teachers from the 5 selected schools. With the help of the school staff, parents were contacted on phone and visited by the researcher in their homes and some in work places for administering of questionnaires over during the data collection period.

During the same period, unstructured interviews were conducted by the researcher and recorded on the Voice Recorder with permission granted by participants, so as to reduce on

interview duration and efficiency compared to note taking during interviews. Thereafter, the recorded interviews were later transcribed by a stenographer after which the researcher had to cross-check the voice recorded interviews against the transcribed interviews. Interviewed participants included; the School Head Teachers, School Accounts Assistants, the Administrators at District level such as; District Education Standard Officers (DESOs) or the Education Standard Officers for Special Education (ESOs) and District Planning Officers (DPO). Data collection was done over the period of six weeks during the third term of 2016 school calendar.

### **3.8 Data Analysis**

Data analysis was understood from the point of view of Burns and Grove (2009) cited in Chimhenga (2014) as a process conducted to reduce, organise and give meaning to data collected during research. Furthermore, Kombo and Tromp (2014) show that data analysis involves scrutinising the acquired information and making inferences.

In this study, data analysis involved coding of questionnaires, checking for completeness of responses to question items containing raw data obtained during field work. Each individual participant was assigned a serial number, for instance; semi-structured questionnaire participants were coded with numbers 1 to 61. Every variable from the questionnaire was also assigned with a standardised numerical code that was captured in SPSS data view and data variables respectively for easy handling of the collected data with a view of producing numeric results.

Thematic analysis was used to analyse data according to common themes emerging from interview data obtained as well as from the semi-structured follow up questions in the questionnaire. To arrive at this, the researcher had to read through all the 61 questionnaires and the transcribed interviews and sorted the opinions into specific response categories and grouped common themes and phrases. Thereafter, all the common emerging and merging themes were identified and reported in a narrative form as findings of the study for the qualitative information. Further, the face interview data were also coded such that districts were coded as P1, Q1, R1, S1, and T1 whereas; schools were coded as P2, Q2, R2, S2, and T2 Accordingly. Some of the Verbatim captured during interviews were used to triangulate with the numeric data. Rice and Ezzy (1999) say that thematic analysis involves the identification of

themes. As for the quantitative information, these steps made it easy to produce a systematic and comprehensive summary of the numerical data set. Statistical data was subjected to statistical analysis using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 to perform the descriptive statistics in which tables were produced showing frequencies and percentages that summarised the data.

### **3.9 Validity and Reliability**

The term validity had been defined by Joppe (2001) as the extent to which a research instrument, truly measures that which it was intended to measure or how truthful the research results were. In other words, does the research instrument allow the researcher to gather data that will enable answering of the research questions with a view of achieving the objectives? On the other hand, the term reliability had been defined by Joyner (2000) as simply the extent to which results were consistent over time. A measurement is said to be reliable or consistent if the measurement can produce similar results if used again in similar circumstances

Hence, with a view of enhancing the validity and reliability of the research instruments in this study, a pilot study was conducted at Munali secondary school in Lusaka in order to test the instruments in terms of clarity of the questions as well as their objectivity. Thereafter, necessary adjustments were made to all the research tools to make them more effective and ready to be administered in the field.

The principle of triangulation was applied so as to enhance validity of the research findings. Triangulation was done by making use of different kinds of data collection instruments such as: semi-structured questionnaires, unstructured interview guide, the observation checklist and document review. This was done so that the weakness of one instrument would be supplemented by the strength of the other and information obtained was compared.

### **3.10 Limitations of the Study**

Limitations of the study is described in Best and Kahn (2009) who state that it includes conditions which were beyond the control of the researcher and may also place restrictions on the conclusion of a particular study. In this case, the study was constrained by the literature on financing of Special Education largely from within the region and that posed a greater limitation to the study. Another limitation was on the confidentiality of the sources of data at school level faced with unwillingness to release school financial records. Lastly, the sample is

from one province only out of the ten provinces in Zambia. For this reason it narrowed the scope of the study restricting generalization of the research findings to one province only and not to the whole country. On the other hand, the limitations were reduced in literature by taking into account literature across the globe, use of document review for secondary data that could not be obtained as primary data as well as involvement of more districts within the province helped to make the study findings valid and reliable.

### **3.11 Ethical Considerations**

Ethical clearance was sought from Humanities and Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee at the University of Zambia. An introduction letter was obtained from the University of Zambia. Permission was also sought from all the respective participating institutions for the study. In the field, participants were selected accordingly and thereafter, an explanation of the nature of this study was done by the researcher. A written consent was also obtained from the participants to confirm their willingness to take part in the study. Furthermore, the names, personal details of the participants as well as the information collected remained confidential, though some of the participants requested for their institutional names were connected to the report, but for uniformity, the real names have been left out except the use of titles.

### **3.12 Chapter Summary**

In this methodology chapter, the following concerns have been addressed; the research design which was a descriptive survey in nature to explore the current financing practice in Special Education in Zambia. It chapter also covered; the study population, study sample, sampling procedure, data collection instruments such as semi-structured questionnaires, unstructured interview guide, observation checklist as well as document review. The data collection procedure, data analysis and ethical consideration have been discussed too. The next chapter contains the presentation of the study findings.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The previous chapter presented the methodology that was used to undertake the study in which different methods and techniques were employed to get information for the study. Therefore, this Chapter carries a presentation of the study findings based on the research questions that were raised in chapter one. The study findings were presented using common themes, cross tabulations, frequencies, and percentages, as well as verbatim expressions made by the participants during data collection. The chapter is arranged according to the order of research questions as follows:

1. What was the current financing practice in Special Education?
2. What factors influenced the current financing practice in Special Education?
3. What is the implication of the current financing practice in Special Education on the provision of quality education in Zambia?

#### **4.1 The Current Financing Practice in Special Education**

The study question to be addressed in this section is: what was the current financing practice in Special Education? The question was broken down into statements that would help to address completely the current financing practice in Special Education as follows:

##### **4.1.1 Sources of Funding in Special Education**

In an exploration of the current financing practices in Special Education, the study sought to identify the sources of funding in Special Education by scrutinising every possible source of funding. The identified sources of funding included were at National level involving the Government through GRZ grant and NIF, while at school level it was through PTA, parents of children with SEN and other direct and indirect cooperating partners as presented in the later sub-sections of this segment .

##### **4.1.1.1 Government funding in Special Education**

This section presents both secondary and primary data involving government funding in Special Education. The study sought to establish the government's current financing in Special Education thereby tracing the trends of government financing the education sector over the

period of ten years. The findings of the study on government investment in the citizenly education were captured in relation to the GDP for the period 2006 to 2015 was captured as indicated in the table below (the US\$1 exchange rate was equivalent to unrebased K3,800 by the year 2008, K5,000 up to the year 2011 and K10 rebased up to the year 2017).

**Table 1: Trends in public expenditure on education (ZmbK Billion)**

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
	Actual	Budget	budget	budget	Budget							
<b>GDP (ZmK)</b>	38.5	46.1	54,8	64.6	77.6	93.3	106.0	120.9	166.8	1897	207.4	232.4
Education Expenditu (EE)(ZmK)	1,513	1,851	2,371	2,847	2,909	3,522	4,501	5,209	8,599	9,415	9,100	10,600
<b>EE as % GDP</b>	3.9	4.0	4.3	4.4	3.7	3.8	4.2	4.3	5.2	5.0	4.4	4.6

Source: World Bank (2015); MoF (2016); PcW Budget Bulletin (2016/2017)

Table 2 shows the budgetary allocation to education against the country’s GDP for a period of Ten years. Education Expenditure as percentage of GDP had been fluctuating between 3.7 percent being the lowest in 2010 to 5.2 in 2014 being the highest. A slight decline to 5.0% in 2015 and a further decline to 4.4% in 2016 and 4.6% in 2017 were recorded. Between 2006 and 2013, public education expenditure grew steadily; from K1.5 billion (\$394,000) in 2006 to K10.6 billion (\$10.6 Million). in 2017 The study further found out that Zambia’s education sector ranks well above the average for Sub-Sahara countries on the Overall Appraisal of benchmarks involving *access, quality and relevance, equity, effectiveness, and efficiency*. The Sub-Sahara Africa benchmark is 4.2 percent as public expenditure devoted to education. Results in Table 1 above show that during the years 2012 to 2017, Zambia’s GDP to the education sector had ranged been 4.2 percent and 5.2 percent, suggesting that Zambia had made improvements in financing education when compared with the Sub-Sahara Africa benchmarks.

Concerns on how much funds were actually released to the education sector by the Ministry of Finance, a desk review and interviews with participants established the actual funding to the education sector for the years 2015 and 2016 captured in Table 2 below. It should be noted here that the education sector was allocated 20.5 percent in the year 2015 and 17.4 percent in

the year 2016 of the National budget presented to Parliament by the then Minister of Finance, which translates into the information showing in table below;

**Table 2: Government funding to the education sector at National level (\$1=K10)**

		<b>Description of Budget</b>	<b>ZMB Kwacha</b>	<b>US-Dollar</b>
For the year 2015	GRZ Funding	National Budget	46,700,000,000	4,670,000,000
		Education Proposed budget	9,415,000,000	941,500,000
		Education Current Budget	9,500,473,387	950,047,338
		Education Consumable Budget	8,222,896,815	822,289,681
For the year 2016	GRZ Funding	National budget	53,140,000,000	5314,000,000
		Education Proposed budget	9,100,000,000	910,000,000
		Education Current Budget	8,162,357,721	816,235,772
		Education Consumable Budget	7,706,487,339	770,648,733

*Source: Ministry of Finance-Integrated Financial Management System, (2016); Unicef Zambia (2016); pwc-budget bulletin (2015)*

Table 3 above shows GRZ funding to the Education Sector; the national budget represents the budget that was presented before parliament by the Minister of Finance; education proposed budget represents the budget proposal from GRZ funding; education current budget represents the approved budget by parliament from the GRZ funding; while education consumable budget represents the actual funds that MoF released for education. The consumable budget of the education sector was allocated to the following volts (see appendix VI): Human Resource, Planning and Information, Distance Education and Directorate, Standards and Curriculum, Teacher Education SPS- C, Early Childhood Education, Primary Schools-COPP. As can be seen, the allocation of funds at the Ministry of General Education headquarters did not show the amount allocated to Special Education. Commenting on the education sector budget, MESVTEE (2015) acknowledges that indeed the education sector received the largest budgetary allocation at almost 20 percent of the total national budget; over 80 percent of the Education Sector allocation was spent on personnel emoluments leaving just below a third of the budget for other non-Personnel Emolument programmes. It could be deduced that the current financing practice in Special Education did not have a direct allocation of funds from the National level.

However, information relating to donor support of the education system at national level could not be accessed except at school level as was indicated in Table 3 below.

A further review of the Citizens Budget (2015) shows that government indented to shift from Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) to Output Based Budgeting (OBB) effective 2016 and 2017 as a pilot for the education sector. The ABB was in effect from 2004 to 2015. Review of the report of the Parliament Committee on estimates with focus with performance of first quarter 2017 budget showed 15.1 percent as an increment on the education budget. The report shows that the implementation of the OBB had scored some successes at National level except at provincial and district offices where there were challenges of adherence to the policy by members of staff.

At the school level, it was established that funding for the years 2015 and 2016, through GRZ grants and NIF were as shown in the table below (the amounts were presented in Zambian Kwacha which could be converted to US-Dollar at the rate of US\$1 equivalent to K10 during the years 2015, 2016 and 2017).

**Table 3: Government funding Special Education at school level (\$1 = ZMB K10)**

Type of school	year	Ministry funding	School Total Funding	Grant Frequency/yr	Special Issues (12% of grant)	Special Education budget	Sp.Ed. alloc. (5% of Special Issues)
1. P2 Secondary school	2015	GRZ Grant	202,089	5	24,250	58,885	1,212
		NIF	-	-	-	-	-
	2016	GRZ Grant	110,453	3	13,254	51,221	662
		NIF	-	-	-	-	-
2. Q2 Secondary school	2015	GRZ Grant	180,964	2	21,715	58,885	1,085
		NIF	-	-	-	-	-
	2016	GRZ Grant	115,209	1	13,825	51,220	691
		NIF	-	-	-	-	-
3. R2 Secondary school	2015	GRZ Grant	114,389	1	13,726	125,780	686
		NIF	-	-	-	-	-
	2016	GRZ Grant	64,661	1	7,759	51,220	387
		NIF	15,252	1	-	-	-
4. S2 Special School	2015	GRZ Grant	43,960	1	5,275	58,885	263
		NIF	-	-	-	-	-
	2016	GRZ Grant	74,574	1	8,948	52,220	447
		NIF	-	-	-	-	-
5. T2 Special School	2015	GRZ Grant	-	0	-	-	-
		NIF	-	-	-	-	-
	2016	GRZ Grant	-	0	-	-	-
		NIF	-	-	-	-	-

Source: Desk Review (2017); Education Accounts (2017)

Table 3 above shows that four schools out of the five that participated in the study did receive GRZ grants for the years 2015 and 2016, and only one school received funding from the NIF account. Ideally, the GRZ grant should be released every month of the year but it was established that once release of the GRZ grant per year was common from among the receiving schools. Allocation of funds to Special Education at school level was at 5 percent of the Special Issues of which Special Issues was at 12 percent of the total amount received as GRZ grant in the Education Sector.

The study also sought to ascertain the actual beneficiaries of GRZ grant by school enrolment as well as the categories of disabilities present from each of the schools under study. The information was collected as shown in the table below.

**Table 4: Beneficiaries of the GRZ grant for the year 2016**

Name Of School	Enrolled		Total Learners	Disability Category	GRZ Grant– 2016 (Zmb Kwacha)	Allocation per learner
	Boys	Girls				
1. Special Unit at P2 Secondary	12	14	26	LD	662 (\$66.2)	25 (\$2.5)
2. Special Unit at Q2 Secondary	11	8	19	HI and Physical	691 (\$69.1)	36 (\$3.6)
3. Special Unit at R2 Secondary	15	2	17	LD and HI	387 (\$38.7)	22 (\$2.2)
4. S2 Special Sch.	69	130	199	HI, VI, LD & physical	447 (\$44.7)	2 (\$0.2)
5. T2 Special Sch.	48	61	109	LD and HI	-	-

*Source: Fieldwork (2016)*

Table 4 above shows the numbers of GRZ Grant beneficiaries from the schools under study. It was noted from the table that the Special Unit at P2 secondary school received K662 (\$66.2) to cater for 26 special learners identified to have Learning Disabilities (LD) during the year 2016. The other Special Unit at Q2 secondary school received K691 (\$69.1) to cater for 19 Learners identified to have HI and those with physical challenges. The third Special Unit at R2 secondary school received K387 (\$38.7) to cater for 17 learners identified to have LD and HI conditions, while the fourth school, S2 Special School received K447 (\$44.7) 199 learners identified to have conditions ranging from; HI, VI, LD and Physical disabilities. As for T2 Special School, the GRZ grant was not being received. Views of participants who were interviewed gave different reactions to the 2016 practice by the government in financing to Special Education as will be seen in the subsequent sections below.

It should be acknowledged that the actual figures relating to the complete budgets, income from all the identified participating funders as well as a comprehensive expenditure for Special Education at school level could not be accessed during data collection for the reason that, such data was not being compiled by the schools and as such it never existed in all the schools or the districts even up to National level.

Going forward, a question seeking the knowledge of participants (parents and teachers) as to whether the government was financing Special Education in Southern Province was posed. A descriptive statistical data response is as displayed in table 5 below.

**Table 5: Views on whether government is funding Special Education in Southern Province**

Is government financing Special Education?		Frequency			Total
		Not Sure	Yes	No	
category of respondent	Teachers	0	24	2	26
	Parents	8	7	20	35
<b>Total</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>61</b>

Source: *Fieldwork (2016)*

The results in Table 5 above showed that from the 61 participants, the majority (31) indicated that the government of Zambia was financing Special Education, whereas 22 indicated that the government was not financing Special Education and the (8) were not sure as to whether government was financing Special Education or not. The majority of the participants who either indicated that the government did not fund or were not sure were actually the parents, and they further stated that they had never seen or heard anything that the government had done to support the provision of education to the children with Special Education Needs. The results seem to suggest that parents had not been enlightened in matters relating to government financing of Special Education.

In support of lack of funding from the government as purported by the (20) parents, the head teacher of R2 Special School in R1 district argued that:

*“The school does not receive any funding from government. The only thing that the government has done is to send teachers here. I can confirm that all the teachers here are deployed by the government and they receive their salaries from government but we have never received any support in terms of finances or a grant. Instead the Sisters of Mercy are the ones who mobilise the funds to buy teaching and learning materials”*

However, to support the idea that government was financing Special Education, an Accounts Assistant from P2 Secondary School with a Special Unit in P1 district explained that:

*“At the moment we just have some school fees which pupils pay but we do receive some monthly grants from the government, though it is not received regularly and are not specifically meant for the Special Unit but for the school in general. From the same money we purchase what is needed for the Special Unit. There is nothing that comes specifically for the Special Education unit from the government.”*

In another view given by the District Planning Officer (DPO) from P1 district, show that government gave the schools money for Special Educational Needs, during the interview, this DPO explained and said that:

*We receive funding from the government and a component from donors although the donor component of late has been very critical but then we have special NGOs like Community Based Rehabilitation (CRB) which assist in the provision of Special Education. CBR has been financing the running of the history department and they are also currently working on the lamps at one of the primary schools within the district practicing inclusive education.*

Generally, most participants had the knowledge about the government financing Special Education. These sentiments were further supported by a Head teacher of S2 Special School of S1 district who submitted that:

*I can say the school is a grant-aided school, so the government gives us a grant but it is not enough to cater for our needs, that grant is not enough, the parents to the children, the guardians or sponsors of the children through and PTA have decided to subsidize the government efforts.*

The view was further supported by an Accounts Assistant at R2 Secondary School Special Unit in R1 district, the officer gave quite a remarkable and different dynamic view with regard to financing of Special Education, the participant elaborated:

*On behalf of the government, we are supposed to have other funders like these donors...there is this Account that we have called NIF which is supposed to be donor funded but we have not been funded yet like the whole of this year there has been no funding. Imagine we are now almost in December and schools are closing soon but no funding for the whole year. How do you run the school like that? Anyway, we have strictly two sources that is: from government and school fees. Though there is*

*nothing that comes specifically for the Special Education unit, there are certain percentages allocated to each department including the Special Education unit.*

#### **4.1.1.2 PTA funding in Special Education**

The study strove to establish the existence of PTA in the schools that were involved in the study and also to ascertain the role of PTA in financing of Special Education at school level. Table 6 shows the funding of Special Education by the PTA.

**Table 6: Existence of Parents Teachers Association**

Whether PTA Existences		Frequency		Total
		Yes	No	
School Type	Special School	25	1	26
	Unit In Secondary School	33	2	35
<b>Total</b>		<b>58</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>61</b>

*Source: Fieldwork (2016)*

According to the results in Table 6 above, the majority of the participants, 58 out of the total of 61 acknowledged the existence of PTA in the schools while (3) participants indicated that PTA did not exist in their schools. From the interviews, all the (5) Head teachers from the (5) schools confirmed the existence of PTA in their schools. It could therefore, be confirmed that PTA exists in all the schools involved at the time of data collection.

With the view of cost sharing measures in the cost of education, participants were further asked on how much money was being contributed by parents through PTA as user fees to the school so as to support the school resource base. It was revealed that varying amounts of user fees were being paid in each of the five schools as shown in the table below:

**Table 7: PTA user fees contributed by parents at school level**

Sr.No;	Name of School	Amounts Payable for PTA (K)
1	David Livingstone	Nil
2	Kalomo	1000.00 (\$100)
3	Mukuni	30.00 (\$3)
4	St. Mulumba	i) Day Scholars 950.00 (\$95) ii) Boarders 1,250.00 (\$125)
5	Flamboyant	100 (\$10)

Table 7 above shows the amounts that each of the five schools asked parents to contribute towards the school as user fees through the PTA financial pool per school term.

During the interview, one officer confirmed that parents who had children in that school did not contribute the user fees through the PTA financial pool and this participant indicated that:

*Pupils don't pay, they are subsidized by these others, and the ordinary pupils contribute towards PTA then the disabled benefit from that.*

Another participant said this about the payment of user fees for the LSEN to the school coffers: “I think at the moment they pay school fees just like any other pupil”. However, it was discovered that some of the parents did not contribute financially through PTA user fees. They gave reasons such as; they did not have any means to pay while others indicated that they were not sure whether the school required them to contribute any amount. Other parents mentioned that the school would ask for resources only when there was an undertaking or a project in the school and the children would be sent to ask for financial assistance. For example, when there were educational visits the pupils would be required to pay money. An Accounts Assistant interviewed from R2 secondary school of R1 district had this to say about parents’ contributions to the PTA financial pool:

*We have challenges with payments, generally parents are problems when it comes to sponsoring their children both normal and special children, up to now some parents still owe the school some money. There is a challenge in sponsoring their children.*

Generally, PTA appeared to have a pivotal role in supporting of Special Educational programmes at school level in Southern Province.

#### **4.1.1.3 Parents financing in Special Education**

Parents were asked whether their participation in financing of education of the children with Special Educational Needs made the children receive enough finances to meet the cost of education. Responses were obtained as captured in the table below;

**Table 8: Parents Financing of Child’s Education**

Whether child receives enough finances		Frequency		Total
		Yes	No	
Source Of Income	Salary	3	10	13
	Business	2	11	13
	Others	4	5	9
<b>Total</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>35</b>

*Source: Field work (2016)*

Table 8 shows the results of whether the children received enough finances from their parents to meet the cost of education. It was revealed that out of the 13 parents whose source of income was a salary (3) said ‘yes’ and (10) said ‘no’ indicating that parents financing of the children with special needs despite receiving a salary was insufficient to meet the cost of education for the child with Special Education needs. This trend is observed even in parents whose source of income was business and others. From another category of 13 parents whose source of income was some form of business, (2) indicated ‘yes’ and (11) indicated ‘no’ to their child receiving enough finances towards cost of education. The other 9 parents had other forms of sources of income, in which (4) indicated ‘yes’ and (5) indicated ‘no’ to the same question. Table 6 further reveals that out of the 35 parents with various sources of income, 25.7% (9) indicated that their children received enough finances and the majority 74.3% (26) indicated that their children did not receive enough finances towards meeting the cost of education.

Parents from all the five districts were further asked about how much finances their children required per term or per year. Most of the parents reported that they did not know how much finances or resources were required for their children’s education. On the other hand, some parents mentioned varying amounts required by their children such as: K200 (\$20), K500 (\$50), K1, 000 (\$100), K1, 500 (\$150) and others mentioned K3, 000 (\$300) per school term. The results seem to suggest that parents were not fully aware of the cost of educating their children with Special Education needs.

In an interview, it was also confirmed that parents were involved in funding Special Education at school level; one of the participants from Q2 secondary school with a Special Unit in Q1 district explained that;

*We depend on grants that come from government occasionally or rarely. Apart from that, there is some local policy that was arrived at by the parents through Parent Teacher Association, where some money is levied to parents so that maybe that money are used for a particular activity or a certain series of activities to raise funds. Now the funds that have been raised either from the grants, little user fees or made by the local policy, when it comes to this unit we were able to buy some teaching and learning materials and the one which is more current is the sponsoring of the trip to Mazabuka where they went to interact with children of the like nature from the province, I don't know whether it's from the nation or the province, they went there and they had some interaction like for a week.*

Parents were further asked to indicate their level of financial support towards the education of a child with Special Education Needs in comparison with what they felt was required per term; the responses were as captured in table below.

**Table 9: Parent’s level of financing Special Education against the required amounts per school term**

Parents’ funding level towards termly amounts needed		Frequency			Total
		Below	Equal	Do not know	
Parents, Source of Income	Salary	8	3	2	13
	Business	4	5	4	13
	Others	3	2	4	9
<b>Total</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>35</b>

*Source: field work (2016)*

Table 9 shows results on the parents’ level of financial contribution towards the education of children with Special Education Needs. The results show that, parents that raised finances ‘below’ the required amount were 15 such that the salaried parents were the majority; 10 parents raised ‘equal’ to what they thought was required and the other 10 parents ‘did not know’ how much money they raised and invested in the education of their child’s education per term.

#### 4.1.1.4 Cooperating partners' financing of Special Education

Participants were asked as to whom else other than the government was participating in financing Special Education. The following names were mentioned by the participants: the British Council, Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR), Spar Choma, Time to Learn, FAWEZA and the Zambia Agency for Persons with Disabilities among others. Furthermore, participants were asked on what approach cooperating partners funded Special Education; Three options were given to the participants to pick a 'yes', 'no' or 'not sure' response. It was learnt that the common approach by cooperating partners in financing of Special Education was the school as whole as a matter to which the majority of the participants (31) indicated 'yes'; (22) indicated 'no' and 8 indicated 'not sure' and 1 participant did not respond. Another salient way was where the individual LSEN received finances directly from other funders. To this 35 participants indicated 'no', 23 indicated 'yes' and 2 were not sure

In favour of the cooperating partners funding Special Education, P2 Special School head teacher from P1 district clearly stated that the British Council had been funding Special Education and elaborated as I quote:

*basically the state of the infrastructure is okay, I can take you round the school you see what is happening, there is the special care that we give them which is different from these other pupils with the help of the British council, though it's not something that is guaranteed maybe the British council will come in once in a while it's not something you can rely upon. We have already registered ourselves with the British council, our name is in their data base, and whenever they have something they come on board on their own and say that we will help you in one way or another. British council has actually funded the construction of the new classroom block where the children are learning from. They fund events like International day for the disabled though this year they have not yet appeared.*

The British Council appeared to be supporting Special Education in just one Special Unit from among the participating schools in Southern Province: a one by two classroom block was recently constructed at the school using funds from the British Council and a variety of teaching learning materials were being delivered to this Special Unit every so often.

Additionally, the study found out that Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR) was one of the funders in Special Education. This was also asserted to earlier on by a DESO of P1 district who described Special Education financing in the district. Two districts mentioned that they benefited from CBR and during an interview with the DPO from R1 district. The officer reaffirmed the activities of Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR) and explained that:

*CBR has been running Special Education programmes at district level and though, at individual levels some would donate a wheel chair, one would donate clutches and so on... talking of CBR, it has been a long standing partner itself having received funding from there.*

Spar Choma was also mentioned at one of the Special Schools as being one of the funders who so often supported the school. An interview with an Accounts Assistant from S2 Special School in S1 district mentioned that:

*I can confirm that Spar Choma also brings things like washing materials and the like they bring a track. They assist a lot every term. You know we have children that come from very poor families and are normally dumped by the parents in our school, so when Spar Choma makes such a contribution it goes a long way in terms of assistance.*

It was observed that Time to Learn and FAWEZA were also funding Special Education in some schools. In an interview with an Accounts Assistant at P2 secondary school, the respondent was quoted as saying;

*“we have sponsors who take up children like Time to Learn and FAWEZA; they come here to pick up maybe two to ten children and start paying for them, because I can tell you from here, that not only children in the Special Unit do benefit from these funds but other children from the main school benefit a lot from the sponsorship.”*

Another agency that was noted as a funder at R2 Special Education Unit and S2 Special School was Zambia Agency for Persons with Disabilities (ZAPD). The Accounts Assistant of P2 school revealed that:

*“We have clubs like Zambia Agency for Persons with Disabilities who I think they play a very big role as well, they come from time to time, we tell them of these pupils who are failing to pay and most times they have taken up to pay for them”.*

Most respondents indicated during the follow up questions that well-wishers in their capacity as individuals and companies at times have showed up to give assistance to children with special needs. For instance, a head teacher at S2 Special School in S1 district explained that:

*“Funders are there, well wishers, donors, many of them are individual funders. We are usually visited by different people and when they look around they feel to help in one way or another. That's how some infrastructure or buildings have been put up because some people come on board to help in whatever way they want. Others donate inform of food stuffs though once in a while. We have one consistent funder from Japan who buys ice creams every year on the 24<sup>th</sup> of October to the pupils”.*

Another view in line with the former was expressed by a Head teacher of Q2 secondary school in Q1 district who explained that:

*“There are people who come on board sometimes as individuals, some of them are running these units where they come from, for example, last term there was a teacher from the UK who came and stayed with us because we kind of befriended ourselves with that school. The interest of these people is really with Special Education unit and when they come, they see the challenges that we have over here and they come on board and say let me donate a laminator for example, so that these teaching and learning materials are protected by putting a transparent paper. This lady of course she brought some pencils, some crayons, and other things for using. Those things added colour to the unit.*

The question about other funders that participated in the provision of resources in Special Education was also addressed by an Education Standards Officer – Special Education (ESO-Sp.Ed) in R1 district who revealed that:

*We have social welfare through which social cash transfer is already in practice though not consistent. The social welfare are the ones who are giving us more problems because we have many pupils who are under social welfare who are not paid up to now. We also have some NGOs we call them some cooperating partners*

*like Cheshire Homes, Sight Savers, Save the Children, though it's not certain, we don't know whether they are going to respond because they are just well wishers, they are not obliged to bring anything. They just bring to us the resources at their mercy.*

A follow up question was asked to establish as to how the funders were identified or recruited into the Special Education funding programme other than the government. Majority of the participants indicated that they had 'no idea' on how funders were identified, 11 indicated 'self identification' meaning, funders came on their own, 3 indicated that 'learners identified the funders' and 18 indicated that 'schools identify the funders' on behalf of the special learners.

#### **4.1.2 Identification of Funders in Special Education**

Concerning procedures if there was any, put up in the schools on identification of funders in Special Education during the interview, an Accounts Assistant at P2 secondary school with a Special Unit in P1 district, it was said that: "*so we are out sourcing the funds from...like we have approached Chief Mukuni, maybe he will help us in one way or another*". Similarly, another explanation was put forward by the Accounts Assistant at S2 Special School of S1 district saying:

*With the people who are on school board we try to find those who can help pay for some pupils because we cannot manage, we are going round to find people who can pay for these pupils and at least people have come around. As for the parents who are not able to pay we tell them to at least bring something, I told you that one was able to bring something because they are not able to pay. So through such initiatives, at least they are being helped and also trying to appeal to government to be consistent again.*

Another question sought to establish the systems that were put in place to harmonise the operations of participating funders in Special Education was posed. The entire administrator Participants indicated that there was no system of collaboration among funders or rather contracts with the government or the school or the learners themselves.

To justify the absence of the system to collaborate, a head teacher at T2 Special School of T1 district mentioned;

*I feel you cannot subject the funders to that, I mean, they are just helping out of their kindness, it is not their responsibility to fund Special Education but its government's responsibility so there is no need.*

Other participants still felt that harmonisation through an agreed and coordinated form of collaboration among funders was needed if Special Education was to prosper, unlike leaving it to the mercy of the funders who may most of the time ignore this responsibility.

#### **4.1.3 Adequacy of Finances Received by Schools**

Teachers were asked whether their institutions received adequate finances towards Special Education budgets. The responses were captured as in the table below;

**Table 10: Views on whether Schools receives adequate funds**

whether schools receive enough budget funding		Frequency		Total
		Yes	No	
School type	Special School	1	12	13
	Unit in secondary school	0	13	13
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>26</b>

*Source: field work 2016*

Table 10 shows that out of the 26 teachers, (25) of them responded with a 'no' to the question that their schools received adequate funding, and only (1) was of a view that the school received adequate funding. The results show that Special Education school and units did not have enough funds to the needs that would allow running of the school or units affairs.

In line with the perceived results in table 10, the contribution made by an Accounts Assistant at P2 secondary school with a Special Unit in P1 district complemented the views of the teachers. The Accounts Assistant clarified the issue of a budget deficit or surplus by saying:

*Normally it's a budget deficit... let me give you a background; we normally rely heavily on school collection to run the school. I may project that we will spend K89,000 (US\$8,900), it's just an example, then I receive K60,000 (US\$6,000) from school children and the cash at hand is K67000 (US\$6,700), it means that certain activities let's say running of examination papers will be affected. These days there are these political pronouncements where you cannot chase a child in order to get*

*the child pay. So people are relaxed, yet in order for the school to run it needs money. So now, what can I do?*

#### 4.1.4 Determinants of the Budget for LSEs

Participants were asked if the suggested factors in table 11 below influenced the budget at the time of its preparation for the education of learners with disabilities. Parents were expected to state their own practice as it was at the time of budgeting for the child in the family whereas school educators were to state the practice during the school budgeting process. Responses from the 35 parents and 26 school educators were as captured table below.

**Table 11: Responses on Factors That Could Determine the Budget in Special Education**

The determinants of the budget include:	Responses					
	Parents			Teachers		
	Not sure	Disagree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Agree
The type of disability the child had	2	29	4	3	19	4
The severity of the disability the child had	3	22	10	5	19	2
Availability of resources for the family	1	13	21	1	7	18
Financial strength of those that were helping with funds	10	10	15	4	6	16
How much the funders have decided to give the child	6	13	16	4	7	15
The foreseeable economic benefit in educating this child	3	23	9	3	15	8
The academic progress of this child with disability	3	21	11	2	15	9

*Source: fieldwork 2016*

Table 11 above shows the results to the question whether a type of disability was a determinant when budgeting for a child with disability. From the results it can be deduced that 29 (82.8%) parents and 19 (73.1%) teachers disagreed while the minority indicated that they were not sure and others agreed to that. ‘Disagree’ in this case implies that both teachers and parents saw the type of disability not as an important determinant of how much should be allocated towards the disability. For the severity of the disability with the child as a determinant: (22) parents and (19) teachers representing the majority indicated that they ‘agree’ while the minority indicated

that they were 'not sure' and 'disagree', implying that parents and teachers were not moved by the severity of disability in terms of fund allocation. For the determinant relating to availability of family resources: 21 (60.0%) parents and 18 (69.2%) teachers indicated 'agree' representing the majority while those that indicated 'not sure' and 'disagree' were the minority. Furthermore, table 11 shows the financial strength of those that were helping with funds as a determinant, to this, 15 (42.9%) parents indicated 'agree' while (10) indicated 'not sure' and another (10) indicated 'disagree'. As for the teachers 16 (61.5%) indicated 'agree' whereas (4) indicated 'not sure' and (7) indicated 'disagree'. How much the funders have decided to give a child as a determinant: 16 (45.7%) parents agreed, (13) indicated 'disagree' and (6) indicated 'not sure' while for the teachers, 15 (57.7%) agreed, (7) disagreed and (4) were 'not sure'. The foreseeable economic benefit in educating this child (one with special needs) as a determinant: 23 (65.7%) parents and 15 (57.7%) teachers agreed as the majority whereas the 'not sure' and 'disagree' were a minority side. The academic progress of the child with disability as a determinant received: 21 (60.0%) parents and 15 (57.7%) teachers indicated 'disagree' while the minority indicated 'not sure' and 'disagree'.

Participants were further asked if they considered any of the proposed determinants when preparing the budget for LSEN. The majority of the respondents 84% said 'no' while the minority 16% said 'yes', suggesting that the proposed determinants were not taken into consideration.

The education administrators were asked to state the financing model that determined the Special Education budget when preparing it, as such, during an interview with the DPO of T1, the idea was elaborated by saying:

*Usually we are guided by the strategic plan, what we put in the strategic plan is what will come in the annual budgets. Yes even for the medium term expenditure frame work, this is the short term budgeting period. The true procedure is that, we are supposed to receive budgets from schools; this office coordinates budgeting and consolidation into a district budget. Although I must mention that of late there hasn't been much consolidation into the district budgets and the reason is that, the levels of funding are not good or rather are low, you will find that when schools bring their budgets, they bring very huge budgets and the receiving which we have*

*from HQ are minimal, so we have to prioritize but the Special Education is one of the priority areas in this previous strategic plan... in the previous planning periods the revised sixth developmental planning, Special Education is the one on the top priority.*

#### **4.1.5 The practice of a needs based budget**

Teachers were asked if they participated in budgeting for the LSEN and to indicate whether, according to their knowledge, the school budget was a needs based. The descriptive statistical data is captured in the table below:

**Table 12: Responses on the practice of a Needs Based Budget**

whether budget is a needs based		Frequency		Total
		Yes	No	
School type	Special School	3	10	13
	unit in secondary school	0	13	13
<b>Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>26</b>

*Source: Fieldwork 2016*

Table 12 shows that from both school types: (3) teachers from Special Schools indicated ‘yes’ whereas (10) indicated ‘no’ to the practice of a needs based budget when budgeting at school level, whereas teachers from Units in secondary schools none indicated ‘yes’ and all the (13) indicated ‘no’. Responses in Table 12 show that (23) out of (26) participants indicated ‘no’, indicating that the needs of the learners were not considered during budgeting for Special Education. Furthermore, the majority of the school educators never took part in budgeting instead it was established that finance committees existed and budgeted for the learners with Special Educational needs in schools.

During an interview with the Accounts Assistant at P2 Secondary School with a Special Unit answered the question that sought to understand whether there was an adherence to the needs-based budget for learners with Special Educational Needs. The Accounts Assistant explained what happens by saying:

*When we make the budget, we call the Special Unit as a department on its own, as an accountant I apportion the amount or allocate the amount according to the needs of the department and the Special Unit is part of the departments, but the*

*allocation depends on the needs of each department and these needs vary, like here the largest department is the social science department, it has about 14 teachers and the more the teachers it means the more the children or pupils and so even the allocation will be bigger than when I talk about the Special Unit. So I look at the number of staffs and that of children and then we follow that we allocating.*

A follow up question was posed to ascertain if the Special Education unit operating as a department had an input in the budgeting process. The explanation was given that:

*Yes. What I do is that, when budgeting I allocate funds then we sit down with them to discuss on how we are going to consume the allocated funds, I control on what should be done by either refuse or accept ideas and propose some.*

The Accounts Assistant was further asked if the allocated amount by the accounts office could be adjusted according to the needs of individual learners. In response, the following was disclosed:

*No, there is budget control. When you are doing budget control, you know budget line, it means you have to work within your means, it's like your salary, you can budget according to your salary not more than your salary otherwise you will start surviving on credits. I control the budget and determine the sealing.*

#### **4.1.6 The current status of funding to Special Education**

Participants were asked about the current status of funding Special Education in reference to consistency of cash flow into schools from the identified funders that were identified in the study. Government was one of the identified funders, hence a follow up question that sought to establish the view of participants over the consistency of GRZ grants cash-flow. Teachers from both Special Schools and units in secondary schools shared their views as captured in the table below

**Table 13: Teachers' views on consistence of government grant cash-flow**

Teachers' views on GRZ cash flow		Frequency			Total
		Not Sure	Poor	Good	
School type	Special School	2	9	2	13
	Unit in secondary school	0	11	1	12
<b>Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>25</b>

Source: *Fieldwork 2016*

Table 13 shows the results of the teachers' views concerning the GRZ consistency cash flow to both the Special Schools and the units in secondary schools. The majority of the teacher participants, (20) indicated that it was 'poor' while (2) indicated that they were 'not sure', (3) indicated 'good' and (1) did not respond.

An interview involving the ESO-Special from R1 district revealed that:

*Funding has always been erratic, you find that in an ideal situation, it is supposed to be a quarterly funding, first quarter we receive some funding, second quarter we receive another funding, the third quarter we receive another but now you find that the first quarter funding will come in December now what do we do all this while, you find that you are in a mess of no funding at all.*

Parent participants were asked on how they would describe the current financing of Special Education by the Government and the responses were captured in the table below.

**Table 14: Parents' views on Government Financing Special Education**

Status of grz funding		Frequency			Total
		Not Sure	Poor	Good	
School type	Special School	5	8	0	13
	Unit in secondary school	6	12	4	22
<b>Total</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>35</b>

Source: *Field work (2016)*

The results in Table 14 above show views of the 35 parents on status of government financing Special Education. The results were that (11) of the participants said they were 'not sure', (20) said it was 'poor' and only (4) said it was 'good'. The results indicate that the status of government financing to Special Education was poor from parents' views.

Furthermore, parent participants were asked on how they would describe the participation of Non-government funders to Special Education, the responses were generated in Table 15

**Table 15: Views on Non-Government Financing Special Education**

How is NGO financing to Special Education		Frequency			Total
		Not Sure	Poor	Good	
School type	Special School	5	3	5	13
	unit in secondary school	8	5	9	22
<b>Total</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>35</b>

*Source: Field work (2016)*

Results in Table 15 above show that of the 35 parents (13) were ‘not sure’ (8) said ‘poor’ and (14) said ‘good’ to the question involving status of NGO funding to Special Education. The results mean that people had mixed views about the state of financing of the donor. Those not ‘sure’ and those that indicated ‘good’ seem almost tallying up.

As for the status of parents’ participation in financing Special Education, a view was sought from teachers. The teachers were asked on how they would describe the participation of parents in financing of Special Education and Table 16 generated the responses as shown.

**Table 16: Teachers’ views on status of parents financing to Special Education**

How is parental financing in Special Education?		Frequency		Total
		Poor	Good	
School type	Special School	7	6	13
	Unit In Secondary School	14	8	22
<b>Total</b>		<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>35</b>

*Source: Fieldwork (2017)*

Table 16 above shows the results from which 60.0% (21) participants indicated ‘poor’ and 40.0% (14) indicated ‘good’ giving as impression that financing from parents did not meet the expected standards.

Another question sought to rank the identified funders according to the order of consistence in funding Special Education. Parents and teachers were asked of their views as to which funders were consistent in financing Special Education at their schools and the responses were obtained as captured in table below:

**Table 17: Funders thought to be consistent in financing Special Education**

Cash-flow consistence from funders		Frequency					Total
		GRZ	PTA	Church	Business House	Others	
School type	Special School	3	4	6	3	6	22
	Unit In Secondary School	5	2	2	2	22	33
<b>Total</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>55</b>

*Source: Fieldwork 2016*

Table 17 shows that (28) participants were of the view that funders other than the GRZ were consistent in financing Special Education, (8) were of the view that GRZ and the church were consistent, (6) indicated that it was the PTA and (5) indicated that it was business houses that were consistent with financing Special Education. Other funders represented family members such as uncles, sisters, uncles, well-wishers and friends that were helping to finance the education of these LSEs.

In an attempt to further verify the prevailing practice on the consistency of funders in financing Special Education, an interview conducted with the head teacher of P2 secondary school with a Special Unit in P1 district, it was reported;

*We have already registered ourselves with the British council, our name is in their data base, and whenever they have something they come on board and say that we will help you in one way or another.*

It was further revealed by the participants that cash flow from other funders was better than that from the government. It was also established from the teachers that funders supported Special Education in various ways, 50.0% of the respondents said some funders funded both the whole school and learners, 23.1% said some funders supported learners only while 26.9% said other funders supported the school only.

#### **4.1.7 Satisfaction levels with financial management for Special Education**

Pertaining to the level of satisfaction by funders in the manner that the schools handled finances, teachers were asked to air their views and they responded in the following pattern: (16) teachers (8 from Special Schools and 8 from units in secondary schools) felt that funders were 'satisfied' while a total of (9) participants (5 from Special Schools and 4 from units in

secondary schools) indicated that they were ‘not sure’ whether funders were satisfied or not and (1) participant did not respond.

The views on the levels of satisfaction among participants themselves in the manner in which these schools handled the finances were also captured according to category of participants; 9 teacher (4 from Special Schools and 5 from units in secondary schools) indicated ‘not satisfied’ while 16 (9 from Special Schools and 7 from units in secondary schools) indicated ‘satisfied’ and (1) participant did not respond.

As for parents, in response to the some question on satisfaction levels in the manner that schools handled the finances; (4) parents from Special Units in secondary schools were ‘not sure’, while (3) from Special Units in secondary schools indicated that they were ‘not satisfied’ whereas 24 (10 from Special Schools and 14 from units in Special Schools) indicated that they were ‘satisfied’ and (4) did not answer. Therefore, the general view as can be deduced from the responses is that participants were satisfied in the manner that schools handled the finances. Those that were not satisfied mentioned that, the school did not tell them anything, others said money is being deviated to other programmes other than Special Education.

#### 4.1.8 School Financial Reports

The study sought to ascertain if it was a requirement for the schools to provide periodic financial reports to the stakeholders in Special Education and how often the reports should be made available if any. The participants responded in the following pattern as captured in Table below.

**Table 18: Responses on whether the school required financial reporting**

Whether the school is expected to issue financial reports		Frequency		Total
		Yes	No	
Category of Respondent	Teachers	21	4	25
	Parents	24	11	35
<b>Total</b>		<b>45</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>60</b>

*Source: Field work (2016)*

Table 18 above shows the results on whether the school was required to issue a financial report. As can be seen, 75.0% (45) participants from both schools indicated ‘yes’ and 25.0% (15) indicated ‘no’. Additionally, participants were asked a follow up question as to how often

the financial report was given, to which 17.4% of the participants said termly while 82.6% said yearly. The results show that the financial report was a requirement and released yearly.

#### 4.1.9 Funders Withdrawing

The research solicited the views of participants whether they knew of any funders that had withdrawn from financing Special Education. The views were as captured in the table below:

**Table 19: Whether there were funders who withdraw from financing Special Education**

Funders withdrawing from funding		Frequency		Total
		Yes	No	
School type	Special School	2	23	25
	unit in secondary school	6	29	35
<b>Total</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>60</b>

Source: *Fieldwork (2016)*

The results in Table 19 show the responses of the participants as to whether there were funders that have withdrawn funding from Special Education in the recent past. It can be seen (23) participants from the Special Schools and (29) from the units in secondary schools said ‘no’ funder had withdrawn, while (2) from Special Schools and (6) from units in secondary schools said acknowledged withdraw of the funders in Special Education.

The ESO-Special from R2 district gave another view concerning funders thought to have withdrawn from financing Special Education and explained that:

*Due to the economic crunch, organizations have been affected, NGOs have pulled out, like there is one that comes into my mind HHI which was in Monze, it pulled out because of the economic crunch, Organizations indeed pull out, and because of this central funding, donors pump in some cash through the Ministry Headquarters but that cash does not reach the children targeted by the donor. They pull out, meaning that pupils are left with no sponsors and so the schools find it difficult to keep these children without sponsors because you can't engage the parents as they cannot too. Another sponsor of a visually impaired child pulled out last year 2015/2016 and the child has since stopped since the parents were unable to pay and no one came in including our office to say keep this child in school which is so unfortunate, we should have come in and let this child continue*

#### **4.1.10 The Current Strategic Practices in Financing of Special Education**

With the purpose of understanding the current financing practices available in Special Education, participants were asked of any strategies that Special Schools and Special Units were engaged into with a view to finance Special Education, in a situation where the government financed budgets were experiencing deficits. In response, participants gave their views from lived experiences. It was learnt during the study that there were some available initiatives that schools opted to explore in financing Special Education and these were; undertaking in Production Unit (PU) activities such as chicken production and vegetable gardening; running of school Tuck-shop making and selling of artworks by pupils.

An undertaking in Production Unit activities as a school initiative to finance Special Education was strongly supported by the Head Teacher from S2 Special School who argued by saying;

*If we can take advantage of the current career path ways, there is vocational career pathway and that is where the community members are. As a school we can learn to take advantage to revamp the production in the school through those career pathways as long as we teach the children entrepreneurship skills we are going to be generating money because as we will be teaching as we generate monies because we cannot just be talking theoretically, there should be money generated.*

*We need education with production here at this school, money would be coming in, for example if we can grow vegetables, we cannot consume everything and so marketers would be coming to buy from us, but we are doing just a small garden that side.*

It was observed from one of the Special Schools that learners were involved in craftworks in order to raise finances for Special Education. They produced items such; Braziers, wire and board cars and houses, beads and the like as displayed in the pictures 1 and 2:



**Picture 1:** *Braziers fabricated by pupils with Special Educational Needs*

Picture 1 above shows the Braziers that were fabricated by pupils to be sold for cash to the members of the public so as to generate finances for Special Education.



**Picture 2:** *Craftworks by Learners with SEN*

Picture 2 shows the craftworks produced by learners with SEN in which they produced items captured as shown in picture 2. These items were made by pupils and then sold for cash as a way of raising funds for Special Education activities.

An interview with the ESO-Special Education from R2 district shared the thoughts by saying;

*“ Yes, in order to stay afloat amidst of all this prevailing situation, not much has been done as a district in terms of lobbying well wishers We have not ventured into any income generating activity to say maybe we have a hammer meal at school to supplement government grants which are small, so in terms of resource mobilization we have not done anything but I think going forward we may need to come up with income generating activities like a hammer meal which can inject some funding specifically the unit so that we sustain its operations. But truthfully speaking, we have just been lobbying from some few well-wishers. Also during the PTA AGM, there is a slot to talk on Special Education so that parents should really come on board since the government alone cannot cater for these children”.*

At Q2 secondary school with a Special Unit in Q1 district, an DPO shared the experience over the strategies schools were engaged in to finance Special Education and the following was mentioned;

*There is no direct engagement of other stake holders to support children with special needs as per say but generally we do involve the parents through the PTA just to help the school in general. Otherwise there has been no direct engagement towards helping the Special Education Special Unit but it's just general.*

From P2 secondary school with a Special Unit, the Head Teacher pointed out during an interview that;

*There is PTA through which the ordinary pupils contribute to those monies and out of which I allow through the school finance committee an allocation of something for the Special Unit. The British council will once in a while come on board when they think of us. We have FAWEZA and time to learn who also come on board pick up some children maybe 2 to 5 or 6 and start paying for them. That is how I manage the Special Unit; otherwise I have almost nothing for Special Education from the government to talk about.*

In another district, an interview conducted with the District Planner and the ESO-Special Education had similar views where they explained that; the strategies that helped them to engage the cooperating partners is when they hold stakeholders meetings and then they would sell the strategic plans to the stakeholders who would then buy into specific areas of interest. There were organisations that had been running Special Education programs at district level and some at individual levels would donate a wheel chair, one would donate clutches and so on.

## **4.2 Factors Influencing Current Financing Practice in Special Education**

The study question to be addressed in this section is; what factors influence the current financing practice in Special Education? The question was broken down into statements that were hoped would help to bring out an understanding of factors that influenced the financing practice in Special Education. Responses are presented in this section in cross-tabulations form generated from descriptive statistical outputs and verbatim under subheadings as obtained from the field.

### **4.2.1 Attitude on Allocation of Funds to Learners**

Participants were asked as to whether they agreed or disagreed to the assertion that, investing in the education of LSEN was a ‘waste of resources/finances’. Responses from the 61 participants show that 93.4% (57) were on the ‘disagree’ side while 6.6% (4) were on the ‘agree’ side. Indicating that, participants opposed the assertion or the view that financial investment in Special Education was a waste of finances.

Still on the issue of ascertaining the attitude on allocation of resources for LSEN, participants were further asked as to which learners they would allocate more financial resources if they were given an opportunity to allocate. Results showed that; total of 28 participants (18 teachers and 10 parents) said ‘children with disabilities’ 12 (4 teachers and 8 parents) said ‘children without disabilities’, another total of 17 participants (4 teachers and 13 parents) said ‘equal amounts’ and the last total of 4 participants (parents) said ‘it depends on the demand’.

Another area of interest was whether the way parents viewed the child’s disability influenced their financing towards education of that child. Responses were that 14 biological parents said ‘no’ while 12 indicated ‘yes’, 1 grandparent said ‘no’ while 4 said ‘yes’, those with other

relation, 3 said ‘yes’ and 1 said ‘no’. It can be deduced from the responses that the attitude of parents and teachers was not a factor that influenced the current financing practice in Special Education.

#### 4.2.2 Factors thought to influence parents’ participation in financing Special Education

Participants were asked of their views on whether Parents’ willingness to support Special Education was influenced by any of the factors in Table 20 below.

**Table 20: Responses on factors thought to influence parent Participation in Financing Special Education**

Hindrances to parents’ participation		Responses					
		Parents N = 35			Teachers N = 26		
		Not sure	Disagree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Agree
1	The parents’ level of education	1	17	17	0	5	21
2	The parents occupation (business, working, etc)	1	9	25	0	6	20
3	The parents Church/religion	6	24	5	1	12	13
4	The number of children parents have	0	24	11	3	8	15
5	The economic benefit of educating child with disability	6	14	15	0	7	19
6	The attitude of society towards the kind of disability	2	22	11	0	7	19
7	Encouragements received from Government	3	8	24	1	8	17
8	Encouragement received from Civil Society Organisations	6	10	19	1	5	20

Source: *Fieldwork (2016)*

Table 20 shows the responses given by both parents and Teachers to the concern that the listed factors influenced the parents’ participation in financing Special Education; concerning the parents’ level of education; parents, 17 and Teachers, 21 indicated ‘agree’, 17 parents and 5 teachers indicated ‘disagree’. The parent’s occupation (business, working, etc); 25 parents and 20 Teachers indicated ‘agree’, 9 parents and 6 Teachers indicated ‘disagree’.

The parents Church/religion; 24 parents and 12 Teachers indicated ‘disagree’ whereas 5 parents and 13 Teachers indicated ‘disagree’, 6 parents and 1 Teacher were ‘not sure’. As to the number of children parents have, results show that; 24 parents indicated ‘disagree’ while 15

Teachers indicated 'agree', 11 parents indicated 'agree' while 8 Teachers indicated 'disagree' and 3 were 'not sure'.

Concerning the economic benefit of educating child as a factor influencing the current financing practice; 15 parents and 19 Teachers indicated 'agree', 14 parents and 7 indicated 'disagree' whereas 6 parents were 'not sure'. The attitude of society towards the kind of disability; 22 parents as majority, indicated 'disagree' while 19 Teachers majority indicated 'agree', 11 parents indicated 'agree' while 7 Teachers indicated 'disagree' and 2 parents were 'not sure'.

As to whether parents were influenced by encouragements received from Government in financing of Special Education; 24 parents and 17 Teachers agreed, 8 parents and 8 teachers disagreed whereas 3 parents and 1 teacher were 'not sure'. Furthermore, encouragements received from Civil Society Organisations; responses show that 19 parents and 20 Teachers indicated 'agree', 10 parents and 5 Teachers indicated 'disagree' while 6 parents and 1 teacher were 'not sure'.

#### **4.2.3 Factors associated with funders' level of Satisfaction**

In order to ascertain whether the levels of satisfaction in the manner schools handled finances, accountability, transparency, and financial usage in Special Education were also a factor that influences current financing practice in Special Education. Participants were asked to give the views that they had, the responses were as follows; 77.4% (24) of the parents indicated that they were satisfied in both the manner of handling and accountability, transparency and financial usage. Teachers also 64.0% (16) indicated satisfaction, while the minority in both categories indicated that they were not satisfied.

#### **4.3 The implication of the current financing practice on the provision of quality education**

The third objective of the study sought to help understand the extent to which current financing practices identified in the first objective were impacting the provision of quality education to learners with Special Education needs. The question addressed in this section is; to what extent is the impact of the current financing practices on the provision of quality education? Likewise,

the question was broken down into statements that were hoped would help in an exploration of the extent to which the current financing practices impact on the provision of quality education.

### 4.3.1 The implication on infrastructure expansion for Special Education

Participants were asked of their views if the current financing practice would bring about increased infrastructure expansion in the schools and in response participants were expected to disagree or agree to that. The descriptive statistical is shown in Table 21;

**Table 21 Views on Increased Infrastructure Expansion**

Likelihood of infrastructure expansion		Frequency			Total
		Not Sure	Disagree	Agree	
School Type	Special School	4	17	5	26
	Unit in secondary school	3	23	9	35
<b>Total</b>		<b>7</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>61</b>

*Source: Fieldwork (2016)*

Table 21 above shows that 11.5% (7) of the participants were ‘not sure’, the majority 65.6% (40) of the participants disagreed, suggesting that infrastructure was in a bad state while 23.0% (14) agreed that there would be increased infrastructure expansion.

A similar view concerning infrastructure expansion as a result of the current financing practice in Special Education was shared by the DESO from R1 districts who explained;

*In terms of infrastructure, at the moment I think most of it is not appropriate especially for learners who would want to use wheel chairs. I say so because there are no ramps in schools and even the chairs where the learners should sit are not those specifically for children with Special Education needs. Also the case of toilets, the VIP toilets especially in rural set up just the door way cannot allow a wheel chair to pass. Basically I can just say that we are not doing fine in the area of infrastructure.*

Furthermore, a Head teacher from S2 Special School of S1 district lamented at the situation resulting from the current financing practices in Special Education that had created the state of infrastructure in that school. The Head teacher stated;

*Come January, I don't know how really it will be, because for the first time we are going to have grade 12 and we don't have a classroom for grade 10 to grade 12, so*

*meaning that it's the issue of congestion. Because the number of the grade 9 who wrote is 22 next year 2017, they should be grade 10s, if they were all to pass meaning that we are going to have 20 deaf children more, where are we going to put them. Look here, DEBS office has been working on the secondary section classroom block behind there; it's now over five years, nothing much is seen to be happening. So I think the infrastructure would be the first priority and we don't have the labs yet in the school;*

The physical verification of the existing infrastructure for Special Education was done by using an Observation Checklist. Information obtained during observations showed that two of the schools (one secondary, one special) had modified the initial architectural and design barriers in the school. Despite the fact that they were not adequate and fully appropriate for the LSENs; one Secondary School had not attended to the infrastructure at all owing to availability of finances; it was further observed that one Special School had good, appropriate and adequate infrastructure constructed by the agency running it.

A further observation was made on the environmental accessibility status of Ramps and Walkways; in the three schools (2 secondary schools and 1 Special School) they were in bad state, not adequate and inappropriate; in one secondary school they were completely unavailable and in one Special School, they were available, appropriate and in a very good state.

An observation centred on the availability of classroom space was also made, and it was observed that four schools (3 secondary schools and 1 Special School) had classroom space available for LSENs, though not adequate and not appropriate and some in bad state. One Special School had adequate, appropriate and a very good state of classroom space for learners.

A check on the appropriateness of the toileting system to the identified nature of disabilities from each of the schools; it was found that two secondary schools did not have any separate and appropriate toilet for LSENs instead they shared the ordinary toilets with the rest of the other learners. Two schools (1 Special School and 1 secondary school) had toilets for the LSENs but in a bad state, not adequate and not appropriate for LSENs, it was further observed that one Special School had toilets in a good state, adequate and appropriate for the LSENs.



**Picture 3:** *The inappropriate Bathroom and Toilet system for special learners*

Picture 3 above shows the Bathroom and Toilet system used by learners with physical impairments at one of the secondary schools and had been excluded from the main facility used by other learners in the school.

#### **4.3.2 The implication on Provision of Teaching and Learning Resources**

Participants were asked of the views if the current financing practice would bring about an improved provision of teaching and learning resources and in response participants were expected to disagree or agree to the assertion. The descriptive statistical data output produced a case processing summary and the responses were captured in table 22 below:

**Table 22:** **Views on adequacy of teaching and learning materials**

Likelihood of better teaching learning materials		Frequency			Total
		Not Sure	Disagree	Agree	
School type	Special School	0	19	7	26
	unit in secondary school	4	28	3	35
<b>Total</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>61</b>

*Source:* *fieldwork (2016)*

The results showing in Table 22 above were that out of the 61 questionnaire participants; 6.6% (4) indicated 'not sure', the majority, and 77.0% (47) indicated 'disagree', and 16.4% (10) indicated 'agree'. The majority of the participants held the view that there was inadequacy of teaching and learning for Special Education in schools. The results in table 22 were in agreement with the views expressed during interviews, for instance; an interview conducted with the DESO from P1 District whose view complemented the views of teachers and parents and it was said that;

*We have received a few of learning and teaching materials but still they are inadequate. We don't have materials like Braille papers, tactile materials and the like for the visually impaired.*

With the purpose of checking the extent of the impact of current financing practices in relation to the status and availability of specially designed furniture that would aid teaching and learning such as desks and chairs was physically done, and it was observed in all the five schools that they were completely unavailable. Further, physical checking on the availability and status of assistive technology, it was observed that all the five schools pointed out at one or more items available in the school. However, most of the items categorised were in a bad state, not appropriate, and not adequate. Those captured during the checking were; dysfunctional computers, Television sets, Printers and some of the donated items that could not just be operated effectively by the learners and teachers as well due to lack of appropriateness in the Zambian society.

The impact of financing practice attached to availability and status of text books as part of the teaching learning materials was observed, from two secondary schools, the text books for LSENs were not available at all; the other three schools (2 Special Schools and 1 secondary school), text books were available but in bad state, not adequate and not appropriate to the current syllabus.

The availability of specialised equipment was also considered; it was observed that two secondary schools had completely no specialised equipment for LSENs while the other three schools (2 Special Schools and 1 secondary school) had some specialised equipment available though in a bad state and not adequate. Among the specialised equipment available were; wheel chair, magnifying glass, wall mirrors and Braille printers.

### 4.3.3 The implication on Staffing for Special Education in Schools

Participants were asked on whether the current financing practice in Special Education would bring about improvement in staffing of Special Education staff in schools. The descriptive statistical data output produced a case processing summary of Valid N = 61 and responses as captured in table 23 below;

**Table 23: Views on Increase on Staffing for specialised and Support staff**

Likelihood of improvement on staffing levels		Frequency			Total
		Not Sure	Disagree	Agree	
School type	Special School	0	11	15	26
	unit in secondary school	5	22	8	35
<b>Total</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>61</b>

*Source: Field work (2016)*

Table 23 captured the results as follows; 8.2% (5) indicated ‘not sure’, 54.1% (33) indicated ‘disagree’ and 37.7% (23) indicated ‘agree’ to the fact that the current financing practice would improve staffing for Special Education.

An inquiry into the ratio of teacher to pupil per class was also done, it was discovered that all the five schools had a lower number of teachers as compared to the number of pupils. Further, it was observed that specialised services were completely unavailable in the schools except for one Special School that had a clinic run by one Nurse. The specialised services were accessed from the nearby hospital within the nearest town.

In question was the availability and adequacy of Personal Assistants, through observation, it was noted that three secondary schools did not have any person assisting in the Special Education unit and instead the special teachers attended to every needed service for LSEs, whereas the Special Schools had employed at least one Personal Assistant through the school board though not adequate as compared to the number of learners needing an Assistant.

### 4.3.4 The implication on provision of quality education

Participants were asked of their views if the current financing practice would bring about improved quality of Special Education in schools. The descriptive statistical data output produced a Case processing the responses as follows;

**Table 24: Views on Improved Quality of Special Education**

Improved Special Education		Frequency			Total
		Not Sure	Disagree	Agree	
School type	Special School	1	10	15	26
	unit in secondary school	5	24	6	35
<b>Total</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>61</b>

Source: Field work (2016)

Table 24 shows that out of the 61 participants, 9.8% (6) said ‘not sure’, the majority, 55.7% (34) indicated ‘disagree’ and 34.4% (21) indicated ‘agreed’ towards improved quality of Special Education in schools. This denotes that the respondents were not in agreement that there is improved quality of Special Education.

The similar concerns about quality of Special Education were also held by interviewed respondents. For example, ESO-Special from Q1/P1 districts doubted the current financing practices in financing Special Education and mentioned that;

*The 5% or so allocated to Special Education from the government grant is just a drop in the ocean; the standards are not there or quite minimal. We are very much lagging behind in that particular area of education.*

Participants suggested ways in which provision of quality Special Education would be enhanced by good financing practices in Special Education; ways such as community engagement. The DPO of R1 district suggested that;

*We need to sensitize the communities around and also identify stakeholders that can help us in that area of financing Special Education. Maybe by having meetings with them and also to educate them because first we need to change the mindset of people so that they start appreciating that these learners are supposed to be in school. And once they appreciate that’s when they can release funds to support schools. The best way maybe, we can start with coming up with open days were we can invite the business houses, parents also to come to chat with learners. And during PTA meeting I feel that can be discussed.*

Other respondents so an engagement with business houses into what is called public private partnership (PPP) as a solution towards financing Special Education would help provide quality education for learners with Special Educational needs. the DPO of T1 stated that:

*But now we are moving in by bringing on board business houses. This one is an eye opener to bring in business houses. Maybe business houses can help us to fund or modify the infrastructure to cater for Special Education learners.*

A Head Teacher from Q2 secondary school reiterated government engagement to be able to influence positively and mentioned that;

*There was need to request the government to increase the funding so that these learners can have the right to education just like these other normal learners. I would say normal in inverted commas. So that they receive same quality of education we are looking for and even in terms of standard, the bench for standard practice for the other learners too. Once we move in that direction then we will be talking about inclusive education which will be catering for all categories of learners in acquiring education.*

The sentiments were equally captured from the head teacher of S1 Special School who explained in this way;

*all stake holders starting from the pupils themselves, the members of staff, parents, disability people organizations, the managing agency, the church, community, well wishers, we need to come together to be involved and do our part so that we complement each other, we should be able to have activities that help us generate money, because you cannot run an institution without money. You need money whether you like it or not and just like I was saying that we have limited resources, from all areas of the stake holders but we can put our heads together and appreciate each other's efforts and a part we play in involving ourselves in other responsibilities which are dependent on funding.*

#### **4.4 Chapter Summary**

The above chapter presented findings of the study. The findings of the study were presented according to the three research objectives from which, research questions were generated and segmented into controllable components by both the participants and the researcher. The major themes emanating from the objectives were: the current practice in financing Special Education, in which the picture of the practice in financing of Special Education had been created showing the participants at national levels, district level and school levels. The

participants in financing Special Education have been identified as; the government contributing 5 percent to Special Education through the GRZ grant at schools, the PTA through user fees of varying amounts per school, parents to LSENs also participate in financing Special Education as well. Others were the cooperating partners and other funders contributing in various ways monetary and material directly to the school or indirectly through individual learners in support of Special Education. The way through which funders were identified and engaged into funding Special Education schools level have had been stated, also the trend of cash-flow from these funders for Special Education had been ascertained. The chapter has also presented results on the factors that were thought to have an influence on the current financing practice such as the attitude of parents and teachers, education levels of parents and many others. Lastly the chapter presented the results concerning the implication of the current financing practices on the provision of quality education to LSENs involving infrastructure, teaching and learning materials and staffing. The next chapter contains the discussion of the study findings and presented in a way that the study questions emanating from objectives were answered adequately.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The previous chapter presented the findings of this study where a descriptive survey approach had been used applied to combine both qualitative and quantitative techniques, such that quantitative techniques supplemented the qualitative approach. In this chapter, the findings of the study on the current financing practice in financing of Special Education in Zambia, Southern Province were discussed. The discussion was anchored on the following three study questions emanating from the study objectives and these were: To explore the current financing practices in Special Education; To identify factors that influence the current financing practice in Special Education; To ascertain the implications of the current financing practice in Special Education on the provision of quality education. The discussion of findings is arranged in the order of objectives presented in the previous chapter.

#### **5.1 The Current Financing Practice in Special Education**

The first objective was: To explore the current financing practices in Special Education and the research question addressed is; what is the current financing practice in Special Education? It was aimed at ascertaining the available practices in financing of Special Education on the Southern Province in Zambia.

##### **5.1.1 Sources of Funding For Special Education**

The study outlined the identified participants in financing of Special Education that participated as institutions or individuals. It should be noted early enough that the study established no harmonisation among the funders who were just working independently in meeting the Special Educational needs. It was observed that MoE (1996) highlighted a policy statement by the Ministry on Special Education provision which stated that the Ministry was committed to providing education of particularly good quality to pupils with Special Education needs, and some strategies to achieve the targets were also stated such as; the Ministry will cooperate with private, religious, community and philanthropic organisations in meeting the Special Education needs of exceptional children. In practice, the cooperation between the Ministry and Funders still remained unguided or rather there was lack of collaboration. In practice, all the funders have never had harmonised funding in Special Education, instead

funding is left at the will and ability of the financiers who may not be persuaded for funds if they failed to do so. Beyani (2013) advocated for a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to bring about harmonisation among the various funders. This is because through the MoU, support to education among funders can be successful and strengthened through planning and budgeting, improving transparency, accountability and monitoring and evaluation; unlike the current practice in Special Education. It seems that the idea of Beyani for a MoU would suit better as a form of collaboration among funders towards meeting the actual financial cost of educating LSEs.

Sources of Special Education financing in Ontario show that, mainly it was the grant system (Ontario Ministry of Education 2015) catering for different areas such as: classroom funding which covered; Special Education Per Pupil Amount (SEPPA) which was the fundamental funding towards the cost of Special Education provision calculated on total enrolment as well as the grade level basis; High Needs Amount (HNA) which took into consideration the variation share of needs per learner, as well as the School Board's needs; Special Equipment Amount (SEA) was given to Special Education to buy computers, software and related equipment. The practice in Ontario, if adopted by the Ministry of Education in Zambia would help improve the way Special Education units were being supported financially in Zambia.

#### **5.1.1.1 Government Financing Special Education**

The study found out that government was one of the sources of financing in Special Education on the Southern Province in Zambia. According to a UNESCO (2016) study following a period of decline in education delivery and performance, due to growing poverty and under investment in education between 1980 and 2001; Zambia had undertaken considerable policy development and reform to meet evolving National aspirations and social demands to improve its National education system. In line with the argument by UNESCO (2016), the study revealed that three schools were indirectly receiving financial support for Special Education at 5 percent of the total grant sent to schools. The 5 percent was an allocation to Special Education from the 12 percent allocated to Equity and Special Issues as grant allocation from government financing program to education. P2 secondary, Q2 secondary and R2 secondary that operated Special Units were the beneficiaries of the 5 percent share of the GRZ grant; S2 school received a direct grant for Special Education (amount withheld) at the rate stipulated in

Table 3. The fifth school, T2 had never received any GRZ-grant, at the time of data collection from the time it was opened five years earlier, except that the school is being supported by receiving the teaching staff on government payroll. The findings were in agreement with the study by Kayuka (2014) on the copperbelt and North-western provinces of Zambia found out that the Zambian government gave grants to Special Education Units however; they were released irregularly and inconsistently. With such information, it could be clear that the Special Schools and Special Units should have put in place some strategies of engaging with funders in order to survive since government financing was not standard and equal to the demand.

However, the practice in financing of Special Education by the government in Zambia appeared to be contrary to the findings of the study conducted in New Jersey by Kolbe, et al (2007) who observed that New Jersey provides districts with aid for Special Education and related services categorically for Special Education programs which was separate from government grant for general education and is dedicated to supporting the costs for Special Education and its related services. State aid was allocated using a “weighted pupil” formula guided by The Comprehensive Educational Improvement and Financing Act (CEIFA) of 1996 in New Jersey. This formula established a four-“tiered” system of funding and specified that an “appropriate education was to be defined in terms of the core curriculum content standards and related assessments.” Each of the four tiers provided a set dollar amount per student who meets pre-specified eligibility criteria and was meant to provide differential funding based on students’ need for those services. The weighted pupil formula required that learners with Special Education needs were assessed and financed according to the needs assessed. However in Zambia it appears, the 5% is allocated regardless of the special needs of the learner and the related financial cost of such needs.

In accordance with the study concerning the state of the Zambian government financing Special Education, a study by European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (2003) agrees that governments do fund Special Education, on the contrary the study revealed that countries have adopted different models of financing for Special Education from the two main ones namely; centralised model where national level policy dictates systems of funding such as direct input-funding budget for Special Education schools or the pupil bound budget system. The second model of financing Special Education was the decentralised model where

the region or local authority was responsible for organising Special Education resources and services. The Zambian government also had been financing Special Education but without financing model adopted for Special Needs Education. It seemed therefore, lack of a financing model had compromised the financing of Special Education in Zambia.

The study further revealed that donor funding to the NIF account had reduced to the lowest level ever. Participants associated the reduction to the economic challenges that everybody in Zambia was facing today. However, participants did not know which funders by name had withdrawn the funding to Special Education through the NIF Account. Meaning the participants still hoped that donor funding to Special Education was still coming but as to when? They did not know. These results were in conformity with the study by Peters (2003) who acknowledge a mixture of financial support in Special Education by stating that 63 percent of education costs were covered by governments, 35 percent by the private sector, and 2 percent by external support. Financing of Special Education practices were never restrictive since each government uses its own approach hoped to be its best according to the prevailing conditions. Nevertheless, the study by Peters indicated that all the participating countries faced some resource constraints and financing challenges in meeting the needs of LSEN in secondary schools to enhance effectiveness of service delivery, and this situation appeared to be similar to Zambia on the Southern Province.

The results of the study where it was revealed that government was funding Special Education showed contradiction from the New Jersey Special Education practice shown in Kolbe, et al (2007) where districts were provided with aid for Special Education and related services. This “categorical” aid was separate from state aid for general education and was dedicated to supporting the costs for Special Education with its related services. State aid was allocated using a “weighted pupil” formula in New Jersey contrary to the practice in Zambia where at National level provincial level and district levels, Special Education allocation did not exist.

The results on government financing special in Southern Province were similar to Kayuka (2014) study who stated that government only released the educational grants irregularly and inconsistently. Government was responsible for recurrent expenditure in education and if the funds were released irregularly and inconsistently towards recurrent expenditure, the most likely result is inadequately funded budgets in schools. MESVTEE (2015) indicated that the

larger share of the Ministry's budget allocation was swallowed by personal emoluments and only a small share was allocated to facilities and materials for Special Education.

#### **5.1.1.2 PTA Financing Special Education**

In an attempt to understand the role of the PTA in Special Schools and Special Units in secondary schools in relation to financing practices in Special Education, the study established that there was need for the existence of PTA in schools. Parent participants were asked as to whether PTA existed in the schools where they enrolled the children and similarly the role of PTA towards financial contributions in support of Special Education. The study confirmed the existence of PTA in all the schools however, it was established that the PTA financial contribution towards school resources varied from one school to another and one of the schools did not have PTA financial contributions for learners with Special Education needs. The implication of this practice in financing of Special Education includes a discrepancy from one school to another in quality and quantity of teaching and learning materials as well as classroom space and resources that were intended to meet the National Curriculum for all learners.

Some of the parents in the schools where PTA financial contributions were required did not know that they needed to contribute to PTA hence the financial base were strained. The finding was in line with the comment made by MoE (2015), where it was stated that; the Ministry needed to encourage schools to spend funds collected from parents on improving teaching and learning resources as well. The Ministry further emphasised the need to revisit the practices in education that have traditionally been applied to finance school capital projects also to buy buses at school level. Ultimately, resolving the tensions between competing priorities in the MESVTEE budget is crucial. The big ticket expenditures, while agreed to by parents, were prioritized over purchase of books and other teaching and learning materials. The role of PTA, however, made it possible for all the parents including parents of children without SEN to also have a contribution in financing Special Education through the funds allocated to the special learners.

#### **5.1.1.3 Parents Financing Special Education**

Apart from participating in financing of Special Education through PTA by parents of ordinary children, the study pointed out that parents were participating in financing of Special Education

directly as indicated by the majority of the questionnaire participants and key informants through interviews. The nevertheless, this study found out that parents' participation did not help the child receive enough finances towards meeting the budgetary requirements, regardless of the parents' source of income (salary, business and others). The study showed that though parents' contribution to Special Education still remained below the perceived required financial and resource supply for Special Education. Parents provided financial support by taking care of the child's education through purchase of school uniforms, books, pens, pencils, packed meals, and transport to and from school on a daily basis. The findings were in line with the study by Kelly (1991) who had observed that parents bore a substantial cost arising from the direct educational needs of their children and those that directly related to educational needs of their children and those related directly to education. Parents took care of the direct educational costs that included payments for educational supplies, the purchases of educational materials examination materials, and examination fees among other costs.

There were variations of results for parents that had children at a Special Units and those that had children in Special Schools that accommodated children in boarding facilities. From the study results, it was observed that parents that had children in Special Schools with boarding facilities contributed more finances for the services accessed by their children, for example feeding. Parents participated in financing towards upkeep of their child within boarding facilities; those finances did not include educational materials. On the other hand, parents expressed concern over the higher fees that they were required to contribute and appealed for government and well-wishers' intervention. The findings of the study therefore, agreed with that of Kelly (1991) who explained that parents took a substantial cost of education and they regarded paying for the children as their responsibility as such, they bore the cost of required school uniforms, payments for transport to and from school, examination fees and also school meals both in day and boarding schools. The World Bank (2015) study stated that the household expenditure on education was progressive against the income level in the of the families, some families fell in the category of being poor, as such parental participation in financing Special Education still remained a burden to them.

The amounts that parents paid varied from school to school and from each grade level to another as well as day school to boarding school. Parents still participated despite the

observation made in Nampanya-Serpell (2000) study that, Zambian families were large and the required school payments were made over and over on behalf of several children, which alone drained on parental resources towards direct and indirect costs of education. In a situation where parents could not afford the cost of decent education for children with disabilities, children were likely to be dumped into Special Schools or Special Units that appeared to have less to no parental resource support towards Special Education.

The study discovered that parents did not know how much finances or resources were required for their children's education per term or per year; this means that parents financed education according to the resources available for the family to spend on education. Though, varying amounts related to parents' financial ability other than the needs of learners were revealed. Some of the parents indicated that their children needed as small as K200 (US\$20) per term while others indicated that they needed about K4000 (US\$400) to take their children to school per term. Most of the parents that had a stable source of income such as a salary were the ones in the majority of spending about K4000 (US\$400).

#### **5.1.1.4 Cooperating partners in financing Special Education**

With regard to the existence of other funders that were participating in financing Special Education, the study confirmed that such funders actually existed and the names of these funders were given by the participants. The distribution of funders' names confirmed that each of the Special Schools and units in secondary schools had its own funders that were different from each of the five schools that participated in the study. The identified funders had different capacities in funding as could be detected from the available facilities for Special Education in each of the five schools. It was observed that none of the schools had similar facilities as the other. They also had particular areas of interest in financing Special Education, for example, it was disclosed during the study that one named funder provided only Ice cream once per year on Independence Day at one of the Special Schools, another named funder provided groceries every term at one of the five schools. This finding is similar to the finding by Peters (2003) in an evaluation of Education For All Targets from the 63 countries that participated globally, the study showed that Special Education funding sources reported a mixture of state, voluntary organizations, NGOs and Parents in most of the countries that participated. As indicated in the study, all the participating countries faced some resource constraints and financing challenges

in meeting the needs of LSEN in secondary schools to document effectiveness on service delivery. In Southern Province, Zambia, all the schools that participated in the study also indicated similar financial challenges in meeting the needs of the learners.

The study confirmed a lack of collaboration and harmonisation among funders in the province which was expressed through variation in the help provided and depending on their financial capacity. For example, different funders in different schools provided the same type of services but at a different scale. Funders named in the study to have contributed in the construction of classrooms were; a charity organisation named Butterfly and constructed a one and only single room for Special Education at Mukuni secondary school; the British council constructed a spacious one by two classroom block at David Livingstone Special Unit. At Kalomo secondary, the school converted one of the ordinary classrooms to be used as a Special Unit. At St. Mulumba, funded by the Catholic Church under the responsibility of various organisations fathers, priests and sisters within the church, similar arrangement in funding Special Education were made, and it was the same with Flamboyant Special School in Mazabuka.

It was seen from the results that there was no building that was put up by government specifically meant for Special Education from all the visited schools during the study except one classroom block which was still under construction at one of the Special Schools, though for many years now without being completed. Capital projects in Special Education were funded by well-wishers and donors and this is in agreement with the World Bank (2016) where it was established that capital expenditure was mainly in the hands of donors in Zambia and the government did less for Special Education.

### **5.1.2 Budgeting in Special Education**

While there were common considerations when budgeting for any program to take place, this study made proposals to the participants about some of the considerations at the time of budgeting for the LSENs both at home and school levels.

At the school level, budgeting for Special Education was reported to be mainly the responsibility of the finance committee. One Accounts Assistant explained that even though the school budgeted for Special Education, the national budget could not be changed to cater for local needs. The school was just waiting to receive the GRZ grant that the government had

managed to release at that moment without necessarily looking at the learners' needs. The GRZ grants were received once or twice or three times in a year instead of monthly as per policy. However, the schools had more access to the PTA financial pool than any other though not all parents contributed in supporting the school budgets. The results show a contradiction to what was obtaining in the Belgium practice on financing Special Education, where Nusche, et al (2015) showed that schools received yearly budgeted amounts in four quarters, and every June and December schools submit half year's financial reports that were sent to the Ministry after all partners have met twice a year in consultation and confirmation of all the financial activities for Special Education.

The study sought to ascertain whether the type of disability that an individual learner had as well as the severity of the disability were taken into consideration during budgeting in Special Education. The study established that for the current financing practice in Special Education; the type of the disability and its severity were not taken into consideration at the time of coming up with the cost of educating learners with special needs, or rather, the cost was not known. One of the Accounts Assistants explained that *all the students were given like an envelope expense whether one needed more than the other, it did not work out in that way because of the limits that i am given by the Ministry to work within.*

The majority of the participants agreed to the assertion that the availability of resources for the family was taken into consideration when preparing the budget for LSENs at the family level. One of the Head teachers justified this by explaining that the family could not manage to direct all the available resources towards one child and leaving out the rest of the members to starvation. Therefore, family resource restricted the budget for special children; as such those families that had more resources were able to supply most of the needed resources towards the education of children with disabilities. Additionally, the study established that there were other well-wishers who supported the cost of educating children with disabilities within the family; for example, the economically able elder brothers or sisters, other relatives and other well-wishers that could come through the school and make donations of monetary or material in nature.

When considering the cost of educating LSENs, participants agreed that it depended on the financial strength of those that accepted to help with finances. One of the participants

explained that, *well-wishers cannot be forced to give what you want, what if they don't have, and they were just helping you. So those well-wishers that had more, they brought more, and those with less, they were free to bring what they had. Actually, most of them were just individuals, for example the man that buys Ice-creams every year on Independence Day. The funders themselves decided how much to put into the education of special children, and the study noted that funders played different roles; some bought uniforms and shoes only, others paid the school fees only, others donate teaching and learning materials only, while other funders concentrated on infrastructure only, and so on.*

On the concern that the foreseeable economic benefits for educating the child with SEN were part of the considerations when budgeting in Special Education; the study revealed that foreseeable economic benefit were not considered at all. On the contrary one of the head teachers supported the idea and explained; *every parent should expect something after investing into the education of his child. It was being African actually to educate the children and then they also help you as a parent when you are aged, we cannot dispute that fact of economic benefit, so they should be able to help the parents and the family as a whole.* Furthermore, the study found out that the academic progress of the child with disability was not a consideration in arriving at the cost of educating the LSEN, whether the child was progressing in academics or not, it was considered less important. One ESO-Special explained that there is always hope that one day these children may improve in their academics as well.

The study further found out that practicing of a 'needs based budget' in financing Special Education was not done. It was established that the school administration through the Accounts Assistants decided on how much resources to allow for Special Education out of the existing PTA financial pool. Further it was observed that Special Education as in itself, did not have a direct allocation from the Ministry. Instead the government grant to secondary schools had an allocation of 12 percent on special issues. It was out of the special issues allocation that 5 percent of it was allocated to Special Education. Finally, the finances that were reaching Special Education programs were too small to enable meaningful resource provision for quality education. However, one Special School was receiving a specific GRZ grant for Special Education and it was observed that the provision of teaching and learning resources in this school proved to be better as compared to Special Units in secondary schools.

As could be noticed from the results above, budgeting at both family level and school level appeared to lack guidelines and as such it was quite challenging to point out as to how budgeting in Special Education was being done. Notably, the budgeting in Special Education had not improved; one Accounts Assistant confirmed that the schools normally experienced a budget deficit. This finding is in harmony with the study by Beyani (2013) who noted that there was an insufficient budget allocated to the education sector hence delivery of quality education was undermined. The education sector experienced yearly budget deficits whose impact would be more severe on learners with Special Educational needs since they required an additional cost to cater for Special Educational Needs.

The results in this study were further contradictory of The European Agency for Development in Special Education (1999) study which showed that in Austria the budget calculation for Special Education was above all based on the number of pupils in each Special Education placement. The provinces in Austria decided on the employment of teachers in schools, and the community was responsible for the maintenance of both mainstream and Special Education institutions. However, The European Commission (2015) study contradicted allocating individual budgets to pupils with SEN because it encouraged schools and parents to seek the allocated funds hence escalating the number of pupils indentified as having SEN.

The results further were in contrast with the study by Nusche, et al (2015) who stated that in Belgium, Special Education had some specific standards adopted and used to calculate the working budget for Special Education. Support personnel such as; therapists, nurses, pedagogical, psychological and social staff have specific budget in Special Education too. While in Southern Province these much needed personnel services were not available in schools and rarely accessed at the hospitals. Significantly, to learn from the results of the study by Parrish and Chambers (1996) that approximately 12% public education budgets were allocated to Special Education and that the cost per student is about 2.3 times the cost of regular education. Additionally, National Council for Special Education (2014) in the USA, The Department of Education and Skills is responsible to fund some of the support services to children with disabilities that have been enrolled in schools. The services include; school transport to the nearest special class or available school.

The results show that, to the best of participants' knowledge, financing in Special Education is not based on any known financing model. One DPO expressed shock during interviews upon an inquiry of the financing model that is being used in financing Special Education. The DPO explained to have never heard of a financing model in Special Education. The European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (2003) talked of two common models during budgeting that would appear Zambia was using though stakeholders seemed not to follow any of the two; the centralised model where national level policy dictates systems of funding such as direct input-funding budget for Special Education schools or the pupil bound budget system. The other model was the decentralised model where the region or local authority was responsible for organising Special Education resources and services. Furthermore, during budgeting in Australia, the study by UNESCO (1996) showed models of resource allocation for students with disabilities that used an Index based on the educational needs of students, as such, the resources required to meet the individual needs of the student were provided at the school where the student attended. Each student was allocated resources in monetary form in which the school had the capacity to convert to the appropriate support.

### **5.1.3 Identification of Funders in Special Education**

In line with the Ministry of Education (1996) policy document that allowed other funders to support Special Education in Zambia; a concern was raised in the study to find out how funders were being recruited into financing Special Education. The study established that there was no existing systemic order or procedure in getting funders to finance Special Education, instead participants indicated that; most funders approached the schools to offer support in accordance to their areas of interest such as teaching learning materials, infrastructure, material needs of LSEs and social events such as sports and on disability commemoration days. On the other hand, most of the parents did not know how to find funders and hoped that the government could just help to find funders. Furthermore, on a lower note, schools themselves identified and approached some prospective funders on behalf of learners the edge of failing to meet financial obligations. The school Accounts Assistants, school boards and school agents helped to link the schools and some learners to funders who were already known to have interest in financing Special Education like Time to Learn, Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR) and Zambia Association of Persons with Disabilities (ZAPD).

Though the funders that were participating in financing Special Education existed and identified, the study still revealed that the cash flow into schools remained poor and government grant was the most unpredictable fund to receive. The study results showed that funders other than the government were more consistent in supplying finances and other resources to schools. Among the identified funders, PTA was more consistent and reliable in financing Special Education simply because the school is able to remind the parents to pay. PTA was followed by the funders that finance Special Education through the church and then the well-wishers who only appeared in accordance to their programs and not to the learners' educational needs. However funders supported Special Education by giving financial assistance to learners only, others to schools only while others assisted both the learners and the schools as a whole.

With regard to whether these Special Education funders were satisfied with the manner of financial management in schools that they were funding; the study identified two strong views where, the teachers and administrators indicated that the funders were satisfied. While a contradictory view was held among the parents in that they were not satisfied with the manner that schools managed the contributed finances in Special Education. However, both parties acknowledged the financial reports that were being reported yearly. One Accounts Assistant indicated that the financial reports were audited before they were presented to the stakeholders otherwise the stakeholders would reject the non-audited financial reports. The PTA financial report was also acknowledged by some of the parents that showed satisfaction with the practice.

A further inquiry relating to the identified funders as to whether there were some that withdrew their support in Special Education due to any known reasons; the study revealed that there were few funders that consistently continued to financing Special Education as compared to those that were known before. According to the participants, one of them from a secondary school expressed doubt as to whether some of the funders were still interested or they had withdrawn because the school had not heard from them for a long time. Notably, the funders who funded specific projects and the project was completed were no longer there in schools yet without notice. The study noticed donor participation in financing Special Education contrary to the view by Kelly (1998) expressed 27 years ago; that many donors in the field of education

viewed Special Education as a bottomless pit with little or no immediate returns to show to the public on donor inputs in education.

#### **5.1.4 Current strategic practice of financing Special Education**

The study revealed discrepancies in the strategies that districts and schools were currently practicing in financing Special Education. Some districts and schools had not put in place any strategies as the time of study, towards resource mobilization apart from depending on the government education grants and PTA contributions in schools. At one of the Special Units in a secondary school, the LSEN were supported by the PTA financial pool funds contributed by the parents to pupils in the mainstream.

Further, the study found out that one Special School was engaged in Production Unit Projects where gardening was done and supplied to the school Kitchen. Another project in the school was the Tuck-shop that supplied fast moving goods to teachers and pupils within the school. The profits were then allocated to support other need areas within the school. Additionally, the same school was engaged in keeping Broiler Chickens that were either supplied to the school Kitchen or sold at a profit to the community. Another Special School supplemented the school budget by engaging pupils to crafts-works were they produced some items such as Braisers, beads, wire cars and others that were sold to the community mainly on school open days when the community was invited into the school. Also on daily basis the items were displayed to the public.

#### **5.2 Factors influencing the current financing practice in Special Education**

The question that was posed concerning the factors that influenced the current finance practice in Special Education was comprehensively addressed in the study. The study established various factors that influenced financing in Special Education as discussed in this section.

It should be appreciated that Special Education in Zambia was initialised by Missionary Pioneers during the time when the education system was still under the influence of Great Britain's educational system policies developed before 1964. Studies have upheld the role of Christian Missionary work in as far as the provision of formal education to persons with disabilities had been concerned in Zambia (Kalabula 1991; Mandyata, 2002 and Kaoma, 2005). The Christian church had continued to run formal education programs involving individuals

with disablements as it was to other persons. An observation was made in this study where it clear that schools operated by church mission organisations, they rated better on the observation checklist scale whose score ratings were 1, 2 and 3. The results of the observations seem to prove that the mission operated schools were leading in friendly infrastructure, available teaching learning materials, staffing of assistant personnel and general initiative to source for funding in Special Education. It appeared the Christian orientation had an influence in supporting Special Education as could be seen from the government operated schools that the environment was not impressive for Special Education, though this assertion needs further scrutiny amid scanty available literature.

The study confirmed government participation in funding Special Education in Zambia by grant system and according to what was known by the teachers and administrators who participated in the study was that the government grant should have been released monthly during the school term. Participants were asked on how they viewed the government cash flow into the schools and the majority indicated that it was poor while a few said it was good. However, the study noted that the government did not observe the condition of releasing finances at monthly stipulated intervals instead finances that could have been released monthly were now released once or twice during the whole financial accounting year as explained by some administrators.

It should be appreciated that government was well positioned to participate in financing Special Education. The factors that influenced government to participate in financing Special Education were partly because government had a responsibility to invest into the education of its citizens (Kelly, 1998). MoE (1996) indicated in the Educating our Future policy document that the Government of Zambia had expressed a commitment to ensure that all learners including those with disabilities were provided with quality education. The government was positioned to uphold the principle that every individual had an equal right to educational opportunities. This meant that every individual child, regardless of personal circumstances or capacity, had a right of access to, and participation in the education system. Therefore, it was important also to appreciate that the Government, through Ministry of Education had developed an equity strategy advocating, promoting fairness and inclusion conditions that equalize learning opportunities and access to education by everyone including the SEN. Ideally

government aimed to ensure financial or supply of resources for Special Education programs be observed appropriately hence the introduction of NIF. The NIF approach ensures consistency between policies aimed at improving equity among all learners including the LSEN. That also involved activities and initiatives undertaken to achieve the equity objective through the Ministry of General Education.

Some participants were of the view that government was finding it challenging to finance Special Education due to the prevailing bad economic situation in the country. Similarly, an economic view was attached by the World Bank (2016) as one of the factors influencing the current financing practices in education and Special Education inclusive. Though the World Bank confirmed an economic development raise for Zambia to a lower-middle-income status with a Gross National Income Per Capita of US Dollar 1,350 in 2012, the high prevalence of poverty was still being experienced. It appeared Special Education had not been given attention despite the reported raise in Zambia's economic development. The UNESCO (2016) study attributed the current financing practice in Special Education to Zambia's share of GDP devoted to education at 4.3% as being lower than the average for the Southern African Region of 4.9% and Sub-Saharan Africa at 4.5% in 2013.

There was great need now for the government to robust the GDP to a level that would sustain sufficient funding to Special Education. The Global Campaign for Education (2014) noted the IMF policies, and argued that the IMF policies were squeezing Zambia's education system by consistently and knowingly under-estimating the spending needs in education and other sectors alike to operate within the IMF agreements before Zambia qualified for debt cancellation early 2000s. The deliberate under-estimation practice is referred by Jensen (2004) as a syndrome and referred to it as 'Budgeting with eyes shut', the reasons as to why the government grants to education were not released regularly could be attached to the syndrome of budgeting with eyes shut such that the budget priority appeared to be starting and ending at personal emoluments other than the educational needs of the learners in general.

An exploration of some of the seemingly known factors that could have an influence on parents' participation in financing Special Education; and divergent views were expressed by the parents as well as teachers. The study results revealed a poor Parental financing practice in Special Education. However, it was established that the education levels of parents and the

relationship with the child did not influence the parents' willingness to support the child's education. Parents indicated willingness to have their children acquire education like other people in the society. The majority of the parents confirmed that their children were educable and they looked forward to a better quality of life as a result formal education. The poor parental financing of Special Education was a result of the inability to support due to lower income as was seen from the results that, parents who did not manage to raise the required amounts of money in supporting the education of the children were either not on salary or had other sources of income. In line with the finding, Beyani (2013) felt that participation of parents in financing Special Education was felt as a burden on the side of the parents. In this study, it was realised that parents supplied school uniforms, shoes, transport between home and school as well as food. Similarly, most countries acknowledge the importance of parents in matters relating to Special Education provision, and some gave them a central role in the processes of assessment and decision-making (Memmenasha & Ainscow, 2008).

The finding mentioned concerning the education of parents as one of the factors that influenced financing in Special Education was contrary to the findings of the study by Akinyi and Nyangia (2015) conducted in Kenya and it re-emphasised the parents' education status as a factor influencing the financing of education for the children. In a study by Akinyi and Nyangia, it was observed that most families with special children in public schools were mainly from poor economic background and they did not have the very basic education which would make them want their children to be better than themselves in terms of academic attainment. The UNESCO (2016) findings on family levels of illiteracy were connected to poverty and general low levels of human development in the family. It was observed that it became increasingly difficult for illiterate parents to support their children in school activities as the children would develop more competencies and more in-depth knowledge over the years. To the contrary, this study brought a different position of parents on the education of children with Special Education needs in Southern Province. This study established the desire of parents to have their children get more educated and become socio-economically independent.

The study revealed an understanding of positive discrimination when dealing with people with disabilities however supply of financial resources had remained poor. The majority of the

parents when asked as to which children between those with and those without disabilities they would allocate more funds if they were to be given an opportunity to allocate; they indicated that they would allocate more funds to those with disabilities. Also the teachers and administrators mentioned the same position. This position shows a step towards positive discrimination on people with disabilities. What it therefore meant was that, inadequate financing to Special Education could be attributed to other factors beyond what the participants would manage to control.

From the teachers and administrators' views on whether the education level of the parents was a factor influencing financing in Special Education, the majority seem to have this notion in the positive. The reason given was that levels of education had an influence on the economic strength of the parents to support the education of children. However, the parents disagreed to this assertion and instead they wanted their children to be better than them in education hence they did what they could manage to the best of their effort. The study established that the occupation of the parents to children with disabilities was one of the factors that influenced on the parents' participation in financing Special Education. An occupation determined the financial strength of the family, and for this study, most of the parents had other forms of sources of income, meaning they depended on asking from other relatives and family members who had an income or from well-wishers to enable the child go to school.

As to whether the church or religion of the parents of children with a disability did influence the parents' participation in financing Special Education; the study firstly established that all the parents were Christians and they disagreed with the assertion of the church or religion influencing their participation in financing of Special Education. Most parents showed believe in God who gave each person differently and a disability with the child was not any choice of their own but God allowed it. As such they first of all accepted the child's disablement as God's will and secondly, they accepted the child as being any other family member. Therefore the church or religion of the parents did not influence the parents' participation in financing Special Education in Southern Province.

Furthermore, the participants in the study stated that they were Christians as such they understood the concept of disability from that angle and that made the findings to be in contrast to what the study by Akinyi and Nyangia (2015) highlighted. Their study found out that

societal socio-cultural factors exhibited negative attitude towards people with special needs in education this was so because of cultural believes and values in the society. Generally, some cultures blame the causes of disability to ancestral sins and misdeeds. It is such beliefs that lead to attitudes reported to be unfavourable amongst members of society including teachers, pupils and policy implementers. A similar view was shown in the study by Mandyata (2015) who reported the negative parental and societal attitudes towards the education of persons with disabilities as being among other factors that could influence support to Special Education in Southern Province Christian communities, this view was subscribed to God and as such parents disagreed to that factor instead they indicated that it never influenced their participation in financing Special Education.

An inquiry about the number of children that parents had as to whether it was one of the factors that influenced financing in Special Education by the parents; the study established that it did not influence the parents' participation in financing Special Education. The parents themselves disagreed to this aspect. Instead a common view was that if given an opportunity to allocate funds to children with or without disability, they would allocate more resources to children with disabilities. Furthermore, parents disagreed to the idea of educating children so that in return, they will economically benefit them; instead they wanted the children to be economically independent. Meaning that, parents hold a positive attitude in allocation of resources for LSEs. The study noticed that a similar response was common among the teachers who also shared their views in support of the parents who mentioned that they would allocate more resources to learners with disabilities than they would to learners without disabilities. This attitude exhibited by parents and teachers was a sign of positive discrimination in the manner that persons with disabilities were viewed in society.

The results concerning the number of children that parents have as a factor that influenced financing in Special Education were also noted in the study by Nampanya-Serpell (2000) who observed that; the Zambian families were large and the required school payments were made over and over on behalf of several children. This alone drained on parental resources towards direct and indirect costs of education. However, in this study parents disputed the observation by Nampanya-Serpell (2000) study, the majority had small families but they still faced challenges in meeting the educational requirements of the children.

The parents disagreed to the view that they received encouragement from Government and Civil Society Organisations concerning them to participate in financing of Special Education, and in fact the study established that parents had not been talked to by officials representing government and nongovernment organisations on the education of their children. The majority of the parents indicated that, they just heard from their children that they had a sponsor at school and they did not know the sponsors including the form of support children got from the sponsors. From these findings, it appears there were no direct avenues that could harmonised the operations of government, nongovernment groups as well as parents in the field of Special Education. Learning from the study by Beyani (2013) who commented that one of the factors seen to have had influence on the current financing practice in Special Education was the legal lacuna and the directive principles of the Zambian Constitution that could not be used to hold anybody accountable for failure to sufficiently finance Special Education. Mayo (1994) observed that Special Needs Education (SNE) could not advance in isolation; it must be part of the overall educational strategy based on laws and legislation, the practice that seemed to be missing in the Zambian education system.

The above findings concerning those factors deemed to have an influence on financing Special Education by parents, other studies have shown contradicting results from what was established in this study while some findings were in agreement with other studies conducted. Notably in this study, it was confirmed that cash flow from the cooperating partners was not consistent but there was no confirmation of withdrawal from financing by cooperating partners. The funders in grant aided Special Schools were reported to be supporting Special Education still. Hence, the assertion in Kelly (1998) associating financing of education for special learners viewed as a bottomless pit may not be a favourable position in the current practice.

### **5.3 The Implication of the Current Financing Practices on the Provision of Quality Education**

Concerning the implication of the current financing practices in Special Education on the provision of quality education; the study ascertained an implication on the infrastructure for Special Education; an implication on the provision of teaching and learning resources; an implication on staffing for Special Education in schools; and an implication on the general quality of Special Education provision in schools.

### **5.3.1 The implication on infrastructure expansion for Special Education**

Concerning the implication of the current financing practice on the infrastructure for Special Education that this current financing practice was posing, the study revealed that there would be no or less infrastructure expansion for Special Education. It was observed that the existing infrastructure was still limited such that in some instances, two levels/grades shared the same room at the same time if more hours were to be spent in school. In some instances the school hours were reduced to three per day so that the same classrooms were used by another level/grade. It was revealed that the Zambian government as the custodian of education, had not put up infrastructure for Special Education and the classrooms that were being used had been constructed by well-wishers, the church and non-government organizations. The walkways, sanitary places such as toilets and bathrooms, the social playgrounds and doorways to toilets, bathrooms, classrooms and hostiles remained inappropriate.

The findings mentioned on the implication on the infrastructure were similar to what Barbara, et al (1998) found in Kenya where the physical infrastructure designed and constructed way before students with disabilities could be integrated into such institutions, remained unchanged to date. Classrooms were not increased and the available ones became overcrowded while toilets remained narrow and unstable for special learners. They lacked financial resources to redesign the physical facilities in the institutions. Barbara et al (1998) further described the impact to the extent that even ramps had not been built making it difficult for learners to use the facilities, a condition that impacted Special Education to the extent of having facilities that were not accommodative in Special Education. In Tanzania, a study conducted by Mmabaga (2002) cited in Musembi (2014) indicated the impact of current practices in financing of Special Education that schools were experiencing shortage of classrooms leading to overcrowding.

### **5.3.2 The implication on the provision of teaching and learning resources**

Concerning the implication of the current financing practices in Special Education on the provision of teaching and learning resources, the study revealed that the current financing practice in Special Education did not seem to bring about an improved provision of teaching and learning resources for Special Education. It was observed during the study that all the five schools lacked teaching and learning materials, mainly the available ones were not adequate

and some inappropriate to the nature of disability presented partly because these materials were donated by western partner schools. The financial contribution made by parents through PTA, largely it was spent on feeding, sporting outings school projects and rarely on teaching and learning materials except pieces of chalk and a few reams of paper. Efforts made by individual teachers to produce teaching and learning materials could not match the demand; hence the practice posed serious shortages of teaching and learning resources in Special Education.

The study conducted by World Bank (2014) showed that at primary school level five students shared one or less text books in mathematics, English and science. At secondary school students shared between 1 and 1.5 text books depending on the subject, however the rural schools faced more challenges than urban schools as well as the enrolment levels. This state of affairs had a negative implication on the effectiveness of services delivered at primary, secondary and tertiary levels in the education sector where learners with disabilities were also integrated. Notably, UNESCO (1992) urged that the availability of adequate text books and instructional materials was known to be one of the most positive and consistent determinants of teachers' willingness to teach; and pupils learning achievements. The study attached a great importance to the provision of adequate books, teaching and all necessary forms of teaching learning materials for Special Education. Now, given the current financing practice in Special Education that could not provide enough books and other instructional materials to complement the provision of quality education in Zambia, the LSEs were not equipped with skills necessary for social economic independence.

This finding was similar to the study by Chhabra (2010) which was done in Botswana on the implementation of Special Education whose study found out that teachers were concerned about the inadequate equipment and the non-availability of paraprofessionals to support meaningful Special Education. East Africa Standard (2003) cited by Ogolloh (2008) showed that the shortage had opened up for donor participation who several times donate teaching and learning materials that lacked the local aspect of education or have no real meaning to local societies due to the western approach in teaching children.

In Lusaka similarly, Malunga (2007) bemoaned that teachers did not have enough teaching aids for the Visually Impaired. Teaching aids such as manual alphabet, sign language dictionaries, text books with illustrations in sign language, speech mirrors, hearing aids; a situation

associated to the financing practice in Special Education. The current financing practice available in Southern Province is likely to compromise the quality of education due to the state of teaching and learning materials.

### **5.3.3 The implication on Staffing in Special Education**

Another Concern was about the implication of the current financing practices in Special Education on staffing for Special Education in schools. The study results suggested that the current financing practice in Special Education could not bring about improved staffing of Special Education personnel in schools. Staffing levels in Special Units in secondary schools were found to be still very low for the teaching staff and none for the assisting staff while in grant aided Special Schools, the school boards employed assisting staff whose salaries were from PTA financial pools. The assisting staffs were unskilled Special Education handlers but assisted only with garden upkeep, laundry and cookery within the schools as such no specialised services were provided the assisting staff.

Currently, it appeared that the government position was not so clear on employing of teachers and other personnel in Special Education since 2014 when government decided to freeze employment as justified by Minister of Finance then Alexander Chikwanda quoted by Lusaka-times newspaper. Earlier on, a similar observation was made by Beyani (2013) who stated that there had also been a shortage of teachers and teaching and learning materials; general school infrastructure was inadequate, the situation attributed to insufficient budgetary allocation to the Ministry of Education in the national budget despite the fact that the education sector had a larger share of the national budget almost every year.

Furthermore the implication on staffing was highlighted in the study by Global Campaign for Education (2014) focusing the IMF policies believed to be squeezing Zambia's education system. As the efforts by the government to meet the IMF guide of 8% GDP public sector expenditure, the Ministry of Education had to restrict any recruitment of new teachers such that, at the time of this study, most schools still lacked teachers and support staff in Special Education and the serving members of staff offering Special Education were being underpaid. The World Bank (2014) had a similar finding with that of Global Campaign for Education; it stated that teachers were under paid in Zambia and too few as compared to the numbers of

learners in classrooms. The IMF policy had an implication on the Zambia's education system causing a high teacher pupil ratio in ordinary classrooms and special classes as well.

The school board employed assistant personnel in Special Education and the salaries came from the school fees that parents contributed to the PTA financial pool. This practice was also noted by The World Bank (2014) in a study on global economic prospects where it was observed that in Zambia, the majority of the primary and secondary schools charged school fees despite the free education policy as a result of the prevailing inadequate financing of education. It was found that primary schools both government and grant-aided still charged school fees in spite of the government Free Primary Education policy and on average, primary schools charged an annual school fee of K31 (US\$3.1) to each student and K275 (US\$27.5) on average in secondary school. This study however realised that in Southern Province, the school fees were at K30 (US\$3) per term at one of the Special Schools, K100 (\$10) at another Special School, and the other Special School charged K950 (US\$95) for the day scholars and K1,200 (\$120) for boarders, whereas one secondary school charged K1000 (US\$100) for all the pupils as boarders.

Beyani (2013) observed that the user fees introduced in schools were a burden to parents/guardians and a hindrance to quality education. Parents were made to cover almost every aspect of Special Education from fees to books, shoes, uniforms, food and transport. The above results on school fees show that parents were engaged in financing Special Education similar to what Beyani had stated. This practice could bring about debate against the free education pronouncements by the government and it could be one of the reasons as to why some parents were not paying for the education of their children since they felt it was the responsibility of government and donors.

#### **5.3.4 The implication on the Quality of Special Education in Schools**

The study revealed that with the current financing practice in Special Education, it would not be possible to bring about improved quality of Special Education in schools. One ESO-Special confirmed that standards were hardly checked and noticed that there was just nothing to call 'standards'.

Hamusunga (2012) when analysing the performance of the Zambian education system noted that; although the Ministry of Education had adopted a number of policies to guide the provision of education equitably, the system currently did not assure quality of education to all categories of learners due to lack of adequate financial investment in education by stakeholders. The study also noted the need for strategies that could specifically address cross cutting issues among them; the Children with Special Educational Needs (CSEs). The ideas that were shared in the study by East Africa Standard (2003) in Kenya cited by Ogolloh (2008) which revealed similar results concerning the quality of services to LSEs that were adversely affected due to the acute shortage of specialised aids and equipment. The study conducted by Meki (2005) mentioned of a negative implication too, on the quality of education given to learners when the financing situation escalates to the extent of shortages in teaching learning resources, as such there is no quality of education to talk about as was mentioned by the DESO of P1 district.

The findings in this study were in conformity to Beyani (2013) on the impact of funding to Special Education. Beyani attributed the shortages of teachers, teaching learning materials and general inadequate school infrastructure to insufficient budgets for education. The experiences of insufficient budgeting for education had an implication on the effectiveness of meaningful Special Education delivery in all placement settings including Special Schools and Units in secondary schools.

#### **5.4 Chapter Summary**

This chapter has discussed the findings of the study based on the three questions of the study derived from the study objectives. The chapter discussed the current financing practices in Special Education beginning with the revealed various available funders for Special Education mentioned by the participants and these were; the government, Parents Teachers Association (PTA), parents of children with Special Education needs, direct cooperating partners with schools or with individual children such as British Council, Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR), Spar Choma, Catholic sisters, other well-wishers. It has also shown that funding from Donors through the NIF account benefited only one school in the period of two years. The study observed that some parents still did not contribute the user fees through PTA financial pool and they indicated that they were not aware of the contribution required of them. There was agreement from both sets of data collected, from the interviews (Qualitative data) and the

questionnaires (Quantitative data) showing that financing Special Education had not been harmonised among funders. The chapter further discussed the school strategic initiatives to finance Special Education through production unit activities, Tuck-shop, and crafts work by pupils. The chapter also discussed the factors that influenced the current financing practice in Special Education. The study appeared to strongly suggest that; the attitude of parents as funders and teachers as planners at school level did not influence the current financing practices. Furthermore, the chapter discussed the implication of the current financing practices on the provision of quality education, focusing on the implication on infrastructure, teaching learning resources, staffing as well as on the quality of Special Education provision and it seemed that; the current financing practice would not bring improvement in Special Education. in relation to the theoretical framework on which the study sought guidance, the study recognised the confirmation of financial investment in education by both the government and the society as advocated for by the Human Capital Theory founded by Theodore Schultz (1961). The next chapter presents the conclusion to the study together with the recommendations.

## CHAPTER SIX

### CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The previous chapter presented a discussion of the study findings and this chapter presents a summary of the findings from the study and also the recommendations emanating from the findings of the study anchored on the study objectives.

#### 6.1 Conclusion

This study was an exploration of current financing practices in Special Education in Zambia with a view of knowing the influencing factors in funding Special Education as well as the financing practice implications on the provision of quality education and it focused on the Southern Province of Zambia. It could be acknowledged that there had an adherence to the 1996 National Policy in education that opened up for other funders to participate in supporting Special Education on the basis of cost-sharing, as seen from the study that other than the government, there are funders that were currently participating in funding Special Education, namely; the PTA through user fees, the parents to LSENs, the Churches, Business, houses and other organisations together with individuals as cooperating partners, however, there were no modality to enhance collaboration towards meeting the educational needs of LSENs. The participation of the national government and its citizens in funding Special Education brings justification for investment in education advocated for by the Human Capital Theory founded by Theodore Schultz (1960).

Concerning funding Special Education from the National level, the study concludes, Special Education has no allocation in the budget; instead a percentage is calculated at school level for learners as 5 percent of Equity and special Issues translating into minimal amounts from the GRZ grants ranging from K387 (US\$38.7) to K691 (US\$69.1) for the year 2016 at school level calculated at the rate of 5% of the Special Issues that has a share of 12% of the received GRZ grant. Concerning the budget for LSENs; at the family level, generally it appears it was not part of the current practice, while at the school level, though the budgets were generated, it appears there was no adherence to the budget; firstly the budget was not a needs based and secondly it was dependent on the available funds at a time as well as how much the school administrators were will to spend for Special Education as compared to other activities, and thirdly, there was

usually an experience of budget deficit. The study also concluded that cash-flow into the school from all funders was poor and special learners' financial needs were not being met. The strategic initiatives to alleviate inadequate funding to school include school economic activities including; school production unit, school Tuck-shop and lobbying from well-wishers.

With regards to factors that influence the current financing practices in Special Education, the study concluded that; the parents' sources of income, the economic challenges being experienced in the country and the uncertainty as to who should fund Special Education had an influence in financing of Special Education. On the other hand, it was concluded that the attitude of parents and teachers at school level, the parents' level of education, and the occupation of parents were not among the factors that influenced the current financing practice in Special Education.

Based on the findings, it was concluded that the implication of the current financing practices on the provision of quality education did not allow have an expansion of the Special Education infrastructure, improvement of teaching and learning materials and general quality of Special Education.

## **6.2 Recommendations**

- i. Ministry of General Education (MoGE) Zambia needs adequate financial investment in the provision of Special Education to develop necessary social economic skills in the learners with Special Educational needs so that Zambia can attain her vision 2030 middle-income status.
- ii. The Ministry of General Education should create the Special Education Directorate at Ministry of General Education Headquarters so that Special Education can have a direct allocation in the education sector budget like early childhood, who should be charged directly with strategic planning for Special Education policy implementation at national and local levels, and mobilisation of adequate financial resources for effective management of Special Education delivery.
- iii. Government should develop strategies to engage Civil Society organisations in lobby and advocacy on the public private partnership with identified well established

business houses in the Southern Province so as to reinforce resources mobilization for Special Education facilities such as appropriate furniture, classroom space special equipment and assistant staff. Further, The civil society needs to take the lead in agitating for an increased national and local resource allocation in Special Education by seeking greater participation in program planning, evaluation and budgeting

- iv. In order to improve financing to Special Education, there is need for Zambian Parliament to pass a law that would compel the Ministry of Finance to release educational grants as stipulated in the policy.
- v. The government through MoGE should aid schools to put up the right infrastructure and instructional materials for Special Educational needs through the provision of funds allocated specifically for special needs education
- vi. The Ministry of Finance and Ministry of General Education need to implement the decentralisation policy that would allow the decentralised budgeting system that can accommodate the identified needs of individual learners with Special Education needs at classroom level.
- vii. Infrastructure for public secondary schools should be rehabilitated, expanded and reconstructed so that all infrastructures respond to the needs of Learners with Special Education Needs so as to enhance access to school programs for all learners.

### **6.3 Suggestions for Future Research**

- i. To replicate this study in all the provinces of Zambia so as to comprehensively understand the available financing practice in Special Education.
- ii. To develop a Special Education financing model that adequately harmonise financing Special Education in Zambia
- iii. To investigate the position of the business community's role concerning corporate social responsibility towards funding Special Education in Zambia.
- iv. To investigate the level of LSEs participation in the National economy after completion of their education

## REFERENCES

- Achola, P., & Bless, E. (1988). *Foundation of Social Research Methods: An African Perceptive*. Lusaka, Government Printers.
- African Disability Rights Yearbook (2015). Available on, PULP, [www.pulp.up.ac.za](http://www.pulp.up.ac.za)
- Akinyi, L. E., & Nyangia E., O. (2015). Challenges Facing Implementation of Inclusive Education in Public Secondary Schools in Rongo Sub- County, Migori County, Kenya; *Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) Volume 20, Issue 4*, [www.iosrjournals.org](http://www.iosrjournals.org)
- Barbara, J. S., Michael R. V., & William G. M. (1998). Implementing Instructional Adaptations for Students with Disabilities in Inclusive Classrooms. *Remedial and Special Education Journal vol. 19 (2), 106-119*
- Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2009). *Research in Education* (10th Ed.). New Delhi. PHI Learning Private Limited.
- Beyani, C. (2013). *Zambia effective delivery of public education services: A review by AfriMAP and the Open Society initiative for southern Africa*, available on [www.Osisa](http://www.Osisa)
- Bloomberg, L. D. & Volpe, M. (2008). *Completing Your Qualitative Dissertation: A Roadmap from Beginning to End*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Blount, B. K. (2005). *Can I Get a Witness?: Reading Revelation Through African American Culture*. Westminster John Knox Press.
- Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burns, R. B. (2000). *Introduction to Research Methods*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications
- Chhabra, S. (2010). 'Inclusive education in Botswana: The perceptions of school teachers' 20 *Journal of Disability Policy Studies* 219.
- Chikwanda 2015 lusaka times, October 18 2013. Chikwanda defends government's employment freeze till 2015.
- Chimhenga, S. (2014). *An Assessment of the Factors Affecting The Implementation Of Inclusive Education For Children With Learning Disabilities In Zimbabwean Primary Schools*, (Doctorate of Education Dissertation) University Of South Africa

- Chituma, M. M. (2005). The degree of community participation in managing school finances in selected schools in Mansa District; Unza. Masters Dissertation.
- Dae-Bong, K. (2009). Human capital and its measurement; the 3rd oecd world forum on “statistics, knowledge and policy” *Charting progress, building visions, improving life* Busan, korea - 27-30
- Dawson, C. (2002). *Practical research methods: A user-friendly guide to mastering research*. Oxford: Deer park production.
- Elmusharaf, K. (2012). *Quantitative Data Collection Techniques*. [www.gfmerch](http://www.gfmerch)
- European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (2003). *Key Principles for Special Needs Education: Recommendations for Policy Makers*, [www.european-agency.org](http://www.european-agency.org). Accessed on 17/05/2016.
- European Commission (2015). Support for children with Special Educational Needs
- Global Campaign for Education (2014). *IMF Policies Squeeze Zambia’s education system*. [www.oxfam.org](http://www.oxfam.org).
- Government of the Republic of Zambia, (2012) Persons with Disability Act; Lusaka Government Printers.
- Graham-Brown, R. M. (1996). Seven Million Plus Need Special Attention. Who Are They? *Music Educators Journal*, Vol. 58, No. 8, *Music in Special Education (Apr., 1972)*, pp. 22-25, Sage Publications, Inc
- Hamainza, W. L. (2015). *An Exploration Of Factors Affecting Provision Of Guidance And Counselling Services In Inclusive Secondary Schools In Southern And Lusaka Provinces, Zambia*: Masters dissertation, UNZA.
- Hamusunga, J. (2012). *An analysis of the performance of the Zambian education system*; Lusaka, ZANEC.
- Jensen, S. (2004). *Zambia and the PRSP – come hell or high water?* Independent Policy Analysis
- Joppe, M. (2000). *The Research Process*: Retrieved from <http://findarticle.com/article/mi/qa5253>. on February 25, 2017.

- Kalabula, D. M. (1989). *Special Education in Zambia: A historical review and education for the visually handicapped children*, M.Ed dissertation, University of Birmingham, Unpublished.
- Kalabula, D. M. (1991). *Integrating Visually Handicapped Children into Zambian Ordinary Secondary Schools*. Birmingham University, Ph.D, Thesis: Unpublished.
- Kalabula, D. M. (2007). *Special Education in Zambia*. Lusaka: Musumali Press
- Kaoma, S. K. (2007). *Inclusive education in Northern Province: What head teachers, Teachers, Parents and pupils say*; Unza. Masters Dissertation.
- Kasonde-Ng'ndu, S. (2014). *Writing A Research Proposal In Educational Research*; Lusaka, UNZA Press.
- Kayuka, J. (2014). *Management of Special Education units in the face of inadequate funding in primary schools of North-Western and Copperbelt Provinces*. Unza, Masters Dissertation.
- Kelly, M. J. (1991). *The financing of education in Zambia*; Paris, international institute for educational planning.
- Kelly, M. J. (1998). *Special Education: Policies, Strategies and Challenges*, "Special Education Seminar for Provincial Education Officers, Principals of Teachers' Colleges and Principal Inspectors of Schools". Lusaka, 22-28 February, unpublished Seminar Paper.
- Kolbe, T. McLaughlin, M., & Mason, L. M. (2007). *Special Education Funding in New Jersey: A Policy Analysis*; University of Maryland, College Park.
- Kombo, D. K. & Tromp, D. (2006) *Proposal and Thesis Writing: An Introduction*. Makuyu: Paulines Publications Africa
- Kombo, D. K., & tromp, D. L. A., (2014), *Proposal and thesis writing; an Introduction*: Nairobi, Kenya.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology; Methods and Techniques* (2rd edition); New Delhi, New Age International Publishers.

- Leedy, P. D. & Ormrod J. E. (2005). *Practical research: Planning and design* (8th ed.). New Jersey: 86 Pearson Education.
- Malunga, T. (2007). An investigation on the use of sign language and oral language by regular teachers teaching Hearing Impaired children; University of Oslo, Norway. Thesis.
- Mandyata, J. M. (2002). Teachers' views on inclusive practices: A case study of basic schools in Kasama District, Zambia; Unza. Masters Dissertation.
- Mandyata, J. M. (2015). *Community and School Partnerships in Inclusive Education: An Evaluative Study of Primary Schools in Kasama, Zambia*: University of Zambia, Lusaka.
- Mandyata, J. M. (2016), Current Phase of Special Education Provision in Zambia: *Paper Presentation at Master of Education (Special Education) Seminar, School of Education UNZA, February 8<sup>th</sup>* (unpublished).
- Martin, E. W., Martin, R., & Terman, D, L. (1996). *The legislative and litigation history of Special Education: the future of Special Education for students with disabilities* Vol. 6. No:1. available, [www.Semanticscholar.org](http://www.Semanticscholar.org).
- Mbewe, E. G. (2015). *An investigation of teachers', pupils' and parents' perceptions towards the use of Chinyanja as a medium of instruction at lower primary schools: a case of selected primary schools in Lusaka district, Zambia*; Masters dissertation. Unza Lusaka.
- Meki, K. (2005). Financing of Free Basic Education in Lusaka Schools, M A Dissertation, Unpublished. Lusaka.
- Memmenasha, H & Ainscow, M. (2008). *The Education of Children with Special Needs: Barriers and Opportunities in Central and Eastern Europe*; Italy, ICDC
- MESVTEE (2014). Educational Statistical Bulletin. Lusaka: MESVTEE
- MESVTEE (2015). *Education for All 2015 National Review Report: Zambia*. Accessed from [www.unesco.org](http://www.unesco.org)
- Mfundo, U. (2007). *Southern African Development Community Review of the Status and Capacities for the implementation of the Protocol on Education and Training*.
- MoE (1977). Education Reforms: Proposals and Recommendations; Lusaka, government printers.

- MoE (1996). *Educating our future: national educational policy*; Lusaka, Institutional Suppliers limited.
- MoE (2002). *Ministry of Education Circular Number 3*. Lusaka: Ministry of Education
- MoE (2011). *The Education Act, No. 23 of 2011 419*. Lusaka: Government Printers.
- MoE, (1992). *Focus on learning: Strategies for the development of school education*. Lusaka: Zambia Education Publishing House.
- MoF (2015). *Citizens Budget*; available from [www.cabri-sbo.org](http://www.cabri-sbo.org)
- MoF (2015). *The Proposed 2016-2018 Medium Term Expenditure Framework and the 2016 budget Green Paper*, accessible: [www.mof.gov.zm](http://www.mof.gov.zm)
- Msabila, D. T. & Nalaila, G. S. (2013). *Research Proposal and Dissertation Writing: Principle practice*. Dar-es Salaam: Nyambiri Nyangwire Publishers.
- Msoroka, M. (2010). *Financing Education in Tanzania: Policy Transformations, Achievements and Challenges*, Munich, GRIN Verlag, <http://www.grin.com/en/e-book>
- Muchindu, D. (2010). *The impact of social and economic factors on access to free education in the basic schools of Zambia; the case of Monze district*. Unza.Masters dissertation, L
- Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (2003). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi: Acts Press.
- Munsanje, J. S., Kalabula, D. & Nzala, A. M. (2006). *Inclusive education for children with visual impairment in Zambia: a situational analysis*. AFR 023
- Munsanje, J. S., Kalabula, D. & Nzala, A. M. (2006). *Inclusive education for children with visual impairment in Zambia: a situational analysis*. AFR 023
- Musembi, K. D. (2014). *School Factors Affecting Head Teachers' Provision of Special Needs Education in Public Primary Schools; Kenya'* M.Ed dissertation
- Nampanya-Serpell, N. (2000). Social and Economic Risk Factors for HIV/AIDS-Affected Families in Zambia. In *AIDS and Economics Symposium, Durban* (pp. 7-8).
- Natalie Parish & Ben Bryant – Isos Partnership (2015). *Research on funding for young people with Special Educational needs*; department for education, [www.gov.uk/government/publications](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications)

- National Council for Special Education (2014). *Children with Special Educational needs; information booklet for parents*. [www.ncse.ie](http://www.ncse.ie)
- Ndhlovu, D. (2008). Challenges faced by pupils with disabilities in accessing Education in Inclusive Schools in Zambia: Lusaka, University of Zambia.
- Nusche, D., et al. (2015), *OECD Reviews of School Resources: Flemish Community of Belgium*; OECD Publishing, Paris. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264247598-en>
- Ogolloh, M. M. (2008). *Attitudes of Regular Primary School Educators towards Inclusive Education in Kisumu District, Kenya*. Med. Thesis. Nairobi: Kenyatta University
- Ontario - MoE (2015) *Education Funding: A Guide to the Grants for Students Needs*; Ontario, Queen's printer for Ontario.
- Orodho, J. A. (2003). *Essentials of Educational and Social Sciences Research Methods*: Nairobi, Masola publishers
- Orodho, J. A. (2014). *Techniques of writing research proposals and reports in Education and social sciences*, Kanezja Ap Enterprises
- Parrish, T. B. (1996). Special Education Finance: Past, Present and Future: *Journal of Education Finance, Vol. 21, No. 4*.
- Parrish, T. B., & Chambers, J. G. (1996). *The Future of Children, Vol. 6, No. 1, Special Education for Students with Disabilities*, Princeton University. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1602497> Accessed: 27-01-2016.
- PcW Budget Bulletin (2015). *Zambia at 50 cracking the figures*. Retrieved from [www.pwc.com/zm](http://www.pwc.com/zm)
- PcW Budget Bulletin (2016). *Zambia at 50 cracking the figures*. Retrieved from [www.pwc.com/zm](http://www.pwc.com/zm)
- PcW Budget Bulletin (2017). *Building resilience and unlocking potential; Zambia's 2017 National Budget*. Retrieved from [www.pwc.com/zm](http://www.pwc.com/zm)
- Peters, S. J. (2003). *Inclusive education: achieving education for all by including those with disabilities and Special Education needs*; World Bank, The Disability Group.

- Republic of Kenya – MoE (2009). The National Special Needs Education Policy Framework: available on [www.unesco.org/education](http://www.unesco.org/education), accessed 9/3/2017.
- Rosen, H. S. (1999). *Public Finance*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Russ-Eft, D., & Preskill, H. (2001). *Evaluation in Organizations*. New York: Basic Books
- Schultz, T. W. (1961). *Investment in Human Capital*. *American Economic Reviewed*, 51, 1-17.
- Schultz, T. W. (1960). *Investment in Human Capital: the Role of Education and of Research*. New York: The Free Press.
- Sidorkin, M. A. (2007). *Human Capital and the Labor of Learning: A Case of Mistaken Identity*. *Educational Theory*, 57(2). 159-170.
- Snelson, P. D. (1970). Educational development in Northern Rhodesia 1883 - 1945
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2006). *Validity issues in mixed methods research: Calling for an integrative framework*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the AERA, San Francisco.
- UNESCO (1994). Final Report: World conference on special needs education; Salamanca.
- UNESCO (1996). *Legislation pertaining to special needs education*
- UNESCO (2015). *Education Policy Review; Zambia*. Retrieved from [www.unesco.org](http://www.unesco.org)
- UNESCO (2016). *Zambia Education Policy Review: Paving the Way for SDG4-Education 2030*; [www.unesco.org](http://www.unesco.org)
- Unicef (2016). *Zambia Education budget brief; Review of Budget Performance and 2016 Allocations*. Retrieved from [www.unicef.org](http://www.unicef.org)
- White C.J (2003) *Research Methods and Techniques*. Pretoria: Mustung. Road 44.
- World Bank (2004). *Public And Private Funding of Basic Education in Zambia*; Africa Region Human Development Working Paper Series. [www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org)
- World Bank (2014). Review of Zambia country assistance strategy.
- World Bank (2016). *Education Public Expenditure Review in Zambia*; Internet [www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org)

APPENDICES

Appendix III:

Respondents' Consent Form

The University of Zambia  
School of Education Dept of EPSSE

Dear Sir/Madam,

REF: REQUEST FOR CONSENT AS A RESEARCH RESPONDENT

I am MAINZA F. CHINDOLO, a student at The University of Zambia studying for Master of Education in Special Education. I am requesting you to take part in my research as a respondent. The research is about:

**“Financing of Special Education in Zambia: An exploration of the current practice in Southern Province”.**

Your participation is going to help me come up with information regarding the matter mentioned above. Be assured that the information you will share with me remains confidential and only for academic purposes.

Your consent to this request will go a long way.

Yours Faithfully,

..... (Sign)

Mainza F. Chindolo – Researcher/Student

**Consent by respondent**

Having read or heard the information concerning this research, I hereby consent by virtue of office/position/parent to be one of the respondents. In this regard, I reserve the right not to answer particular questions if necessary.

Name: ..... Sign: .....Date: .....



**SECTION B:**

6) Is there a Parents Teachers Association (PTA) in your School?

Yes [ ]                      No [ ]

7) If the answer to 6 is 'Yes' do parents contribute money to your school and please state the amount. How much? K.....

8) Does your school receive funding from any of the following?

- GRZ                                      Yes [ ]      No [ ]
- Churches                                Yes [ ]      No [ ]
- Clubs                                     Yes [ ]      No [ ]
- Business houses                      Yes [ ]      No [ ]

9) Name any other source of funding or resource support to learners with Special Educational needs (LSEN) at your school .....

10) Does your school receive enough finances to meet its budget?

Yes [ ]                      No [ ]

11) How would you rate the availability of teaching and learning materials at your school?

Very poor [ ]      Poor [ ]      Good [ ]      Very good [ ]      Excellent [ ]

12) Do you participate in budgeting for Special Education in your school?

Yes [ ]                      No [ ]

If 'Yes' please explain how and if 'No' please explain why you do not participate.....

13) Who are the participants in budgeting for the special learners in your school? .....

14) Does the school budget indicate the individual financial needs of each learner?

Yes [ ]                      No [ ]

15) Funders support Special Education in this school by:

- a. Financing individual learners only                      [ ]
- b. Financing the school only                                      [ ]
- c. Some funders finance both individuals and school                      [ ]
- d. All funders finance both individuals and school                      [ ]

16) When preparing the school budget, does the school take into account the following factors to arrive at the budget? (Mark according to your level of disagreement/agreement against each item)

<b>The budget is determined by:</b>		<b>I am Not Sure</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
a.	The type of disability each learner had					
b.	The severity of the disability for each learner					
c.	Availability of resources from GRZ					
d.	Financial strength of the funders other than GRZ					
e.	How much the funders have decided to give the school					
f.	The foreseeable economic benefit in educating LSEN					
g.	The academic progress of learners with disability					

17) What other factors do you think have an influence when your school is budgeting for the LSEN? Please specify .....

18) Do you know whether there was a budget deficit or surplus in the last few years in your school (please mark)

Not sure [ ]      Budget deficit [ ]      Budget surplus [ ]

Please explain how you know your response .....

19) If your answer to question 17 is 'Budget deficit' state the steps that your school take? .....

20) How does your school identify the funders other than GRZ and parents? (mark all the appropriate)

- ✓ They advertise themselves [ ]
- ✓ They are identified by learners themselves [ ]
- ✓ The school identifies the funders on learners' behalf [ ]

Any other ways, please indicate.....

21) Is there a system in which funders in Special Education are being coordinated?

Yes [ ]      No [ ]

If yes, please explain how it is done .....

22) How consistent is the GRZ cash flow into your school?

Not sure [ ] Very Poor [ ] Poor [ ] Good [ ] Very good [ ]

23) How consistent is the cash flow into your school from funders other than GRZ

Not sure [ ] Very Poor [ ] Poor [ ] Good [ ] Very good [ ]

24) Which funders have been consistent in financing your school (please indicate by name, example; GRZ, PTA, club name, church name, business house name, etc) .....

25) Is there a requirement for the school to provide periodic financial reports to the funders?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

26) What is the level of satisfaction by funders in the manner that your school handles finances?

Not sure [ ] Very Unsatisfied [ ] Unsatisfied [ ] Satisfied [ ] Very Satisfied

27) What is your level of satisfaction in the manner that your school handles finances?

Not sure [ ] Very Unsatisfied [ ] Unsatisfied [ ] Satisfied [ ] Very Satisfied [ ]

28) Are there any funders in the recent past that have withdrawn funding for any reason?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

If 'Yes' please describe the reason(s).....

29) What strategies are currently put in place by your school to ensure availability of finances/resources for LSEN? .....

### SECTION C:

30) If you were given an opportunity to allocate financial resources to learners, where would you allocate more?

- To learners without disabilities [ ]
- To learners with disabilities [ ]
- Equal amounts [ ]

Please justify your choice .....

31) Do you see any positive discrimination trends in allocation of resources to Special Education at your school?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

Pease explain your response: .....

32) Some people say ‘its waste of money/resources to invest in the education of children with disabilities’. How much do you agree with this statement?

Not sure [ ] strongly disagree [ ] Disagree [ ] Agree [ ] Strongly Agree [ ]

Please explain your position .....

33) How would you describe GRZs current financing of Special Education

Not sure [ ] Very bad [ ] bad [ ] good [ ] very good [ ]

34) How would you describe the participation of Non Government funders in financing Special Education? Eg. parents, Church Organisation, Clubs, Business houses, etc

Very bad [ ] bad [ ] good [ ] very good [ ] Not sure [ ]

35) Do you agree that parent’s willingness to finance a special child’s education is influenced by: (please mark according to your level of agree/disagree)

<b>Influenced by:</b>		<b>I am Not Sure</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
a.	The parents’ level of education					
b.	The parents occupation (business, working, etc)					
c.	The parents Church/religion: Christian, Muslim, etc					
d.	The number of children parents have					
e.	The economic benefit of educating child with disability					
f.	The attitude of society towards the kind of disability					
g.	Encouragements received from Government					
h.	Encouragement received from Civil Society Organisations					

36) Mention any other factors (left out in 32 above) that you think do influence parents’ participation in financing Special Education .....

37) Do you think funders are satisfied with the levels of accountability, transparency, financial decision making for Special Education by your school?

I am not sure [ ] Not satisfied [ ] Somewhat Satisfied [ ] Satisfied [ ]  
very satisfied [ ]

Please justify your response .....

38) Are there any other factors that influence funding of Special Education that you may wish to share

.....

**SECTION D**

39) With the current practice in financing of Special Education in Zambia, do you agree that there is; (Please show by marking below)

<b>Impact on:</b>		<b>I am not sure</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
a	Increase in Infrastructure expansion in the schools					
b.	Better provision of Teaching and learning resources					
c.	Improved number of special Teachers in school					
e.	Improved quality of Special Education in schools					
f.	No Shortage of teaching and learning space in schools					

40) Could you explain any other impact of current practice in financing of Special Education you might have seen .....

**The End:      thank you so much for your participation**

Appendix C: Sem-Structured Questionnaire for Parents

NO:

The University of Zambia
School of education: Dept of EPSSE

Date: .....

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am MAINZA F. CHINDOLO, a Med (Sp.Edu) student at the University of Zambia carrying out a research on "Financing of Special Education in Zambia: An exploration of current practice in Southern Province".

You have been selected to participate in the study so that you can give objective information, as such be assured of confidentiality as well as academic target of the study. Please do not show your names.

SECTION A:

- 1) Your Gender (please mark): Male [ ] Female [ ]
2) Your marital status: Married [ ] windowed [ ] single [ ] other status [ ]
3) Your highest level of education: Primary [ ] Junior sec sch, [ ] Secondary sch, [ ] tertiary level [ ]
4) What is the relationship with the child: Biological child [ ] Niece/Nephew [ ] Grandchild [ ] Other relation [ ] Not related [ ]
5) Number of people leaving in your house? .....
6) Grade levels of other siblings and how many per level?
Early childhood Centre [ ] how many? .....
Primary School [ ] how many? .....
Secondary School [ ] how many? .....
Tertiary Level [ ] how many? .....
7) What is your major source of Income?
Salary [ ] Business [ ] Others [ ] please specify .....
8) What is your church or religion?
Not applicable [ ] Christian [ ] Muslim [ ] Others (specify).....
9) How do you feel about the disability with your child? (Please explain) .....

10) Does your feeling influence you the way you are supporting the education of this child?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

Please explain your response .....

11) Do you think your child can be educated to the level that you are satisfied with?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

Please explain why you say so .....

**SECTION B:**

12) Is there a Parents Teachers Association (PTA) at your child's school?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

13) If the answer to question one is 'Yes' do parents contribute PTA money to the school and please state the amount. How much? K.....

14) Does your child receive funding from any of the following? (please tick)

- GRZ Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Churches/Religious group Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Clubs Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Business houses Yes [ ] No [ ]

15) Name any other source of funding or resource support to your child's education .....

16) Other than GRZ, How did you identify the funders towards your child's education? (mark all the appropriate)

- ✓ They advertise themselves [ ]
- ✓ They are identified by learners themselves [ ]
- ✓ The school identifies the funders on learners' behalf [ ]

Any other ways, please indicate.....

17) Does your child receive enough finances to meet his/her school budget?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

18) How much does your child require per term/year for his education? K .....

19) How much do you managed to rise out of the total budget per term/year? K .....

20) How would you rate the availability of teaching and learning materials at your child's school? Very poor [ ] Poor [ ] Good [ ] Very good [ ] Excellent [ ]

21) What are the major items that you are required to financially support for your child's education?  
.....

22) Why do you have to spend money to educate a child with Special Education needs?.....

23) Whose responsibility do you think it is to finance the education of children with Special Education needs?.....

Explain why you have given the above response.....

24) When preparing the budget towards education of your child, do you consider the following aspects to help arrive at the budget? (Mark according to your level of disagreement/agreement)

<b>Considerations when budgeting for CSENs include:</b>		<b>I am Not Sure</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
a.	The type of disability your child had					
b.	The severity of the disability your child had					
c.	Availability of resources for the family					
d.	Financial strength of those that are helping with funds					
e.	How much the funders have decided to give the child					
f.	The foreseeable economic benefit in educating this child					
g.	The academic progress of this child with disability					

25) What else do you consider when budgeting for CSENs? Please specify;.....

26) Did you manage to provide the resources needed to your child's education in the last few years?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

If the answer is 'No' please explain what you did to solve the problem.....

27) How good do you think is your financing towards your child's education?

Not sure [ ] Very Poor [ ] Poor [ ] Good [ ] Very good [ ]

28) How good is the GRZ financing towards your child's education?

Not sure [ ] Very Poor [ ] Poor [ ] Good [ ] Very good [ ]

29) How good is the financial support by Non-government funders towards your child's education?

Not sure [ ] Very Poor [ ] Poor [ ] Good [ ] Very good [ ]

30) Which funders do you think are consistent in financing education of learners with disability?

(Please indicate by name, example; GRZ, PTA, the club, the church, the business house, etc)

.....

31) Is there a system in which funders in Special Education are being coordinated?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

If yes, please explain how it is done .....

32) Is there a requirement that the school provides you with periodic financial reports?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

If 'Yes' please state how often? .....

33) What is your level of satisfaction in the manner that your school handles finances?

Not sure [ ] Very Unsatisfied [ ] Unsatisfied [ ] Satisfied [ ] Very Satisfied

34) According to your answer in 33 above, are you encouraged to financing your child's education in that school?

Not sure [ ] Very discouraged [ ] Discouraged [ ] Encouraged [ ] Very encouraged [ ]

35) Is there a funder that was funding your child's education and is no longer funding now?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

If 'Yes' please describe the reason(s).....

36) What strategies have you put in place as a parent to ensure availability of finances/resources for child with disability? .....

### SECTION C:

37) Which of your children do you allocate more finances for their education?

- Children without disabilities [ ]
- Children with disabilities [ ]
- Equal amounts [ ]

Please justify your choice.....

38) Some people say 'its waste of money/resources to invest in the education of children with disabilities'. How much do you agree with this statement?

Not sure [ ] strongly disagree [ ] Disagree [ ] Agree [ ] Strongly Agree [ ]

Please explain your position.....

39) Do you agree that the following have influence on you as a parent towards financing of special needs education

<b>Financing by parents is influenced by:</b>		<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>I am Not Sure</b>
a.	The parents' level of education					
b.	The parents occupation (business, working, etc)					
c.	The parents Church/religion: Christianity, Muslim, etc					
d.	Number of children parents have					
e.	Economic benefit of educating child with disability					
f.	The attitude of society towards the kind of disability					
g.	Encouragements received from Government					
h.	Encouragement received from Civil Society Organisation					

40) Mention any other factors (left out in 38 above) that influence parents' participation in financing Special Education.....

41) Are you satisfied with the levels of accountability, transparency, financial decision making for Special Education by your child's school?

I am not sure [ ] Not satisfied [ ] Somehow Satisfied [ ] Satisfied [ ] Very Satisfied [ ]

Justify your response.....

42) Does the way you view your child's disability influence your financing of his/her education?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

Please explain your response.....

**SECTION D**

43) With the current practice in financing of Special Education in Zambia, do you agree that there is;  
 (Please show by marking below)

<b>Implications of the current financing practices in Special Education</b>		<b>I am not sure</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
a.	Increase in Infrastructure expansion in the schools					
b.	Better provision of Teaching and learning resources					
c.	Improved number of special Teachers in schools					
d.	Improved quality of Special Education in schools					
e.	No Shortage of teaching and learning space in schools					
f.	Improved quantity and quality of specialised materials					

44) Could you explain any other impact of current practice in financing Special Education you might have seen

.....

.....

.....

**The end**  
**Thank you for being helpful**

## **Appendix D: Interview Guide for Administrators**

Respondent's background: Please say something about yourself:

### **A. Institutional background**

Please say something about your district: the state of infrastructure, furniture, teaching and learning resources and any other in your Special Schools/Units.

### **B. The current practice in financing of Special Education**

Please describe the current practice in financing of Special Education in your district (how Special Education in being funded):

Probe on the following themes: *funding model in place, district/school relation in budget preparation, your role in budgeting, determinants of your budget, source of resources, categories and names of funders (person/association/club/institution), level of financing (budget deficit or surplus proof), funders' engagement strategies, consistency of cash flow from GRZ/funders, funders' knowledge of your expenditure, funders' access to budget, funders' withdrawing from funding, which level of funds distribution had a bigger share of GRZ funds ie HQ, PEO, District or at school level*

### **C. Factors that influence the current practice in financing Special Education**

What do you think is currently influencing the practice in financing of Special Education?

Probe for the following: *GRZ funding, church, clubs, business houses, etc. Funders' satisfaction levels*

### **D. The implications of the current practice in financing of Special Education on the provision of quality education**

What could be the implication of the current practice in financing of Special Education to your institutions?

Probe on the following: *expansion of infrastructure for Special Education, teaching and learning materials for special learners, human resource development, learners dropping out of Special Schools, current employed strategies adopted to mitigate the impact on Special Education.*

**Appendix E: Observation Checklist**

**SCHOOL CATEGORY:**

SPECIAL SCHOOL [ ]

SPECIAL UNIT IN SECONDARY SCHOOL [ ]

- Key:**
1. completely unavailable/not there at all
  2. Available but; in bad state/not adequate/not appropriate/poor
  3. Available and in good state/adequate/appropriate/very good

Sn.	Description of concern	1	2	3	Brief comments
1	Finances available to modify architectural and design barriers in the school social environment eg, play grounds				
2	Environmental accessibility status of Ramps and walk ways				
3	The status and availability of specially designed desks and chairs				
4	Availability of classroom space				
5	Appropriateness of Toilets with the nature of identified disabilities				
6	Availability and status of assistive technology				
7	Availability and adequacy of personal assistants				
8	Availability and status of text books				
9	Availability of specialized services				
10	Availability of specialized equipment				
11	The ratio of teacher to pupil per class				

Appendix F: GRZ funding to education sector 2016

Budget Usage		Date: 20.08.2017	Page: 1 / 1
Fiscal Year	Financial Management Area GRZ FM Area 2016	FM Commitment Budget Version	0
Fund/Group	Funded Program/Group	Functional Area/Group	Year of Cash Effectivity
Funds Center/Commitment Item	Consumable Budget	Consumed Budget	Available Amount
800101 HQ	7,706,487,339	7,699,824,234	6,663,105
220000 Recurrent Charges (RDCs)	4,440-	4,440-	4,440
800199 HUMAN RESOURCE AND A	6,732,387,483	6,729,406,426	2,981,056
210000 Personal Emoluments (PEs)	6,705,731,181	6,703,778,333	1,952,848
220000 Recurrent Charges (RDCs)	26,656,302	25,628,094	1,028,208
260000 Grants & Other Payments	750,147,222	748,762,234	1,384,987
800299 PLANNING AND INFORMA	24,626,462	24,466,337	160,125
220000 Recurrent Charges (RDCs)	317,257,879	316,033,599	1,224,281
229100 CAPEX-AUC	408,262,880	408,262,298	582
260000 Grants & Other Payments	0	0	0
310000 CAPEX-Movable Assets	7,503,637	7,039,937	463,700
800399 DISTANCE EDUCATION DIRECTORATE	886,451	866,489	19,962
220000 Recurrent Charges (RDCs)	6,617,186	6,173,448	443,738
260000 Grants & Other Payments	153,174,305	151,583,366	1,590,939
800499 STANDARDS & CURRICUL	153,174,305	151,583,366	1,590,939
220000 Recurrent Charges (RDCs)	13,765,042	13,702,168	62,874
800599 TEACHER ED. & SPS -C	13,765,042	13,702,168	62,874
220000 Recurrent Charges (RDCs)	4,725,966	4,680,626	45,340
800699 EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUC	600,639	555,543	45,096
220000 Recurrent Charges (RDCs)	4,125,327	4,125,083	244
260000 Grants & Other Payments	10,481,296	10,481,296	0
800799 PRIMARY SCHOOLS-COPP	482,323	482,323	0
220000 Recurrent Charges (RDCs)	9,998,973	9,998,973	0
260000 Grants & Other Payments			
			8,162,357,721
			6,757,686,715
			6,705,731,181
			50,950,534
			1,005,000
			1,086,348,138
			29,647,699
			317,257,879
			444,374,502
			295,068,058
			8,830,866
			1,899,393
			6,931,473
			177,140,474
			177,140,474
			21,087,057
			21,087,057
			9,409,081
			5,242,020
			4,167,061
			12,892,909
			2,893,936
			9,998,973

Source: Ministry of Finance (Integrated Financial Management System).

Guide 2016:

Current Budget /Budget K8,162,357,721

Consumable Budget/ Releases K7,706,487,339