FROM MAINSTREAMING TO INCLUSION: HAVE SHIFTS IN PARADIGMS IMPROVED THE PRACTICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION IN BOTSWANA?

Boitumelo Mangope
University of Botswana
mangopeb@mopipi.ub.bw

Ahmed Bawa Kuyini
University of New England, Australia
kuyinia@une.edu.au

Charles Musaruwa
University of Botswana
cmusarurwa@gmail.com

Thenjiwe Emily Major
University of Botswana
majorte@mopipi.ub.bw

Koyabe Bramwell
University of Botswana
bkoyabe@yahoo.com

Boitumelo Ramoroka Tiny
University of Botswana
ramorokab@ub.ac.bw

Abstract

Educational placement for children with disabilities remains a controversial issue facing the world today characterized by paradigm shifts in the conceptualization and practice of education for learners with disabilities, ranging from 'Mainstreaming' and 'Integration' to 'Inclusion'. One would have thought that through conceptualization shifts, learners with disabilities would have benefitted significantly. However, there seems to be no agreement as to which paradigm offers the best education for learners with disabilities. Botswana, as part of the global community is also caught up in this paradigm shift debate. Therefore, this position paper presents an overview of the evolution of special education policy and its associated practices in Botswana. It focuses on learners with intellectual disabilities as part of the Inclusive Education constituency in Botswana. It explores the challenges posed by continual paradigm shifts and practices as evidenced in the existing literature and from the findings of an exploratory study in Botswana. The paper makes several recommendations on the practice of Inclusive Education, including the need for clear legislation, a thoughtful and well researched transition involving entire school communities.

Key words: Special Education, Inclusive Education, Mainstreaming, Intellectual disabilities, Botswana

Introduction

Inclusive Education, Mainstreaming and Integration are all concepts associated with the educational placement for learners with disabilities. The very existence of these concepts is proof that educationists do not agree on them as ideal for placement of leaners with disabilities hence one can conclude that placement of learners with disabilities has remained a controversial issue. Research has shown that some stakeholders (scholars, educators, and parents) favor the use of special schools, while others prefer regular school environments as best placement options for educating learners with disabilities. As a result, several terms or concepts have often been used to define the best educational environment for learners with disabilities, and these include mainstreaming, integration and more recently, inclusion or Inclusive Education. Botswana, as part of the global community has also been caught up in this debate. Questions that need to be asked are: Is this kind of change worth it and is this kind of change necessary? Are these shifts in conceptualization beneficial to Botswana's educational system? Have these shifts improved practice and outcomes?

To address these questions, a wide range of literature on special/inclusive education in Botswana, the policies from an evolutionary perspective, and empirical studies around school practices in relation to learners with intellectual disabilities were reviewed. The criteria for selecting literature were specific enough to ensure that only policy documents and statements, and research papers that centered on special education and inclusive education for learners with disabilities in Botswana qualified for inclusion. International literature on mainstreaming, integration and inclusive education either by content or objectives was also consulted/ reviewed.

Mainstreaming, Integration and Inclusion: unpacking the concepts

In the evolution of education for learners with disabilities around the world, special schools were established for the education of such learners (Mukhopadhyay, 2014). As part of this process, significant efforts were made to develop a common system of special schools to support each disability group and special schools became widely accepted by most stakeholders - parents, educators, learners and the society (Dart, 2006). However, over time, the special schools began to be perceived by many as a form of segregation of learners with disabilities (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2010; United Nations, 2011). Thus, in many countries, including Botswana, educational policies have shifted towards educating children with disabilities in regular school settings (Mangope, Otukile-Mongwaketse, Dinama, & Kuyini, 2018; Mudekunye & Ndamba, (2011); Mukhopadhyay, S. (2014). This is in line with the concept of 'Least Restrictive Environment' (LRE) which asserts that it is a learner's right to be educated in a setting that is as close to 'normal' as possible (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2010). The LRE principle and its variations is associated with the terms like "mainstreaming", "integration" and "inclusion", which now guide the education of children with disabilities in Botswana's regular schools (Adedoyin, 2017; Otukile-Mongwaketse, Mangope & Kuyini, 2016).

Some researchers are of the view that mainstreaming, integration and inclusion, generally mean the same thing; that learners with disabilities should be educated in regular schools with their peers without disabilities (Chhabra, Strivastava & Strivastava, 2010; Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2000; Thomazet, 2009). Others argue that the terms differ primarily because of the degree to which learners with disabilities are expected to participate in the regular school environment and how the services will be

provided for such individuals in the regular school environment (Ainscow, Booth & Dyson, 2006; Landsberg, Kruger & Nel, 2005).

According to Friend & Bursuck (2002), mainstreaming involves the physical placement of learners with disabilities in regular education settings only when they can cope with the traditional curriculum with some assistance. Proponents of mainstreaming assume that a learner must 'earn' his/her place in the so called regular classes by demonstrating an ability to keep up with the instruction offered in regular classrooms (Landsberg, Kruger & Nel, 2005; Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2010; Sharma & Deppler, 2005; Stainback & Stainback, 1996). However, as educators, we totally agree with Friend & Bursuck, (2002)'s view that some learners with disabilities should be brought to regular schools more for socialization purposes so that they learn social skills from their peers without disabilities. Peer education plays a crucial and effective role in socialization and mainstreaming facilitates this process.

Integration is a process whereby learners with disabilities are confined to a special class/unit but within the regular school (Sharma & Deppeler 2005). Learners only join their 'normal" peers outside the classroom during recess, sporting activities and clubs (Chhabra, et al., 2010) and this according to Hopkin, (2004) is social integration. Learners are brought into the regular school just for socialization purposes to develop social skills. In the 1960s and 1970s, the United State of America and other developed countries, provided such special classes for learners with mild disabilities within regular schools (Konza, 2008). Thormazet (2009) adds that in this type of practice, the admission of a learner with disabilities into a regular school implies learners coming to the same school, but with minimal degree of mingling with other learners without disabilities. They do not participate enough in the activities of the school with their peers without disabilities or the rest of the regular school community. This is only physical integration, which implies that learners with disabilities are under the responsibility of the special education teacher, pursue a different curriculum and may or may not mingle with their peers without disabilities during recess, sporting or clubs (Wah, 2010). Foreman (2001) and Sharma, and Deppeler (2005) maintain that the emphasis is always on the learner to "fit" the system rather than the system to make changes to fit the needs of the learner. This implies that governments do not come up with systems that solve problems associated with learners with disabilities but come up with what they think are solutions. Any leaner with a disability then should fit into what is being offered.

Inclusive education on the other hand, emerged from 'integration' and 'mainstreaming' under the philosophy of Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). The two concepts mainstreaming, and integration have been sidelined in favour of "inclusive education" or "inclusion", which is considered a more advanced and more relevant conception of the two (Mastropieri & Scruggs 2010). Although inclusion like its predecessors, describes an environment that is as close to 'normal' as possible, philosophically it is slightly different. Learners with disabilities are served 'primarily' in regular education classrooms, under the responsibility of the regular classroom teachers, with appropriate aides and support within the regular classrooms (Ainscow et al. 2006, Mastropieri & Scruggs 2014;). Mastropieri & Scruggs (2014), and Sharma & Deppeler (2005) further postulate that when necessary and justifiable, the learner may be withdrawn from the regular classroom to a resource room to receive a specific instruction before being taken back to the regular classroom. This approach has been criticized by researchers like Stainback and Stainback (1996) who argued against routine removal of students with disabilities from regular classrooms to receive assistance because doing so exposes their vulnerability, interferes with their

learning, and trains them to be dependent. They advocate for full inclusion, where by learners with disabilities are served entirely within regular classrooms with all the necessary support services provided within those classrooms for the rest of their stay in the school., with no instances of withdrawal. If full inclusion is to be achieved, regular school classrooms should be restructured and resourced enough to accommodate every child irrespective of disability and ensuring that all learners belong to the same school community (Foreman, 2011; Stainback & Stainback, 1996). Full inclusion implies that inclusion ought to be and will be physical, social and academic in nature.

Physical inclusion facilitates the possibility of social inclusion. Social inclusion is where learners' relationships with other peers and community in the school are nurtured as an integral part of the broader inclusion process. This is because nurturing positive social inclusion is far more complex than the physical presence of the child in the classroom (Cornoldi, Terreni, Scruggs & Mastropieri 1998; Cook, Tankersley, Cook, Landrum 2000; Friend & Bursuck 2002). To be socially included means belonging to the group and sharing the same experiences as all other members and any reduction in the amount of shared time weakens the quality of social inclusion (Hopkin, 2004). Academic inclusion encompasses curriculum inclusion, which involves teaching learners with disabilities according to their needs and not by a predetermined kind of curricular standards (Mangope, 2016).

The conception of inclusion as espoused above is therefore part of the broader (comprehensive) human rights program, whose supporters argue that all types of exclusion are ethically wrong (Avramidis, Bayliss & Burden, 2000). However, other scholars like Kauffman (1999) argue that trying to force all learners into the inclusion framework is just as unjust and stigmatizing as trying to coerce all learners into the system of special classes or special schools. This implies that learners should be taken to a school which best suits their needs rather than group all learners as if they do not have their own peculiar attributes. In other words, what needs to be considered are the needs of the learner, as they are fundamental to the determination of the learner's placement.

Conceptual and Policy shifts on Special Education in Botswana: An Historical Perspective

The education of learners with disabilities in Botswana officially started in segregated special school settings, just after independence in 1966 (Abosi, 2000; Dart, 2006). These schools were built and operated mainly by non-governmental organizations.   This situation remained in place until the early 1990s when Botswana endorsed the Salamanca conference agreement (UNESCO 1994). Following this endorsement, the government of Botswana enacted several key policies around national development and the education of learners with disabilities. According to 'Kagisano' (Education for Social Justice), all children had to attend school (Government of Botswana, 1977), meaning that, the government had the idea of universal access to education long before the Salamanca Statement. However, this idea was built around the concept of "mainstreaming", where all children had to attend general schools that incidentally, lacked necessary support for those who needed it (Mangope, 2016).

In the 1980s, the Botswana Government discontinued the trend set by non-governmental organizations of building more special schools, and opted to build special units in already existing primary schools to provide educational services for learners with disabilities (Government of Botswana, 2008). This move signified the Botswana government's buy into the concept of integration. Currently, there are more than forty special units/classes for learners with intellectual disabilities, four for the

visually impaired and two for those with hearing impairment in the country. These efforts were later guided by the Revised National Education Policy on Education of 1994 (RNPE), (which states that, as far as possible, education of such learners should take place in regular schools to prepare them for social integration), and the National Development Plan 9 (which, explicitly advocates for inclusive education) (Government of Botswana, 1997). The RNPE was based on the premise that Education should be accessible to all children with or without disabilities. This was enhanced by the adoption of the 9-year basic education system which facilitated access by all children (Government of Botswana, 1993). Under this system more junior secondary schools were opened in most communities, and automatic promotion to secondary education for all learners was implemented. Furthermore, school fees that were considered a barrier to education, especially for children from poor families, child headed families and children with special needs, were abolished to increase access to education. The nine-year basic education structure was reversed to the ten-year structure to adequately prepare learners for further education, enhance integration into the community and create equal access to schools for all children (Pansiri, 2008; Tabulawa, 2003). Despite the good intentions of the 10-year program, evidence indicates that the objective has not been fully achieved as implementation has been less satisfactory for children with disabilities, who remain largely unaccepted in regular schools (Adedoyin, 2017; Mangope, 2017; Mukhopadhyay, 2014).

In examining conceptual shifts in special education, it can be noted that Botswana followed a path like other countries worldwide where mainstreaming preceded integration. The only point of departure, as noted by Matale, (2002) is in the inception of special schools where Botswana adopted a 'mainstreaming' instead of special schools. There are several reasons as to why some countries opted for mainstreaming instead of special schools, the most important being that countries differ in the goals, means and approaches for educating students with disabilities. Countries also differ in educational systems, educational goals, history of education, student populations, teacher training, and so on (Hopkin, 2004). These differences affect practices, for example, high population density facilitates the establishment of separate special schools as there will be enough students to fill up the schools. Botswana had a relatively small population of about 1.5 million (Dart, 2006), which was also sparsely distributed, hence making it difficult for Botswana, to invest in special schools since only a few students would be enrolled in such schools. Thus, the country found it fit to adopt an open system that ensured all children would be absorbed in the already existing regular schools by then.

More recently, the Government of Botswana adopted the concept and policy of inclusive education through the Inclusive Education Policy of Botswana (IEPB), 2011) to buttress the provisions of the RNPE. Inclusive education in Botswana is defined as an education system that ensures all children in the neighbourhood attend the same regular school and classrooms, regardless of their differences (Government of Botswana, 2011).

Despite this declaration, special classes still exist in some schools in Botswana, and some proponents of inclusive education are unhappy about their existence (Dart, Didimalang & Pilime; 2002; Mangope & Mukhopadhyay 2015). Botswana is caught up in between the practices of integration and inclusion causing problems in implementation (Mukhopadhyah, Nentty, & Abosi, 2012; Mukhopadhyay, Moswela & Molosiwa, 2009). This is because the notion of integration or inclusion in Botswana has never been backed by law unlike in other countries like in the USA where changes are backed by

legislation such as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (Public Law 105-117, 1997). As a result, any new measures seem ineffective as there are no binding laws to enhance the effectiveness of the changes. With the support of the law, it becomes imperative for all stakeholders to change their attitudes and strategies to meet the needs of children with disabilities (Jonas, 2014).

Another major challenge as observed by Nthitu, Kathard & Sayed (2012) is the mystified conceptualization of inclusion. This lack of understanding among teachers has huge implications for translating policy into practice. It appears that in the absence of a clear articulation of policy definition of inclusion, many classroom teachers will continue to think that it is synonymous with integration. Both the RNPE and the Inclusive Education Policy of Botswana, (2011) are heavily influenced by the medical discourse. This is evident through the use of phrases like 'special units', 'categorization of children with disabilities', and 'the need for experts in educating learners with disabilities' in the RNPE and the inclusive education policy documents. The shift in paradigm seems to have not brought change in practice for children with special needs, especially for those with intellectual disabilities (Molosiwa & Mangope, 2011). There appears to be a contradiction between policy and implementation by inclusive educators in Botswana (Mangope, 2016). Parents of learners with disabilities are skeptical and confused about the implications of the policy, torn between fulfilling a legal requirement and what is best for their children. And teachers seem to lack the ability to differentiate between integration and inclusion (Nthitu, et al. (2012), with some teachers thinking that the two concepts are synonymous (Mangope, 2016). This could be reflective of the language used in the Inclusive Education Policy of Botswana (2011), where it is not clear whether schools should pursue integration or inclusion.

The Shift in Paradigm and the Case for Learners with Intellectual Disabilities in Botswana

As noted earlier, learners with intellectual disabilities are taught in special classes/units in some of the primary schools in Botswana. The government took this initiative as a way of trying to make education accessible to everyone including children with intellectual disabilities (Government of Botswana, 2008; Inclusive Education Policy of Botswana, 2011). The implication was that the government opted for an integration model which was considered the most appropriate for children with intellectual disabilities.

Despite these efforts, some gaps in the policy guidelines and implementation of the policy have been observed. Available research indicates that paradigm shifts from "mainstreaming," "integration" to "inclusion", appear to be posing problems (Jonas, 2014; Mukhopadhyay, et al., 2012). This is because neither the RNPE nor the IEPB policies did clearly indicate how special education units were supposed to operate. Furthermore, the special education units also did not come with implementation guidelines and this lack of clarity generated a discrepancy between policy and practice such that different practices take place in schools with students with diverse types of disabilities. A good example is that a special unit for students with intellectual disabilities operates in a separate way from a special unit for the students with hearing and visual impairments (Dart, et al., 2002; Mangope, 2016). The reality is that while Botswana claims to be operating an inclusive system, in practice, it is running mainstreaming and integration systems.

The other challenge relates to lack of progression through the levels of education. Learners usually stay in the units for many years without making any progress and if they happen to leave the units, there is lack of progression since there will be no schools available or services to absorb them (Dart, et al. 2002; Mangope, 2016).

Other research reports (Dart, 2006, Government of Botswana, 2008; Hopkin, 2004) raised concerns about marginalization and dropout rate. Dart (2006) reported that learners with intellectual disabilities were still being marginalized and most of them dropped out of school. In addition, the system was not equipping them with the necessary skills to be integrated into the community. This implies that even though there were paradigm shifts in the field of special education to deliver better outcomes, children with disabilities, especially those with intellectual disabilities are still disadvantaged by the regular education system (Mangope, 2016; Molosiwa & Mangope, 2011). Thus this study argues that shifts in practice have not yet made impact on the way such learners receive education. It is still 'integration program' being implemented in the name of "inclusion" hence failing the learners with intellectual disabilities.

Conclusion

It is critical that any education system considering a change in practices take the necessary precautions to plan effectively. Experience and observation in the education system of Botswana has led us to believe that despite the existence of good education ideologies, not all learners benefit from the implementation of the inclusive policy. One such group of learners is learners with intellectual disabilities. An Attempt to remedy this problem has placed attention on developing special units for learners with disabilities. This effort is only half of the strategy that would ensure full benefits of inclusive education. While it is obvious that the child's needs take precedence over the practice, the multiple shifts in conceptualization and practices made the government miss the focus on what is really at stake; the education of the child. As such, while we do not agree with the basic tenets of inclusion, there is no need to rush and adopt any single, dominant view of learning or teaching. Unless adequate caution is exercised, there is the danger that, Botswana is about to replace one orthodox practice with yet another and promote a "one size fits all" notion of education system. Thus, planning requires constant assessment of practices and results. Constant reflection is necessary if we ever hope to be able to make clear determinations about which specific strategies will help children to become happy citizens who can contribute to society.

When considering a move from one approach to another, it is important that the entire school community be involved in a thoughtful, carefully researched transition. Dramatic top-down directives will polarize parents, teachers, and students, and will create environments that are hostile to change. As it is true in other areas of school restructuring, change must be based on research and broadly shared beliefs and philosophies. Most importantly if change is to be effective, it must be backed up by legislation to ensure that everyone is responsible. Otherwise the education of learners with disabilities will always be left behind as no one will take it seriously without any legal support.

References

Abosi, O. (2000). Trends and issues in special education in Botswana'. *The Journal of Special Education,* 33 (1), 48-53.

Abosi, O. (2007). Educating children with learning disabilities in Africa. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 22 (3), 196-201.

Adedoyin, E. O. (2017). The significance of inclusion concept in the education system as perceived by junior secondary school teachers: Implications for teacher training programmes in Botswana. *Global Journal of Social Sciences Studies*, 3(1), 13-28.

Abosi, O., & Koay, T. L. (2008). Attaining development goals of children with disabilities: Implications for inclusive education. *International Journal of Special Education*, 23 (3), 1-10.

Ainscow, M. (2007). From special education to effective schools for all: A review of progress so far. In L. Florian, *The Sage Handbook of Special Education*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Ainscow, M., Booth, M., Tony, & Dyson, D. (2006). Inclusion and the standards agenda: Negotiating policy pressures in England". *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 10(4-5), 295-308.

Ashman, A., & Elkins, J. (2005). *Educating children with diverse abilities* (2nd ed.). French Forest, Australia: Pearson Education

Ashman, A., & Elkins, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Education for Inclusion and Diversity* (3rd ed.). French's Forest, NSW: Pearson Education Australia.

Ashman, A., & Elkins, J. (1998). *Educating Children with Special Needs* (3rd ed.) Sydney: Prentice Hall.

Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P., & Burden, R. (2000). 'A survey into mainstream teachers' attitudes toward the inclusion of children with special educational needs in the ordinary school in one local education authority.' *Educational Psychology*, 20, 191-195.

Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P., & Burden, R. (1999). 'Student teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of children with special educational needs in the ordinary schools'. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 16, 277-293.

Avramidis, E. & Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' attitudes towards integration/inclusion: A review of literature. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 17 (2), 129-147.

Chhabra, S., Srivastava, R., & Srivastava, I. (2010). Inclusive Education in Botswana: The

perceptions of School Teachers. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 20(4), 219-228.

Cook, B. G., Tankersley, M., Cook, L., & Landrum, T. J. (2000). 'A survey into mainstream teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of children with special educational needs in the ordinary school in one local education authority'. *Educational Psychology,* 20, 191-210.

Cornoldi, C., Terreni, A., Scruggs, T., & Mastropieri, M. (1998). 'Teachers' attitudes in Italy after twenty years of inclusion.' *Remedial and Special Education,* 19, 350-363.

Dart, G. (2006) 'My eyes went wide open –an evaluation of the special needs education awareness course at Molepolole College of Education, Botswana'. *British Journal of Special Education*, 33 (3), 130.

Dart, G. (2007). 'Provision of learners with special educational needs in Botswana; A situational analysis.' *International Journal of Special Education*, 22 (2), 56-58.

Dart, G., Didimalang, C., & Pilime, S. (2002). *An Evaluation of Special Units for Children with Mental Retardation of Botswana Primary Schools in Molepolole*: Molepolole College of Education. Unpublished manuscript.

Friend, M. (2006). *Special education: Contemporary perspectives for school professionals*. Boston: Pearson.

Friend, M., & Bursack, W. D. (2008). *Including students with special needs* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Press.

Friend, M., & Bursack, W. D. (2002). *Including students with special needs. A practical guide for classroom teachers* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Foreman, P. (1996). *Integration and inclusion in action*. Australia: Harcourt Brace & Company

Foreman, P. (2011). *Inclusion in action*. Australia: Cengage Learning Australia.

Foreman, P. (Ed). (2008). *Inclusion in action* (2 ed.). South Melbourne: Thomson.

Foreman, P. (Ed). (2001). *Integration and inclusion in action*. Marrickville; N.S.W: Harcourt Australia.

Government of Botswana, (2011) *Inclusive education policy*. Gaborone: Government Printers.
Government of Botswana. (2001). *Seventh Biennial Report 1999-2000*, Gaborone. Educational Publications Division, Ministry of Education. Gaborone. 1-80

Government of Botswana (1977). *Education for Kagisano*, Gaborone: Government Printers

Government of Botswana (1993). *Report on the National Commission on Education*. Gaborone: Botswana Printers.

Government of Botswana (1994). *The Revised National Policy on Education*. Government Paper No. 2 of 1994 Gaborone: Government Printers.

Government of Botswana (2003). *National Development Plan 9 (draft)*. Gaborone: Government Printers.

Government of Botswana (Presidential TASK Group) (1997). *Long Term Vision for Botswana: Towards Prosperity for All Batswana*: Government Printers.

Hallahan, D.P., & Kauffman, J.M. (2003*). Exceptional learners: Introduction to special education* (9th Ed.). New York: Allyn & Bacon.

Hopkin, A.G. (2004). Special education in Botswana: Social inclusion or exclusion? Botswana *Journal of African Studies*, 18 (1), 88-101.

Jonas, O. (2014). The right to inclusive education in Botswana: Present challenges and future prospects. *African Disability Rights Yearbook*, 2, 3-31.

Kauffman, J.M. (1999). Commentory: Today's special education and its messages for tomorrow. *The Journal of Special Education*, 32 (4), 244-254.

Kauffman, J. M. (1993). How we might achieve the radical reform of special education. *Exceptional Children*, 60, 6-16.

Kisanji, J. (1993). *Special education in Botswana: Policy guidelines and strategy for implementation*. Gaborone, Consultancy report. Ministry of Education. Unpublished Manuscript.

Kisanji, J. (1999). *Models of inclusive education: Where do Community Based Support Programs fit in? Paper presented at the workshop on inclusive education in Namibia. "The challenge for teacher education", 24th -25th March.* Rossing Foundation, Khomasdal, Windhoek, Namibia.

Konza, D. (2008). Inclusion of students with disabilities in new times: Responding to the challenges of learning and learner; exploring learning for new times. University of Wolongong, p.236, Kautroba, Konstantina Vamvakari, Malyinamand, Theodoropoulos.

Landsberg, E., Kruger, D., & Nel, N. (2005). '*Addressing barriers to learning': A South African perspective*'. Pretoria. R.S.A. Van Schaik Publishers.

Mangope, B., Otukile-Mongwaketse, M., Dinama, B. & Kuyini, A.B. (2018). Teaching practice experiences in inclusive classrooms: The voices of University of Botswana special education student teachers. *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, 14(1), 57-92.

Mangope, B. (2013). Inclusive Education for learners with intellectual disabilities in Botswana primary schools: A case study. *National Teacher Education Journal*, 6(1), 31-35.

Mastropieri, M. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (2010). *The inclusive classroom: Strategies for effective instruction.* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice- Hall.

Mastropieri, M. A. & Scruggs, T. E. (2014). *The Inclusive Classroom: Strategies for effective instruction.* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice- Hall.

Matale, J. L. (2002). *Structures and resources in the education system for learners with special needs. Paper presented at the Curriculum, Dvelopment and Evaluation Seminar on Curriculum and Special Education, August 7th-9th, 2002*. Department of special education, Ministry of Education, Gaborone.

Molosiwa, S., & Mangope, B. (2011). Inclusive education of learners with intellectual disabilities in Botswana primary schools: Is it happening? *International Association of Special Education,* 54-57.

Mudekunye, J., & Ndamba, G. T. (2011). Views of parents on the inclusion of children with special needs in physical education in Masvingo, Zimbabwe. *Journal of African Studies and Development,* 3(1), 9-14.

Mukhopadhyay, S. (2009). Factors influencing the status of inclusive education for learners with disabilities in Botswana primary schools: Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Botswana.

Mukhopadhyay, S. Molosiwa, S., & Moswela, E. (2009). Teacher trainees' level of preparedness for inclusive education in Botswana schools: Need for change. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, 2 (2), 51-58.

Mukhopadhyay, S., Nenty, H. J., & Abosi, O. (2012). *Inclusive Education for learners with disabilities in Botswana primary schools.* Sage open, 2012.

Mukhopadhyay, S. (2014). Botswana primary schools teachers' perception of inclusion of learners with special educational needs. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs,* 14(1), 33-42.

Nthitu, J. M., Kathard, H., & Sayed, A. (2012). Teachers' perspectives on inclusion of disabled learners in Botswana. www.lcint.org/download.php?id=941

Pansiri, O. N. (2008). Improving commitment to basic education for the minorities in

Botswana: A challenge for policy and practice. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 28(4), 446-459.

Sharma, U., & Deppeler, J. (2005). Inclusive Education in India: Challenges and Prospects. *Disabilities Studies Quartely,* 25 (1). Retrieved June 12, 2008, from http://www.dsq-sds.org/2005winter-toc.htm/

Stainback, S., & Stainback**, W.** (1996). *Inclusion: A guide for educators*. New York, United States: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co. Inc.

Thomazet, S.S. (2009). From integration to inclusion: Does changing term improve practice? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 13(6), 553-563

UNESCO, (1990). *World declaration on education for all: Meeting basic learning needs*, Paris; United Nations Education, Science and Cultural Organization.

UNESCOCO, (1994). *The salamaca statement and framework for action on special needs education*. (Paris, UNESCO).

United Nations, (2011). *Disability and the Millennium Development Goals: A Review of the MDG Process and Strategies for Inclusion of Disability Issues in Millennium Development Goal Efforts*. New York.

Wah, L.L. (2010). Different strategies for embracing inclusive education: A snapshot of individual cases, from the three countries. *International Journal of Special Education*, 25 (3), 98-109.

Weeks, S. G. (1993). Reforming the reform; education in Botswana. *Africa Today*, 40 (12), 49-57.