

Administrative Service Provision in the Cameroon Inclusive Education Pilot School Project

Mih Julius Nuh

University of Yaounde 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

The issue of inclusion can be discussed within the context of the wider international concerns such as the 1990 Declaration, the 1994 Salamanca Declaration and the 2015 Incheon Declaration among others. Whereas the Jomtien and Salamanca Declarations highlights access to educational opportunities for all children especially those with vulnerabilities, the 2015 Incheon Declaration recognises that regular schools with inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combatting discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building an inclusive society and achieving education to the majority of children and improve the efficiency and ultimately the cost effectiveness of the entire education system (UNESCO 2015).



This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license

In a similar way, UNESCO points out that an inclusive education system can be facilitated if ordinary schools become inclusive. In other words, when the schools become better in education for all children in their communities in the same school environment. In this respect the debate would no longer be about what inclusion is and why it is needed. The key question in the opinion of the European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education (EASNIE) would then be how it can be achieved. As school systems increasingly recognize the need for inclusive education, the discussion over the best system that would enhance the learning capacities of children with disabilities seems to gain centre stage. According to Zigmond, an effective way to increase the academic achievement of children with disabilities is to enrol them in ordinary classroom settings together with their peers who do not have such disabilities. And this depends on whether the schools are ready to respond to the essential needs of an inclusive education delivery system.

In Cameroon, inclusive education is a relatively new emphasis in the education policy options. Although public speeches have been made for quite some time about the education of children with special needs, it is only in the private sector that some noticeable efforts were made to set up institutions to cater for such needs. Tchombe while assessing the situation of inclusive education in Cameroon, argues that although the Cameroon government has undertaken measures through policy statements between 1983 and 2010 to enhance the educational rights of all children and particularly those with disabilities, it has not effectively provided an overall policy guidelines for

the implementation of inclusive education even though there have been some conscious efforts to improve access to schools for children with disabilities.

Since 2015, efforts are being made by the government and private education private promoters to provide inclusive education opportunities to children with disabilities. These include the Cameroon Ministry of Basic Education inclusive education pilot schools project; the Cameroon Baptist Convention Health Services (CBCHS) inclusive education pilot school project and the Sightsavers inclusive education pilot school project respectively. These inclusive pilot school projects are run separately from each other.

Statement of the Problem

As pointed out earlier, inclusive education delivery is currently carried out by different promoters in form of projects. These projects are described below in the following paragraphs:

With respect to the Cameroon Baptist Convention Health Services (CBCHS), it is an arm of the Cameroon Baptist Convention (CBC), a faith-based organisation that provides care to all as an expression of Christ's love. The CBCHS has a long-standing history of working in the domain of disability. The CBCHS prides itself in starting the journey to inclusive education as far as the 1980s when little was known about this approach to teaching and learning in Cameroon. .

The CBCHS' approach to inclusive education consists of stakeholders' mobilisation through awareness raising campaigns and direct interventions where necessary. The Projects counts seven schools

Concerning the Ministry of Basic Education inclusive Pilot School Project instituted by the strength of Order NO 7707/A/SO1/MINEDUB/SG/DEMP of 1st August 2015; some government primary schools were transformed into government practicing primary and government primary schools. These schools according to their new mandates are required to enrol children with disabilities who were hitherto enrolled in special schools or those who simply stayed at home because of lack of educational opportunities. The project has sixty-eight schools.

With regards the Sightsavers Inclusive Pilot School Project, Sightsavers has been working in Cameroon since 2000s to respond to high level participation restrictions in access to education for children with disabilities. The project's goal is for more children with disabilities including children with visual impairments, to be educated alongside their peers in the wider government education system. Sightsavers intervene in seven schools as well.

The general conclusion that can be drawn from the above description could be summarised under the following two points:

1. The current administrative service provision in the Cameroon inclusive education pilot schools was not developed from a common national policy perspective or resource specifications.
2. The schools experience differentiated resource needs, which could impact on the quality of service delivery thereby creating significant differences among them.

Based on the above conclusion, the problem that defines the focus of this study is whether or not significant differences exist in the availability of administrative service provision in the three categories of schools mentioned above and what factors (if any) could explain such differences.

Objectives of the Study

General Objective of the Study

The general objective of this study is to describe and assess the differences (if any) that exist in teacher attitude, pedagogic practice and administrative service provision in the three inclusive pilot school projects in Cameroon.

Specific Objectives of the Study

Based on the general objective the specific objectives of the study are spelled out below:

1. Describe and assess differences, if any, in the availability of administrative service provision to teachers in Cameroon inclusive pilot schools.
2. Identify and describe the factors (if any) that influence availability of administrative service provision to teachers in the three category of inclusive pilot schools in Cameroon.

Research Questions

General Research Question

The general research question guiding this study is as follows:

To what extent does the availability of administrative service provision to teachers differ in the Cameroon inclusive pilot schools and what could explain these differences?

Specific Research Questions

Based on the above general research question, the following specific research questions were formulated:

1. To What extent does the availability of administrative service provision to teachers differ in the Cameroon inclusive pilot schools?
2. What factors (if any) account for the differences in teacher attitude, pedagogic practice and availability of administrative service provision in the Cameroon inclusive pilot schools?

Hypotheses

Based on the research questions, the following hypotheses were formulated.

General Hypothesis

Significant differences exist in the availability of administrative service provision in Cameroon inclusive pilot schools under study.

Specific Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

HA: There is a significant difference in the availability of administrative service provision to teachers in Cameroon inclusive pilot schools.

H0: There is no difference in the availability of administrative service provision to teachers in Cameroon inclusive pilot schools.

Research Question

What factors (if any) influence the administrative service provision the Cameroon inclusive pilot school project?

Methodology

The study made use of survey design with a cross sectional perspective. Data was collected using a checklist of twenty items addressed to thirty-two headteachers teaching in the inclusive pilot

schools. Interview guides were used to collect qualitative data linked to the objectives of the study. Data collected was analysed using appropriate statistical procedures and the results displayed in tables.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Administrative service provision here is understood within the context of this study to mean financial, material and human resources and other related services that enhance the management of education in general and inclusive education in particular.

As concerns financial resources, they are guided by the following theories: (1) the 2003 Resource-Dependence and Equity Theory by Pfeffer and Salancik and (2) the 1997 Equity theory by Heise. The Resource Dependence Theory focuses on the relationship between the schools considered here as organisations and their external resources. It equally highlights the dependency of the educational institutions on financial resources from external sources such as the government, funding from private donors and tuition fees. On the other hand, the 1997 equity and Equality Theory focuses on fairness and equality in the way resources are distributed in the educational financing. The theory emphasises the importance of addressing socio economic disparities and providing adequate financial support to disadvantaged students and schools to reduce inequalities in education.

The current financing mechanism in the inclusive pilot schools in Cameroon is based on this equity and equality financing model as concerns government schools since all schools receive the same amount of money for their operations. But CBCHS and Sightsavers funding model seem to focus on the needs on the ground thus giving room for flexibility in funding procedures.

In an analysis undertaken to determine the dynamics involved in the cost as funding inclusive education in developing countries and/or poor countries, the author explores the cost-effectiveness of inclusive education by analysing its measurability and sustainability. The literature that was reviewed reveals that the cost of inclusive education is less expensive and more sustainable than that of the traditional system in which general and special education are programmed and financed separately. The paper concludes that while it was difficult to find literature on the measurement of the cost of inclusive education in developing countries, that inclusive education can cost up to 41% less than that of the traditional parallel system. However, this can only be achievable if developing and/or poor countries embrace the central principles of inclusion and adopt best practices in that regard.

See criteria for inclusion in terms of infrastructure and other related services by Booths and Ainscow

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

Presentation of Results According to All Stakeholders

School Infrastructure for All

The situation of School Infrastructure for All per Stakeholder are presented in Table 1:

Table 1: Percentage Distribution of School Infrastructure for All Per Stakeholders.

	School Infrastructure for All	Stakeholders								
		G.S.			C.B.C.			S.S.		
		A (%)	ICBA (%)	NA (%)	A (%)	ICBA (%)	NA (%)	A (%)	ICBA (%)	NA (%)
1	The school has facilities accessible to all children, including those with disabilities.	8	32	60	50	25	25	100	0	0
2	Availability of classrooms for all	44	40	16	100	0	00	0	0	100
3	Availability of special laboratories	0	0	100	00	0	100	0	0	100
4	Availability of special facilities that enhance access to playgrounds	8	4	88	50	25	25	100	0	0
5	Availability of separate toilets for boys	84	8	8	75	25	0	100	0	0
6	Availability of separate toilets for girls	80	12	8	75	25	0	100	0	0
7	Availability of classes on the ground floor and upper stairs of the building.	48	12	40	100	0	0	100	0	0
8	Availability of a safe drinking water supply accessible to all children, including those with disabilities.	64	8	28	50	0	50	67	0	33
	overall	42	15	44	63	13	25	83	0	17

Note. G.S: Government Schools; C.B.C: Cameroon Baptist Convention; S.S: Sightsavers Schools; A: Available; ICBA: In the Course of Being Acquired; NA: Not Available;

Government Schools

The overall results for this cluster show that the administrative services provision for this cluster were largely insufficient as reported in the table above. However, the schools can only boast of services like the separate toilets for boys and girls, availability of drinking water for all children and to some extent availability of classrooms for all pupils.

CBC Schools

The results for this cluster indicate that the schools of this education agency are largely average in terms of the administrative services provision as shown in Table 1 above. However, services such as separate toilets for boys and girls are available. Services such as availability of special laboratories especially for children with disabilities as well as other school facilities and their accessibility to all children were available in these schools.

Sightsavers Supported Schools

The results of this cluster for this category of schools are better than those of the other two categories of schools as indicated in the table and figure above. Most minimum administrative services were available in these schools. Apart from the school water drinking points where only

66.7% of the schools were reported to have these facilities all the other requirements were available in these schools.

Special Education Needs

The situation of Special Education Needs per stakeholder are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Percentage Distribution of Special Education Needs for all Stakeholders.

	Special Education Needs	G.S.			C.B.C.			S.S.		
		A (%)	ICBA (%)	NA (%)	A (%)	ICBA (%)	NA (%)	A (%)	ICBA (%)	NA (%)
1	Availability of material currently in use by children with disabilities.	28	16	56	25	25	50	67	33	0
2	Availability of classroom boards and other facilities in class accessible for children with disabilities.	48	24	28	75	25	0	67	33	0
3	Availability of resource rooms for children with disabilities.	0	4	96	25	0	75	0	0	100
4	Availability of a record of children with disabilities.	56	4	40	75	0	25	100	0	0
5	Availability of special classes for people with disabilities.	0	12	88	0	0	100	0	0	100
6	A plan for in-service training of teachers in inclusive education.	16	24	60	100	0	0	67	0	33
	overall	25	14	61	50	8	42	50	11	39

Note. G.S: Government Schools; C.B.C: Cameroon Baptist Convention; S.S: Sightsavers Schools; A: Available; ICBA: In the Course of Being Acquired; NA: Not Available.

Government Schools

The results of the cluster indicate that the administrative services provision in terms of Special education needs are equally insufficient as highlighted in the table above. However, some services are available, though in limited supply. They include the availability of records of children with disabilities and the availability of classroom boards and other facilities and their accessibility to pupils with disabilities. Some material currently in use by children with disabilities are also reported.

CBC Schools

The results in the above table and figure show the availability of some administrative services such as plan for in-service training of teachers in inclusive education, availability of records for children with disabilities as well as classroom boards and other facilities for children with disabilities. The rest of the services were either in insufficient supply or were in the process of being acquired by the school administration.

Sightsavers Supported Schools

As concerns special education needs for this category of schools, most indicators were largely available as recorded in the table above. Apart from resource rooms whose availability was quasi absent, all the administrative services under study in these schools were above average.

Support Services

The situation of Special Education Needs per stakeholder are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Percentage Relative Availability of Support Services for All Stakeholders.

	Support Services	G.S.			C.B.C.			S.S.		
		A (%)	ICBA (%)	NA (%)	A (%)	ICBA (%)	NA (%)	A (%)	ICBA (%)	NA (%)
1	Availability of specialized teachers for each type of disability.	0	8	92	50	0	50	0	0	100
2	Availability of social workers.	4	8	88	50	0	50	67	0	33
3	Availability of both women and men in the staff.	80	0	20	100	0	0	0	0	100
4	Availability of adapted material for different types of children with disabilities.	4	28	68	50	0	50	33	33	33
	Overall	22	11	67	63	0	37	25	8	67

Note. G.S: Government Schools; C.B.C: Cameroon Baptist Convention; S.S: Sightsavers Schools; A: Available; ICBA: In the Course of Being Acquired; NA: Not Available.

Government Schools

The results of respondents indicate that the administrative services provision for this cluster for all schools in the sample was largely insufficient as depicted in the table and figure above. The availability of adapted material for different types of children with disabilities, the availability of both women and men as members of staff for these schools as well as the availability of specialised teachers for each type of disability are of limited supply.

CBC Schools

The results of this cluster as seen in Table 3 above indicate that the administrative services provision is average as concerns most of the items. Exceptionally, the schools do relatively better as concerns the availability of both women and men in the staff. Here, the gender factor which is equally a critical element of inclusion is taken care off by this Educational Agency.

Sightsavers Supported Schools

From the table above, the majority of schools in this sample do not seem to have specialised teachers for all the disciplines taught in the schools. Additionally, the personnel in these schools are either made up of only men for one school or women in other schools. The gender balance is seemingly absent in this category of schools. All other services are absent or are in the process of being provided for.

Partnerships and Resources Mobilisation

The situation of Special Education Needs per stakeholder are presented in Table 4 below:

Table 4: Percentage Distribution for Partnerships and Resources Mobilisation per Stakeholders.

	Partnerships and Resource Mobilisation	G.S.			C.B.C.			S.S.		
		A (%)	ICBA (%)	NA (%)	A (%)	ICBA (%)	NA (%)	A (%)	ICBA (%)	NA (%)
1	Availability of commonly used material coming from the government.	72	8	20	0	0	100	67	0	33

2	Availability of commonly used material coming from partners.	28	8	64	100	0	0	67	33	0
3	Availability of commonly used material coming from the community.	16	12	72	50	25	25	67	33	0
	Overall	39	9	52	50	8	42	67	22	11

Note. G.S: Government Schools; C.B.C: Cameroon Baptist Convention; S.S: Sightsavers Schools; A: Available; ICBA: In the Course of Being Acquired; NA: Not Available.

Government Schools

The results of this cluster indicate that the schools depend essentially on resources coming from the government as depicted in Table 4 above. The results for the other sources of partnerships and resources mobilisation here may be veiled by the overly presence of government schools in the sample.

CBC Schools

The results of the cluster in the table above indicate that the schools depended essentially on their partners for either partnerships or resources mobilisation. The rest of their partnerships were with the community. And nothing came from the government in terms of resources.

Sightsavers Supported Schools

The results of this cluster indicate a very positive availability rate of administrative services provision for this category of schools as shown in the table above. The schools did better in terms of partnerships and resources mobilisation with the communities, other partners as well as with the government.

Testing Hypothesis

Overview of Hypotheses

We now test the hypothesis that "There is a significant difference in the availability of administrative service provision in the Cameroon inclusive pilot schools." Our alternate and null hypothesis are presented below:

Null hypothesis (H₀): "There is a significant difference in the availability of administrative service provision in the Cameroon inclusive pilot schools."

Alternative Hypothesis (H_A): "There is no significant difference in the availability of administrative service provision in the Cameroon inclusive pilot schools."

Results of Hypothesis Tests

As explained in our Methodology, the difference in the availability of administrative services for a given category of the checklist would be significant if the mean response (\bar{X}) was significantly close to the middle value (2) of the rating scale. Therefore, we adopted $\mu_0 = 2$ as our benchmark.

The results of the hypothesis tests are summarised below. For each cluster of questions, we calculated the weighted mean response (\bar{X}), the standard deviation (s), and the z-statistic. Table 5 which shows the overall mean and standard deviations of the weighted mean score for each cluster.

Table 5: Overall Mean and Standard Deviation for Each Cluster.

	Cluster/items	Weighted Mean, \bar{X}	Overall Standard Deviation, σ_x
1	School Infrastructure for All	2.10	0.93
2	Special Education Needs	1.73	0.89
3	Support Services	1.64	0.88
4	Partnerships and Resource Mobilisation	1.96	0.95

Presentation of the z-test for Hypothesis 3

Using the two-tailed, one-sample z-test, we calculate the z-statistics using the formulae presented in the methodology. The calculated values of the z-statistics and the corresponding p-values are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Overall z-statistics and p-values per Clusters.

	Cluster/items	z-statistics	p-value
1	School Infrastructure for All	0.60	0.55
2	Special Education Needs	-1.68	0.093
3	Support Services	-2.31	0.021
4	Partnerships and Resource Mobilisation	-0.25	0.803

Summary of Test Decision

From the p-values obtained in Table 6, and based on the decision criteria outlined in the Methodology, we obtained the decisions in Table 7 for each cluster element.

Table 7: Summary of Hypothesis Test Decision per Cluster.

	Cluster/items	Test Decision
1	School Infrastructure for All	H0 Not Rejected
2	Special Education Needs	H0 Not Rejected
3	Support Services	H0 Rejected
4	Partnerships and Resource Mobilisation	H0 Not Rejected

Inferences from the results

The following inferences were made from the p-values and the results of the test decision for each cluster.

School Infrastructure for All.

The p-value (0.55) was greater than 0.05, hence we did not reject the null hypothesis H0 which states that there is a significant difference in the availability of administrative service provision in the Cameroon inclusive pilot schools as concerns School Infrastructure for All. This indicated that the availability of infrastructure in this category was significantly polarised between available or not available, even though the infrastructure in this category were mostly available.

Special Education Needs.

The p-value (0.093) was greater than 0.05, hence we did not reject the null hypothesis H0 which states that there is a significant difference in administrative service provision in the Cameroon inclusive pilot schools as concerns Special Education Needs. The sample mean (1.70) was significantly close to the benchmark (2.0) indicating that the availability of special education needs in the pilot schools varied significantly, though these needs were mostly not available.

Support Services.

The p-value (0.021) was less than 0.05, hence we rejected the null hypothesis (H₀) which states that there is a significant difference in the availability of support services in the Cameroon inclusive pilot schools. The mean score (1.6) was significantly less than the benchmark (2.0) indicating that the availability of support services in the pilot schools was significantly similar in that support services were significantly not available.

Partnerships and Resource Mobilisation.

The p-value (0.8) was greater than 0.05, hence we did not reject the null hypothesis (H₀) which states that there is a significant difference in the availability of administrative service provision in the Cameroon inclusive pilot schools as concerns Support Services. The mean score (1.96) was significantly close to the benchmark (2.0) indicating that the availability of partnerships and mobilisation of resources across the pilot schools varied significantly and was polarised.

Conclusion

From the results of the hypothesis test outlined above, we observed that the availability of administrative service provisions varied significantly in three out of four of the clusters. Hence, we accept the hypothesis that: "There is a significant difference in the availability of administrative service provision in the Cameroon inclusive pilot schools."

Discussion

In this discussion, emphasis was laid on the availability of basic services provision, resource and/or material and financial that each school in the sample is expected to have and which enable the schools to provide for the needs of all pupils including those with disabilities. The results of this study were grouped into four themes including school infrastructure for all, special education needs, support services and partnerships and resources mobilisation. The findings of the study showed that the availability of school infrastructure for all stood at 48.4%; special education needs at 30.2%; support services at 27.3 % and partnerships and resource mobilisation at 42.7% respectively for all the schools that made up the sample. On the contrary, 38.7% of the schools did not have the school infrastructure for all, 56.8% did not have the required special education services; 63.3% did not have the support services and 46.9% did not have the required partnerships and resource mobilisation. Also, 12.9% of the schools declared that the required school infrastructure for all were in the process of being put in place, 13% of the schools were in the process of setting up the required special education services; 9.4% were in the process of putting in place the required support services while 10.4% were about to establish the required partnerships and resources mobilisation.

When the results were distributed between the category of schools from the sample, they showed that Sightsavers did better than CBCHS schools in terms of the availability of school infrastructure for all (availability rate: 83.3%), and partnerships and resources mobilisation (availability rate: 67%). CBCHS schools did better than Sightsavers in terms of support services (availability rate of 62.5%); however, they were equal in terms of special education needs (availability rate: 50%). Government schools were the least in all the four elements (school infrastructure for all: 42%; special education needs: 24.7%; support services: 22%; and partnership and resource mobilisation: 38.7%). The administrative services provision of the schools, in the sample are discussed under the following themes:

School Infrastructure for all and special education needs

School infrastructure is often at the centre of debate for effective inclusion. School infrastructure for all means that all pupils, including those with disabilities have an easy access to all school infrastructure. This school infrastructure includes: Classrooms, playgrounds, toilets, libraries,

resource rooms among other things. Pupils and especially those with disabilities must have easy access to these facilities. Inclusive education requires both the active removal of barriers to inclusion such as removal of barriers to physical access to the school building as well as the creation of environments in school that are child-centred and include representations of the full spectrum of people found in society. Removing barriers requires adjustments in school physical structures. UNICEF (2014a, p. 35), recommends an advocacy and promotion of child-friendly school designs and architecture that provide safe, inclusive, welcoming environments for all children in a way as to enable learning environments including accommodation with physical and mental/learning disabilities. And children with disabilities do not benefit from the school system unless it is made accessible as per their needs.

The findings from the study showed that school infrastructure, especially for government schools, do not provide easy access to all pupils. For example, one head-teacher from one inclusive pilot school had this to say about her school infrastructure:

I would say that I am not satisfied at all with the school infrastructure. The site for the inclusive school is so dangerous And I insist that it is not adapted to receive a handicap child.

Writing about school infrastructure, Rieser had this to say: All new construction should be fully accessible for those with disabilities; retrofitting of existing buildings is of equal importance. A change in construction norms to this effect should be explicitly agreed by donor community. Government ministry of procurement and building, and involving the community and taking cost-effective decisions are all essential.

The special education needs in this study included adapted material for children with disabilities and how pupils with disabilities had easy access to these materials. The results from the study showed that Sightsavers-supported schools did better than CBCHS schools and Government schools in these two areas (special education needs: 61.3%; support services: 67%), as compared to 50% for special education needs and 62% for support services as concerns CBCHS schools. Whereas Government schools recorded 24.7% for special education needs and 22% for support services respectively far below the expected threshold.

The adaptation of material for use by pupils with disabilities depends on the support that the school systems receive from the promoters or different stakeholders. But in this study, headteachers have mixed feelings about the quantities and the qualities of the material put at their disposal for the use of pupils with special education needs. In an interview with one of the headteachers, he had this to say:

So far, we have a handful of those material, but they are not all, depending on the variety of enrolment that we have. We have about Fifty-three children, with different impairments, ranging from mild to severe. So, the material we have is limited. We have a wide range of material that are still needed so that the inclusive practices will be more effective.

When asked about the material they were using in school this is what one headteacher said:

The problem which we have with material is that it is not adapted

The contribution of adapted material in the special education needs of pupils with disabilities is underscored in the literature. The Central Board of Secondary Education states that in an inclusive classroom it may require changing certain physical structures such as the doors, boards, etc. to accommodate students with physical disabilities, adjusting the seating-chair to allow a student with auditory problems to lipread easily.

Partnerships and Resource Mobilisation.

In this study, this sub theme was measured by investigating the availability of the partners that the schools had and the contribution of the partnerships in resource or financial mobilisation that

benefited the schools. In the overall situation of the schools, the results of this study showed that only 42.7% of the schools indicated availability of these partnerships. This sub theme is divided into a number of items including the availability of material commonly in use that comes from the government, the availability of material that comes from the community and the availability of material that comes from partners. In terms of the availability of material, Sightsavers-supported schools did better (66.7%) than CBCHS schools (50%) and Government schools (38.7%). Government schools tailed the chart with only 38.7% of the partnerships and availability of resources, fruits of the partnerships.

In this study, focus has been on identifying how the schools mobilise resources (material and financial) that enhance inclusive practices in these schools. School Headteachers were asked to identify the type of assistance they receive from stakeholders, and whether or not they were satisfied with the types of assistance received. Asked about the type of assistance received from the government, one of the headteachers said:

We received the minimum package from the government and this comes through the council. We equally receive rolling chairs.

In CBCHS school Nkwen, the headteachers equally described the non-assistance of the government when he said:

So far, from the government, we cannot come out with any particular thing we have received from the government for the past five years, in relation to inclusive education.

Funding mechanisms through the mobilisation of material resources seem to be stronger when it concerns external partners who were working with the schools.

The Ministry of Basic Education's budget allocation for inclusive education is transferred to councils. The funds are used to procure materials that are used in the sixty-eight (68) inclusive pilot schools. This funding mechanism coincides with that described by Booth and Ainscow when they say that resources are not just about money. Booth and Ainscow argue that the minimisation of barriers to learning and participation involves mobilising resources within the school and its communities. And there are always more resources to support learning and participation than are currently used within any setting. Accordingly, resource mobilisation means that; (1) Staff expertise is fully utilised, (2) Staff develops resources to support learning and participation, (3) Community resources are known and drawn upon, (4) School resources are distributed fairly so that they support inclusion. (Booth & Ainscow; 2002)

education plans. Booth and Ainscow (2002), contend that inclusion is also about building the community more widely and schools can work with other agencies and with communities to improve educational opportunities and social condition within their localities (Booth & Ainscow, 2002).

Conclusion

The findings of this study reveal that the availability of administrative service provision such as school infrastructure for all, special education needs, support services and resources mobilisation in the inclusive pilot schools depended on whether the school belonged to the CBCHS, Government or Sightsavers. No inclusive pilot school met the standard or norms of an inclusive school in terms of infrastructure for all, special education needs, support services since these indicators were below the average threshold.

The study recommended the following:

1. The national policy for inclusive education which is the process of being validated, should define the mechanisms of the financial model for the inclusive education delivery in Cameroon

2. Research should be carried out on the impact of administrative service provision on the academic achievement of pupils in the inclusive pilot schools including children with disabilities.

References

1. Ainscow, M. (2011). Some Lessons from International Efforts to Foster Inclusive Education. *Innovación Educativa*, 21, 55-74.
2. Banks, J., Frawley, D., & McCoy, S. (2015). Achieving inclusion? Effective resourcing of students with special educational needs. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. doi:10.1080/13603116.2015.1018344
3. Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2002). *Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools*. Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.
4. Boyle, C. (2014). Labelling in special education: Where do the benefits lie? In A. Holliman (Ed.), *The Routledge International Companion to Educational Psychology* (pp. 213-221). London: Routledge.
5. Busch, T. W., Pederson, K., Espin, C. A., & Weissenburger, J. W. (2001). Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities: Perceptions of a First-Year Teacher. *Journal of Special Education*, 35(2), 92-99. doi:10.1177/002246690103500204
6. CBCHS. (2020). *CBC Health Services' Interventions in Inclusive education. Annual Report*. Cameroon Baptist Convention Health Services.
7. Central Board of Secondary Education. (2020). *Handbook of Inclusive Education* (1st ed.). New Delhi: CBSE.
8. Connecticut School Finance Project. (2016). *Improving How Connecticut Funds Special Education: An analysis of special education finance system across the country, and recommendations for implementing best practices*. Retrieved from www.CTschooolsfinance.org
9. Davis, P., & Florian, L. (2004). *Teaching strategies and approaches for children with special educational needs: A scoping study*. Department for Education and Skills. London: Queen's Printer.
10. Ebersold, S., & Meijer, C. (2016). Financing Inclusive Education: Policy Challenges, Issues and Trends. In A. Watkins, & C. Meijer (Eds.), *Implementing Inclusive Education: Issues in Bridging the Policy-Practice Gap* (Vol. 8, pp. 37-62). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited. doi:10.1108/S1479-363620160000008004
11. Egeberg, H. M., McConney, A., & Price, A. (2016, July). Classroom Management and National Professional Standards for Teachers: A Review of the Literature on Theory and Practice. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(7), 1-18. Retrieved August 2020, from <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol41/iss7/1>
12. European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education. (2014a). *Five Key Messages for Inclusive Education: Putting Theory into Practice*. EASNIE.
13. European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education. (2014b). *Inclusive Education in Europe: Putting theory into practice. International Conference, 18 November 2013: Reflections from researchers*. Odense, Denmark: EASNIE.
14. Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2006). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw Hill.

15. Heise, M. (1997). *Equal Educational Opportunity, Hollow Victories, and the Demise of School Finance Equity Theory: An Empirical Perspective and Alternative Explanation*. Cornell Law Faculty Publications.
16. Hunt, J. H., & Andreasen, J. B. (2011, October). Making the most of universal design for learning. *Mathematics Teaching in the Middle School*, 17(3), 166-172. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5951/mathteacmidscho.17.3.0166>
17. Mariga, L., McConkey, R., & Myezwa, H. (2014). *Inclusive Education in Low-Income Countries: A resource book for teacher educators, parent trainers and community development workers*. Cape Town: Atlas Alliance and Disability Innovations Africa.
18. Metts, R. L. (2000, February). Disability Issues, Trends, and Recommendations for the World Bank. In *Social Protection Discussion Paper*. Washington, D.C: Social Protection Advisory Service, The World Bank.
19. Myers, J. (2016). *Costing Equity: The Case for Disability-Responsive Education Financing*. Brussels: IDDC, International Disability and Development Consortium. Retrieved May 2022, from <https://www.iddcconsortium.net/blog/librairie/costing-equity/>.
20. Ndam, T. (2012). *Whole School Inclusion: A Case Study of Two Secondary Schools in Cameroon*. School of Education, University of Exeter.
21. NSW Government. (2014). *Classroom Management of Students with Special Education Needs: Quality of Initial Teacher Education in NSW*. New South Wales Government.
22. OECD. (1999). *Inclusive Education at Work: Students with Disabilities in Mainstream Schools*. Paris: OECD.
23. OECD. (2017). The Funding of School Education: Connecting Resources and Learning. *OECD Reviews of School Resources*. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264276147-en>
24. Peters, J. (1999). What is Inclusion? *The Review: A Journal of Undergraduate Student Research*, 2(Art. 5), 15-21. Retrieved from <https://fisherpub.sjf.edu/ur/vol2/iss1/5>
25. Peters, S. (2004). *Inclusive Education: An EFA Strategy For All Children*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
26. Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. S. (2003). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. Stanford University Press.
27. Richmond, M., & Fairchild, D. (2013). *Financing the Education of High-Need Students*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute, Searle Freedom Trust.
28. Rieser, R. (2008). *Implementing Inclusive Education: A Commonwealth Guide to Implementing Article 24 of the UN Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
29. Sharma, U., Forlin, C., & Furlonger, B. (2015). *Contemporary Models of Funding Inclusive Education for Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder*. Program for Students with Disabilities (PSD) . Department of Education and Training for the State of Victoria.
30. Sibanda, P. (2018). The dynamics of the cost and funding of inclusive education in developing countries. *Scientific Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences*, 7(9), 816-822. doi:10.14196/sjpas.v7i9.2555
31. Sightsavers. (2019). *Inclusive Education Project. Annual Report*. Unpublished.
32. Sightsavers. (2022b). *Cost and budget impact analysis of inclusive education for children with disabilities in Cameroon*.

33. Tambo, I. (2012). *Principles and Methods of Teaching* (2nd ed.). Buea: Anucam.
34. Tambo, I. (2014). *Training Modules for Teaching and Supervision in Cameroon schools (Pilot Project)*. Sightsavers. Unpublished.
35. Tchombe, T. (2017). *Analysis of Inclusive Education in Cameroon Draft Report*.
36. UNESCO. (1994). The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. *World Conference on Special Needs Education: Access and Quality*. Salamanca, Spain: United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization.
37. UNESCO. (2005). *Guidelines for Inclusion: Ensuring access to education for all* (Vol. ED.2004/WS/39). Paris, France: United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization.
38. UNESCO. (2008). Inclusive Education: The Way Of The Future- Reference Document. *International Conference on Education Forty-eighth session*. Geneva: United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization.
39. UNESCO. (2015). Incheon Declaration: Education 2030: Towards Inclusive and Equitable Quality Education and Lifelong Learning for All. *World Education Forum*. Incheon, Republic of Korea.
40. UNICEF. (2014a). *Conceptualizing Inclusive Education and Contextualizing it within the UNICEF Mission: Webinar 1 - Companion Technical Booklet*. New York: United Nations Children's Fund.
41. United Nations. (2006, December 13). United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and Optional Protocol. *Sixty-first session of the General Assembly*. New York. Retrieved April 18, 2022, from <https://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convoptprot-e.pdf>
42. Vayrynen, S. (2000). Inclusive education: A challenge, a process. *Paper presented at ISEC, 2000, Including the excluded*. Manchester, UK: University of Manchester. Retrieved December 10, 2022, from http://www.isec.org.uk/abstract/papers_v/vayrynen_1.htm
43. Westbrook, J., Durrani, N., Brown, R., Orr, D., Pryor, J., Boddy, J., & Salvi, F. (2013). *Pedagogy, Curriculum, Teaching Practices and Teacher Education in Developing Countries. Final Report*. Education Rigorous Literature Review. Department for International Development.
44. Winter, E., & O'Raw, P. (2010). *Literature Review of the Principles and Practices Relating to Inclusive Education for Children with Special Educational Needs*. Meath: National Council for Special Education.
45. Zigmond, N. (2003). Where should students with disabilities Receive Special Education Services? Is one Place Better than Another? *University of Pittsburgh, Journal of Special Education*, 37/No. 3/2003/, 193–199.