

Full Length Research Paper

Effect of Collaborative Teaching on Inclusive Education Policy Implementation in Primary Schools in Namutumba District

Mutakubwa Magidu

College of Education, Open and Distance Learning, Kampala International University, Uganda.

Author E-mail: magidu50@gmail.com; Tel. +256774454455

Received 7 July 2022; Accepted 3 September 2022; Published 14 September 2022

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this study was to document the influence of collaborative teaching, cultural factors, and social factors on inclusive education policy implementation. Three objectives directed this study: to establish the influence of collaborative teaching on inclusive education policy implementation, to establish the influence of cultural factors on inclusive education policy implementation and to establish the influence of social factors on inclusive education policy implementation. A sample size of 473 was used to obtain responses from teachers, head teachers and SMCs. A Self-Administered Questionnaire was used. Data analysis was done using Chi-square to relate socio-demographic characteristics to main variables, mean and standard deviations to establish significant factors and regression (ANOVA) to determine the influence of the three correlates on inclusive education policy implementation. Findings showed that the four categories of collaborative teaching namely; face to face interaction, positive interdependence, individual or group accountability and group behaviour have a positive significant statistical influence on inclusive education policy implementation. The study also identified that cultural factors have a significant statistical influence on inclusive education policy implementation. The study further found out that social factors had a significant statistical influence on inclusive education policy implementation. Conclusively, collaborative teaching, cultural factors and social factors had significant statistical influence on inclusive education policy implementation. Major recommendations were that the public should be encouraged to join special needs education courses so as to increase on the number of inclusive education teachers and instructors in primary schools and technical schools respectively. There is need to have strong leadership to make inclusive practices a reality in schools. These leaders must have adequate knowledge of what inclusive practices entail and how to mobilize staff so those practices are effectively implemented. There must also be a collaborative effort between community, parents and the school to ensure that learners with disabilities do not encounter any form of discrimination at whatever cost. This will enable them live a positive life and aim higher in their academics.

Keywords: Collaborative teaching, inclusive education policy implementation, primary schools

INTRODUCTION

According to Mulipola (2016), Inclusive Education is important for five reasons: all parents want their children to be accepted by their peers, have friends and lead regular lives thus fulfilling families' visions of a typical life for their children; Children develop a positive understanding of themselves and others; Development of friendships and learning social skills; Children learn important academic skills; and all children learn by being together. UNESCO (2016) recommends that inclusive education becomes a reality such that all learners access quality education that meets basic learning needs and enriches lives. However, in many societies, this requirement is not attained owing to reported challenges related to issues of assessment to determine learners'

progress, academic training in special needs for teachers and introduction of technology to schools. On the other hand, Saren (2016) identified that managing both special needs and ordinary learners in one classroom at the same time distracts from educational experience ordinary learners receive. In a classroom that offers general Education, one mainstream teacher offers a curriculum while the special education teacher simultaneously completes the mediation process with special needs students. This kind of organization makes each group suffer from distraction.

According to MoES (2014), Uganda is signatory to International Agreements/Commitments that provide for learners with special needs, which led to an instrument

called Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education to define the policy of inclusive education in the following ways; the Right of all children, including those with temporary and permanent needs for educational adjustments to attend school, the Right of all children to attend school in their home communities in inclusive classes, the Right of all children to participate in a child-centered education meeting individual needs, the Right of all children to participate in quality education that is meaningful for each individual.

To implement the above stipulations, MoES (2014) policy statement expects the nature of inclusive education to be as follows; the traditional/long-established approach of Special Education was and is still focusing on learners with disabilities specifically. Learning support was and still is provided in special schools and in special classes (Units/Annexes) integrated in the ordinary schools. Learners with barriers (special needs) arising from disability conditions usually require Specialized support services (e.g. Sign language interpreters, Braille transcribers etc.); Specialized teaching methods; Access to resource rooms and use of specialized technology to access curriculum. Summarily, this approach takes care of learners with visible impairments, usually in the severe-profound levels requiring specialized support.

Namutumba district has been chosen for this study because it is an area in Busoga region where inclusive education is given much attention. Besides, it is one of the areas in Uganda, which, though facilitation is released by various stakeholders, the implementation of Inclusive Education policy in respective schools still shows a lot to desire. The cultural factors, social factors and the way teachers collaborate with learners with disabilities have gained much attention as key issues influencing inclusive education policy implementation. Knowing the influence of each of these three aspects in school and attending to weak areas helps to enhance implementation of inclusive education, a policy which is almost becoming less important in Namutumba district.

The approach to teaching used by teachers are the main correlates of inclusive education which affect policy implementation. This study points out that the three correlates are responsible for ineffective implementation of the policy of inclusive education thus they are worthy investigating. Moreover, these countries have different social environments, and models of implementing inclusive education which might not be similar to the context of Uganda.

This study seeks to examine the effect of Collaborative teaching on inclusive education policy implementation in primary schools in Namutumba District.

Literature review

A research conducted by (Brown et al., 2002) cooperative learning demonstrated overwhelmingly positive results

and confirmed that cooperative modes are cross-curricular, and they require learners to engage in group activities that increase learning and adds other important dimensions. The positive outcomes include: academic gains, improved race relations and increased personal and social development. One of the key issues pointed out in the theory used throughout this study underscores the need for inclusiveness and democracy in classrooms. If cooperative learning calls for engaging in group activities, then the aspect of inclusiveness is catered for and thus concern of collaboration becomes easy while in groups.

Face-to-face interaction: Face-to-face verbal interaction refers to the physical set up of a group. Students need to be clustered together in a tight group, facing each other, in order to have the kind of interchange necessary to accomplish the task. Groups should begin small, when students are just beginning to work together and develop their skills (Anderson and Minke, 2007). However, based on these findings, the arrangement of pupils in this way is not so common among many primary schools. Now, face to face interaction is not even documented so much as an aspect of collaborative teaching most especially in Uganda. It is on this note that the study was sought necessary.

The quality of interaction would depend on a number of factors such as: the grade and frequency in which the students cooperate among themselves in their academic tasks, giving feedback between each other in their learning activities, sharing learning experiences and life experiences, plus supporting and engaging among themselves in their feelings and educational expectations (Brown et al., 2002). In this context, collaborative teaching brings out two aspects of inclusive education theory. One of them is creation of an optimum environment, which is a direct role of a teacher to ensure that pupils are free to interact with each other. Second, the theory of inclusive education identifies a need to have a democratic classroom whereby each pupil chooses to join a group of their choice. By so doing, groups with common interests are established. The teacher is now left with a duty to ensure that the common interest is directed to learning.

The implementation of an appropriate interaction process constitutes a major component that helps to improve the student outcome in many academic and behavioural problems, and helped to establish a greater academic environment in the classroom (Terenzini et al., 2001). Still going back to the inclusive education theory, the aspects of availability of rights is emphasized. In connection with this point, appropriate interaction process would mean that a teacher does not in any way interrupt any interactions amongst learners such that they are free to look for pupils of common interests.

Positive interdependence: Deutsch describes three types of interdependence in a class and these are positive interdependence, neutral interdependence, and

negative interdependence.

With positive interdependence, the learners attach value to productive collaboration, which follows from the conviction that the learning environment permits everyone in the class to succeed (Brude, 2000). Positive interdependence is promoted by a grading system in which everyone in the class could earn an A. On the other hand, grading on a bell curve that requires set percentages in the class to receive Cs, Ds, and Fs does not promote positive interdependence.

In neutral interdependence, students believe that there is no value in working together and that the efforts of the other students in the class will not affect their grades. It is an “I can’t help anybody, nobody can help me, and nobody can hurt me” attitude. In negative interdependence, students believe that the activities of other students have the potential for lowering their grades (Anderson and Minke, 2007). In the context of this study, negative interdependence is preferred by special needs education learners when their able-bodied counterparts stigmatize and disassociate with them.

Negative interdependence occurs when students believe they are competing with other students for the desirable grades and that success by some requires failure by others. Although many people believe that competitive environments bring out the best in individual learning performances, many studies show that cooperative learning environments promote superior results (Banville and Rikarad, 2001). However, among the results, there is no information about Uganda or on how negative interdependence brings about positive results in implementation of inclusive education.

Positive interdependence is the belief by everyone that there is value in working with other students and that both individual learning and work products is better as a result of collaboration. The following quotes illustrate different perspectives on positive interdependence: “Positive interdependence is linking students together so one cannot succeed unless all group members succeed. Group members must know that they sink or swim together (Brady and Tsay, 2010). Just like negative interdependence, positive interdependence as an aspect of inclusive education is not widely discussed in relation to implementation of inclusive education at grassroots levels, thus creating a need for more studies.

When students clearly understand positive interdependence, they understand that each group member’s efforts are required and indispensable for group success and that each group member has a unique contribution to make to the joint effort because of his or her resources and/or role and task responsibilities”. “Positive goal interdependence ensures that the group is united around a common goal, a concrete reason for being, such as ‘learn the assigned material and make sure that all members of your group learn the assigned material (Strully and Strully, 2006). Positive goal interdependence manifests some instructions which need

to be demonstrated in schools where this study was carried out. Sharing of information among group members, for instance was not identified in primary schools targeted thus a need for this study.

When positive interdependence is solidly structured, it highlights that (a) each group member’s efforts are required and indispensable for group success and (b) each group member has a unique contribution to make to the joint effort because of his or her resources and/or role and task responsibilities. Doing so creates a commitment to the success of group members as well as one’s own and is the heart of cooperative learning. If there is no positive interdependence, there is no cooperation (Brown et al., 2002). This study was therefore intended to explain how the situation is, in primary schools in Namutumba District primary schools.

Many teachers know of the affective filter hypothesis, which proposes that certain emotions can act as filters in the flow of academic learning. Negative feelings, such as fear and embarrassment, can interfere with a learner’s ability to process information. In a psychological equivalent to the physiological fight-or-flight response to a threat, a student who experiences negative emotions during learning will either seek escape or freeze up (Banville and Rikarad, 2001). Learning still takes place, but it is all directed at the threat itself. On the other hand, students experiencing positive emotions have an improved flow of academic information and a heightened state of learning (Brady and Tsay, 2010). Individual/group accountability is another aspect of collaborative teaching which this study looks at: Individual accountability is a belief by everyone that she/he is accountable for their performance in learning. Phrased negatively, an individual believes that she/he cannot receive a satisfactory rating by riding on the coattails of other members of the group (Anderson and Minke, 2007).

One principle of group accountability is that a group must be accountable for achieving its goals and each member is accountable for contributing his or her share of the work. Individual accountability on the other hand exists when the performance of each individual is assessed and results are given back to the group or individual in order to ascertain who needs more assistance, support, and encouragement in learning (Allen and Scwartz, 2015). In this case, the purpose of cooperative learning groups is to make each member a stronger individual in his or her right just as the theory of inclusive education stipulates it in Inclusive educational theory when he talks about the need for definition and availability of rights for each pupil. Students learn together so that they subsequently can gain greater individual competency. Individual accountability is the element, which provides for each student believing that it is important for him/her to learn the material. Each team member feels in charge of their own and their teammates’ learning and makes active contribution to his or her group (Brady and Tsay, 2010).

Group behaviours: Research by Strom indicates that it is very important for pupils to have sufficient social skills, involving an explicit teaching of appropriate leadership, communication, trust and conflict resolution skills so that they can cooperate effectively. Social skills are explicitly taught to learners so that they work among themselves, not only in terms of cooperation but also without hostility and teacher 's authority (Strom and Strom, 2003).

This clearly bring out the aspect of democracy, whereby Bundoora, in the theory of Inclusive education advocates for an inclusive and a democratic classroom where a respective teacher is supposed to teach pupils not to discriminate each other on grounds of disability status, religion and other reasons. By instilling this in their minds, they are prepared to unite with each other and form groups geared towards not only cooperation but solving academic problems.

Sometimes learners are placed in a particular learning environment merely because they are labelled as belonging to a category of learners for which a particular kind of educational placement exists. Because the placement has occurred through the attachment of a label rather than through an appropriate assessment of the educational needs of the learner or what is required by the system to meet those needs, placement may not only be inappropriate to learner's needs but it may result into a learner being marginalized (Allen and Schwartz, 2015).

METHODOLOGY

Research design

A descriptive and Correlation design was used to conduct this study. According to the Kowalczyk (2010), this type of research design is a test under controlled conditions made to demonstrate a known truth, examine the validity of hypothesis or to determine the efficiency of something previously untried. Prior to this interpretation, available studies have tried to explore much about teaching methods, school environment and other related factors affecting education but the aspect of inclusive education still lacks a lot of information in the publications. A research paradigm involving use of mainly quantitative approach was used. Among the strengths of this paradigm are; complementary strengths and non-overlapping weaknesses, superior evidence for the results since a mixture of methods can result into generation of similar findings.

Study population

The study population was obtained from five Sub Counties of Namutumba district with various numbers of schools as indicated in the (Table 1).

Sampling techniques

Purposive sampling

In this study, headteachers were included directly as heads of schools whose findings contain responses about the entire school environment. They know more than teachers and their responses can be used to back-up those from teachers thus the phenomenon of generalization. The main advantage of purposive sampling is that a researcher can reach a targeted sample quickly and it is easy to get a sample of subjects with specific characteristics. Additionally, researchers can draw on a wide range of qualitative research designs.

Cluster sampling

In most cases, the commonest form of cluster sampling is area sampling used to consider the study area by sub sects based on common characteristics. In the context of this study, government aided primary schools are targeted. All primary schools in Namutumba district were clustered into private and public and only public schools were selected. This sampling approach has been used because Namutumba district consists of both private and public primary but the aspect of Inclusive Education is mainly an aspect of public or government schools.

Stratified sampling

This approach involves consideration of the study population by common characteristics. The study population is divided into subgroups called strata. Whereas cluster sampling was used to consider the study population by type of school, stratified sampling was used to categorize the study population into males and females. This applied to teachers, School management Committee Members (SMCs) and head teachers. It was done to avoid being gender biased during distribution of tools for data collection.

Simple random sampling

This was used for selecting individual respondents from each stratum. As the most used sampling technique, it is necessary for this study because it is normally free from errors in classification, it is suitable for the use of inferential statistics given the fact that this study has a quantitative part, and it is free from bias and prejudice. The study used SRS to select each pupil after considering the aspect of gender. Random sampling eliminates bias by giving all individuals an equal chance to be chosen.

Data collection instruments

The study was conducted using a questionnaire.

Table 1: Study population by category.

| Sub County | No. of schools | Teachers | Head teachers | SMCs |
|------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Kibale S/C | 8 | 104 | 8 | 96 |
| Namutumba | 6 | 78 | 6 | 72 |
| Mazuba | 3 | 39 | 3 | 36 |
| Nangonde | 9 | 117 | 9 | 108 |
| Nabweyo | 9 | 117 | 9 | 108 |
| Totals | 35 | 455 = (N ₁) | 35 = (N ₂) | 420 = (N ₃) |

Source: DEO's office documents

Table 2: Reliability results according to Crombach Alpha.

| Variable | No. of items | Coefficient | Percentage |
|----------------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|
| Inclusive Education Policy | 7 | 0.906 | 90.6 |
| Collaborative teaching | 20 | 0.726 | 72.6 |
| Cultural factors | 12 | 0.812 | 81.2 |
| Social factors | 20 | 0.866 | 86.6 |

Source: primary data from Namutumba primary schools, March 2017

A questionnaire was chosen for its practical nature, wide coverage of many people in short period of time and results are easily quantified and presented, (Popper, 2004, p.5). A questionnaire was used to obtain findings from teachers.

Validity

Validity was ensured by carefully selecting questions for questionnaires respectively. The questions set were discussed with experts to ensure that all concerned the main objectives and hence could handle each study area without leaving out necessary information. Validity of a study was important because if the results were not valid, then the study would be meaningless. If it did not measure what the study intended, then results could not be used to answer the research question, which is the main aim of the study.

Reliability

The reliability of instruments was tested using the Crombach Alpha method automatically programmed in Statistical package for social Sciences (SPSS) software. The rule of thumb is that a reliability scale that is from .70 and above is always accepted. However, any reliability scale below that percentage is considered unacceptable and tools of data collection revised. This principle was followed in handling reliability of the study. Reliability was run because it addresses the overall consistency of a research study's measure. If a research instrument, for example a survey or questionnaire, produces similar results under consistently applied conditions, it lessens the chance that the obtained scores are due to randomly occurring factors, like seasonality or current events, and measurement error. Results from the reliability analysis were as indicated in (Table 2). The Crombach Alpha coefficients obtained as indicated in Table 2 shows that

the content used to measure correlates of inclusive education policy implementation had reliability scales meeting the required coefficient of .70 or 70%. Inclusive education policy items were 7 and measured up to a reliability scale of .906, translating into a reliability score of 90.6%. On the other hand, collaborative teaching was underlined by a Crombach coefficient of 0.726, which is translated into 72.6%. In addition, the content for Cultural factors consisted of 12 items, whose reliability scale as per Crombach coefficients was .812, translating into 81.2%. Finally, social factors were measured by twenty (20) items equaling to a Crombach coefficient of .866 or 86.6%. In other words, the highest reliability was realized with social factors, followed by cultural and then items for collaborative teaching.

Data analysis

The collected data were coded, grouped thematically for easy analysis and reporting. Data were analyzed statistically by use of SPSS and reported by the help of Tables. The background information of respondents was analyzed using frequencies and percentages. Further, the significance of the background information to the correlates of inclusive education was tested using Chi square statistics indicating degrees of freedom (df) and probability value (P-value) significant at $p < .01$. The average Mean values and standard deviations were used to establish factors which explained collaborative teaching as a correlate of inclusive education policy implementation.

On the other hand, regression coefficients were used to determine the influence of each correlate of inclusive education policy implementation at $p < .05$. Analysis of Variance coefficients were used to establish the extent to which each of the correlates influenced inclusive education.

Ethical considerations

Ethical considerations are important whenever the collection of data involves human beings. The main ethical issues to be considered include physical and psychological harm, deception, informed consent, and privacy. Confidentiality was considered to protect respondent's image since some of the issues handled pertained to the security of their work. Respect and dignity were accorded while setting the questionnaire. Thus, all respondents were given equal treatment to enable each to participate willingly.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

Table 3 shows a summary of findings obtained in relation to the six characteristics explaining background information of respondents.

The study examined the age distribution of respondents with the purpose of ensuring that all respondents were mature and reasonable enough to participate in the study. Results on age-brackets in the above table revealed that the highest number of respondents was in the age bracket of 40-49 (37.7%), followed by those in the age brackets of 30-39 (24.9%) and 20-29(9.51%). These findings imply that all respondents were in the active age-group and could interpret questionnaires well without any bias, thus improving the reliability of findings. The study also examined the period of service to enrich findings by generating mixed views from teachers who had been in service for a short time and those who had been serving in inclusive education for quite a long period of time. The period of service was measured using a minimum of 1 year and a maximum of 10 years and above. Findings in (Table 3) show that the highest percentage (49.5%) of the respondents had served as teachers in inclusive education for a period exceeding ten (10) years. Others (42.2%) had served for a period of 6 to 10 years, and the least percentage (8.2%) had served for a period of 1 to 5 years. As a result, the data obtained came from experienced people who were familiar with the requirements of the inclusive education policy as well as factors related to its implementation over time, increasing the reliability of the findings.

This was investigated for two reasons: one was to enable readers acknowledge the various kinds of disabilities existing in primary schools where the inclusive education policy is operational. Second was to make relationships on how various disabilities are handled in these schools. Based on findings in (Table 3) above, 35.5% of the respondents reported that visual impairment was the commonest disability, followed by hearing impairment, which had a percentage representation of 32.2%, physical impairment, with a percentage representation of 30.6%, and the other categories of

disability was represented by 30.6%. Statistical data from (Table 3) above indicates that there were 323 male respondents, representing 73.7%, compared to 115 female respondents, representing 26.3%. This significant difference in gender distribution can be attributed to the fact that there was more recruitment of males than female teachers.

Many parents feel comfortable when they entrust their children who have disabilities with teachers in school. Consequently, there was a need to investigate the roles of teachers as per this establishment. Table 3 shows that 52.7% of the respondents were just mere teachers of inclusive learners, followed by 35.4% were counselors at school and 11.9% relatives of inclusive learners.

The effect of collaborative teaching on inclusive education policy implementation

The first objective required an establishment of the effect of collaborative teaching on inclusive education policy implementation. This was determined through regression analyses for the four categories of collaborative teaching/learning visavis inclusive education policy implementation (Table 4). According to (Table 4), the four categories of collaborative teaching namely; face to face interaction, positive interdependence, individual or group accountability and group behavior ($R = .241$, $R^2 = .058$, $P < .05$). This means that 24.1%-unit change in collaborative teaching leads to 5.8% positive influence on the implementation of inclusive policy education implementation. Based on Table 4.2, most of the significant factors are embedded in positive interdependence, such that the use of collaborative teaching leads to the following: a deeper understanding of the material, participation of all group members, promotion of friendship, working in solitude to enhance individual desires, and promoting competition among learners to iron out weaknesses. These are in line with research conducted by Ciuffetelli, (2009) who demonstrated overwhelmingly positive results and confirmed that cooperative modes are cross-curricular, and they require learners to engage in group activities that increase learning and adds other important dimensions.

In the context of inclusive education, collaborative teaching is helpful in bringing about positive outcomes especially when pupils of different family statuses, social constructions, age, gender, and generally of various disability status come together to give meaning to the concept "inclusive education". In other words, collaborative teaching contains the real implication of inclusive education when it comes to face to face interactions. According to (Table 4), face-to-face interaction among learners as emphasized by teachers was discovered to have four advantages. First, it enabled teachers to evaluate learners fairly when using collaborative teaching approach, enables teachers to

Table 3: Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents.

| Characteristic | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Age category | | |
| 20-29 | 40 | 9.1 |
| 30-39 | 109 | 24.9 |
| 40-49 | 165 | 37.7 |
| Period of service | | |
| 1-5 years | 36 | 8.2 |
| 6-10 years | 185 | 42.2 |
| More than 10 years | 217 | 49.5 |
| Nature of disability | | |
| Visual impairment | 155 | 35.4 |
| Hearing impairment | 141 | 32.2 |
| Physical impairment | 134 | 30.6 |
| Other | 8 | 1.8 |
| Gender | | |
| Male | 323 | 73.7 |
| Female | 115 | 26.3 |
| Responsibility towards the one with disability | | |
| Counsellor at school | 155 | 35.4 |
| Mere teacher | 231 | 52.7 |
| Relative | 52 | 11.9 |

Source: primary data from Namutumba primary schools, March 2017

Table 4: Collaborative teaching and inclusive education policy implementation.

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|-------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| (Constant) | 1.682 | 0.239 | | 7.044 | 0.000 |
| Face-to-face | -0.083 | 0.060 | -0.074 | -1.385 | 0.167 |
| Positive interdependence | 0.248 | 0.055 | 0.261 | 4.520 | 0.000 |
| Individual or group accountability | 0.011 | 0.058 | 0.010 | 0.185 | 0.854 |
| Group behaviour | -0.017 | 0.036 | 0.024 | -0.479 | 0.632 |

a. Dependent Variable: Inclusive education policy

R = .241

R² = .058

Adj. R = .049

P < .05

evaluate the extent to which learners could socialize with each other, it eased supervision of the class unlike if it were for one pupil, and it also made pupils free to ask any questions they wanted to enhance their understanding. This is just like Brown et al., (2002) indications that the quality of interaction would depend on a number of factors such as: the grade and frequency in which the students cooperate among themselves in their academic tasks, giving feedback between each other in their learning activities, sharing learning experiences and life experiences, plus supporting and engaging among themselves in their feelings and educational expectations.

The study established that among the five categories of collaborative teaching, positive interdependence was commonly reported in Namutumba District. This includes aspects such as deeper understanding of material, participation of all group members, promotion of

friendship, working in solitude to enhance individual desires and promoting competition among learners to iron out weaknesses. These results are in line with Johnson (2005) results which also state that collaborative teaching in terms of positive interdependence promotes participation of all group members, and challenging each other over an issue thus necessary for implementation of inclusive education.

Individual or group accountability was another aspect of collaborative teaching that was mentioned though with very limited responses in support. According to the study, individual or group accountability is geared towards enabling everyone participate equally towards common theme. This is in line with Treeze (2013) findings which cites out that individual or group accountability enables each or all members to share responsibility for their collective output and for their success in achieving their goals thus building team work and enriching the benefits

of collaborative teaching as a correlate of inclusive education policy implementation. Individual accountability as a structural element in collaboration is pivotal to prevent and lower the likelihood of free riders or social loafing. Individual accountability is the belief that everyone will be accountable for her/his performance and learning.

Conclusion

Concerning the influence of collaborative teaching/learning on inclusive education policy implementation, it was concluded that the four categories of collaborative teaching namely; face to face interaction, positive interdependence, individual or group accountability and group behavior have a positive significant statistical influence on inclusive education policy implementation. Particular attention was given to positive interdependence emphasizing a deeper understanding of the material, participation of all group members, promotion of friendship, working in solitude to enhance individual desires, and promoting competition among learners to iron out weaknesses.

Recommendations

Giving challenging problems to prevent independent work, any task or problem should be too difficult or consume too much time for a single student. Thus, group problems or tasks are necessarily different from those given to individuals. Problems, with unique solutions, or that require divergent thinking are preferable. In the business world, groups are formed to take advantage of different background knowledge and skills. This may be less possible in the classroom, unless you have a mix of skills such as writing, mathematics, graphics, and computer skills.

Secondly, mutual goals Students must be placed in a situation with a common goal so they sink or swim together and there is no advantage in one person abandoning the others. In addition, joint rewards whereby an individual bonus can be awarded to each member of the group if all members of group succeed in achieving a predetermined level of performance. Another method is to give a single grade to all members of the group for the group effort.

Restricted or shared resources can also work where pupils can be made to collaborate if they are restricted by the resources made available. This happens naturally with limited quantities of expensive laboratory equipment. It can also be done deliberately by giving just a single handout to the group or by giving different information to different group members of the group members.

Designated roles making different people responsible for singular tasks or aspects of the problem prevents one student from doing everything. Students learn to take on responsibility and how to depend on others. Context-rich

problems are an answer to effective collaborative learning. The main idea of the problem can be embedded in a complex story line, featuring the reader as a problem-solver. These are preferable to more traditional, bare-bones problems that have been stripped of all but the most essential elements. The "story" approach requires students learn what to do by discussing problem details. With the growing number of inclusive schools, special educators are expected to make adaptations and accommodations to the curriculum, their instructional techniques and evaluation procedures, as well as their classroom behavior management styles.

Those specialists who are already engaged in inclusive schooling must be provided with sufficient instructional resources, while at the same time encouraged to continue their efforts to reach out to all learners.

REFERENCES

- Allen, K. E., and Schwartz, I. (2015). *"What is Inclusive Design"*. Inclusive Design Research Centre. OCAD: OCAD University.
- Anderson, K. J., and Minke, K. M. (2007). *Parent involvement in education: Toward an understanding of parents' decision making*. London: The Journal of Educational Research.
- Banville, D., and Rikarad, L. (2001). *Observational tools for teacher reflection*. New York: Journal of physical.
- Brady, M., and Tsay, M. (2010). *A case study of cooperative learning and communication pedagogy: Does working in teams make a difference?* London: Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.
- Brown, L., Schwarz, P., Udvari-Solner, A., Kampchroer, E., Johnson, F., Jorgensen, J., and Gruenewald, L. (2002). *How much time should students with severe intellectual disabilities spend in regular education classrooms and elsewhere?* New York.
- Brude, M. B. (2000). *Family-centered early intervention: Clarifying our values for the new millennium. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*. New York: DRE.
- Ministry of Education and Sports MoES. (2014). *Special Needs and Inclusive Education Department*. Kampala: The Republic of Uganda Ministry of Education and Sports.
- Mulipola, G. (2016). *The Benefits of Inclusive Education*, 1-2.
- Saren, D. (2016). *The rise of Inclusion Education in the United States, The past 20 years of inclusion education*. Washington DC: Specialneed.com.
- Strom, P., and Strom, R. (2003). *Student evaluation of cooperative learning: The Interpersonal Intelligence Inventory. Presentation to the Annual Meeting of the*. Washington DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Strully, J., and Strully, C. (2006). *Friendships as an educational goal: What we have learned and where we are headed*. In W. Stainback and S. Stainback (Eds.), *Inclusion: A guide for educators*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.
- UNESCO. (2016). *Policy Guidelines on Inclusion in Education*. PARIS: UNESCO.