THE PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTING THE INCLUSIVE EDUCATION POLICY FOR THE PROMOTION OF STUDENT FRIENDLY ENVIRONMENTS IN TEACHER EDUCATION COLLEGES IN ZIMBABWE

Alexander Katiyo [a],
Partson Virira Moyo [b],
Norman Rudhumbu [b],
[a]Nyadire Teachers' College, Zimbabwe
[b] Bindura University of Science Education, Zimbabwe
Corresponding author: katiyoat@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigated how teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe implemented the inclusive education policy to promote student friendly environments, whether there was a significant difference between state-run and church-run colleges in the way they implemented the policy, whether there were challenges related to the implementation of the policy, and if there were ways to enhance the policy implementation process. The study adopted the multi-case design in which state-run and church-run teacher education colleges were involved. Qualitative data were collected through semi-structured in-depth interview questions with the 2 Principals as well as through focus group discussions with 15 College Academic Board (CAB) members and 15 Student Representative Council (SRC) members purposely selected. Survey questionnaires were used to gather quantitative data from a random sample of 543 student teachers. The major findings were that the implementation of the inclusive education policy promoted physically, socially and academically friendly student environments; that lack of involvement of the students and the centralised process constrained the implementation. T-test results showed that there were no significant differences between state-run and church-run teacher education colleges in the manner in which the inclusive education policy was implemented. The study concluded that involvement of students and decentralisation of the implementation process would enhance the promotion of student friendly environments.

Keywords: inclusive education policy; policy implementation; student friendly environment; teacher education college

1.0   Introduction

The inclusive education policy framework is enshrined in the following selected international legal instruments: United Nations Standard Rules on Creating Equal Opportunities for People Who Live with Disabilities (1993); World Declaration on Education For All (EFA), (UNESCO, 1994) and United Nations Conference on Basic Rights of People Who Live With Disabilities (2006). These instruments advocate that the inclusive education policy implementation basically is a human and legal right. The implementation of the inclusive education policy involves a range of strategies in order to regulate the physical, social, academic and psychological environments with a common objective to create inclusivity that promotes student friendly environments for students in teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe (UNESCO, 2012).

It is estimated that 10% of any population live with physical challenges (World Health Organisation, 1994). Forms of disabilities include hearing impairment, amputations, visual impairment and behavioural disorders. Student teachers in teacher education colleges come from different cultural and socio-economic backgrounds. In addition, these students have unique academic abilities, interests and needs. In this context, inclusive education implementation processes should benefit student teachers from all backgrounds, student teachers with unique academic abilities and needs and those who live with any form of disability. Policy implementers and student teachers should be involved in the implementation of this policy collectively in order to enhance the promotion of student friendly environments. In addition, key stakeholders in teacher education such as principals, lecturing staff, non-lecturing staff and the student body should make valid contributions for the successful implementation of the inclusive education policy (UNESCO,2012:13). The successful implementation of the policy should manifest in the policy decision-making structures of the teacher education colleges, the physical infrastructure set ups as well as the social beliefs and attitudes of the student teachers, lecturers and non-lecturing staff. A special conference held in Salamanca, Spain, 7-10

June 1994, acknowledged that every learner is characterised with unique physical and academic abilities, interests, social needs as well as teaching and learning needs. The 1994 Salamanca statement and inclusive education framework for action ensured that the education of students with disabilities forms integral part of education system globally. The inclusive education policy framework is premised on the concept that students who come from different economic, cultural and social backgrounds, and those who live with physical disability should have equal access to learning opportunities under one roof (UNICEF, 2010).

The complexity in promoting student friendly environments in teacher education colleges through the implementation processes of the inclusive education policy needs to be investigated in order to come up with plausible processes that enhance student friendly environments. Selected evaluation studies done by UNICEF on the Child Friendly Schools (CFS) concept implementation targeted Early Childhood Development (ECD) centres and primary schools (Madu and Okoye, 2017) and one carried out by Zendah in 2016 focused on secondary schools (Andrus, 2018). Of significance is the fact that, in all the aforementioned researches, no specific attention was given to the implementation of inclusive education in teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe. The inclusive education initiative endeavours to ensure that every student teacher is subjected to an environment that is emotionally secure, physically safe, socially interactive and psychologically enabling (Taole, 2013). Based on this background, the focus of inclusive education policy implementation processes should be anchored on addressing barriers to inclusivity and consequences of any form of inequality, discrimination and environments that naturally exclude the participation of student teachers in teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe on the basis of their physical and social differences, economic backgrounds, learning difficulties and physical disabilities.

1.2. Statement of the research problem

The promotion of student friendly environments through the implementation of the inclusive education policy is an issue which draws the attention of many governments across the world because it affects the students' physical, social and academic environments (Andrus,2018). Literature on student friendly environments shows unexplored areas that include the processes of implementing the inclusive education policy, ways of curbing challenges of exclusion among student teachers who live with disability and other differences and factors that constrain the implementation processes (UNICEF, 2012). The researchers in this study did not come across a study conducted in the context of inclusive education policy implementation in church-run and state-run teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe. Further, literature review showed potholed literature on specific implementation processes of the inclusive education policy which promote student friendly environments in teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe. The knowledge gaps include lack of specific programmes that orient key stakeholders on inclusive education and strategies that enhance the implementation of inclusive education (Chireshe,2013:7). It is this background that prompted this study which is an endeavour to examine the process of implementing the inclusive education policy for the promotion of student friendly environments in teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe and the challenges which may be encountered during that process.

1.3. Research questions

The research process was guided by the following questions: -

- How do teacher education colleges implement the inclusive education policy for the promotion of student friendly environments in Zimbabwe?
- What are the challenges faced by teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe in the implementation of inclusive education policy?

- Is there a significant difference in inclusive education policy implementation between church-run and state-run teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe?

- How can inclusive education policy implementation processes be enhanced to promote student friendly environments in teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe?

2. Review of related literature

This section gives an overview of related literature on inclusive education policy implementation in an effort to promote student friendly environments.

2.1. The meaning of the inclusive education concept

The inclusive education policy advocates for a total inclusive physical, academic and social environment that accommodates and tolerates students of diverse backgrounds and those with different physical challenges in the mainstream of teacher education (Allan, 2015). The government of Zimbabwe's inclusive education policy framework guides teacher education institutions to become all-encompassing teacher education colleges in order to cater for student teachers of diverse backgrounds and abilities. Further, the policy outlines how the infrastructural facilities should be planned and constructed in order to accommodate students who use wheel chairs, hand crutches and those who are partially blind. The teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe have to continuously review their college-based inclusive education policies in order to match the ever-changing demands of inclusivity such as having accessible infrastructure and curriculum needs so that they become relevant and in order to uphold the promotion of student friendly environments.

2.2. The meaning of student friendly environments

According to Laeka (2013) student friendly environment refers to positive and enabling conditions in terms of the physical, psychological, social-wellbeing, emotional and safety needs of the students. The indicators of student friendly environments include:

- provision of a safe, inclusive and welcoming environment for student teachers with diverse needs;
- attracting student teachers to willingly participate in all college curriculum activities;
- support of student teachers' academic, emotional and social welfare;
- respect of student teachers' rights;
- fair treatment of all student teachers regardless of their gender, race, religious, economic backgrounds or political affiliation and
- maintaining open door policy spaces to all students (Chabbott, 2014).

In brief a student friendly environment refers to accommodative physical, social and academic spaces that do not discriminate human beings on the basis of their physical stature, race, colour, gender or beliefs (Attig & Hopkins, 2016).

2.3. Factors that influence the promotion of physically, academically and socially friendly student environments

The process of implementing the inclusive education policy which results in the promotion of student friendly environments refers to coming up with teacher education environments or surroundings that provide inclusivity and are student friendly (Webster, 2018). The implementation of the inclusive education policy may be influenced by the clients; the physical infrastructure and the social relationship or day to day interaction of the organisational stakeholders (Webster, 2018). The physical infrastructure refers to the lecture rooms, halls of residence, library and sporting facilities. In the context of this

paper, the promotion of student friendly environments when implementing the inclusive education policy in teacher education colleges may also be influenced by student teachers' demands, their past and current experiences and cultural orientations.

2.4. The process of promoting socially friendly student environments

Andrus (2018) describes the social environment as the immediate social settings in which learners, lecturing staff and non-lecturing staff interact on a day-to-day basis, where they live most of the time and where a new culture occurs through socialization. The social environment is the sum total of individuals' cultures brought in the institution by socialisation through religious beliefs, previous educational experiences, gender expectations and general individual expectations. Socially friendly student environment refers to developed settings that accommodate feelings, desires, beliefs, relationships and diversities of all members of the institution (Chimonyo, Mamvura, Kaputa, Hlatywayo, Munemo, Nyatsanza, & Mutandwa,2004:2). Sallis, Bauman, and Prett (2016) and Andrus (2018) propound that when the inclusive education policy is well implemented, it has high potential to promote socially friendly student environments outcomes. The attributes that promote socially friendly student environments include zero tolerance of any form of abuse of learners by staff or among students themselves, the promotion of friendly learner-lecturer relationships and a discrimination free environment (Sallis, Bauman, & Prett ,2016 and Andrus, 2018). The implementation of the inclusive education policy would result in socially friendly student environments that empower student teachers to be able to express their feelings freely, respect the rights of other students, to be free from forms of abuse and to view others as equal beings.

2.5. The process of promoting physically friendly student environments

The physical environments in teacher education institutions refer to lecture rooms, lecture theatres, laboratories, halls of residence, computer rooms, educational media and technology studios, library and sporting facilities (Jagemann, 2018 and Carayon, 2012).

The authors further articulate that for these physical learning spaces to be student friendly, they should be accessible to all students, well lit, well ventilated and should have inclusive furniture as well as interactive boards, while the spaces should be neatly kept all the time. Related studies by Graetz (2015) in North America and Nwangwa (2016) in Nigeria show that there is a significant relationship that exists between the state of the physical environment and the academic performance of learners. The implementation of the inclusive education policy regulates the way infrastructure is designed, developed, constructed and furnished for it to be inclusive, user-friendly, safe and accessible. Further, the process of coming up with student friendly physical learning spaces should ensure that they are noise free for individual studies, kinaesthetic and generally accessible to students of various physical stature and needs. The implementation of the inclusive education policy in teachers' colleges in Zimbabwe should advocate for user-friendly physical environments which provide for the safety of students and allow them to feel that they are naturally accepted by the physical environment.

2.6. The process of promoting academically friendly student environments

An academically friendly student environment in teacher education colleges embraces aspects that include non-discriminatory enrolment of students, inclusive teacher education curriculum, friendly teaching and learning strategies and student-friendly assessment approaches (Young and Fried, 2013). The authors further assert that in order to promote an academically friendly student environment, there is need to inspire a sense of belonging, love and individual mental freedom and the students should be allowed to learn the same curriculum under one roof. The enablers of academically friendly student environment include selection of students without bias, designing teaching and learning activities that accommodate students from different backgrounds and tailoring academic evaluation instruments to suit both the able bodied and the physically challenged students (Graetz, 2015). The implementation of the inclusive education policy should avail an academic environment which is accommodative, respects and recognises individual

physical and academic differences, thereby promoting sound learning approaches that are academically friendly to students. The extent to which the processes mentioned above can be enhanced was explored by this study.

2.7. Complexity in the implementation of the inclusive education policy

The complexity in the implementation of inclusive education policy is viewed under unforeseen factors that emanate from planning, social, involvement of stakeholders and policy decision making processes (Osman, 2013). Factors which have the possibility to handicap the implementation of the inclusive education policy as articulated by Sabastier (2014), Martin and Stevenson (2014) include incompetent staff, lack of adequate resources and unpleasant physical environments. Further, the implementation is constrained by complexity of the administration systems as well as lack of acknowledgement of relevant policy implementation strategies that bring friendly environments which may require engagement of all stakeholders and implementers. These factors thus place inclusive education policy implementation as a critical area that should be explored in order to come up with usable processes that institute transparency; effectiveness and student-friendly environments. In summary, this paper sought to come up with processes that enhance inclusive education policy implementation, which allow students to feel that they are safe to express their emotions, are secure, loved, accepted and cared for by the teacher education system.

3. Methodology

The research adopted the multi-case design which involves more than one case in a study (Hartley, 2014). In this study church-run and state-run teacher education colleges took part in order to establish how they implemented the inclusive education policy and whether there was significant difference in the manner in which they implemented the policy for the promotion of student friendly environments. The target population of this study was 242 teachers' college policy implementers and 6 600 student teachers.

3.1. Sample size of student teachers

A sampling size format at 95% confidence level and 5 % margin error as given by Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, (2009) was used to randomly select the quantitative sample size of 543 student teachers as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Sample size of student teachers from the two teacher education colleges

Teacher Education Colleges	Freq.	% Of sample
Church-run	252	46.4
State-run	291	53.6
Total	**543**	100%

3.2. Sample size of policy implementers

A sample of policy implementers for each case was purposefully selected from participants with knowledge of the area of study. The sample size is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Sample size of policy implementers from the two teacher education colleges

Category	Principal	CAB members	SRC members
Church-run	1	8	8
State-run	1	7	7
Total	**2**	**15**	**15**

3.3. Research instruments

Semi-structured in-depth interview questions were used to gather qualitative data through focus group discussions with College Academic Board members and Student

Representative Council members as well as face-to face interviews with the principals. The descriptive data covered aspects which included the process of inclusive education policy implementation in promoting physically, socially and academically friendly student environments, challenges of implementing the policy and the extent to which the students were involved in inclusive education policy implementation. Survey questionnaires with Closed-Likert scale rated 1 to 5, with provided responses were used to collect quantitative data from student teachers who were on campus. The gathered quantitative data included students' level of involvement in the inclusive education policy implementation process and outcomes of the inclusive education policy implementation.

The qualitative responses were analysed using Atlasi8.ti software to come up with themes. The quantitative data were analysed using IBM SPSS version 21 to come up with categories in line with the research questions. The two sets of results were merged during the interpretive discussion of findings and conclusions were drawn.

4. Results

The section presents qualitative and quantitative results concurrently.

4.1. How teacher education colleges implement the inclusive education policy to promote student friendly environments in Zimbabwe

The qualitative data were gathered through focus groups discussion with Student Representative Council (SRC), College Academic Board (CAB) members and interviews with principals.

Table 3: Responses from SRC, CAB and principals on the implementation of inclusive education policy in state-run and church run teachers' colleges

Implementation of inclusive education policy responses	
Church-run	**State-run**

FG1 SrcM2: "If you observe the college surroundings, it's neat, accessible, user-friendly and socially the students and staff members interact well, we have been empowered to respect individual rights and to send our work electronically, that's the environment is friendly to us."

FG1SrcM5: "What I have noticed is that the college embarked on the construction of infrastructure which is inclusive and is in line with Inclusive Education college policy, being it lecture rooms or sporting facilities; these are student friendly including those who live with disability."

FG1 CAB 6: "The Inclusive Education policy has actually empowered the students and created Social student environments friendly."

P1: "In terms of our inclusive education policy, it permitted students to be free, meet and discuss their social challenges in the campus, the reporting structure is user-friendly, students are treated the same regardless of their gender.'

P1: "As an institution we have managed to maintain an environment where students have freedom to air their views freely, the SRC has been instrumental in relaying information to admin, no harassment and fighting reports, the social environment is friendly."

FG1CAB1: "In my view, the Inclusive Education Policy has some positive aspects which consider the class of students who live with disability but it's not that much."

FG2SrcM4: "The policy made us to receive lecture notes, send assignments, present seminar papers online."

FG2 CAB 3: "I feel that the college has done a lot as contribution to a student friendly environment that has seen the purchase of left and right-handed science kits, the establishment of hostels indoor games, rumps into all entrances, improved students' welfare through the inclusive education policy."

FG2CAB7: "In my opinion, the Inclusive education policy is socially accepted during implementation it upheld students' social life, there are no serious challenges."

FG2SrcM7: "I have observed that the inclusive education policy has made our life here safe as we are protected legally by the policy, no harassment, no bullying, no cases of victimization of students were experienced in the college."

FG2SrcM1: "I think from the other side the institution has not done much on coming up with practical subject assessment policy that is inclusive especially in Physical Education and Music Education, that's my feeling."

P2: "The policy has made the students to appreciate the social, physical and academic environments because their welfare has greatly improved. they even testify that the environment is inclusive."

Key: **FG2CAB1** = Focus Group 2 College Academic Board; **FG1SrcM**= Focus Group 1 Student Representative Council member **FG2SrcM**= Focus Group 2 Student Representative Council member; **P2** = Principal of state-run; FG**1CAB1** = Focus Group 1 College Academic Board; **P1** = Principal of church-run

4.1.1. Promotion of socially friendly student environments

The Student Representative Council (SRC) members of the two teachers' colleges viewed the implementation of the inclusive education policy as having empowered the student teachers and promoted socially friendly student environments. They highlighted that the inclusive education policy promoted the following: permitted student teachers to interact freely when discussing their social challenges on- campus, managed to put in place reporting structures that were student-friendly, students received the same treatment regardless of their gender or stature. church-run, SRC focus group discussants also

revealed that the inclusive education policy inculcated in students a culture of respect of other student teachers' rights and property, which, in their view, were basic in the promotion of socially friendly student environments.

In state-run, the SRC participants concurred in their sentiments that through the inclusive education policy, the following were successfully implemented: First, it guided and shaped the institution to operate a social environment that was free from operational and administrative challenges. Second, the participants further acknowledged that the inclusive education policy assisted student teachers to operate in safe social life environments as the policy legally protected them from sexual harassment, bullying and victimization.

The College Academic Board (CAB) members of the two teacher education colleges echoed each other in their sentiments that the inclusive education policy protected student teachers from forms of emotional abuse and harassment, thereby enhancing the respect of students' rights.

4.1.2. Promotion of academically friendly student environments

The SRC participants of the two teachers' colleges highlighted that the introduction of the inclusive education policy promoted an academically friendly student learning environment as student teachers are able to communicate their seminar papers online, send soft copies of assignments and make consultations online in the comfort of their halls of residence or homes and they learn the same curriculum under one roof. The principal of the church-run teachers' college, highlighted that the implementation of the inclusive education policy created an environment in which student teachers had the academic freedom to air their views freely.

4.1.3. Promotion of physically friendly student environments

The church-run participants, in the SRC and CAB focus groups were in agreement in their views with the principal on the contribution of inclusive education policy implementation to come up with some facilities and resources that are accessible to student teachers living with disability. The discussants further explained that inclusive education policy implementation contributed to the construction of lecture rooms, public toilets and sporting facilities that are accessible to all students. The state-run college principal said that inclusive education policy regulated the renovation of old buildings at the college, which were constructed without consideration of student teachers living with physical disabilities and the new buildings were constructed considering students who use wheelchairs and crutches.

Overall, the results show that the implementation of the inclusive education policy by the two teachers' colleges empowered student teachers and demonstrated inclusivity, hence promoting student friendly environments socially, academically and physically.

4.2. *Challenges of implementing inclusive education policy in TECs in Zimbabwe*

Qualitative data were gathered from student representative council (SRC) members and College Academic Board (CAB) members using semi-structured in-depth interview questions while quantitative data were gathered from student teachers who were on campus through the administration of survey questionnaires.

Table 4: Responses from SRC, CAB members and principals on challenges faced during the implementation of inclusive education policy in state-run and church run teachers' colleges

Responses on inclusive education policy implementation challenges

Church-run	State-run
FG1SrcM7: "In my view the implemention of the inclusive education policy is done from top-down, we are not involved fully." **FG1CAB1:** "In brief, the challenge which influence the implementation is that everything is done at the top." **FG2CAB4**:" From my point of view, the college has not deliberately come up with clear activities that involve and benefit students who live with various disabilities. I suggest it's an area that needs attention." **P1:** "We have financial and material challenges to use here."	**FG2SrcM3:** "The challenge I personally face is that we are not involved during implementation." **FG2SrcM4:** 'As SRC we are not directly involved during implementation." **FG2CAB2:** "I agree that students are not included directly during the implementation of inclusive education policy." **P2**: "I think the inclusive education policy implementation is handicap by lack of money and other resources."

Key:

FG2CAB1 = Focus Group 2 College Academic Board; **FG1SrcM**= Focus Group 1 Student Representative Council member **FG2SrcM**= Focus Group 2 Student Representative Council member; **P2** = Principal of state-run; FG**1CAB1** = Focus Group 1 College Academic Board; **P1** = Principal of church-run

Results in Table 4, showed that the SRC members of church-run teachers' college indicated that the policy was implemented from top-down and they were not involved, while the state-run also echoed that they were not directly involved during the implementation of the policy.

In Table 4, the CAB members of the two teacher education colleges highlighted that the challenges that influence the inclusive education policy implementation were that students were not consulted and everything was from top to bottom. The two principals also echoed each other that inclusive education policy implementation was constrained by lack of financial and material resources.

In order to find out the extent to which students were involved during the implementation of inclusive education policy, participants were asked on their level of agreement with the statements as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Involvement of student teachers during the implementation of the inclusive education policy

TECs	Item	N	1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Church-run	Implementation of inclusive education involves students	252	41(16.3%)	47 (18.6%)	63 (25%)	72 (28.6%)	29 (11.5%)	2.29	1.1980
	Policy implementation include participation of the students who live with disability	252	32 (12.7%)	62 (24.6%)	55 (21.8%)	82 (32.5%)	21(8.3%)	2.98	1.1909
State-run	Implementation of inclusive education involves students	291	45 (15.5%)	68 (23.4%)	61(21%)	80 (27.4%)	37 (12.7%)	2.37	1.1532
	Policy implementation of include participation of the students who live with disability	291	63 (21.6%)	64 (22%)	65 (22.3%)	72 (24.7%)	27 (9.3%)	2.77	1.1347

Key: N= Number of sample participants; Criterion Mean (CM)= 3 and above indicates high agreement in student teachers' level of involvement during college-based policy implementation in this study;

Results in Table 5 showed that in church-run participants, 28.6% agreed and 11.5 % strongly agreed to the assertion that they were involved during the implementation, with a mean score of 2.29 and standard deviation of 1.1980. In state-run participants,27.4 % agreed and 12.7 % strongly agreed to the same assertion that students were involved, with a mean score of 2.37 and standard deviation of 1.11532. Further, results in Table 5 showed that of the church-run participants, 32.5 % agreed and 8.3 % strongly agreed that students who live with disability were involved, with a mean score of 2.98 with a standard deviation of 1.1909. In state-run, 24.7 % agreed and 9.3 % strongly agreed that students who live with disability were involved with a mean score of 2.77 and standard deviation of 1.1347. The results indicated that the students were lowly involved.

16

The Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was used to establish the strength and significance of the relationships between the independent variables (level of involvement and the dependent variable (effectiveness in promoting SFEs in teachers' colleges). Two independent variables are said to be multicollinear if they are highly correlated (r≡≥0.9) with r = -1 or +1 being viewed as perfect correlation (Pallant, 2011). These correlations were the basis for checking multicollinearity in this study.

Table 6: Spearman's rank correlation analysis on student teachers' involvement during college -based policy implementation

Correlations			
1. Inclusive education policy implementation Effectiveness	Pearson Correlation	1	2
	Sig. (2-tailed)	1	
	N	543	
2. Level of student involvement	Pearson Correlation	.427**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	543	543
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Key: N=Total number of participants

The Spearman's rank correlation results in Table 6, indicate that the correlation between inclusive education policy implementation and level of student teachers' involvement was, (r=.427, p<.01), which indicates a weak relationship. The results imply that the low level of student teachers' involvement during the implementation of the Inclusive Education Policy processes constrained the promotion of student friendly environments.

Overall, results showed that inclusive education implementation was constrained by the centralised policy decision- making process, low involvement of the student body and non-participation of students who live with disability in teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe.

4.3. A comparison of inclusive education policy implementation processes in the two colleges

In order to compare the implementation of the inclusive education policy in the two Teacher Education Colleges, TEC A (church run) and TEC B (state run), a hypothesis for the predictions in the study's assumptions that the researchers had prior to the findings was done. First a test of normality of the data using the Shapiro-Wilkins test was conducted as shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Test of data normality

	Mean Statistic	SD Statistic	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilkins		
			Statistic	df	Sig	Statistic	Df	*Sig
			Level of implementation of inclusive education policy					
Inclusive Education Policy	3.85	.701	.084	341	.982	.417	341	.713

Results in Table 7 demonstrate that, $p > .05$ which shows that results were not significant. The results, therefore, indicate that the inclusive education policy implementation data is normally distributed. As a result, a parametric tool namely independent t-test, was used for testing the hypotheses in this section.

The Hypothesis tested here was:

> H_0: There is no significant difference between the teachers' colleges inclusive education policy implementation strategies in church-run and state-run.

> H_1: There is a significant difference between the teachers' colleges inclusive education policy implementation strategies in church-run and state-run.

Table 8: T-test of Inclusive Education Policy implementation strategies in teacher education colleges

	TECs	Mean	SD	T	Df	*Sig.

Inclusive Education Policy implementation	*Church-run*	*1.27*	*.4448*	*3.071*	*431*	*.097*
	State-run	*1.27*	*.4437*			

Sig. p < .05; CM = 1.5

The criterion mean (CM) of 3 and above indicates high implementation effectiveness while standard deviation (SD) the decision dispersion from the mean score in the study. Results in Table 8 indicates mean scores of 1.27 with SD of .4448 in church-run and 1.27 with SD .4437 in state-run indicating a low implementation strategy in both teachers' colleges. Further, the T-test results of (t (431) = 3.071; p = .097; p > 05) on inclusive education policy implementation strategies indicating that there was no significant difference in the implementation strategies of the inclusive education policy between church-run and state-run student teachers. Hence the null hypothesis (H_0) was accepted.

The overall results suggest that the two teacher education colleges used similar strategies to implement the inclusive education policy in an effort to promote student friendly environments.

4.4. Enhancing inclusive education policy implementation process

Table 9: Responses from SRC, CAB members and principals on strategies that enhance the implementation of inclusive education policy in state-run and church run teachers' colleges

Responses on inclusive education policy implementation strategies that enhance the process	
Church-run	**State-run**
FG1SrcM4: "In my view the implementation of the inclusive education policy should involve all key stakeholders." **FG1CAB3:** "In brief, the process can be enhanced by making those who live with disabilities participate as well." **FG1CAB5:**" In my view, the college has to suggest activities that directly involve the clients and involve students who live with various disabilities." **P1:** "I think in future we need to decentralise the implementation process by engaging the student representative council."	**FG2SrcM2:** "I personally feel that if the administration consults us as students during implementation, the process might be strengthened." **FG2SrcM7:** 'As SRC we should be directly involved during implementation for the success." **FG2CAB4:** "I think collective policy decision making and wide consultation enhance the implementation of inclusive education policy." **P2**: "In my view strategies that my enhance the implementation process include working together with SRC as a family."

Key: **FG2CAB1** = Focus Group 2 College Academic Board; **FG1SrcM**= Focus Group 1 Student Representative Council member **FG2SrcM**= Focus Group 2 Student Representative Council member; **P2** = Principal of state-run; FG**1CAB1** = Focus Group 1 College Academic Board; **P1** = Principal of church-run

Results I Table 9 showed that the SRC members and the CAB members of the two teachers' colleges indicated that the process of inclusive education policy implementation can be enhanced by consulting and involving key stakeholders. The principals also highlighted that decision making process could be decentralised by engaging the SRC members in order to enhance the implementation process.

Overall, results showed that the inclusive education policy implementation process can be enhanced by decentralising policy decision making and involvement of the student body.

5. Discussion of findings

Inclusive Education Policy implementation process proffers the fundamentals of promoting student friendly environments. The paper established five themes that emerged from the Inclusive Education Policy implementation process which are discussed as this section unfolds.

5.1. The promotion of student friendly environments through the implementation of inclusive education policy

5.1.1. Promoting physically friendly student environments

The results of the study established that there was deliberate construction of infrastructure that became accessible to student teachers who lived with disability. The results also showed that the old infrastructure that included lecture rooms, laboratories, libraries, lecture theatres, ablution and sporting facilities were renovated for them to be physically friendly to students. Further, ramps were constructed on pavements, paths and entrances that allowed student teachers who use wheelchairs and hand crutches to access the facilities easily. Earlier researches by Liasidon (2012) and Kerlinger (2017), established that physically friendly student environment facilities refer to physical infrastructure designed in a way that allows easy access and movement as well as minimum distraction and crowding, which supports self-student regulation. In the same vein, the study showed

that the inclusive education policy framework guided the teacher education colleges policy implementers in Zimbabwe to procure student-friendly learning equipment that accommodated the left-handed, right-handed, physically disabled and the hard of hearing. The results also revealed that the two teacher education colleges' sporting facilities for all the sports codes were inclusive, hence promoting physically friendly student environments. This paper established that the implementation of the inclusive education policy in teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe regulated the promotion of physically friendly students' environments.

5.1.2. Promoting socially friendly student environments

The results also showed that inclusive education policy implementation promoted socially friendly environments that empowered student teachers to interact freely, express their social life feelings without fear and to have freedom of expression. Further, it was established that the policy enabled student teachers to develop a culture of accommodating each other regardless of their gender, race, religious affiliations, physical stature or abilities. The findings of this study are in line with Boucher (2015), who notes that a socially friendly environment respects individual rights and private life. This study also established that the inclusive education policy implementation in the two teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe regulated the social environment that legally protected the student teachers from emotional abuse, physical abuse, sexual harassment, bullying, racism, victimisation and other gender related abuses. Further, the study established that inclusive education policy implementation strategies regulated the promotion of socially friendly student environments that enhance inclusivity in teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe.

5.1.3. Promoting academically friendly student environments

The results of the study showed that the academically friendly student environments of the two teachers' colleges were promoted through the implementation of the inclusive

education policy, which allowed the able-bodied student teachers and those who lived with disability to learn the same curriculum under one roof. Further, the paper established that the teacher education curriculum was designed in such a way that all subject areas (courses) were done by all students under one roof, irrespective of their gender or physical stature.

5.2. Inclusive Education Policy implementation challenges in TECs in Zimbabwe

The Spearman's rank correlation analysis established that the student teachers were not directly involved in the inclusive education policy implementation process and this constrained the implementation outcomes. Further, the principals and Student Representative Council members of the two teachers' colleges highlighted that the policy decision-making structures were centralised, thereby limiting the promotion of student friendly environments.

5.3. Comparison of inclusive education policy implementation between church-run and state-run teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe

The T-test results of the study showed that there was no significant difference in implementing inclusive education policy in church-run and state-run teachers' colleges. It also emerged from the study that the two teachers' colleges used similar strategies in implementing the policy. The findings confirm the assertion by Kaputa, Nyatsanga and Chimonyo, (2011) that tertiary education environments in private and government institutions in Zimbabwe are regulated by the same policy framework, which regulates the provision of student friendly environments.

5.4. Processes that enhance the implementation of inclusive education policy

The following factors that enhance the implementation of the inclusive education policy emerged from the study:

First, a proactive direct involvement of student teachers enhances the promotion of socially, physically and academically friendly student environments. There is resonance between the current study findings and Bouchier (2015) and Oghenekaro's (2018) study findings which note that the involvement of key stakeholders accommodates the diversity of input and interests that influence the promotion of SFEs.

Second, the policy implementation process that involves key stakeholders who included the SRCs, student body, CAB members, the principal and the general staff members highly enhanced the promotion of physically, socially and academically friendly student environments.

Overall, the study findings established processes that subscribe to: collective policy implementation, direct involvement of the student body and students who live with disability enable policy implementers to promote the student friendly environments in TECs in Zimbabwe.

6. Conclusions and recommendations

The study made the following conclusions and recommendations based on the findings:

First, inclusive education policy implementation promoted physically, socially and academically friendly student environments.

Second, the T-test results showed that there were no significant differences between the church-run and state-run teacher education colleges in the way they implemented the inclusive education policy. Thus, the paper concluded that the two teachers' colleges used similar strategies to implement the Inclusive Education Policy in their quest to promote student friendly environments.

Third, the paper concluded that the challenges that militated against the inclusive education policy implementation processes for the promotion of student friendly environments in the church-run and state-run teacher education colleges, included the centralised policy decision-making and low level of involvement of the student body.

Fourth, the study further concluded that in order to enhance the process of inclusive education policy implementation, the implementers should: (a) provide decentralised inclusive education policy implementation decision-making structures, which promote democratic and group decision principles; (b) directly involve the student body in policy decision making in order to enhance the promotion of student friendly environments in teacher education colleges in Zimbabwe.

Based on these findings, the authors recommend that a collective inclusive education policy implementation process that involves the student teachers from the bottom level to the top policy implementers could enhance the promotion of student friendly environments.

References

Allan, J. (2015). *Inclusion and exclusion in the university.* (2nd Edition). London: Routledge Falmer.

Andrus, D (2018). *Impact of Social Environment on Education.* California: Las Angels.

Attig, G & Hopkins, J (2016). *Assessing student- friendly institutions: A guide for programme managers in East Asia and the pacific.* Bangkok: UNICEF East Asia and pacific Regional Office.

Bouchier, D (2015). *Idealism and revolution.* New York NY: St. Martins.

Carayon, P. (2012). *The physical environment in health care.* Boca Raton: Tylor & Francis group.

Chabbott, C. (2014). *UNICEF'S student- friendly schools frame work: A desk review.* New York: United Nations Children's Fund.

Chimonyo, I., Mamvura, E, E., Kaputa, T, T. M., Hlatywayo, L., Munemo, E., Nyatsanza, T.D & Mutandwa, E. (2004). *Breaking down barriers to inclusive education in Zimbabwe.* Harare: Zimbabwe Open University.

Chireshe, R. (2013). *The state of inclusive education in Zimbabwe: Bachelor of Education (Special Needs Education) students' perceptions.* Journal of Social sciences,34(3),223-228.

Graetz, K.A (2015). *Psychology of learning environments.* Boston, Mass: Winona State University press. ladder

Hartley, T. (2014). *Case study research: design and methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Jagemann, H (2018). *Sports and the environment: Ways towards achieving the sustainable development of sport.* (6 Edition). Courbertin: Arenzano (Pvt) Ltd.

Kerlinger, F.N. (2017). *Foundations of behavioural research.* (3rd edition). Fortworth: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

Laeka, P.A. (2013). *Student- friendly college administration and student-centred learning.* Bangkok: National Book printer.

Liasidou, A (2012). *Inclusive education. politics and policy making.* New York: Maiden suite.

Madu, B.C. & Okoye, C.A. (2017*). Assessment of the implementation of student -Friendly environment initiative programme in Enugu State*, Nigeria. *Developing Country Studies* 3(9): 1-13.

Martin, L.M and Stevenson, R.T (2014). *Parties and policy making in multiparty governments: The legislative median, ministerial autonomy and the coalition compromise.* American Journal of Political Science 58:979-996.

Nwangwa, M.A (2016). *Emotional environment affects human behaviour*. Lagos: Research Institute. Lagos: Research Institute.

Oghenekaro, A.P. (2018). *Deployment of soft skills for effective customer service in the 21st century library.* Journal of computer and communications, 6(03),43.

Osman, F.A. (2013). *Public policy making: Theories and their implications in developing countries.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Sabastier, P.A. (2014). *Theories of the policy process.* Boulder, Co: Westview Press.

Sallis, J.F, Bauman, A and Prett, M (2016). *Environmental and policy interventions to promote physical and emotional activity.* Moscow: The Gale company.

Saunders, M.N.K; Lewis, P and Thornhill, A (2009). *Research Methods for Business students*. (8th Edition). United Kingdom: Pearson csc.

Taole, A. (2013). *The role of teachers in friendly schools.* Boston: Allyn and Beacon.

UNESCO (1994). *The Salamanca Declaration and Framework for action*. Paris.

UNESCO (2012). *Child friendly schools: Policy monitoring and implementation.* (4th Edition) New York, USA: UNICEF

UNICEF, (2010). *Student friendly education centres: Monitoring and evaluation.* New York, USA: UNICEF

United Nations (2006). *Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities*. New York.

Webster, M (2018). *The Effects of physical environment on cognitive development.* London: SAGE Publishers.

World Bank report (1994). *Human capital and economic development*. Washington, D.C.

Young, D.J and Fried, A (2013). *A Multilevel Analysis of learning environments and students' attitudes.* Boca Raton: Tylor & Francis group.