

ANALYSIS OF ADOPTION OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142 ON DUE PROCESS, LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT AND EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN ANAMBRA STATE

Ogbu, E.N.

Department of Educational Foundation, Enugu State University of Science and Technology, (Esut), Enugu, Nigeria.

Abstract: The main purpose of this study was to determine if due process procedure and procedural safeguard, least restrictive environment and expenditure of funds are adopted in inclusive public primary schools for pupils with special needs in Anambra State, Nigeria. Three research questions and three hypotheses were formulated to guide the study. The study adopted the survey research design. The population for the study consisted of 1,038 public primary school head teachers in 1038 public primary schools in Anambra State. A sample size of 289 head teachers were used. This comprised 95 male and 194 female head teachers, and 113 urban and 176 rural head teachers. A questionnaire titled “Analysis of adoption of public law on due process procedure and procedural safeguard, least restrictive environment and expenditure of funds Questionnaire (APLLEFQ)” was used for data collection. The reliability of the instrument was 0.82. The research questions were answered using mean and standard deviation. The research hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance using two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The results of this study shows that there is no significant differences between the mean scores of urban and rural schools in Anambra State on the adoption of due process procedure and procedural safeguard, least restrictive environment and expenditure of funds. Thus, the researcher recommended that Anambra State government should adopt the indices of Public Law 94-142 in inclusive Primary Schools in Anambra State, Nigeria.

Introduction

Recent legislation has extended and clarified the legal rights of children with special needs under the Public Law 94-142 on many issues affecting children within the ages of 3-21. This also include children who are currently served and those who are underserved. It also sets out requirements for diagnosis, non-discriminatory assessment, individualization of programming and personal development of children.

The recent provision of educational opportunities to children with special needs in the public schools did not come about by chance. There were many court cases reflecting the issues and conflicts of our times. In the past, children with special needs were entirely excluded from any public supported programme. Some children were totally neglected and hidden away, others were abused and exploited. In many communities, there were no facilities or services whatsoever to help children with special needs and their families (Cumbs 2009).

On the other hand, some of these children were educated by devoted teachers and parents. Results of many court cases and legislation have confirmed that children with special needs is no less than any other citizen and has the right to free appropriate programme of public education(Adams,2015). Thus, there is a need and also a range of educational placement options that

can be provided to serve children with special needs approximately in a team approach.

A child according to Free Dictionary (2013) is a young human being below the age of puberty or below the legal age of maturity. It is a fact therefore of knowledge that children are unusually incapable of managing their own affairs and protecting their rights without the help of adults (Thompson, 2013). This is why children are regarded as belonging to the vulnerable group. Hence, the legal instrument PL.94-142 the American law for all handicapped children Act of 1975 is a shining example. Public Law 94-142 is a law to amend the education of the handicapped Act to provide educational assistance to all children with special needs and for other purposes. This public Law was enacted by the congress of the United States of America’s assembly, that this Act may be cited as the situation for all handicapped children Act of 1975(Adeshina,2016). Public Law 94-142 guaranteed a free, appropriate public education to each child with a special need in every state and locally across the country. Thompson noted that the public Law was meant to improve the rights of meeting the individual needs of and improving infants, toddlers, youths with special needs and their families.

Some of the components of P.L 94-142 to indicate important current trends in the field of special education include (i) Due process procedure and procedural

Ogbu, E.N. (2022).

Journal of Continuing and Development Education| ISSN: 2714-3376

<https://journalcde.com/index.php/jcde/index>

K-INJO: 164

safeguards (ii) Least Restrictive Environment and (iii) Expenditure of funds, that is, education at public expense regardless of schools financial constraints, personal development, equal protection and fair assessment (Adonai –Spiff, 2014). Who are those entitled to receive these special service? In the broad view of P.L 94-142, it is very explicit that every children with various forms of exceptionalities including visual impairment, hearing impairment, mental retardation (intellectual disability, physical and health impairment, behavioral disorders, communication and speech impairment, learning disabilities, multiple disabilities, at risk children, autism, albinism and the gifted and talented, to mention but a few are those entitled to receive these special services. They are all entitled to specially designed instruction to meet his/her unique needs and related services as maybe required to assist the child to benefit from special education.

The issue about the Public Law 94-142 is that it did not specify how the intent of the law was to be carried out in individual cases, perhaps in the past because the philosophy underlying the precluded does not support a mandate. How can curriculum and services for the children with special needs be uniformly prescribed if we simultaneously require that these be tailored to the child's need?. Therefore specific services were not mandated through which all concerned could join forces to determine what is appropriate for the child. Example is due process procedure and procedural safeguard.

Due process procedure and procedural safeguard.

In law, due process means the correct process that should be followed which is designed to protect someone's legal rights (The free dictionary, 2013) In P.L. 94-142 Acts of 1975, the United States Congress enacted a Law to promote a system of procedures safeguards designed to protect the rights of children with special needs with their parents. Due process remains an impartial process hearing on matters relating to the identification evaluation or educational placement of a child with a special need or a free appropriate public education to the child. Put in another way: protect the rights of children with special needs and their parents by ensuring that due process confidentiality of records and parental involvement in educational planning and placement decisions are taken. Best (2013) noted that all children and their parents also have the right to due process under the Law, which includes the rights to be notified of any decision

affecting the child's educational placement, to have afavourable hearing and present defense to see a written decision, and to appeal any decision not favourable.

Many authors like Hallaham and Kauffman in Best (2013) noted that one important element of due process is the acknowledgment of a pupil as a person with important rights and responsibility.

Jameson (2014) opined that lots of people have questioned why highly specified legal safeguards are necessary to protect the rights of children with special needs.

In the same vein, Adams (2015) queried why highly specific legal safeguards for children with special needs are necessary as (i) placed in an educational programme, many handicapped children remain there for the rest of their educational care (ii) decision to place children in special education programme was often made primarily on the basis of teacher recommendation (iii) severely and profoundly handicapped children have routinely been excluded from public school programme (iv) a disproportionate number of children from minority cultural groups have been placed in special education programme (v) the level of educational service provided to residents of institutions has both very low or even non-exist.

Due process procedure and procedural safeguards has rights to include the right to be notified of any decision affecting the child's educational placement. In advanced countries like Japan, the United States, United Kingdom all these circumstance led to increased activism by parents of the handicapped children and by lawyers, advocates and other stakeholders. All these have particular important implication for special education in our primary schools today.

In Nigeria the case is different; Abel (2008) opined that parents of children with special needs unduly protect their children to the point of refusing to hand them over for formal education, while some even deny the existence of such a child in their homes. Abel also averred that most parents are not aware of anything about due process procedure and procedural safeguard and hence, they are not aware of whether or not they are meant to have access to the records of their children. Some parents of children with special needs are not even interested in the schooling of their children. They are simply looking for a place to dump their children during school hours to enable them go about their own activities. Legislation is thus used to address the issue of due process in primary schools in Anambra state. The question raised in a similar research is this – are regular

primary school teachers trained to embrace features inherent in due process? It remains an affirmative response.

Least restrictive environment

The current movement to external educational opportunities to children with special needs is an outgrowth of the civil rights movement. All children are now recognized to have the right to equal protection under the law which has been interpreted to mean the rights in a free public education in the least restrictive appropriate setting.

Least restrictive environment is one of the features and important part of PL 94-142. It is a relative concept which implies that each child with special needs be educated in the child's special educational needs which can be met at the same time, most closely parallel a regular school programme. According to Jones (2013) the word environment makes it sound like a place. Rather, it simply refers that children who get special education should be in the same classroom as other children as much as possible. It means a rule which govern all and thus regulation to be framed in such a manner that it provides protection to all children civil liberties. However, Jameson (2014) asserts that if there is a legitimate governmental purpose to be achieved, the test permits governmental regulation to be restrictive.

Least restrictive Environment (LRE) remains a principle that guides children's educational programme. The LRE for each child may look different because the children are unique. According to Limman (2016) the most restrictive educational setting is the home and hospital. It is provided for pupils who cannot attend school due to mental health reason.

Another principle of LRE is that pupils with special education needs be educated in settings as close to regular classes as appropriate for the child.

Ganny (2016) reveals that there has been heated argument especially in the professional community about how to achieve these goals. Much of the discussion on LRE has reflected specific place, that in a physical context rather, it should be suggested that the same placement or setting can be either facilitating or restrictive depending on the social organization or specific activity that comprise on given context. Thus, a different view is provided by many authors and socio-cultural theory which proposes a unit of analysis that includes the individual in interaction with a specific activity setting.

The Public Law 94-142 does not in any way advocate the placement of all the handicap children in regular

classes to remain in regular classes without the supportive services they need, neither did the legislation suggest that regular teachers educate all children with special needs without help from special educators and other specialists. A major challenge in Least Restrictive Environment is maximizing the placement and movement of pupils with special needs into educational environment that are normalized as possible. Integrating pupils with special needs into regular classroom has the potentials of maximizing their potentials. The segregationary programme as currently being practiced is self-defeating for it gives the picture of a rejected group in the society. This practice does not give pupils with special needs enough room and courage for self-actualization and development.

Expenditure of Funds

The Law was designed to back up its mandate for free appropriate public education by providing federal funds to help state education departments and local government authorities and Faith-Based Organization meet the additional costs of education of children with special needs, those who have never been served and those who are underserved. Public Law 94-142 also compelled the states and local government authorities to ensure to comply with this law.

However, Adesina (2016) reveal that the provision of Special Needs Education requires heavy funding and comprehensive planning in either public or private schools and the number of the handicapped children may be hard to determine; but Adeoye (2017) stated that in Nigeria they could be up to 12 million primary school pupils who are currently benefitting from special education. Many states and local government contended that the federal assistance to provide for children with special needs have not been sufficient because the schools themselves are financially pressed to meet the cost of educating the needs of children with special needs. Such funding and resources shall be required for the following:

- i. Special facilities that are free of architectural barriers or have appropriate architectural modification.
- ii. Special equipment and materials.
- iii. Resource centers
- iv. Diagnostic and assessment centers
- v. Supportive services.
- vi. Personal development.
- vii. Scholarships for pupils with special needs.
- viii. Workshops and seminars.
- ix. Special library.

- x. Transportation.
 - xi. Administrative and management services.
 - xii. Monitoring and data collection and records.
- There is also adequate remuneration (Special Needs Education Allowance) for teachers and those working with special needs units, centers and institutions.

According to Adeoye (2017) in a similar study reveal that this provision has been highly challenging and controversial and there is much disagreement over what kind of related services are necessary and reasonable for the school, and what should be the responsibility of the parents. Many schools especially public schools declined especially in the face of slow down and rebalancing of global economy.

Adeoye reiterates that the federal and state budget for general and special needs education is grossly inadequate. The federal government's declaration of full support for special education in 1975 was a bold step taken with anticipation of a buoyant economy that can find all facets of special needs education, but the present periods of inflation, economy recession and unfavorable terms of trade seem to negate this gesture. Adeoye reveal that in Nigeria, even when the money is available, there is unique publicization and delay in its release. It is unfortunate that this era of scramble for resources and access to educational provision does not favour special needs education which to many is a social welfare programme and not a right especially in Anambra State.

The geographical coverage in this study is Anambra State. Anambra State derived its name from the Anambra River which itself is tributary of River Niger. It shares boundaries with Abia, Imo, Delta, Enugu and Kogi States, and it also covers a land area of about 4.416 sq km. Anambra State is situated on a fairly flat land. The predominant language of Anambra State is Igbo language, while over 70% of the people are professing Christians. Anambra State has six education zones; namely Awka, Ogidi, Onitsha, Nnewi, Aguata and Otuocho education zones.

Statement of the problem

Public Law (PL) 94-142 states that all children with special needs between the ages of 3 and 21 regardless of the type or severity of their disability, shall receive a free, appropriate public education which emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs. This education must be provided at public expense; that is, without cost to the child's parents. This legislation has also provided for adequate

funding and procurement of facilities needed and it recognizes the rights of the child and his family as to their confidentiality. It also provides safeguards for the evaluation and placement of children, requires the seeking out of those unserved and those underserved in the least restrictive environment. The legislation has also been used to promote information on Special Needs Education.

However, it is unclear if public primary schools in Anambra State adopted the features inherent in the PL 94-142 as regarding due process procedure and procedural safe-guard, least restrictive environment and expenditure of funds. The study is of primary schools in Anambra State.

Research questions

The following research questions were formulated to facilitate the study

1. To what extent was the provision of due process procedure and procedural safeguard adopted as a feature of PL 94-142 in integrated primary schools in Anambra State?
2. To what extent was the provision of least restrictive environment adopted as a feature of PL 94-142 in integrated primary school in Anambra State?
3. To what extent was the provision of expenditure of fund adopted as a feature of PL 94-142 in integrated primary schools in Anambra State?

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference between the mean opinion scores of male and female head teachers in urban and rural integrated public schools on the adoption of due process procedures and procedural safeguard as a feature of Public Law 94-142 in Anambra State.
2. There is no significant difference between the mean opinion scores of male and female head teachers in urban and rural integrated public schools on the adoption of least restrictive environment as a feature of PL 94-142 in Anambra State.
3. There is no significant difference between the mean opinion scores of male and female head teachers in urban and rural integrated public schools on the adoption of funds as a feature of public Law 94-142 in Anambra State.

Methods

The research design adopted for the study was a survey research design.

According to Owens (2012) a survey design is one in which a group of people or item is studied by collecting and analyzing data from only a few people or items considered to be representative of the entire group.

The population for the study consisted of 1038 head teachers teaching in the 1,038 primary schools in the state. This population consisted 344 male and 694 female head teachers in public primary school in Anambra State. This comprised 95 male and 194 female head teachers, 113 urban and 176 rural head teachers. Thus Anambra State was stratified into education zones. There are six education zones in Anambra State.

The Yaro Yamane formular was used to calculate the total sample size of the head teachers. Proportionate sample technique was used to determine the number of schools and sample sizes for each education zone, the sample size was selected using balloting with replacement method considering location and gender. In each sample school, the head teacher of that school was chosen. Simple random sampling technique was used to sample schools for male and female head teachers respectively.

The main instrument used for this study was a self-designed questionnaire on Analysis of PL 94-142 on due process, least restrictive environment and expenditure of funds for pupils in primary schools (APLLEFQ) and two sections of A and B. Section A had information on the location of the respondents while section B had three section of 20 items. The items were arranged according to the research questions they answered. The face validity of the questionnaire was established through the judgment of three experts in

special education. For reliability of the questionnaire, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was used to compute the reliability using SPSS 15.0 computer software. The reliability coefficient was 0.82 which was an indication that the questionnaire was reliable.

The researcher administered the questionnaire in the six education zones with the help of six research assistants, who were trained by the researcher in a one-day orientation meeting. During the programme, the researcher acquainted them with the purpose of the study, the specific respondents and also explained to them how to administer and retrieve the questionnaire. The response options were Very Great Extent (VGE), Great Extent (GE), Low Extent (LE) and very low Extent (VLE). They were respectively scored 4,3,2 and 1 point.

For this study, about 289 copies of the questionnaires were distributed among the head teachers (both male and female). After retrieval all the questionnaire had 100% return rate. The research questions were answered using mean and standard deviation. The research hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance using two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Mean scores of 2.50 and above were regarded as agree (A) while mean scores below 2.50 were regarded as disagree (D). If F-calculated value is equal to or greater than F- critical value, then the null hypothesis was rejected which means there was a significance difference between the two mean scores being compared. If F- calculated value is less than the critical value, the null hypothesis was not rejected, that is, there was no significance difference between the two mean scores being compared.

Table1: Extent of provision of due process procedure and procedural safeguard as a feature of PL 94-142 in primary schools in Anamabra state

S/N	ITEM	URBAN Male			Female		SD	RURAL Male D			Female		SD
1	My school is an inclusive school	X	Sd 0.61	X GE	5x 2.99	SD 0.72	Dec GE	X 3.41	SD 0.59	DEC	X 3.38	SD 0.41	DEC GE
2	Is your school aware of due process of document for pupils with handicap?	2.11	0.80	LE	2.14	0.76	LE	2.21	0.83	LE	2.18	0.39	LE
3	Does your school regard pupils with handicap as persons?	3.43	0.66	GE	3.33	0.72	GE	3.26	0.83	GE	3.20	0.74	GE
4	Do you have impartial process hearing on matters relating to the identification and evaluation of pupils who are handicapped?	3.72	0.59	GE	3.68	0.42	GE	3.69	0.60	GE	3.73	0.65	GE
5	Do you put up written notice about the placement of the child?	2.11	0.90	LE	2.18	0.84	LE	1.98	0.93	LE	2.20	0.79	LE
6	Does your school send notice about decision to parents?	2.02	0.70	LE	1.86	0.84	LE	1.92	0.77	LE	2.11	0.74	LE
7	Do you help to protect the rights of the pupils and their parents?	2.16	0.70	LE	2.31	0.88	LE	2.06	0.53	LE	1.76	0.46	LE
8	Do parents have access to the records of their children?	1.86	0.39	LE	2.03	0.48	LE	2.06	0.53	LE	1.76	0.46	LE

Table I shows that the urban male and female respondents each agreed on items, 1,3,4 to a great extent (GE) except items 2,5 6,7 and 8 where they responded low extent (LE). Similarly, the rural male and female respondent each disagreed with all the items, on the

table to a low extent (LE) except, items, 1,3 and 4 where they responded great extent (GE) in the overall, both male and female headteachers respondents agreed to a great extent on 3 items and agreed to a low extent on five items.

Table 2: extent of provision of least restrictive environment as a feature PL 94-142 in primary schools in Anambra State.

S/N	ITEM	URBAN Male			Female		SD	RURAL Male D			Female		SD
9	Do you have handicapped pupils in our classes?	2.888	0.98	GE	3.01	0.71	GE	3.16	0.84	GE	2.94	0.69	GE
10	Have you heard of legislation handicapped children?	3.36	0.72	GE	3.42	0.81	GE	3.41	0.76	GE	3.28	0.59	GE
11	Do you put handicapped children and non-	2.77	0.81	GE	2.63	0.66	GE	2.74	0.72	GE	2.63	0.49	GE

	handicapped children together?												
12	Are there issues about placement?	3.64	0.49	GE	3.46	0.52	GE	3.34	0.84	GE	3.52	0.84	GE
13	Are needs of handicapped pupils met at the same time most closely parallel regular school programme	2.63	0.92	GE	2.71	0.84	GE	2.68	0.80	GE	2.79	0.54	GE

The results on table 2 show that out of 5 items, the urban and female respondents each responded great extent in 5 items. The rural male and female head

teachers responded great extent in 5 items. Considering scores for male and female, both genders agreed to a great extent in all five items.

Table 3; Extent of expenditure of funds as a feature of PL 94-142 in primary schools in Anambra State.

S/N	ITEM	URBAN Male			Female			SD	RURAL Male D			Female			SD
14	Does your school get federal funding for pupils with special needs?	2.03	0.48	LE	2.16	0.65	LE		2.26	0.59	LE	2.28	0.58	LE	
15	Are there financial backups from state and local government authorities?	2.11	0.80	LE	2.14	0.76	LE		2.21	0.83	LE	2.18	0.39	LE	
16	Is the money from federal government enough for handicapped pupils?	1.96	0.42	LE	2.16	0.30	LE		2.36	0.50	LE	2.22	0.46	LE	
17	Is it expensive to acquire educational aids for handicapped pupils?	2.42	0.55	LE	2.24	0.58	LE		2.22	0.69	LE	2.46	0.77	LE	
18	Do you relay on external assistance?	2.11	0.90	LE	2.18	0.84	LE		1.98	0.93	LE	2.20	0.79	LE	
19	Handicapped pupils are completely neglected	2.88	0.92	GE	3.01	0.71	GE		3.16	0.84	GE	2.94	0.69	GE	
20	Do you write other philanthropist for funds?	2.10	0.91	LE	21.8	0.84	LE		1.21	0.83	LE	1.96	0.42	LE	

The result on table 3 show that out of 7 items on the table, urban male and female head teachers each agreed to a great extent in only one item and agreed to a low extent in 6 items (items 14,15,16,17 and 18), similarly, the rural male and female head teachers each responded great extent in only one item. The female counterparts also responded great extent in one item, and low extent in 6 items. The urban male and female head teachers had mean scores of 2.88, 3.01, 3.16 and 2.94 respectively with their corresponding standard deviation of 0.92, 0.71, 0.84 and 0.69.

Hypothesis one

There is no significant difference between the mean opinion scores of male and female head teachers in urban and rural integrated school in Anambra state on the extent of adoption of due process procedural procedure safeguard as a feature of PL94-142. This hypothesis was tested at 0.05 level of significance using two-way analysis of variance (2-way ANOVA) this result has shown on table 4.

TABLE 4: 2 WAY ANOVA RESULT DUE PROCESS

Source of variance	Sum of squares	DF	Mean squares	F	Sig	Decision
Corrected model	8.54851	1	854.857	1.161	0.101	
Intercept	734.838	1	734.838	0.998	0.092	

Gender	1521.955	1	1521.955	2.067	0.065	NS
Location	2145.610	1	2,45.610	2.914	0.059	NS
Gender and location	578.004	1	578.004	0.785	0.116	NS
Error	2.6984.86635	385	736.311	0.785	0.116	NS
Total	645.4502	288				

The SPSS (statistical package for social science) computer level of significances for gender was 0.065 which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance for this study. Hence, gender is not a significant factor in this study. Similarly, the SPSS computer level of significance for location was found to be 0.059 which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance set for this study. Thus, location is not significance factor in this study. Similarly, interaction effect (gender and location) is not significant differences between the mean scores

of male and female head teachers in urban and rural integrated public primary schools in Anambra state is the due process procedure and procedural safeguard as a feature of PL 94-142.

Hypothesis Two

There is no significant difference between the mean opinion scores of female and male head teachers in urban and rural public primary schools in Anambra state on extent of adoption of least restrictive environment as a feature of PL 94-142.

Table 5: 2-way ANOVA results on the adoption of east restrictive environment as a feature of PL 94-142

Source of variance	Sum of squares	DF	Mean squares	F	Sig	Decision
Corrected model	6,270.22	1	6,270,212	2.116	0.106	
Intercept	3,167,701	1	3,167,701	1.069	0.072	
Gender	2,895	1	2,895.084	0.977	0.221	NS
Location	2,332.006	1	2,332,068	0.787	0.086	NS
Gender and location	3,22.6996	1	3226.9660	1,089	0.069	NS
Error	844,522830	285	2.963.238			
Total	852.976	288				

The result in table 5 shows that for gender the computer level of 0.221 is greater than 0.05 level of significance for the study. Hence, gender is not a significant factor in this research. For location, the computer found its significant at 0.086 which is higher than the level of significance of this study (0.05). Therefore there is no significance differences between the mean scores of male and female head teachers in urban and rural

integrated public primary schools in Anambra state on the adoption of least restrictive environment as a feature of PL 94-142.

Hypothesis three

There is no significant difference between the mean opinion scores of male and female head teachers in urban and rural integrated public schools in Anambra state on extent of the adoption of expenditure of funds.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	DF	Mean squares	F	Sig	Decision
Corrected model	5,944.218	1	5,944.218	1.943		
Intercept	2,698,302	1	2,698,302	0.882		
Gender	4,206,536	1	4,206536	1.375		NS
Location	2,802,318	1	2,802,318	0.916		NS
Gender and location	2.040.552	1	2,040,552	0.667		NS
Error	871,900.215	285	3,059.29	299		
Total	880,949.621					

The findings on table 6 shows that for gender, the SPSS computer software found gender significant at 1.375 which is higher than the 0.05 level of significance for this study. This means that there is no significant the urban and rural respondents. Interaction effect (gender and location) is also not significant. Hence, there is no significant differences between the mean scores of male and female head teachers in urban and rural integrated public primary schools in Anamabra state on the adoption of least restrictive environment as a feature of PL 94-142.

Discussion

The findings of research question 1 in table 1 show that both male and female, urban and rural head teachers all agreed that their school is an inclusive school, but their school is not aware of anything's about due process procedure and procedural safeguard as a feature of P.L 94-142. Although they regard pupils with special needs, they do not have important process hearing on matters relating to their identification and evaluation. All the respondents opined that they do not put up written notice about the children to their parents neither did they ever send notice to them. Thus, head teachers did not protect the rights of these pupils or do the parents have access to the records of the pupils. The above findings are in line with Abel (2008) who aver that most parents are completely ignorant of due process and procedural safeguard, as most of them do not care above the schooling of their children. Most parents of parents of children with special needs just dump their children in the school and go about their other activities.

The findings for research question 2 on table 2 shows that both male and female head teachers agreed that they have children with special needs alongside non-handicapped pupils in their various classes, and they have heard of legislation on least restrictive environment. The head teachers both male and female agreed to a great extent to meet the needs of those with special needs at the same time most closely parallel regular school programme. The findings agree with Ojole (2014) who asserts that if there is a legitimate purpose, it permits regulation to be restrictive.

The findings for research hypothesis 2 on table 5 show that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of male and female head teachers in urban and rural public primary schools in Anambra State on the adoption of least restrictive environment as a feature of public law 94-142. The head teachers alike both perceive to a great extent that LRE will enhance facilitation and the pupils interaction with a specific

activity setting. Furthermore analysis on table 5 show that gender and location are not significant factors. This means that both male and female head teachers equally agreed to a great extent that LRE is necessary. The findings further agree that location is not a significant factor in adoption of LRE in primary school in Anambra state.

The findings for research question 3 on table 6 showed that male and female head teachers agree that pupils with special needs are completely neglected, as funds are not disbursed to primary schools for the children's educational assistance. This is in the line with Adeoye (2017) who stated that in Nigeria budget for general and special education is grossly inadequate" on location as a factor, the findings on table 6 shows that urban and rural head teachers responded low extent,. This indicate that urban and rural head teachers agree to a low extent that there are no financial backups from states, and even local government, and that it is expensive to acquire educational aids for pupils with special needs.

On table 6 the result of hypothesis 3 shows that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of male and female head teachers in urban and rural primary schools in Anambra state on the adoption of expenditure of funds as a feature of PL 94-142. This means that both male and female urban and rural head teachers agreed similarly to a low extent that funds are not disbursed by federal government for the education of pupils with special needs. Table 6 further shows that gender and location are not significant factors. Similarly, urban and rural head teachers accept equally that they need funds to run the primary schools and help pupils with special needs.

On table 6 the result of hypothesis 3 shows that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of male and female head teachers in urban and rural primary schools in Anambra State on the adoption of expenditure of funds as a feature of PL 94-142. This means that both male and female urban and rural head teachers agreed similarly to a low extent that funds are not disbursed by federal government for the education of pupils with special needs. Table 6 further shows that gender and location are not significant factors. Similarly, urban and rural head teachers accept equally that they need funds to run the primary schools and help pupils with special needs.

Conclusion

Based on the results and discussion of the study, it will be concluded that the adoption of PL.94-142 for due process procedure and procedural safeguard least

restrictive environment and expenditure of funds was very low extent. Further, location of the school does not significantly affect the adoption of PL-94-142 while significant differences does not also exist between urban and rural primary schools in Anambra state.

Recommendations

In the light of the study, the following recommendations were proffered for improvement

1. From time to time head teachers of both urban and rural schools should organize workshops and seminars for teachers in special needs education. Thus experts in the field of special needs education should be initial to enlighten teachers on issues of legislation in special education.
2. Head teachers are also encouraged to attend in-service training in special needs education.
3. There is a need for schools to get federal funding to promote handicap education.
4. Anambra state government should re-activate special needs education in public primary schools

REFERENCES

Beat (2013). Legistration affecting exceptional children. Resources for person with special developmental needs. Journal of research and development in education Accra, 1(12) 115-131.

Adams, T.B. (2015). Funding of orthopedic handicapped and other health impaire unpublished doctoral thesis, university of Jos

Abel, D.Y. (2008). Public law 94-142 and the education of pre-school handicapped children. Journal of mental deficiency. New York 2(3) 181-214.

Jones, T (2013). The physical handicapped child in your classroom. A handbook for teachers. Springfield III

Germany, T.V. (2016). Functional Analysis of retarded development. Journal of Research in mental retardation 1(4) 69-76 new York

Adesina, J.B. (2016) exceptional children An enquiry into its laws and consequences. Journal of education and social sciences university of Ibadan. 1(3) 181-190

Cumbs, (2009) Finacing education and Training of the mentally retarded. American journal of mental Deficiency. New York 1(4) 148-157.

Encarta Dictionary (2009). Encarta premium Microsoft Encarta premium

Beiter, E.A (2010) PL.94-142, education for all handicapped Act Receiving Federal Funds for handicaps alone. Journal of education London-2(6)211-235.

Thompson, F.(2008). Establishing the rights of all children to equal opportunity to an education in London. Journal of Education and sciences. London. University of London 4(12) 144=167.

Chaplan, B.F. (2011) provided funds for training professional to train teachers of mentally retarded children. Journal of early intervention special education. University of Tanzania. 1(3) 123-140

Adonai – Spiff, T (2014). ExternDED previous legislation. Journal of exceptional children Accra 1(3) 22-36.

Horny, A.S (2001) oxford advanced learners dictionary Oxford University Press.