



# Implementation of Child Friendly School Programs in Schools as Perceived by Teachers and Learners from Public Primary Schools in Chesumei Sub-County, Kenya

Dr. Grace Cheruto, Prof. Daniel Allida & Dr. Catherine Amimo

University of Eastern Africa, Baraton, Kenya

Corresponding author: [cheru2013christ@gmail.com](mailto:cheru2013christ@gmail.com)

Received January 30, 2021; Revised March 14, 2021; Accepted March 15, 2021

**Abstract:** This study looked at the implementation of Child Friendly School Program as observed by teachers and learners of primary schools in Chesumei Sub-County, Kenya. The sample comprised of two hundred and thirty one teachers and eight hundred and forty five students. Pilot schools were purposively selected while simple random sampling was used to select non-pilot schools. Data was collected using questionnaires, observation, and interviews. Content analysis was used to interpret qualitative data. Quantitative data was analyzed by use of percentages, means, and standard deviation. Teachers and learners rated highly the implementation of Child Friendly practices such as equity and equality, community linkages and partnerships, and safe and protective school. The ministry of Health and Public Works should also be involved in issues of health, nutrition and infrastructure.

**Keywords:** Implementation, Child, Community, Schools, Programs, Teachers, Learners, Public

## How to cite this article (APA):

Cheruto, G., Allida, D. & Amimo, C. (2021). Implementation of child friendly school programs in schools as perceived by teachers and learners from public primary schools in Chesumei Sub-County, Kenya. *Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education*, 5(1), 11 – 22.

## 1. Introduction

Child Friendly School Programs take cognizance of the rights of children irrespective of their gender, religious and ethnic affiliation, physical and mental abilities and any other inferences. The concept was introduced in 1999 by the Education Section of United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF, 2006). The world conference on Education for All (EFA) that took place in March 1990 in Jomtien, Thailand, articulated the significance of the early years as the foundation for the life of individuals (Republic of Kenya, 2006).

According to Ndani (2010), most African countries ratified the United Nations on the Rights of the Child, through the African Charter on Rights and Welfare of the

child in 1990. Nigeria carried out its first evaluation of CFS in 2008 with an aim of finding out how far the CFS models were being implemented. By providing schools that are child friendly, the country has seen an increase in the enrolments of students, including those with disabilities and the program has also enacted a positive attitude toward the provision of education for all (UNICEF, 2009a).

According to UNESCO/OECD (2005) the Kenya Government has made great strides in embracing the rights of the child, (Constitution of Kenya, 2010). In addition, the Basic Education Act, 2013, reiterates the fact that basic education, which has been made free and compulsory in Kenya, should be operationalized through the legal

framework enshrined in the Act (Basic Education Act, 2013).

According to UNICEF (2010), in a Child Friendly School (CFS) teachers are expected to enhance learning through provision of the child friendly school approach which is: managing a safe and protective school; equity and equality promoting school, health and nutrition promoting school and community linkage and partnership

The future of our nation, Kenya, depends to a large extent on the quality of education and training children will receive while in school. It is on this point that the government of the Republic of Kenya has expressed her commitment to the provision of quality education for all children based on the understanding that education is a basic right and an ingredient for socio-economic development. Children should be seen as the foundation on which the development of our country, Kenya can be erected (MOE, 2010). Many schools in Kenya, especially primary, have not succeeded in implementing Child Friendly Schools Program. Recent events in the education sector in the larger Nandi County have shown that some schools are still continuing to operate in unfriendly environments making them a challenge to learning and teaching. For example, in March 2015, three pupils were burnt to death at Labuywo Academy in Tindiret Sub-County when fire razed their dormitory, leaving 92 others injured and traumatized (Jelimo, 2015, March 7) and before the dust had settled in Nandi County, in June, 2016, 10 class six and seven pupils of Pemja primary school in Nandi South Sub-County were found to be expectant leaving parents and administrators wondering on who could be responsible for the same (Kosgey, Producer, 2016, June 25).

The purpose of this paper was therefore to determine how both teachers and learners of Chesumei Sub-county perceived implementation of child friendly school program.

## **2. Literature Review**

This section will discuss variables which affect implementation of child friendly school programs.

### **2.1 Concept of Child Friendly Schools in Kenya and Other Countries**

Child Friendly Schools (CFS) was introduced as a pilot program in 2002 in eleven UNICEF supported districts of Mandera, Wajir, Marsabit, Turkana, West Pokot, Ijara, Garissa, Isiolo, Moyale, Kwale and Nairobi. This was evaluated in 2008 with a recommendation to mainstream the concept through national policies and plans (MOE, 2010). As observed by UNICEF (2009b), the national manual on CFS was developed and launched by the

Minister of Education in February 2011, thus becoming a national strategy for quality improvement of education. Kenya, the government through the MOE (2008) emphasizes that the safety of learners especially at their tender age is central to the provision of quality education.

The Ministry of Education in Rwanda has developed a document which has four standards expected of Child Friendly Schools Infrastructure which are: a school must have appropriate, sufficient and secure buildings, must be a healthy, clean, secure and have learner protecting environment, must have a child-friendly barrier free environment which promotes inclusive access and equal rights of every child and must have adequate and appropriate equipment that support the level of education (Rwanda, Ministry of Education, 2009).

UNICEF (2006) noted that it's not just getting all children into school but ensuring that the schools work in the best interest of the children entrusted to them. Such schools enable children to develop the ability to think and reason, build self-respect and respect for others, and reach their full potential as individuals, members of their communities and citizens of the world.

A Child Friendly School is inclusive of children when it seeks out children who are attending school and does not discriminate on the basis of difference. It welcomes nurtures and educates all children regardless of their sex, intellectual, social, emotion and language. It provides these children with an education that is free, compulsory and accessible (MOE, 2010).

### **2.2 Safe and Protective Schools**

Dangers in schools include kidnapping of children and gang-related violence, among the youth. Children also experience sexual violence, bullying, taunting, where some teachers and school authorities are perpetrators (UNICEF, 2009c). School safety policies taken to improve the overall safety and protection of children need to be created by involving many partners including teachers, children, community leaders and social service providers (MOE, 2010). According to Souza (2011) when parents enroll their children in school they are entrusting their most precious possessions to other people, thus, a child friendly school should be free of hazardous and risky materials as per MOE (2010).

The journey to school may be unsafe, especially for girls who may experience harassment and physical attacks either on public transportation in cities or remote paths in rural areas. At school, teachers often require girls to do maintenance work while boys study or play: some also allow boys to bully girls. In some cases, extreme physical assault, including rape, may be perpetuated against girls at

school. The threats that come in the form of unequal treatment, harassment, bullying and undervaluing girls harm them in profound and long-lasting ways (UNICEF, 2000).

Stairways, in storeyed buildings should be wide enough and located at both opposite ends of the building, (Chumba, 2006). A school environment that does not accommodate the welfare of its learners or neglects the needs of its learners, especially girls, children with disability, orphans; reflects a non – caring school thus creates a hostile school environment (MOE, 2010). Child Friendly Schools should give attention to prediction, prevention and preparedness in order to make schools protective to learners and teachers,(UNICEF, 2009c).

Most injuries that occur during playtime among pupils are due to improper use of equipment or lack of supervision. During the entire time pupils are on school/grounds, they are the responsibility of the schools and must be adequately supervised (Souza, 2011).

## **2.3 Equity and Equality promoting schools**

Equity in schools means providing equal opportunities for all learners while equality is attending to learners with all fairness without the slightest form of discrimination; such a school that promotes equity and equality promotes the rights and well-being of all learners irrespective of their gender, geographical background, socio – economic status, religion and disability (MOE, 2010). School authorities, children, families, educational institution, health providers and community leaders are best able to identify learners who are out of school and facilitate their enrolment in schools, (MOE, 2010).

## **2.4 Health and Nutrition Promoting School**

A Child Friendly School ensures that learners are healthy and is sensitive to their nutritional and health issues and gives appropriate advice to parents and guardians on the same. A hungry child cannot learn well, (MOE, 2010). Schools should not make children's health worse UNICEF (2009c). Clean hands and clean water can be a means of preventing diseases at school and among learners, (MOE, 2010). Appropriate measures should be put in place to ensure that the water provided is clean and safe (MOES & T, 2001). Adequate nutrition is critical for normal brain development in the early years, and early detection and intervention for disabilities can give children the best chances for healthy development,(UNICEF, 2000) and schools should have enough land for agricultural activities and recreational facilities, physical exercises, fresh air and to avoid overcrowding in buildings and provide enough room for

expansion,(Chumba, 2006). Limo, Jelimo and Kipkoech (2016) have noted that there is a significant positive relationship between school health promoting programs and implementation of child friendly schools initiative, however there are still challenges related to provision of adequate nutrition, clean and safe drinking water as well as access to proper healthcare within the reach of children and communities.

Sruthi (2016) agrees that children, adolescents and their families have an important place in improving their environments to support the health and well-being of children, youth and adults. The Ministry of Education should enhance quality assessment of guidance and counseling in all primary schools, and in turn head teachers should enhance internal supervision in their schools (Owino & Odera, 2014).

## **2.5 Enhancing School-Community Linkages and Partnerships**

According to UNICEF (2009c) linkages come in where schools have been destroyed; the community link helps in restoring normalcy and rebuilding, thus creating a safe community. Children also bring to school their family and community beliefs, practices, knowledge, expectations and behaviors. This helps bridge the world of school, home and the community as children learn from both ends.

According to a circular from the MOES & T (2005) the government should encourage community support for infrastructure development to enhance the success of FPE. They should also be sensitized on the Children's Act of 2001 and as a way of achieving UPE and hence addressing the challenges facing primary education in the country. Mbiti (2007) concurs that the family and the school must seek to create a conducive environment that seeks to enhance the development of worthwhile character values in children. Teachers and parents should therefore lead exemplary lives from which children can copy as they grow and develop into mature individuals.

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1 Research Design**

Concurrent mixed methods design was used so as to build on the strengths that exist in qualitative and quantitative research methods thus helping to understand the phenomenon fully than it would have been when either qualitative or quantitative research methods were used alone (Creswell & Plano 2011). Quantitative research techniques were used more than qualitative research methods.

#### **3.2 Population and Sampling Techniques**

The total population of the sub-county is thirty three thousand, two hundred and five pupils and one thousand two hundred teachers, in one hundred and fifty public primary schools, in five education zones: -Chemundu, Kaptel, Kosirai, Kapsisiywa and Mutwot/Lelmokwo. Purposive Sampling was used to select the three pilot CFS primary schools. Purposive sampling was used to select all teachers (TSC and BOM) including the Head teachers and Deputy Head Teachers and class seven pupils in the schools. A total of 1076 respondents participated in the study with a total of 231 teachers (59 from pilot and 172 from non-pilot schools) and 845 pupils (215 from pilot and 630 from non-pilot schools).

#### **3.3 Research Instruments**

The study used two closed questionnaires (one for teachers and another for the pupils), classroom observation, Head Teachers interview guide and general observation guide.

#### **3.4 Validity and Reliability of the instruments**

In this study, face and content validity of the instruments was considered (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003, and Wanjohi, 2014). A pilot study was done in one public primary school in Nandi Central Sub County, with similar characteristics as the targeted population. The Cronbach's

alpha results were: teachers (0.704 for safe and protective school, 0.713 for equity and equality promoting school, 0.684 for health and nutrition promoting school and 0.686 for enhancing school-community linkages and partnerships) and pupils (0.698 for safe and protective school, 0.605 for equity and equality promoting school, 0.728 for health and 0.866 for nutrition promoting school and enhancing school-community linkages and partnerships). And because the items in the teachers and pupils questionnaires had a reliability of above 0.60 this qualified the instruments as reliable.

#### **3.5 Data Gathering Procedures**

Data collection was done after the researchers got clearance from the relevant authorities. The main instruments that were used during the study were closed ended questionnaires for teachers and pupils, head teachers interview schedule, general observation checklist and classroom observation checklist.

#### **3.6 Statistical Treatment of Data**

Quantitative data was analyzed using SPSS. Percentages, frequencies, means, standard deviation and Mann-Whitney and T-Test were used to analyze data. Qualitative data collected from each question were read, reread and analyzed into themes and sub-themes and conclusions made.

### **4. Results and Discussion**

This study set to seek teachers and learners perception on the implementation of the child friendly school programs in Schools in Chesumei Sub-county in Nandi County. Four factors were used to rate the implementation. These were Safe and protective schools, equity and equality promoting schools, health and nutrition promoting schools and creation of community linkages and partnerships. Below are the findings as rated by the respondents.

#### **4.1 Rating of Teachers**

Teachers were asked to rate the implementation of the Child Friendly School Programs in their Schools using the following scale 3.50 – 4.00 for excellent, 2.50 – 3.49 for good, 1.50 – 2.49 for fair and 1.00 – 1.49 for poor.

**Table 1: Safe and protective schools**

	Pilot schools N=59		Non- Pilots schools N=172	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1.Pupils feel safe within the school compound	3.86	.345	3.83	.472
2. Pupils feel safe walking both to and from school daily.	3.19	.861	3.36	.822
3.Guidance and counseling is promoted in this school.	3.86	.345	3.63	.631
4. This school is a welcoming place for all types of pupils.	3.73	.665	3.72	.712
5. I make pupils understand their mistake before administering punishment.	3.95	.222	3.82	.442
6. I use positive discipline instead of corporal punishment.	3.80	.550	3.70	.602
7. I show love and respect in the process of pupil's discipline.	3.86	.345	3.81	.496
8. In this school a pupil is able to safely report a case of bullying, harassment or harm from adults or other pupils without fear.	3.66	.659	3.55	.744
9. Decisions made in this school are based on what is best for the pupils.	3.66	.659	3.72	.588
10. A pupil in this school feels free to talk to a teacher about things that are bothering him/her.	3.49	.728	3.49	.688
<b>Overall Mean and Std. Dev.</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>.325</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>.319</b>

The implementation of safe and protective school was rated as excellent by teachers with an overall mean of 3.71 and 3.66 in pilot and non-pilot schools respectively. Teachers rated as excellent that; -pupils felt safe within the school compound, guidance and counseling is promoted in their school, the school is a welcoming place for all types of pupils, pupils were made to understand their mistakes before punishment was administered, they used positive discipline instead of corporal punishment, they showed love and respect in the process of pupil's discipline, pupils were able to safely report cases of bullying, harassment or harm from adults or other pupils without fear, decisions made in the school were based on what is best for the pupils and pupil in their school felt free to talk to a teacher about things that are bothering him/her. This shows that the pilot and no-pilot schools are safe and protective for the children as per the ratings of the teachers.

The results concur with the MOE, (2010) that School safety policies taken to improve the overall safety and protection of children need to be created by involving many partners including teachers, children, community leaders and social service providers. The findings also concur with UNICEF (2009c) that child friendly schools should give attention to prediction, prevention and preparedness in order to make schools protective to learners and teachers. The ratings also concur with a study that was done in Kisumu County, which noted that, most of the head teachers have positive attitude towards guidance and counseling in primary schools though some would still need to be trained on the same. (Owino & Odera, 2014). According to UNICEF (2009c) Schools should therefore protect students from psychological harm that is punishment from teachers and peers, verbal abuse, name calling and they should eliminate physical threats, for example corporal punishment by teachers, student violence, bullying, sexual attacks and other gender based violence.

**Table 2: Equity and equality promoting schools**

	Pilot schools N=59		Non- Pilot schools N=172	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1. Pupils in this school have an equal chance to participate in co-curricular activities.	3.78	.559	3.85	.414
2. In this school pupils have an equal opportunity to participate in class discussions.	3.92	.337	3.84	.401
3. I apply the same rules to all pupils equally	3.93	.314	3.90	.385
4. When pupils break rules, I punish them fairly and equally.	3.90	.305	3.86	.450
5. I treat pupils with respect in this school.	3.97	.183	3.96	.226
6. Girls and boys are treated equally when accessing learning materials.	3.95	.222	3.88	.417
7. This school places a high value on understanding and respecting the rights of pupils.	3.75	.512	3.81	.433
8. Pupils in this school have opportunities to serve in leadership roles, such as a member of the student council, or prefects.	3.81	.508	3.83	.500
9. Pupils have great opportunities to succeed in this school.	3.68	.681	3.77	.500
10. *Some types of pupils in this school are treated better than others by the teachers.	1.41	.833	1.52	.921
11. *Boys and girls sit separately in our classes.	1.47	.838	1.59	1.058
<b>Overall Mean and Std. Dev.</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>.264</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>.248</b>

\*Negative statements (recoded in the computation).

The implementation of Equity and Equality Promoting School was rated as excellent by teachers with an overall mean of 3.80 and 3.78 in pilot and non-pilot schools respectively. Teachers rated that they treated pupils with respect, girls and boys were treated equally when accessing learning materials, there was application of the same rules to all pupils equally, pupils had equal opportunities to participate in class discussions, pupils were punished fairly and equally when they broke rules, pupils had opportunities to serve in leadership roles, such as a member of the student council, or prefects, pupils had an equal chance to participate in co-curricular activities, their schools placing a high value on understanding and respecting the rights of pupils and they had great opportunities to succeed their schools.

The ratings concurred with MOE, (2010), that equity in schools means providing equal opportunities for all learners while equality is attending to learners with all fairness without the slightest form of discrimination, such a school that promotes equity and equality promotes the rights and well-being of all learners irrespective of their gender, geographical background, socio – economic status, religion and disability. The findings also agreed with Craig, Kraft, and du Plessis (1998) that schools committed to student learning communicate expectations clearly, give frequent and challenging assignments, monitor performance regularly, allow participatory classroom discussions and give students the chance to participate in and take responsibility for diverse school activities

**Table 3: Health and nutrition promoting schools**

	Pilot schools N=59		Non- Pilot schools N=172	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1. The school provides health education to all pupils regarding the avoidance of high-risk behaviors (for example HIV/AIDS education and prevention of drug abuse).	3.68	.507	3.55	.782
2. Toilets in this school are accessible to pupils.	3.78	.527	3.76	.608
3. Pupils have access to water to wash hands after visiting the toilet.	3.49	.796	2.60	1.158
4. Pupils are provided with clean and safe drinking water.	3.64	.663	2.80	1.174
5. Hawking of food is banned from this school.	3.80	.637	3.50	.988
6. This school has enough, separate toilets for boys and girls.	3.75	.632	3.52	.841
7. Pupils in this school are taught about proper nutrition and balanced diet.	3.59	.698	3.45	.804

8. Physical Education (P. E.) classes promote physical health, exercise, and interaction among pupils.	3.92	.281	3.71	.580
Overall Mean and Std. Dev.	3.71	.365	3.36	.511

The rating of teachers on the implementation of Health and Nutrition Promoting School was excellent in pilot schools and good in non-pilot school with overall means of 3.71 and 3.36 respectively, an indication that most of the CFS programs on health and nutrition had been implemented in their schools. Teachers rated as excellent that in their schools they provide health education to all pupils regarding the avoidance of high-risk behaviors (for example HIV/AIDS education and prevention of drug abuse), toilets are accessible to pupils, hawking of food is banned, they have enough, separate toilets for boys and girls, and Physical Education (P. E.) classes promote physical health, exercise, and interaction among pupils. Teachers in non-pilot schools rated as good that pupils had access to water to wash their hands after visiting the toilet, they were provided with clean and safe water for drinking and they were taught about proper nutrition and balanced diet.

The ratings are on the same page with MOE (2010), that child friendly schools should provide skills based on health education focusing on HIV/ AIDS; stimulate peer support and HIV/AIDS counseling in schools. There should be no discrimination of infected/affected teachers and learners and schools should ensure access to means of

prevention and that schools should have separate, clean and private latrines for male and female teachers and for boys and girls; clean and safe water in all schools and active commitment from the PTA/SMC for maintaining water and sanitation facilities. The ratings also agree with Mbiti (2007) that in schools where flush toilets are used there should be a wash basin for washing hands, whereas in areas where pit latrines are used a water system with a tap should be provided for the same. Keeping toilets clean and attractive in school and at home should be a shared responsibility because everyone uses them. Areas around pit latrines should also be cleared of bushes and grass. MOE (2010) states that some indicators of a safe school should include adequate well maintained facilities, for example toilets, clearly demarcated school ground with proper fencing and school gate, an environment free from drug and substance abuse, trafficking and illegal hawking and low incidences of indiscipline. The ratings concur with UNICEF (2000) that adequate nutrition is critical for normal brain development in the early years, and early detection and intervention for disabilities can give children the best chances for healthy development. Prevention of infection, disease and injury prior to school enrolment are also critical to the early development of a quality learner.

**Table 4: Enhancing school-community linkages and partnerships**

	Pilot N=59 Mean	schools SD	Non- Pilot N=172 Mean	schools SD
1. Parents/guardians are encouraged to participate in decision-making in this school.	3.66	.633	3.61	.753
2. I talk to parents/guardians on how to improve the academic work of their children.	3.88	.326	3.69	.615
3. Parents/guardians are encouraged to attend meetings/events in this school.	3.95	.222	3.79	.564
4. This school has an active Parent Teacher Association (PTA)/School Management Committee (SMC).	3.73	.665	3.37	.898
5. This school is a welcoming and inviting place for all parents/guardians.	3.85	.519	3.77	.573
6. This school provides information on pupil's progress to parents/guardians in a language and format they understand (written or oral).	3.97	.183	3.74	.598
7. This school invites resource persons from the community to talk to pupils.	3.37	.849	3.23	.951
8. Former pupils who have good achievement are invited to this school to serve as role models to our pupils.	3.54	.837	3.34	.932
Overall Mean and Std. Dev.	3.74	.404	3.57	.542

The implementation of Enhancing School-Community Linkages and Partnerships was rated as excellent by teachers with an overall mean of 3.74 and 3.57 in pilot and non-pilot schools respectively, an indication that most of the schools had enhanced school-community linkages and partnerships. The respondents noted that in their schools parents/guardians are encouraged to participate in

decision-making, they are told how to improve the academic work of their children, they are encouraged to attend meetings/events in the school, the school is a welcoming and inviting place for them and the they are provided with information on their children's progress in a language and format they understand (written or oral). However respondents in non-pilot schools rated as good

that their schools have an active Parent Teacher Association (PTA)/School Management Committee (SMC), they invite resource persons from the community to talk to pupils and former pupils who have good achievement are invited to their schools to serve as role models to their pupils an indication that the implementation of this practices is good in those schools. The ratings are on the same page with UNICEF, (2009c), that CFS seeks for children who are out of school and finds ways to bring them to school, explaining the value of Child Friendly Schools can strengthen links between the school and the community through, the school having a Parents Teachers Association that meets and communicates regularly and involves parents from all background (not the elite),the Parents Teachers Association having a plan of action for the school, the school promoting parents participation in discussion and decision making on school policies/activities, the school

utilizing various communication tools to reach out to parents, the school providing information to parents on its reforms/policies/goals, the school inviting parents to discuss concerns about their children and providing regular opportunities for them to inform the school authorities about events at home and community; providing oral messages or translation of communication into parent language.

## 4.2 Ratings of Pupils

Pupils were asked to rate the implementation of the Child Friendly School Programs in their Schools using the following scale, 3.50 – 4.00 for to a great extent, 2.50 – 3.49 for to a moderate extent, 1.50 – 2.49 for to a lesser extent and 1.00 – 1.49 for not at all. Tables 5 to 8 show ratings shown by pupils on the four variables.

**Table 5: Safe and protective schools**

	Pilot N=215 Mean	Schools SD	Non- Pilot N=630 Mean	Schools SD
1. I feel safe within the school compound.	3.58	.744	3.44	.943
2. I feel safe walking both to and from school daily.	3.08	.961	3.14	1.011
3. Guidance and counseling is promoted in my school.	3.43	.787	3.14	1.041
4. My school is a welcoming place for all types of pupils.	3.49	.869	3.05	1.119
5. Teachers make pupils understand their mistake before punishment is administered.	3.20	1.023	3.07	1.083
6. Positive discipline is used instead of corporal punishment in my school.	2.66	1.140	2.63	1.175
7. Teachers in this school show love and respect in the process of pupil's discipline.	3.50	.808	3.34	1.002
8. I am able to safely report a case of bullying, harassment or harm from adults or other pupils without fear.	3.31	.917	2.86	1.108
9. Decisions made in this school are based on what is best for me.	3.35	.845	3.17	1.022
10. I can talk with at least one teacher at school about things that are bothering me.	2.80	1.154	2.82	1.189
<b>Overall Mean and Std. Dev.</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>.494</b>	<b>3.07</b>	<b>.555</b>

The implementation of Safe and Protective school was rated to a moderate extent by pupils with an overall mean of 3.24 and 3.07 in pilot and non-pilot schools respectively. Pupils rated to a moderate extent that felt safe within the school compound, they felt safe walking both to and from school daily, Guidance and counseling is promoted in my school, their school is a welcoming place for all types of pupils, teachers make them understand their mistake before punishment was administered, positive discipline was used instead of corporal punishment, teachers in their school showed love and respect in the process of pupil's discipline, the were able to safely report cases of bullying, harassment or harm from adults or other pupils without fear, decisions made in their school were based on what was best for them and they could with at least one teacher at their school about things that were bothering them an indication that safe and protective measures had been implemented to a moderate extent in the schools as per the pupils ratings.

These findings are in agreement with UNICEF (2009c) that Child Friendly Schools should give attention to prediction, prevention and preparedness in order to make schools protective to learners and teachers. Prediction is foreseeing the imminent risks like malaria that comes during the cold season, political tension leading to violence. Prevention, entails averting the risk to children health and safety, for example, giving vaccines, use of proper hand washing procedures to prevent spread of diseases, prohibiting weapons in schools, fencing off areas of potential danger, for example, swimming pools, and clearing grass to prevent mosquitoes, and preparedness which involves having resources and procedures in place to deal swiftly and decisively with specific dangers to children's health and safety, for example by using simple bells plus text messages to alert the community and parents. According to UNICEF (2009c) schools can be safe and protective environments. Schools should, therefore, protect students from psychological harm that is

punishment from teachers and peers, verbal abuse, name calling and they should eliminate physical threats for example corporal punishment by teachers, student violence, bullying, sexual attacks and other gender – based – violence. Schools should also ensure that beatings,

caning and other humiliating forms of punishment are banned completely. Special attention should be given to orphans and vulnerable children (OVCs) while counseling and medication programs should be made available to children associated with high levels of violence.

**Table 6: Equity and Equality School**

	Pilot N=215 Mean	Schools SD	Non-Pilot N=630 Mean	Schools SD
1. I have an equal chance to participate in school co-curricular activities.	3.37	.865	3.16	1.064
2. I am given equal opportunity to participate in class discussions.	3.66	.656	3.27	1.007
3. Teachers in this school apply the same rules to all pupils equally.	3.49	.858	3.24	1.077
4. When pupils break rules, they are punished fairly and equally.	3.39	.873	3.10	1.138
5. I am treated with respect in my school.	3.37	.902	3.30	.988
6. Girls and boys are treated equally when accessing learning materials.	3.52	.880	3.23	1.072
7. This school places a high value on understanding and respecting my rights as a pupil.	3.45	.840	3.25	1.028
8. Pupils at this school have opportunities to serve in leadership roles, such as a being member of the student council or prefects.	3.58	.769	3.19	1.040
9. I have great opportunities to succeed in this school.	3.73	.628	3.27	1.007
10. *Some types of pupils at this school are treated better than others by the teachers.	2.00	1.146	2.13	1.251
11. *In our class boys and girls sit separately.	1.73	1.093	2.28	1.302
<b>Overall Mean and Std. Dev.</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>.461</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>.537</b>

\*Negative statements (recoded in the computation)

Pupils rated to a moderate extent the implementation of equity and equality school with an overall means of 3.44 and 3.15 in pilot and non-pilot schools respectively. Pupils in pilot schools rated to a great extent that in their schools they are given equal opportunities to participate in class discussions, teachers apply the same rules to all of them equally, they have opportunities to serve in leadership roles, such as a being member of the student council or prefects and they have great opportunities to succeed. The ratings concurred with MOE, (2010) that equity in schools means providing equal opportunities for all learners while equality is attending to learners with all fairness without the slightest form of discrimination; such a school that promotes equity and equality promotes the rights and well-

being of all learners irrespective of their gender, geographical background, socio – economic status, religion and disability. These findings concurred with Craig, Kraft and du Plessis (1998) that schools committed to student learning communicate expectations clearly, give frequent and challenging assignments, monitor performance regularly, allow participatory classroom discussions and give students the chance to participate in and take responsibility for diverse school activities. According to Souza (2011), when parents enroll their children in school they are entrusting their most precious possessions to other people. They expect each child to be supervised and provided with an environment that is both safe and conducive for learning and development.

**Table 7: Health and Nutrition promoting schools**

	Pilot Schools N=215		Non-Pilot Schools N=630	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1. I am provided with health education regarding the avoidance of high-risk behaviors (for example HIV/AIDS education and prevention of drug abuse).	3.50	.911	2.96	1.242
2. The toilets in this school are accessible to pupils	3.05	1.149	2.91	1.156
3. I have access to water to wash hands after visiting the toilet.	3.39	.945	2.60	1.323
4. I am provided with clean and safe drinking water.	3.44	.919	2.99	1.213
5. Hawking of food is banned from our school.	2.93	1.322	2.45	1.293
6. The school has enough, separate toilets for boys and girls.	3.56	.845	3.33	1.042
7. We are taught about proper nutrition and balanced diet.	3.66	.711	3.29	1.053
8. Our Physical Education (PE) classes promote physical health, exercise, and interaction with other pupils.	3.40	.932	2.80	1.210
<b>Overall Mean and Std. Dev.</b>	<b>3.37</b>	<b>.518</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>.650</b>

Pupils rated to a moderate extent the implementation of health and nutrition promoting school with an overall means of 3.37 and 2.92 in pilot and non-pilot schools respectively. Pupils in pilot schools rated a great extent that they are provided with health education regarding the avoidance of high-risk behaviors (for example HIV/AIDS education and prevention of drug abuse), their school has enough, separate toilets for boys and girls and they are taught about proper nutrition and balanced diet indicating that this practices have implemented in this school according to the pupils. However in non-pilot schools this tree practices were rated as to a moderate extent by pupils indicating that they are slightly implemented in this

schools. The ratings concurred with MOE (2010) that child friendly schools should provide skills based on health education focusing on HIV/ AIDS, stimulate peer support and HIV/AIDS counseling in schools, there should be no discrimination of infected/affected teachers and learners and schools should ensure access to means of prevention and that schools should have separate, clean and private latrines for male and female teachers and for boys and girls, clean and safe water in all schools and active commitment from the Parents Teachers Association(PTA) /School Management Committee(SMC) for maintaining water and sanitation facilities.

**Table 8: Enhancing school-community linkages and partnerships**

	Pilot Schools N=215		Non-Pilot Schools N=630	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1. My parents/guardians are encouraged to participate in decision-making at this school.	3.36	.901	3.17	1.087
2. My teachers talk to my parents/guardians on how I can improve my academic work.	3.71	.596	3.23	1.059
3. My parents or guardians are encouraged to attend meetings/events in this school.	3.73	.622	3.29	1.025
4. This school has an active Parent Teacher Association (PTA)/School Management Committee (SMC).	3.29	.967	2.77	1.236
5. The school is a welcoming and inviting place for my parents/guardians.	3.60	.741	3.15	1.065
6. My parents/guardians are given reports on my academic performance by the school in a language and format they understand.	3.45	.878	3.14	1.088
7. The school invites resource persons from the community to talk to pupils	2.91	1.151	2.87	1.149
8. Former pupils who have good achievement are invited to the school to serve as role models for us.	3.01	1.156	3.05	1.139
<b>Overall Mean and Std. Dev.</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>.518</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>.605</b>

Pupils rated the implementation of enhancing school-community linkages and partnerships to a moderate extent with an overall mean of 3.38 and 3.08 in pilot and non-pilot schools respectively. Pupils rated to a great extent that in their school teachers talk to their parents/guardians on how they can improve their academic work, their

parents or guardians are encouraged to attend meetings/events and their school is a welcoming and inviting place for my parents/guardians. The ratings are on the same page with UNICEF (2009c) that Child Friendly Schools can strengthen links between the school and the community through the school having a Parents Teacher

Association (PTA) that meets and communicates regularly and involves parents from all background (not the elite); the Parents Teacher Association (PTA) having a plan of action for the school, the school promoting parents participation in discussion and decision making on school policies/activities; the school utilizing various communication tools to reach out to parents; the school providing information to parents on its reforms/policies/goals; the school inviting parents to discuss concerns about their children and providing regular opportunities for them to inform the school authorities about events at home and within the community, providing oral messages or translation of communication into parent language.

MOE (2010) concurs with the ratings above that besides involving parents and the community, children can learn a relevant curriculum from the community, for example, they can get articles from home that relates to a lesson in class, they can find plants and animals that relate to a lesson. And in schools where there are no female teachers, women from the community can be involved in role model programs. Teachers have a responsibility to communicate regularly with the parents/guardians about their children's learning achievements, work with community leaders to find out which children are out of school and find ways to bring them to school; explain the value of Child Friendly Schools to parents and learners, prepare pupils to interact with the community as part of learning, invite parents/guardians and the community to get involved in the classroom; work with the head teacher to communicate information about Child Friendly Schools to parents and community.

## 5. Conclusion and Recommendations

### 5.1 Conclusion

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings:

1. There is gender disparity among teachers and pupils in pilot and non-pilot schools. Majority of the Teachers in the schools are 41 years and above, have a teaching experience of 15 years and above and are Diploma and Certificate holders.
2. Pilot schools are more child friendly than non-pilot schools.
3. Pilot schools are rated highly in the implementation of Child Friendly Schools program as compared to non-pilot schools that are rated lower in implementation of Child Friendly Schools program by teachers and pupils
4. The main practices that have been implemented by schools are provision of a safe playing ground, provision of adequate and separate toilets for boys and girls and provision of adequate hand washing facilities for teachers and pupils.

### 5.2 Recommendations

The researcher gave the following recommendations:-

1. All stake holders: parents, pupils, teachers and the community should be involved in the creation of Child Friendly Schools (CFS), for example through encouraging the community can construct classrooms through fundraising.
2. Teachers need to be sensitized more on the importance of creating Child Friendly Schools (CFS), through seminars, orientation programs and bench marking.
3. The MOE and other stakeholders should provide adequate resources to be used in the creation of Child Friendly Schools (CFS) for example through provision of infrastructure grants to needy schools, for construction of basic facilities like classrooms, toilets, leveling of playgrounds, fencing of the school compounds, water storage tanks etc.

## References

- Basic Education Act. (2013). *Basic Education. Basic Education Act NO.14 of 2013*. Nairobi: Government Printers.
- Chumba S. K. (2006). Perception of Secondary School Teachers and Head Teachers on the Planning of school buildings in Nandi South District. A thesis submitted to the Department of Administration, Curriculum and teaching School of Education, UEAB. Unpublished thesis.
- Constitution of Kenya. (2010). *The Kenya Constitution*. Nairobi: Government Printers.

- Craig, H., Kraft, R., & du Plessis, J. (1998). *Teacher development: Making an impact*. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, ABEL Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. Clearinghouse for Basic Education.
- Creswell, J.W. & Plano, C.V.L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. clearing house for Basic Education.

- Jelimo, R. (2015, March 7). Three pupils burnt to death as

- fire razes dormitory at Labuywo Academy. *Standard Newspaper, Kenya*. Retrieved from www.standard media.co. ke.
- Kosgey, E. (Producer) (2016, June 25). *10 pupils of Pemja Primary School in Nandi County are expectant leaving their parents in limbo*. [Television Broadcast]. Nairobi. Kenya. KTN.
- Limo, A. Jelimo, J. & Kipkoech, L. (2016). An Evaluation of School Health Promoting Program and the Implementation of Child Friendly Schools Initiative in Primary Schools in Kenya. *American Journal of Educational Research*. 4(13), 2016, 954-960.
- Mbiti, D. M. (2007). *Foundations of School Administration*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- MOE. (2008). *Safety Standards Manual. For Schools in Kenya*. April 2008. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Church World Service.
- MOE. (2010). *Manual Child Friendly Schools*. Republic of Kenya. UNICEF-Kenya.
- MOES & T. (2001). *Health and Safety standards in Educational Institutions*. Nairobi: Circular from MOES & T. Ref. No. G/9/1/69.
- MOES & T. (2005). *Sessional Paper No.1 of 2005, on Policy Framework for Education Training and Meeting the Challenges of Education, Training and Research in Kenya in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Nairobi: Republic of Kenya.
- Mugenda, O., & Mugenda, A., (2003). *Research Methods Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi: Acts Press.
- Ndani, N. M. (2010). *Factors influencing Early Childhood Development teachers Motivation*. Thika District Kenya, PhD Thesis, University of Nairobi – Kenya.
- Owino, J. & Odera, F. (2014). Attitude of Head Teachers towards Guidance and Counseling in Primary Schools in Kisumu West Sub County. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*. 3 (7), 55-62.
- Rwanda Ministry of Education, (2009). UNESCO Rwanda's Child Friendly Schools Infrastructure Standards and Guidelines' Primary and Tronc Commun schools, Rwanda Ministry of Education Approved document May 2009.
- Souza, E. M. (2011). Safety first: Creating a Safe Environment as School. *Journal of Adventist Education*. 74(1): 24-30, 2011.
- Sruthi, A. J. (2016). *Child Friendly Places: A child rights-based, participatory and intergenerational assessment approach to improve community conditions with and for children Conference - Book of Abstracts 2016 Ghent, Belgium*. Retrieved from www.childinthecity.eu/2016 conference/.../Book\_of\_Abstract\_CitC\_2016\_Gent.pdon 20<sup>th</sup> February 2017.
- UNICEF, (2006). *Child Friendly Schools Manual*, New York. USA.
- UNICEF, (2009a). *Child Friendly Schools, Evaluation Country report for Nigeria*. UNICEF, New York, 2009. New York, New York 10017, USA.
- UNICEF, (2009b). *Child Friendly Schools Programming. Global Evaluation Report*. Evaluation Office. United Nations.
- Children's Fund, New York, 2009. United Nations Children's Fund. Three United Nations Plaza. New York, New York 10017.
- UNICEF. (2009c). *Manual Child Friendly Schools*. UNICEFs, Division of Communication. 3 United Nations Plaza. New York, NY 100117, USA.
- UNICEF, (2010). *Education of Section Program*, New York: Division of Community, UN Plaza. New York, New York.
- UNICEF. (2000). *Defining quality education*. A paper presented by UNICEF at the meeting of the International Working Group on Education. Florence, Italy June 2000 New York, NY: Working Paper Series. Education Section Program Division. UNICEF.
- Wanjohi, A. M. (2014). *Social Research Methods Series Proposal Writing. Guide*. Nairobi: Kenya Projects Organizations (KENPRO) Publications.