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ABSTRACT

The Kenya government's effort to adopt and implement the CFS model created a gap with some public primary schools becoming child friendly while others lagged behind. This paper reports a study on the influence of community partnership as a benchmark on the management outcome of child friendly schools. The study was conducted in Makueni County of Kenya in which Child friendly school partnership with Communities was significantly established. A population of about 45,102 was studied producing a sample of 402 respondents. In schools where community partnership existed, 63.6% have operational BOM committees, Parents provided funds for school projects and construction of buildings (58.1%), Parents participated in school's decision-making process (59.4%) and Parents met at least once every month to discuss school development (59.8%). However, other than parents, partnership with other stakeholders was not clear. The study recommended strengthened implementation of community partnership with child friendly schools for the benefit of children.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of Child Friendly School (CFS) emanated from United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), whose resolutions were adopted by the United Nations (UN) General Assembly in 1989 and later ratified in 1990. Subsequently the United Nations Children’s Education Fund (UNICEF) developed the CFS framework as a model for implementing the concept. The UNICEF grounding of CFS framework on the Rights of the Child was based on principles that touch on the rights of children. These principles emphasized on all children to receive education which is free and compulsory as a right, while at the same time set up an environment that encourage enrolment and attendance. The principles also regarded highly the culture and values of the child’s home country which conform to the child’s human rights.

The model also lay out effective procedures that could ensure that children were exposed to excellent education related service delivery which provided a framework on how a school can partner with the surrounding community in the education environment to ensure amiable ecosystem. Similar sentiments have been echoed by Schaeffter (2009), that a CFS framework is essential as it binds families, communities and children in matters concerning school programmes. The CFS model presents well laid down benchmarks (standards) and procedure of the way such schools should be managed and in a manner that meets all-inclusive diversity of societal needs of the children. For instance, schools in Europe and a big number of Common-wealth countries have unique form of CFS Models where programmes are tailored to meet the needs of the education of communities in such a way that the information system can aid in locating and reaching the excluded children or the disadvantaged children (UNICEF, 2009).

Other unique CFS Models are found in different countries of the world; like the Philippines’ model of the CFS the practice is commonly referred to as Child Friendly Families, Child Friendly Communities, Child Friendly Provinces and the Child Friendly Country.

Again, UNICEF (2009), reported that, substantial schools in West-Africa similarly have their own unique model of CFS, with substantial numbers of these schools run by NGOs seemingly being in favour of implementing Child friendly schools with unique characteristics of promoting mostly the girls-friendly initiative. In the case of West Africa, implementation of CFSs was monitored through collaboration of different stakeholders. The West African countries being referred to include Cameroon, Ghana, Burkina Faso, Guinea, Mauritania and Guinea Bissau. Most of these countries have initiated a unique and standardized model which uniquely blend with school environment and in a unique way lead to promotion of school environments that are child-friendly and gender-sensitive (UNICEF, 2009). South Africa on the other hand has substantially progressed...
towards actualizing the provision of child friendly schools. However, there significantly exist some areas of concern with Stakeholders (some) feeling differently when girls cited significant challenges for them while attending classes in addition to their burdening responsibilities at home.

However, the CFS model in Kenya has been anchored in the Constitution of Kenya, 2010 Article 53 (1) (b); that every child has a right to free and compulsory basic education and particularly in Article 10 which envisages the National Values and Principles of Governance. The enactment of the constitution obliged the government to review the education system in line with the international standards of education majorly as framed in the CFS model. Makueni County has also been the focus for many NGOs that have endeavoured to improve infrastructure in primary schools in addition to sponsoring programmes that make schools more child friendly (Makueni County – 2018). In order to implement the UNICEF’s model of a CFS, non-governmental organizations and the immediate school communities have often given schools social and monitory support, however, the support has not been enough. Therefore, there exists concerns about child friendly school partnership with communities, hence this study which focuses on enhancing management outcomes of public primary schools in Makueni County.

Implementation of the CFS model in the Kenyan primary schools started as early as 2002, however, the effectiveness of the implementation has been wanting. Article 53 of the 2010 Constitution of Kenya and the international millennium development goals envisages for every child to have the right to free and compulsory basic education commensurate to international standards as provided for in the UNICEF’s Model of a Child friendly school. However, the level of child friendliness in the public primary schools as required by the model has not been fully established in Makueni County.

For instance, public primary schools in Makueni County have had a share of the reported cases of child insecurity whereby Children have been physically violated at school and within the immediate school community. On the other hand, non-governmental organizations and the immediate school communities (parents included) have often given schools social and monitory support, however, the social and more so the physical infrastructure is wanting in many schools. Therefore, there exists concerns about child friendly school partnership with communities and stakeholders. In this regard, the UNICEF’s CFS model provides the benchmarks which are outstandingly connected to the gaps hereby established and which may inform decision making by managers for the purpose of achieving desired management outcomes in public primary schools in the county.

II. OBJECTIVES

i) To establish stakeholders’ Participation in school management in child friendly schools in public primary schools of Makueni County.

ii) To find out the level of parents’ Participation in school policy making in child friendly schools in public primary schools of Makueni County.

iii) To establish the level of stakeholders’ financial support on school infrastructure and programmes in child friendly schools in public primary schools of

Makueni County.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

The speedy implementation and management of child friendly schools in conformity with international standards require an internal benchmarking framework that guides it. The study significantly assesses the influence of community partnership as an internal school benchmark in public primary schools to provide an informed blueprint on which school managers may select as management criteria for use in leadership and policy formulation within their schools. Improved Child friendly schools will hopefully facilitate holistic growth of children. Children; regardless of status and special needs will ultimately learn in a safe and well protected environments both at school and home.

Child Friendly learning environments facilitates provision of quality education to learners. Teachers as well as parents hopefully acquire an approach to use as a tool in addressing the provision of education which measures to high quality standards on the part of the growing children as on the other hand, will be safe and protected in the event all stakeholders are brought on board for the benefit of children. School managers will have a chance to acquire knowledge to use in addressing managerial issues at school, hence, achievement of desired outcomes.

A. Community Partnerships Internal School Benchmark and Management Outcomes

Children who go to school come from communities and the schools are communities unto themselves. On completion of the educational course, children go back to the same community and therefore apart from the geographical catchment area, the school has the opportunity to establish relations with the youth groups nearby, former pupils, the alumni, scouts and girl guides, religious groups or even language groups and sports clubs with the school. It is critical that a child friendly school links up well with the immediate communities considering that they share a lot in common in terms of interest (UNICEF, 2006). The curriculum taught in school is actually designed to address issues affecting the society; thus, the school community must have strong links for the curriculum to have meaning to learners.

A good community linkage and partnership provides a strategic means to ensure protection of learners. The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) had projected that between the years 2011 and 2020, there was a likelihood of over 140 million girls under the age of 18 years getting married (UNICEF, 2013). The marriages would deprive the children their human rights as children as well as their right to education, health and long-term prospects. This calls for the intervention of schools in collaboration with other community organizations to protect the girl child from this cruel menace. In a study, (World Bank, 2014), posits that elimination of child marriages is successful when approached by multi-sectoral policies other than education and therefore child friendly schools stand a good chance to protect children from these marriages and should therefore link up with other sectors in the community to make schools friendlier for learning and attracting children to remain in school to avoid the marriages.
On the other hand, the local education units, both civic and school administrators as well as the National government ministry charged with the responsibility to oversee education should endeavour to ensure that learners are provided with learning material and an environment where they can physically access the schools of their choice and with relevant learning resources. In addition to reducing physical barriers in the school environment, stakeholders who form the larger community should also look at the economic, psychological, and cultural barriers so as to remove them as well (Miske et al., 2011).

UNICEF (2009) in a study on six countries (Thailand, Nigeria, South Africa, Guyana, Nicaragua, and Philippines), head teachers, teachers and parents who were respondents reveal that strong partnerships between schools and families provide an important element for the success of a CFS. Heads teachers indicate they often informed their school communities of school events. Teachers (82 percent) indicated existence of community awareness of what goes on inside schools. Further, Head teachers (30% -59%) within the six countries attributed part of the CFS success to strong partnerships with local businesses or community organizations. Community linkages with schools was therefore found quite critical and important providing a child friendly school.

Again, Chidi (2013) in a study in Enugu state of Nigeria reveal that CFS framework encourages and strengthens parents to participate more in managing their schools through their Association with Teachers (PTA) in the context of community participation without discrimination on the basis of gender.

The school partnership with the community is also supposed to address pertinent issues in some communities that infringe the rights of children. Such issues border on child marriages as well as Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) which is rampant in some communities in Kenya. For instance, a case study among the Kisi and the Kuria in Kenya about Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) in 2014 recommended that schools should work closely with groups working to eliminate or reduce the FGM menace (Oloo et. al., 2014). The recommendation aimed at strengthening linkage to secure the rights of the girl child to education. The linkage in this context aims to change the cultural beliefs that genital mutilation is passage to adulthood in communities where it is practiced. The communities where it is practiced perceives it to open a chance for marriage which may follow immediately.

Besides the curriculum that should reflect the needs of the society, the community contributes a lot in terms of culture, social wellbeing of children, management and financial support. In a study conducted in Busia County— Kenya (2013) about ‘Situation analysis on conducive learning environment for children withdrawn and prevented from child labour’, majority of the 21 informants interviewed were of the opinion that the community gave very little support to schools. The study also reported parents to have ensured that their children remained in school even if it meant returning them after they dropped out as a result of child abuse. This was strongly attributed to awareness done on child rights and child abuse.

Again, according to Nduku (2003), child friendly schools and the homes that provide children to schools need to interact frequently. In her study, Nduku, (2003), reported that, meetings between teachers, parents and other stakeholders need to discuss issues touching on the welfare of children which includes planning, implementing and even monitoring of school projects so as to make the schools more child friendly. Nduku (2003) continues to argue that talented parents in diverse areas may be of good use by enriching the school curriculum. The interactions also promote community teacher relationship and at the same time minimizing cultural negative effects that may affect enrolment and attendance to school by children.

However, Miske (2010) suggests that the school community may be seen to mean the wider society as well as the nation whereby the national government is charged with the responsibility to provide the legal structures and the necessary finance for supporting development of the Child-Friendly Schools. In addition to social and moral support, stakeholders are bound to provide physical facilities that enhance security and dignity of all school going children. This has however been a priority among the project development plans of a good number of NGOs in Kenya. For instance, WUSC and WTK are helping to build child friendly school environments in marginalized areas for girls and boys in northern Kenya by building more classrooms, ensuring there are adequate teaching and learning materials, and building separate latrines for girls (WUSC & KEEP, 2013).

Makueni County on the other hand has also benefited immensely from communities and NGOs who have greatly provided infrastructural support in public primary schools. Community linkage (especially Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and NGOs) with child friendly schools have served an important role in making schools more child friendly. According to a study in Mito-Andei division of Makueni County by Musau (2012), there was need for schools to strengthen partnership with Non-Governmental organizations and parents associations in order to ensure sustainability of projects which were found crucial for child support when the NGOs wind up their work in the area. Community Based Organizations and the immediate school communities (parents included) have often given schools social and monitorial support but however, a lot more is required to make schools friendlier. This therefore triggers the resolve for this research to investigate how community partnerships influence management outcomes in the public primary schools.

IV. METHODOLOGY - RESEARCH DESIGN

The researcher used a mixed methods triangulation design with a convergent model. The convergent model was found to be fitting in this study since it provided an opportunity for the researcher to identify the characteristics, frequencies, trends correlations and categories of the data which was collected quantitatively and qualitatively - Shona (2019).

The design entailed collection of quantitative data and open-ended questions for qualitative data separately. The quantitative data and the qualitative data were then analysed separately, and the results for each compared and mixed at the interpretation level. By mixing the data, the researcher
compared and contrasted the findings thus, using the qualitative data set to strengthen the quantitative findings (Creswell, 2006). The two data sets produced results that converged during the interpretation stage.

A. Triangulation Design: Convergence Model

The model (Fig. 1.) enabled production of valid results and conclusions that substantiated the phenomenon at hand fairly well.

For this study, qualitative data was collected from Head teachers and county directors who are administrators in the schools and the County respectively and who are in better positions to clarify issues to do with management of CFS. This was done by using open ended questions in interview schedules and document analysis. The entire data collection procedure involved collection of data that could be easily explained, predicted or controlled using a controlled environment of the phenomena under study in which a variety of statistical methods were employed. As explained by Creswell (2006), the model is purposely used in order to obtain conclusions that are valid and well-substantiated about a single phenomenon. Questionnaires for collecting quantitative data, interview schedule and document analysis were therefore the tools used for the research. This approach was considered appropriate for this study since qualitative data was designed to compare and contrast with quantitative data in order to get a better understanding of what the researcher sought out to study about the problem.

In the study, correlation data analysis was used to explain the strength at which respondents understood about the benchmark that form the Child Friendly Schools. Data was collected by way of a survey method thus enabling the researcher to benefit from the easiness of collecting large information by way of questionnaires to a given sample (Orodho, 2009). Data analysis was done using descriptive and inferential statistics which included Pearson correlation and regressions.

B. Target Population

This study (as indicated in Table I) targeted a population comprising of two County Directors (TSC and Ministry), 14,760 pupils of the school leadership, 1,476 Head teachers, 11,152 Teachers and 17,712 Board of Management members. A sample of the population (distributed as shown in the table below) was studied as a representative of the entire population which was 45,102.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of population</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Sampling procedure</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Directors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>11,152</td>
<td>Stratified random</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>14,760</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOM</td>
<td>17,712</td>
<td>Stratified random</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45,102</td>
<td></td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2015.

D. Construction of Research Instruments

The study question was about the influence level of safety and security internal school benchmark on the management outcome in primary schools of Makueni County, Kenya.

The study adopted three types of data collection instruments which included questionnaires, interview schedule (only for County Directors and Head Teachers) and document analysis.

E. Testing Of Validity and Reliability and Establishment of Trustworthiness

The researcher piloted the instruments in three primary schools in Machakos county which neighbours Makueni county and which have similarities. Five teachers in each school and the three Head teachers of the schools participated in the piloting exercise. The sample size was therefore 18 respondents.

A reliability test was carried out whereby the tools were correlated, and a coefficient test done as shown in Table III below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By use of Cronbach’s alpha technique, the Head teachers’ questionnaire test for reliability yielded an overall reliability coefficient of 0.878 which is 87.8%. This was acceptable for the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE IV: RELIABILITY TEST FOR TEACHERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


By use of Cronbach’s alpha technique, the Teachers’ questionnaire test for reliability yielded an overall reliability coefficient of 0.822 which is 82.2%. This was acceptable for the study.

F. Data Analysis Techniques

The data collected was subjected to testing of compliance with the statistical assumptions before analysis which included the Normality of data, checking existence outliers, Checking Multicollinearity, the construct validity instruments and testing of hypothesis.

G. Normality Test

Prior to running a linear regression model, normality testing of the data was done. The test was conducted to ensure that regression results were not spurious (Park, 2015). The graphical method was applied in testing for normality of the data, where the distribution curve was expected to be normal.

a) Regression model

The following linear regression model was estimated.

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \ldots + \beta_5 X_5 + \varepsilon \]

Where:

- \( Y \) = School Management Outcomes
- \( X_1 \) = Children’s Security
- \( X_2 \) = Inclusion of Learners with SNE
- \( X_3 \) = Community partnership & linkages
- \( X_4 \) = Child health promoting programmes
- \( X_5 \) = Equity and Equality promoting among all children
- \( \beta_i; i=1,2,3,4,5 \) = The coefficients for the various independent variables
- \( \varepsilon \) = Error term

V. DISCUSSIONS

A. Influence of Community Partnerships Internal School Benchmark on Management Outcomes in Child Friendly Public Primary Schools

In this section, community partnerships as an internal school benchmark in the management outcome in child friendly school was examined in various ways. These included the respondents rating on the level of community partnerships with child friendly schools, availability of BOM and PTA committees in child friendly schools and parents’ engagement on policy and school infrastructural development in their schools.

a) Descriptive analysis of findings about community partnerships internal school benchmark on management outcomes in public primary schools

Besides the curriculum that should reflect the needs of the society, the community contribute a lot in terms of culture, social wellbeing of children, management, material support as well as financial support. In this study, respondents were asked to rate their perception of their schools’ partnership with communities. The bar graph below shows their ratings.
Again, respondents were asked to indicate whether there were established Boards of Management in their schools, Parents Teachers Association committees and children’s parliament which were fully operational in their schools. The graph above shows response in the study.

The findings on Fig. 3. show that most of the schools examined (63.6%) as per the respondents have fully operational Board of Management committees, 29.29% have fully operational Parents Teachers Association while 11.11% have a fully operational children’s government. Most schools as revealed in the study findings have adopted the BOM management committees as required in the Kenya’s basic education Act 2013. This shows that the schools have incorporated stakeholders well in the management of the schools. As per the policy guiding Boards Of Management in schools, children have too been included in the Board Of Management. The voice of children in the management of schools is indicated to have some impact as shown by the small percentage (11.11%) of the respondents who indicated that their schools had a fully operational children’s parliament which were highly regarded by their BOM. However, the small percentage shows that a lot is required to make majority of the schools compliant to creating space for children’s voice to be heard in the management of their schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financing of schools</th>
<th>1-A</th>
<th>2-SA</th>
<th>3-D</th>
<th>4-SD</th>
<th>5-N</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents in my school provide funds for school projects and construction of buildings</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All major plans to do with development must be endorsed by the PTA before implementation</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents in my school participate in maintenance of school environment like tree planting</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents in my school meet at least once every month</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study also show that there was significant contribution by parents on policy making and infrastructural financing for school development. This concurs with Nduku (2013) that, meetings between teachers, parents and other stakeholders (who in this context form the BOM) need to discuss issues touching on the welfare of their children in school including planning, implementing and even monitoring of school projects so as to make the schools more child friendly. Similarly, this study sought to establish whether there was any community partnership in financing of school development projects. In a Likert scale questions, respondents were asked to indicate their knowledge about parents’ engagement on school infrastructural development using the options 1- Agree without doubts (A) 2- Strongly agree without doubts (SA) 3- Disagree without doubts (D) 4- Strongly disagree without doubts (SD) and 5- Neither agree nor disagree (N). The findings are presented in Table V below.

Almost three quarters of all the school funding is obtained from parents. According to the study findings (table 21), 58.1% (Frequency - 157 out of 270) majority of the respondents agreed without doubts that parents in their school provided funds for school projects and construction of buildings. Another 14.1% (Frequency - 38 out of 270) strongly agreed without doubts with the same opinion. However, parents were found not the sole sources of funds for school projects as per 13.7 % (Frequency - 37 out of 270) and 6.3% (Frequency: 17 out of 270) of the respondents who disagreed without doubts and strongly disagreed (respectively) with the statement. A small number of the respondents forming 7.8% (Frequency - 21 out of 270) neither agree nor disagree that parents are the main source of funds for school projects and construction of school buildings.

All major development projects and programmes for schools were found to receive endorsement by the PTA before implementation as displayed by 59.4% (Frequency - 158 out of 266) majority of respondents who agreed without doubts and 27.1% (Frequency - 72 out of 266) who strongly agreed without doubts. There is however evidence from the study findings that, not all major school plans are endorsed by the PTA as per 6.8% (Frequency - 18 out of 266) and 3.0% (Frequency - 8 out of 266) of the respondents. A few of the study respondents were not sure of who endorses the major school plans as shown by 3.8% (Frequency - 10 out of 266) who strongly neither agreed, nor disagreed that parents in their school were the sole source of funding for school projects. A small number of the respondents forming 16.5% (Frequency - 44 out of 266) who strongly agreed that parents in their school were the sole source of funding for school projects.

The study respondents were not sure of who endorses the major school plans as shown by 3.8% (Frequency - 10 out of 266) who strongly neither agreed, nor disagreed that parents in their school were the sole source of funding for school projects. A small number of the respondents forming 16.5% (Frequency - 44 out of 266) who strongly agreed that parents in their school were the sole source of funding for school projects.
levelling of unwanted pit in the school compound. The findings established slightly over half (44.7%; Frequency - 119 out of 266) majority and 16.5% (Frequency - 44 out of 266) agree without doubts and strongly agree without doubts (respectively) that parents in their schools participated in the maintenance of the school environment. However, there is evidence from the findings that an observable population of parents (18.8% - Frequency; 50 out of 266) and (12.4% - Frequency - 33 out of 266) do not participate in the maintenance of school environment. This is reflected by their response to the statement; “parents in my school participated in maintenance of the school environment activities like planting of trees and levelling of pit in the school compound”.

On the view that parents met to discuss school development at least once every month showed 59.8% (Frequency - 153 out of 256) and 25.4% (Frequency - 65 out of 256) strongly agreed and agreed without doubts.

### TABLE VI: PEARSON’S CORRELATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Community partnership and linkages in the school management of schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fully operational school management body</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parents in my school provide funds for school projects and construction of buildings</td>
<td>0.171 **</td>
<td>0.135 *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. All major plans to do with development must be endorsed by the PTA before implementation</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>0.182 **</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Parents in my school participate in maintenance of school environment like tree planting</td>
<td>0.174 **</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.142 *</td>
<td>0.70.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parents in my school meet at least once every month</td>
<td>0.268 **</td>
<td>0.177 **</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.127 *</td>
<td>0.196 **</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How do you rate your school as a child friendly school</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed) (Researcher, 2017).

Schools are considered child friendly if there is some level of partnership and linkages with the immediate community so that there is involvement of stakeholders in the school development programme. In this study, various level of relationships provides an understanding on the extent to which schools partnered with external stakeholders in the quest to provide child friendly school environment. This included a fully operational school management body (inclusive of parents and stakeholders), funding of the school projects and construction of buildings by parents, endorsement of major school development plans by parents, parents participation in the maintenance of school environment like planting of trees, and periodical meeting of parents to discuss and understand better the schools where their children learn were tested in this study.

Funding of school projects by parents and well-wishers as well as parental participation in management and maintenance of a child friendly school environment provided the testing of community linkages and partnership and the level of operation in the school. A significant positive correlation was obtained between funding of school projects by parents and construction of school building at a correlation coefficient of 0.171, parent’s participation in the maintenance of school environment like tree planting and levelling of pit in the school compound at a correlation coefficient of 0.174 and meetings of parents at least once every month at a correlation coefficient of 0.268. Notably, positive correlations are hereby realized in this study about the importance of parents’ meetings and their involvement in facilitating successful management outcomes of child friendly schools. Forming school partnerships with communities particularly with parents was found an important aspect in the management of child friendly schools as eluded by the findings. Primary objectives of forming partnerships as established in the study are to meet the needs of the learners in their schools as a way of promoting child friendliness in their school environment.

### B. Thematic Analysis: Community Partnerships and Linkages Benchmark on Management Outcomes of CFS

Qualitative data was collected by way of interview with County Directors (CD) and Head teachers about community partnerships and linkages in child friendly schools.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.24018/ejedu.2022.3.2.275
a) Document analysis

Documents obtained from schools revealed that all schools had an active Parents/Teachers association. This was evidenced by available minutes of meetings held at least once every term by the association in which school matters were discussed. Majority of those who attended the meetings were female parents. It was also evident that most of the school infrastructure was constructed with funding from the community; sometimes in partnership with the Kenya government and Non-governmental organizations. Generally, there was established partnership between schools and the community.

b) Findings from interview with County Directors (CD) and Head teachers about community partnership

Respondents were asked to indicate their rating on the level of community partnerships as an internal school benchmark in the management of schools. Interview questions were subjected to County Directors and Head teachers where from the following was the content summary of the emerging themes from the qualitative analysis of their responses;

CD1 stated that “We have often encouraged our schools to create amiable environment with surrounding school communities to exploit an opportunity for the school community to share the responsibility of securing safety for children”. (A CD aged above 50 years)

CD 2 stated that “I am aware that building a Child-Friendly school is costly but it’s an investment opportunity for school communities’ engagement to develop a holistic growth of pupils; one that is likely to take care of their children up to their expectations.” (A CD aged above 50 years).

HT1 teacher said “As far as I am concerned, I think there is need to support the existing Community linkages to promote the well-being of the school by incorporating stakeholders whose interest would contribute”. (Male HT aged above 50-year-old).

Another emerging theme was summarised from the comment of another Head teacher thus;

HT2 “All school administrators should deliberately develop relationship within and without the school community to bring more stakeholders for the sake of creating more supporters for inclusive learning”. (Male HT aged between 45-50 years old).

HT3 commented that “Our school has been linking well with the community by allowing youth to use the school fields for recreation on the weekend”. (Male HT aged between 40-55 years old).

Regarding the question on whether there is adequate Linkage with parents, a respondent commended,

HT4: “Parents and stakeholders contribute to build classrooms in our school but there is need to strengthen the link”. (Female HT aged between 45-50 years old).

Evidenced by the comments, community partnership is an important benchmark in the management of a CFS going by the comments by CD 1, CD2, HT1 and HT3. HT2 goes further to express the need for strengthening the linkages. HT4 goes further to indicate the collaborative benefit achieved from community partnerships. From the findings, it is clear that County Directors encourage BOMs to work with communities in order to make schools more child friendly. Head teachers who are executive officers in the BOMs too agree that partnering with communities especially in providing ideas and finance would help in making schools more child friendly. These findings concur with UNICEF (2009) in a study among six countries (Thailand, Nigeria, South Africa, Guyana, Nicaragua and Philippines), in which head teachers, teachers and parents who were respondents reveal that strong partnerships between schools and families provide an important element for the success of a CFS. Therefore, community partnership and linkages in child friendly schools stands out an important benchmark in making the schools more child friendly.

C. Regression Analysis on Community Partnerships and Management Outcomes in Public Child Friendly Schools

Regression analysis in this study was used to establish the contribution of Community partnerships to the management outcome of child friendly schools. Average scores of (independent variables) which are the Community partnerships, Participation in school policy making, financial support on school infrastructure and programmes were regressed with average scores on rating on management outcomes of schools as child friendly. The result of the analysis has been presented in the model summary analysis of variance tests and summary of coefficients.

This was based on the following model:

Community partnerships,

\[ y_3 = f(\beta_3 + m1+m2+m3 + \varepsilon) \]

Where:

\[ y_3 = \text{Management outcomes in public primary schools} \]
\[ \beta_3 = \text{Constant variable} \]
\[ m1 = \text{Availability of community partnerships and linkages} \]
\[ m2 = \text{Participation in school policy making} \]
\[ m3 = \text{Financial support on school infrastructure and programmes} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]
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\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.044} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]

\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]
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\[ 0 \text{.012} < \text{p value} < 0 \text{.05} \]
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The coefficient of regression was also used to show the relative contribution of each of the indicators of community partnership and management outcomes of CFS. The table below shows the obtained Coefficients of community partnership factors in Management outcomes in CFS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>2.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in school</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>2.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support on</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>1.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school infrastructure and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Management outcomes of child friendly schools


The coefficient of regression in this study indicates that the model had a constant value 0.161. The highest score was for financial support on school infrastructure and programmes with a β coefficient of .338 and a p value of 0.039 > 0.05 indicating a significant contribution towards management outcomes in child friendly schools. Existence of community partnerships with child friendly schools at 95% level of confidence had a β coefficient of 0.320 and a p value of 0.040 > 0.05.

D. Mixing Qualitative and Quantitative Data, Interpretation and Implications

Qualitative and quantitative data was mixed whereby the descriptive, inferential and thematic data strongly complimented each other in relation to the level of community partnerships as an internal school benchmark in the management outcome in schools. Partnership with parents was established as dominant among other stakeholders in the community. The study findings show parents as the main financiers of school projects as well as the main participants in both policy formulation at school level and development movers of school projects. The study observes a potential to grow other school relationships in order to enhance management of Child Friendly Schools.

VI. CONCLUSION

Conclusively, parents and communities are ‘first-line’ duty bearers, responsible for accessing available opportunities for their children and for supporting quality education in their community (Shaefner, 2009), thus, a reason for a strong partnership among stakeholders in the community and child friendly schools. Community partnerships promote the well-being of a school by way of incorporating the community and stakeholders whose interest would contribute positively towards achievement of school objectives. The study established strong partnership with parents in managing and developing the Child Friendly School. The study findings show parents in Makueni County as the main financiers of schools projects as well as the main participants in both policy formulation at school level and development movers of school projects. The study observes a potential to grow other school relationships in order to enhance management of Child Friendly Schools.

Again, a wide range of stakeholders in the community are not engaged and therefore the findings of this study about the community partnership towards the management outcomes of Child Friendly Schools could be indicative of the non-exploited potential as far as a community partnership with schools is concerned, thus, a lot more can be done to tap their contribution in making schools more child friendly.
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