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ABSTRACT

This study investigated the status of safety measures and its effects on performance in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County - Kenya. For effective management and learning of children in schools, safety measures are paramount. In a majority of public primary schools in Kenya, the situation is wanting (Simatwa and Omollo, 2010). Four objectives were explored. They were to: determine the extent to which safety measures had been implemented, establish levels of safety awareness, establish the factors that influenced the implementation of safety measures and find out the strategies that had been devised by headteachers and quality assurance officers to enhance the implementation of safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi – County. The study employed a descriptive survey research design in which 4797 respondents were targeted and a sample size of 479 was used. Questionnaires were used to collect data from teachers and pupils whereas interview schedules were used to collect data from DQASO. Results of data analysis were then presented using frequency distribution tables, bar graphs and pie charts. It was found that the state of safety in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County was in a pathetic condition because almost all the schools had not implemented most basic safety measures. It was concluded that negligence, lack of funds and communication barrier led to unsatisfactory implementation of safety policies. The study recommended that all headteachers ensure that emergency drills are conducted regularly to enhance preparedness and purchase the required number of first aid kits and fire extinguishers. Headteachers should also ensure that construction and maintenance of fences was done to enhance school safety and facilitate a greater involvement of all the stake holders to ensure a collaborative approach to the implementation of safety policies. The Ministry of Education on the other hand ought to ensure that headteachers peg admission to class space to avoid over-crowding in schools, provide all schools in Kilifi Sub-County with funds to implement safety policies and improve on the coordination and follow-up of all the stake holders in the safety policy implementation process.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background information to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, and significance of the study, scope of the study, limitations of the study, assumption of the study, theoretical framework, conceptual framework and operational definitions.

1.1 Background to the Problem

Safety of persons in organizations and institutions of learning is a matter of concern to all worldwide. Many organizations have safety measures put in place and a majority of institutions of learning are regarded as havens of peace globally (Simatwa, 2007). Contrary to the foregoing, many cases of insecurity have been reported in institutions of learning. As witnessed globally, the number of children dying, getting injured in school violence, disasters and emergencies is on the increase. Thousands of school children have died in preventable incidents such as drug and gun violence in American and European schools, the 2004 Beslan School massacre in Russia, the Chinese school blast and the Indian school fires (Cavanagh, 2004; Soomeren, 2002; Reuters, 2004; Simatwa, 2010).

Effective safety measures in schools have received a lot of attention in the recent past. According to Shaw (2002), new collections of good practices have been published. Data have been collected and tools developed that support effective practice. Manuals, guides and training materials have been written (Simatwa, 2010). Many stakeholders meetings have been made on matters of children safety in schools and such bodies as the Council of Europe, the European Forum for Urban...
Security and the Australian Institute of Criminology have been in the forefront (Cavanagh, 2004). Such developments have been fruitful and have shown the need to work in more collaborative and comprehensive ways in improving safety in schools. Consequently, many countries world over have come up with policy guidelines on safety measures in schools (Reuters, 2004). These policies do recognize the multi-dimensional causes of school safety problems and they contain long term plans that encourage partnerships between schools and other stakeholders. Some policies contain the necessary information for funding of project development and implementation, including training and technical assistance.

The United States of America is a showcase where school safety measures have been given a priority. For example, school wide policies and strategies are effected in such a way that they systematically address needs of students, school personnel, the community and the physical plants of the school. Although terrorism, drug related violence, firearms and natural disasters like typhoons floods and hurricanes are major safety threats in the US, the United States Department of Education (U.S.D.E) ensures that safety policies are dully reinforced. As a consequence, many American public schools have zero-tolerance policies on activities that are likely to compromise safety. A survey on crime and safety in schools that was carried out in 1996/1997 showed that 90% of the schools were zero-tolerant to firearms. Also, during the same period statistics indicate that quite a number of schools enhanced safety and security. For example, 96% of public schools required visitors to sign in before entering into the school plant; 80% had a closed school policy that prohibited students from leaving school premises except at specified times whereas 6% of schools had policemen or other law enforcement personnel stationed thirty hours a
week or more at the school in a typical week (United States Department of Education, 2004:65).

In Asia, the picture is completely different from what we have witnessed in America. Here, there is little or total lack of the implementation of school safety policies in both India and China for example. In its report, Reuters (2004) documented the Indian school fire of July 2004, in which 90 children died. It laid its blame on failure by the systems to fully implement safety norms. It is reported that the school building in this case was overcrowded and had only one exit. There were no emergency doors or fire fighting equipment. School tragedies in India, therefore, including the 1995 school fire, which led to the death of 400 students, are blamed on failure by Regulatory Authorities to enforce safety norms. For example, schools may stay for as long as three years without being inspected. In China, things don’t look any better. For example, in the year 2001 a school blast was witnessed in which a storied building collapsed on school children and this was blamed on selective implementation of safety policies. Since then, however, various regulations governing safety in schools have since been strengthened (CERNET, 2004). These include the Law on the protection of minors, the Law on Compulsory Education and the Teachers’ Law. In addition, some Chinese schools have had to cancel activities like gymnastics to reduce death and injury associated with the rigours of physical education. Chinese schools are required by law to take the responsibility for managing and protecting students in their premises. Consequently, they are required by law to buy liability accident insurances to compensate death and injuries that occur in the school premises.
In Africa, the state of safety measures in schools is pathetic – insecurity of the children is ever on the increase (Gicheru, 1998). In South Africa, serious violence, gang activity, rape and sexual assaults on girls in schools have been reported (Shaw, 2002). Because of rampant crime rates in schools, approaches to school safety have been enhanced where Non-governmental organizations such as the Independent Project Trust (I.P.T) and Business Against Crime play a role. There are such projects as “Tiisa Thuto” that involve developing partnerships between schools, parents, local businesses and community organizations in implementing model programs that address the needs of the individual schools. Another approach on the enhancement of school safety in South Africa includes the “Crisp” programme. It organizes school safety teams to link parents, schools, local organizations and police. Thus school safety is seen as a communal event that has to involve all the stakeholders (Simatwa, 2007). However, continued safety problems led to the realization that a more fundamental approach was required. Thus the “Cass” program was initiated. This is a comprehensive model involving local community partners, National government development guidelines and support material for school managers, educators and safety committees (Simatwa, 2007: Simatwa, 2010).

Like in other countries in the world where safety has been a challenge in schools, Kenya is not any better. For example, in 1991 Kenya witnessed a barbaric act where boys in St. Kizito Meru raided the girls’ dormitory resulting into the death of nineteen girls (Simatwa, 2007). In 1993 armed gangsters stormed Hawinga Girls Secondary School, something Oriang (2001) attributed to lack of perimeter fencing that made it easier for the gangsters to access the school and rape students. In addition to the above incidences, another fire tragedy was witnessed in Bombolulu
Girls, Mombasa County where twenty seven girls died in 1998. The cause of this catastrophe was overcrowding (Gicheru, 1998). Odalo (2001) observed that the absence of firefighting equipment and emergency exits led to the high death toll during the Kyanguli Secondary School fire. Sixty eight boys lost their lives in this incident.

Although there exists policy guidelines on school safety in Kenya whose purpose is to create and maintain a safe, secure and caring environment that facilitates and enhances quality teaching and learning processes in schools in the country, little has been achieved as far as safety of the children in public schools is concerned. Some of the specific objectives of this safety guideline for the Kenyan schools include provide opportunities for the learner to exploit and maximize potential for learning, growth and development; provide opportunity for the learner to participate in enhancing school safety; promote, maintain and contribute to the understanding of the child and staff safety; provide a benchmark for monitoring and appraising the safety status d staff who become victims of injury or are taken ill; counsel, guide and advise learners and staff on issues relating to school safety; empower the school to liaise with parents, members of the community and other partners in order to increase awareness about issues related to school safety; empower members of the community to handle disasters and thus minimize risks; provide first line emergency services to learners and staff who become victims of injury or are taken ill; counsel, guide and advise learners and staff on issues relating to school safety; empower the school to liaise with the parents, members of the community and other partners in order to increase awareness about issues related to school safety; and forge alliances and networks that enhance school and child safety (Safety and Standard Manual, 2008).
It is against the above backdrop that teaching and learning processes can only be achieved in a safe and secure environment that facilitates increased learners enrolment, retention, completion and consequently quality education (Safety and Standard Manual, 2008). This can only be attained in a situation where mutual and cordial working relationship between the school management, the surrounding community and all the stakeholders are involved thus bringing about school effectiveness and improvement (Hargreaves, 2001).

In spite of the existence of this safety standard manual which acts as a guideline it is certain that most schools have not complied with it. For example, schools were ordered to remove grills from dormitory windows to protect students/pupils during disasters. Also, school managers were advised to beef up security by employing an adequate number of watchmen (Savula and Atsiaya, 2004). Nonetheless, school safety policies in Kenya as indicated in the Ministry of Education (MoE) Circular No. G9/1/169 (Republic of Kenya, 2001) sets standards which should be followed, but how many schools in Kenya adhere to this? It is against this background that this study aimed at assessing the status of safety measures and their effects on performance in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County - Kenya.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

School safety is vital in every institution of learning. Teaching and learning process can only be achieved in a safe and secure environment. Safe and secure school environment facilitates increased learners enrolment, retention, completion and consequently quality education (Ministry of Education Safety Standards Manual, 2008).
There is a growing concern about the safety of the children in the Kenyan schools. Many incidences of insecurity, fire out breaks and pupils unrest have been on the increase (Simatwa, 2007). The increased events of catastrophes in Kenya including the 2007/2008 post election violence that saw over 300,000 people displaced and many of them being school going children led to the formulation of the Safety Standards Manual for Schools in Kenya (Safety Standards Manual, 2008). In spite of the availability and accessibility of such a manual by many Kenyan schools, calamities are on the increase (Simatwa, 2010). Consequently, the persistent recurrence of safety problems in public schools poses serious questions that demand urgent answers if similar cases are to be avoided in future. Hence the need to assess the status of safety measures and their effects on performance in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County – Kenya.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the status of safety measures and their effects on performance in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County - Kenya.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were:

i. To determine the extent to which safety measures have been implemented in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi – County

ii. To establish levels of safety awareness in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi - County

iii. To establish the factors that influence the implementation of safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi - County
iv. To find out the strategies that have been devised by head teachers and quality assurance officers to enhance the implementation of safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi - County

1.5 Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

i. To what extent have safety measures been implemented in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi - County?

ii. What are the basic safety and security features of public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County?

iii. To what extent have the levels of safety awareness been made in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County?

iv. What is the basic safety and security status of public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County?

v. What factors influence the implementation of safety policies in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi - County?

vi. What strategies have been devised by head teachers and quality assurance officers to enhance the implementation of safety policies in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi - County?

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study would provide valuable insights to the government of Kenya, head teachers of schools, teachers, learners, parents, religious organizations, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), Community Based organizations (CBOs), development partners and the local communities on the state of safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County – Kenya.
This study would provide an opportunity for the learners to participate in enhancing school safety. For example at the beginning of each term in each school there should be an announced fire drill. According to the MOE (2008) each school should have at least two fire drills a month, one announced and one unannounced in order to prepare for any emergency.

The study would also benefit the school administration and the teachers to participate in the evaluation of their own school safety programme. In this case, each school should prepare a check list of safety and safety education in their respective schools. Consequently, each school would be encouraged to put into place regular and thorough inspection for safe condition of school plant, playing grounds, equipment, exit drills and fire fighting gadgets and safety education.

This study would also benefit the school management in that it would cooperate with the community to provide living conditions that are safe to the children. In general, the findings of the study would provide all the stakeholders with data on the general state of safety measures in public primary schools in the county of Kilifi that would be a step in the right direction to pave way for interventional strategies that would effectively serve to minimize accidents and injuries in our schools. This would assist all the stakeholders in the educational sector to work with all Kenyans in developing and propagating national ethos that would make Kenya a prosperous and cohesive nation towards realization of vision 2030.
1.7 **Scope of the Study**

The study was carried out in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County - Kenya. It was to address the status of safety measures in public primary schools. All the schools within Kilifi Sub-County were used in this study. Kilifi Sub-County was chosen because it is in close proximity with the researcher. Data was collected using questionnaires, observation schedules and interview schedules for the Quality Assurance Officers was used.

1.8 **Limitations of the Study**

Accesses of some schools in Kilifi Sub-County were a challenge because of its big size and due to poor road network in the region. Financial constraints also hindered the research in that it limited the researcher to a fairly small sample size. However, to overcome this, the researcher sampled at least 20% of the total population under study as recommended by Mugenda and Mugenda (1999; 2003).

1.9 **Assumption of the Study**

The study was carried out on the basis of the following assumptions:

i. That all the respondents gave genuine, truthful, and honest responses to the questionnaires.

ii. That the school management was aware of the Ministry of Education safety standards and manuals.
1.10 Theoretical Framework

Capital Theory of School Effectiveness and Improvement was developed by Hargreaves. It is based on the outcomes, both cognitive and moral; leverage, which is the relationship between the teacher input and education output; intellectual capital, which is the sum of the school’s knowledge and experience; and social capital, that is, networks of trust and collaboration (Hargreaves, 2001). He argues that an effective theoretical model of schools should provide a working model that should be made up of both effectiveness and improvement. It must have the following four concepts:

i. Outcomes, two kinds: cognitive and moral.

ii. Leverage: Refers to the relationship between teacher input and educational output, or changes in students’ intellectual and moral state resulting from the teacher’s effort.

iii. Intellectual capital: Refers to the knowledge and experience of the school’s stakeholders. This capital grows through creation of new knowledge and through the capacity to transfer knowledge between situations and people.

iv. Social capital: Is the level of trust and collaboration between people, and the existence of strong networks.

High levels of social capital in a school strengthen its intellectual capital (through sharing). Unlike financial capital, social and intellectual capital are increased rather than decreased/depleted by passing on to others (Hargreaves, 2001). He uses this model to bring forth definitions of effectiveness and improvement of schools, by saying that an effective school puts together its intellectual capital (e.g. its capacity
to create and transfer knowledge) and its social capital (i.e. its capacity to generate trust and sustained networks both within and without) to achieve the desired educational outcomes of intellectual and moral excellences, through the successful use of high leverage strategies grounded in evidence-informed and innovative professional practice. Should schools in Kilifi Sub-County put together their capacity to create and transfer knowledge; generate trust and sustain networks both within and without, they would then guarantee their pupils security that will enhance performance.

Going by the above, this study employed the Capital Theory of School Effectiveness and Improvement to investigate the status of safety measures and their effects on performance in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County – Kenya

1.11 Conceptual framework

Based on Capital Theory of School Effectiveness and Improvement, effective schools mobilize their intellectual capital and social capital to achieve desired educational outcomes of intellectual and moral excellence (Hargreaves, 2001). Its applicability in this study can be clearly demonstrated by the fact that all the theoretical concepts – Outcomes, Leverage, Intellectual capital, and Social capital – have a bearing on the status of safety measures in schools and their subsequent translation to quality education. The desired outcomes of safety policy in public primary schools are provision of safe environment to every Kenyan child in primary schools. Using this theory, the study would unearth the status of safety measures in public primary schools which otherwise, if unchecked may hinder the school management and pupils from achieving the desired goals of education. Therefore, the government, school management, stakeholders and the community work together
for the benefit of the schools. Hence, primary education in Kenya can be viewed as a partnership between the government, the stakeholders and the community in provision of education. This study aimed at finding out the status of safety measures and its effects on performance in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kenya.

The pupil’s safety in schools (i.e. which can translate to good performance in examinations, and acquisition of knowledge and skills) termed herein as dependent variable, can possibly be affected by the independent variables (i.e. fire outbreaks, violence, overcrowding in classes, playing grounds, first aid kits, fencing, watchmen on the gates) as demonstrated in figure 1.1.

Reduction of fire outbreak incidents, avoiding violence in and around the school community, reducing the number of pupils in each class to the recommended standards, and providing sufficient playing grounds will most definitely improve the safety standards in many of the public primary schools in Kenya. Availability of first aid kits, fencing of the school compound and above all having a watchman on the gate would ensure that the safety of the pupils in school is guaranteed. All the above variables then would automatically have a direct and/or indirect state of affairs of the safety measures in primary school education.
Independent Variables | Intervening Variable | Dependent
---|---|---
State of safety measures in public primary schools
- Fire outbreaks
- Violence
- Over-crowding in classes
- Playing grounds
- First aid kits
- Fencing
- Watchmen on the gates

Safety policy and guidelines
School committees’ involvement
Parents participation
In-service training of teachers on safety measures
Class size
Pupil awareness

Pupils’ safety
- Good performance in exams
- Knowledge
- Skills

Figure 1.1: Conceptual framework
Source: Researcher, 2015
### 1.12 Definition of Operational Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child</strong></td>
<td>Is a person of below eighteen years (18) of age. In this context, it refers to primary school going children preferably between ages 0-14 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crisp programme</strong></td>
<td>Refers to an approach that is geared to the enhancement of school safety in South Africa which links parents, schools, local businesses and organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disaster</strong></td>
<td>Is a serious disruption of the functioning of a primary school community or society, causing widespread children, learning material, or environmental losses which exceed the ability of the affected population to cope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazard</strong></td>
<td>Natural or human made event that threatens to adversely affect human life in the school environment to the extent of causing disaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>A state of physical, mental and social well-being, not merely the absence of disease infirmity of a school going child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Refers to any built facility or plant for use in the school to facilitate the provision of services which in this case is pupil learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety awareness</strong></td>
<td>These are activities the school management puts in place which aims to make children safe, resilient and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
independent in school by equipping them with the necessary skills required to avoid accidents and injury.

**Safety measures**
These are activities and precautions schools take in order to improve safety of the pupils, i.e. reduce risk related to their health.

**Safety standard**
The level of Quality achievement in relation to a School Safety component e.g. environmental safety, quality water, safe buildings.

**Safety strategies**
These are mechanisms that the school employ to address all aspects of child personal safety and the prevention of accidents and injury while in school.

**School Stakeholders**
Groups of people with roles to play in the running of a school e.g. learners, staff, school committee members, parents, sponsors, NGOs supporting the school, local community, people in charge of security, etc.

**Tiisa Thuto**
This refers to one of the methods employed by the South Africa government in ensuring the safety of the pupils in schools. It involves partnerships between schools, parents, local businesses and community organizations in implementing model programs that address the safety needs of the individual schools.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter presents literature review on general overview of safety measures in schools, implementation of safety measures in schools, factors influencing the implementation of safety measures in public schools, strategies for the implementation of safety measures in schools and the summary of the identified gaps.

2.2 General Overview of Safety Measures in Schools
A safe and secure school environment enhances effective teaching and learning of children. Such an environment is the desire of every society for its children. It is in this context that Lundberg (1994) posited that school safety include the total learning environment, learners, classrooms, the school campus, educators, parents, and the general education stakeholders. This view, therefore, expounds what school safety entails.

A safe school is one that is free from danger and any possible harm, where non-educators, educators and learners can work, teach and learn without fear or ridicule, intimidation, harassment, humiliation or violence (Squelch, 2001). In other words, a safe school is a healthy school, in that it is physically and psycho-socially safe. Such a school’s environment has a very low risk of physical, emotional and psychological injury to its occupants.
In many circumstances, the above definitions of a safe and secure school are not what is witnessed in many schools globally. It is reported that violence at schools is the order of the day (Sunday World, 2005; Daily Sun, 2005; Cape Argus, 2005; Simwata, 2010). Many of the reported cases of insecurity in schools are intentional and in many circumstances children under the age of 14 years are worst affected (Donson and Wyngaard, 2003). Such forms of insecurity as bullying have been reported in schools worldwide. In South Africa, for example bullying is rife at Free State schools and includes punching, excessive tickling, direct vandalism, persistent teasing, gossip, racist remarks, and deliberate exclusion from activities, blackmailing and sexual assault (Anon, 2005). According to Eliason and Frank (2002) theft of property, fighting, physical violence and vandalism, gangsterism and rape are major problems in schools.

In addition to the above account, school safety can be denoted by just examining its physical and psycho-social set-up. In regard to the school's physical environment, the most visible aspects of such features are the quality of the security and maintenance of school buildings and grounds. This implies a clean and safe environment that is conducive to education and has security of property, well-cared for facilities, furniture and equipment, clean toilets, water and green environment and absence of harassment (Squelch, 2000: 138).

The safety of the school campus and buildings, according to Schiffbauer (2000: 73), includes: ensuring that buildings are safe for use and that attention is given to corridors where learners walk to and from classes, and other areas at the school, unused classrooms and outbuildings used for storage, electrical fittings and other service amenities, like plumbing pipes, fencing, lighting at night and sports fields
Therefore creating and ensuring school building safety revolves around the physical maintenance of buildings, i.e. the repair, replacement and general upkeep of the buildings, and continued use of space for its intended purpose (Carter and Carter, 2001).

The above account describes what a safe school entails. It clearly demonstrates that a safe and secure school for smooth learning must have a well maintained physical infrastructure, but it does not show the state of such facilities (i.e. whether the physical infrastructure is fit for learners or not). This therefore leaves a gap to be tackled as far as the status of safety measures in schools is concerned. Hence the aim of this study was to assess the status of safety measures and its effects on performance in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County – Kenya

2.3 Implementation of Safety Measures in Schools

Education for all has been a topic of interest in the recent couple of decades now. It has been discussed in international forums, including United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Conference at Jomtien, Thailand in 1990 and in Dakar, Senegal in the year 2000 (Republic of Kenya, 2005). As a result different countries globally including Kenya have invested huge amounts of their expenditure on education. In Kenya, for example, the government has committed itself to improving the standards of education at all levels. Several reasons have been cited for this. They include education is a fundamental human right, education creates wealth, and education boosts the social setup of people in a country which in the long end help to achieve the goals of national development and integration, and peace.
Based on the above stated reasons, the government has made several changes in the education sector through various appointed commissions. They include the Kenya Education Commission (1964), National Committee on Educational Objectives and Policies (1976), the Presidential Working Party on the Second University in Kenya (1981); the Presidential Working Party on Education and Manpower Training for the Next Decade and Beyond (1988), the Commission of Inquiry in the Education System in Kenya (2000).

In recognition of education to all, the government emphasizes education access, equity, relevance and quality to all children (Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2005). This cannot be achieved without a safer and secure environment that will see enrolment of big numbers of children in schools. Therefore, in order for the government to achieve these goals, it has set interventional strategies that arise from common belief that:

i. Safety in public schools is important towards achieving quality teaching and learning. This is more significant especially in public primary schools where a majority of the children come from poor backgrounds hence their vulnerability to insecurity.

ii. Schools where safety standards have not been implemented are prone with delinquency, truancy and absenteeism, especially among girls.

iii. When children learn under unstable environments, their performance is greatly compromised. Comprehensive school safety is, therefore, fundamental to school success and learner achievement.

iv. The Government’s commitment to the promotion of access, equity, participation, retention, completion and quality at school level of education is bound to be
affected if safety and security concerns are not addressed fully (Ministry of Education, 2008).

Simatwa and Omolo (2010), in a study conducted in Kisumu East and Kisumu West Districts reported that a majority of the schools had the safety standards in place, but there was no school that had implemented the safety standards 100%. The reasons given for such scenarios among others were that in some instances houses build for the head teachers were unoccupied thereby beating the logic behind the construction of such facilities. This would lead to students in boarding schools not monitored closely to ensure that safety measures are adhered to while in school. Another reason that was put forth was that fire extinguisher drills were rarely done to students and it was noted that between the year 2004 and 2006, there was hardly any fire drill exercise conducted for the students (Simatwa and Omolo, 2010). Fire drills are important (Comolotti, 1999) and well serviced fire extinguishers (Makabila et al., 2006) must be in place in strategic positions such that when there is a fire outbreak the children can easily access them while looking for the exit (Gikandi et al., 2006).

Schools should be inspected at least once a year to determine the level of implementation of safety standards. Studies done in Kisumu County (Simatwa and Omolo, 2010; Ahinduka, 2005) found that many of the schools were inspected once a year but some were not. This explains the reason behind frequent school calamities because in most cases chances are that some standards have not been implemented. The introduction of FPE and FSE saw high numbers of children enrolment in schools. As such overcrowding is one major safety threat and according to Odalo (2001) it is a major cause of death due to stampedes in fire incidents. In Kilifi County, there is no any documented evidence to show whether safety policies have
been fully implemented. In this regard, therefore, this study endeavored to find out whether the safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County have been implemented.

2.4 Factors Influencing the Implementation of Safety Measures in Public Schools

2.4.1 Communication

In any organizational set-up, communication is a prerequisite for successful implementation of any policy. Good communication skills will mean that instructions will be well taken. Therefore, poor communication among the educational stakeholders will result in poor implementation of safety measures in public schools (Simatwa and Omolo, 2010). For example, District Quality Assurance and Standard Officers (DQASOs) are the ones charged with the responsibility of ensuring that all quality standards are implemented to the letter and this can be done by proper communication and coordination of the head teachers of respective schools. Maoulidi (2008) affirms that lack of regular communication to sensitize the various stakeholders on their roles hampers smooth implementation of policies. According to Rugut (2003) DQASOs were inefficient in their jobs and did not communicate new policies of the Ministry of Education to their subordinates. Hence this leaves head teachers uncoordinated in the implementation of safety policies.

2.4.2 Head teachers

Whatever happens in any given institution in terms of management and the way things are done is directly related to the type of leadership. Equally, head teachers play a significant role in determining how the Ministry of Education policies and
guidelines governing schools are implemented. This is because as the heads of their institutions, they are charged with the responsibility of ensuring that their schools are safer (Simatwa and Omolo, 2010).

It is generally agreed that head teachers are the managers of primary schools charged with the responsibility of ensuring that all government policies as pertain to the effective running of the school are implemented to the letter. However, the irony is that in some instances things do not go as expected either due to their relaxity or total lack of commitment to their work. It is, for example common knowledge that school insecurity has been witnessed in many schools leaving a lot to be desired hence the need to assess the status of safety measures and its effects on performance in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County – Kenya.

2.4.3 District Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (DQASOs)

Given that DQASOs are charged with the responsibility of implementing quality standards in schools, they play a significant role in the implementation of safety policies. In fact, they act as a link between the MoE, schools and all other stakeholders. Without their supervision, implementation of safety policies in schools would be unachievable. According to the MoE (2008) schools are supposed to be inspected at least once a year and this is basically done by the DQASOs.

Although different studies have confirmed a number of factors as affecting the extent to which safety measures are implemented in schools, there is an existing paucity in terms of data available in Kilifi County. In addition to this, some of the factors such as the level of education of the school community, geographical setting of the school, co-operation by the stakeholders and the political will from the local
leaders may influence the implementation of safety measures in schools. Consequently, this study aimed at assessing the status of safety measures and its effects on performance in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County – Kenya.

2.4.4 Law Enforcement

Whenever an issue of insecurity is reported law enforcement agencies come in handy. The policy makers and the public are much aware on how the police forces react when they learn of an incident of insecurity. In the USA, any sign of violence in schools typically trigger a rapid police response, followed by an investigation and, potentially, prosecutions and sentencing. Also, while an insecurity incident in a school may spur an immediate law enforcement response, the potential for such a scenario impacts law enforcement prevention and preparedness measures. Police are not typically involved in recovery efforts.

From a law enforcement perspective, mass insecurity in schools tends to be single-jurisdiction issues involving a particular community. As such, while sitting governments may not play a direct role in formulating specific county and local practices, it may influence these practices through the availability of grants. Such grants could offer for security or safety programmes ranging from preparedness activities, including planning, organization, equipment purchase, training, exercises, and management and administration.

According to Simatwa and Omollo (2010), Sound financial base is the back bone of any project hence implementation of safety standards to a larger extent depends on the availability of sufficient funds. Lack of enough financial resources has been
identified as one major reason why safety measures and law enforcement in schools is not being implemented (Simatwa, 2003). Enough finances are, therefore, required for the implementation of the safety policies in renovation of buildings in general, procurement of safety equipment and capacity building at each level.

In spite of the existence of law enforcement agencies in Kenya, little is done when it comes to pupils violating safety measures in schools. Many a times pupil culprits are left to roam freely after causing a tragic incidence in schools. Should the law enforcers become vigilant in their actions, chances are that the security measures in schools can be improved hence the purpose of this study was to assess the status of safety measures and its effects on performance in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County – Kenya.

2.5 Strategies for the implementation of safety measures in schools

2.5.1 International and Regional Forums or Conferences

Knowledge about effective school safety practice has expanded considerably (Shaw, 2002). A lot of information has been generated and tools that support effective practice developed as one way of curbing incidences of insecurity in schools. Manuals, guides and training materials have been written. In addition to this, national, regional and international meetings have been organized by bodies such as the Council of Europe, the European Forum for Urban Security and the Australian Institute of Criminology in order to strategize on safety matters of the children in schools (Simatwa and Omolo, 2010). Each of these developments has reinforced the need to work in more collaborative and comprehensive ways in improving safety in schools.
A number of countries have developed cross-sectional, national, regional or local strategies on implementing school safety. Some of these strategies are implemented within the broader context of national crime prevention policies (Shaw, 2002). These strategies recognize the multidimensional causes of school safety problems and the need for preventive long term plans that encourage partnerships between schools and other stakeholders. They may also provide information necessary for funding of project development and implementation, including training and technical assistance (Simwata, 2003).

Although international and regional forums may act as a convenient way of sharing information as regards the importance of safety in schools, this has been of great impact in the developed countries and little is mention in Africa more so the Sub-Saharan Africa where Kenya lies. It leaves a lot to be desired which as a consequence creates a gap that needs to be addressed. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to assess the status of safety measures and its effects on performance in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County – Kenya.

2.5.2 Strict Adherence and Implementation of Safety Policies

Different countries employ different ways of enhancing school safety in schools, but the most profound way is for those institutions to follow the laid down policies to the letter. In the USA for example, school wide policies and practices are implemented to systematically address needs of students, school personnel, the community and the physical plants of the school (Shaw, 2002). The United States Department of Education (U.S.D.E) requires safety policies in schools to be strictly enforced in view of the threats posed by terrorism, drug related violence, proliferation of firearms and natural disasters like typhoons floods and hurricanes.
Most American public schools have zero-tolerance policies on activities that are likely to compromise safety.

In Europe, the implementation of school safety and security policies has been greatly influenced by school tragedies (Cavanagh, 2004) such as the massacre of children, teachers and parents in one of the schools in Russia which resulted in the provision of armed military personnel to guard schools. It is also, argued that in France police authorities regularly coordinate security with school officials. Police and school officials meet at the beginning of each term to work out security details of schools (Soomeren, 2002). It is further argued that policemen are stationed in front of public schools to provide security, maintain the traffic flow and check suspicious activities (Soomeren, 2002; Cavanagh, 2004).

In Kenya, the Safety Standards Manual for Schools that was launched and released in the year 2008 has not fully been implemented (Simatwa and Omolo, 2010). In this manual, the use of policemen to man school gates is not mentioned anywhere as is the case in some of the developed countries. None the less, having the Safety Standards Manual for Schools in Kenya is one thing and implementing it is another one all together, hence the purpose of this study was to assess the status of safety measures and its effects on performance in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County – Kenya.

2.5.3 Curbing Insecurity via Security Projects/Programmes

Formation of partnerships with all education stakeholders can help reduce the insecurity in schools. Such approaches have been witnessed countries like South Africa and have been found to be very successful (Simatwa and Omolo, 2010).
“Tiisa Thuto”, which is a project that involves partnerships between schools, parents, local businesses and community organizations in implementing model programs that address the needs of the individual schools in terms of security matters. In South Africa, also, there are many Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) that are involved in enhancing safety in schools and they include Independent Project Trust (I.P.T) and Business Against Crime (BAC). In the 1990s I.P.T. developed a policy which provided conflict resolution training to students, teachers and school governing bodies.

According to Lulua (2008) development partners like the national government, district government, communities, parents and private sector partners have tried to respond to the infrastructural aspects of educational quality, but safety of the learning environment has not been adequately addressed. He however, goes further to argue that certain programmes such as the safe schools contract (S.S.C) have been implemented as one of the identified interventions which strengthens the roles of teachers, pupils, parents and their involvement in children’s education to enhance quality learning. In this regard the Ugandan Ministry of Education and Sports and USAID introduced more than 200 schools to S.S.C. by the year 2008 so as to enhance safety in schools. This programme works in such a way that education stakeholders identify issues; define safety, the consequences of not having a safe environment for pupils and ways to improve safety of children. They then discuss and agree on how to implement it. Through the experiences in the 200 supported schools, S.S.C. offers a feasible mechanism, for promoting safety in schools through strengthening school-community partnerships and child participation.
In Kenya, the Safety and Standards Manual for Schools is new and as a result there is no much on the ground to show how schools have implemented safety measures hence the need to assess the status of safety measures and its effects on performance in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County – Kenya.

2.5.4 Other Strategies

Schools should not limit themselves to particular ways of enhancing safety of the children while in school, but should explore as many alternatives as possible. Some of the other strategies that may fulfill the needs of a safety programme in a school include training and development, monitoring and evaluation, regular inspection of the school plants by the DQASOs and head teachers ensuring that all government policies as pertains safety in schools are implemented.

Training means preparation in readiness for an occupation or for specific skills and usually is job-oriented whereas development refers to the process of acquiring a wider view of knowledge and skills, it is less job-oriented and is concerned more with employee potential than with immediate skill (Cole, 1996). For efficient implementation of the safety standards policy in schools, the teachers in charge of safety committees must be given relevant trainings in safety measures (MoE, 2008). Internal seminars can be held regularly to offer fire drills on the pupils so that they can be prepared on what to do once there is a fire outbreak. Such strategies of organizing workshops and going for training helps to build capacity that enables teachers and DQASOs to cope with the new and expanded demands of their jobs. Training increases awareness of the rules, improving self-confidence and self-discipline (Torrington et al., 2005). Therefore, there will be new working procedures
or new equipment from time to time, and again training will reduce the risk of safety offenses, negligence or unreliability. Once such a strategy is in schools, definitely the implementation of the safety measures may not be compromised.

Once the training of those involved in the implementation of the safety policies in school and any other relevant stakeholders, it may be of great importance to assess and determine whether the safety set standards are adhered to regularly. This can be done by frequent monitoring and evaluation of the installed equipment. Simatwa and Omolo (2010) averred that frequent monitoring and evaluation of school environment to determine the state of safety measures is a sound strategy towards implementation of the safety policy. Once shortfalls are detected, maintenance and replacement may be done as soon as possible in order to evade any eventual calamity.

The DQASOs are charged with the responsibility of supervising head teachers and in ensuring that all standard operating procedures of the MoE are followed. They, therefore, provide supervisory and advisory roles to head teachers on issues of school safety and security among other things. Consequently, any strategy they devise to enhance the implementation of safety policies must be realistic, achievable and acceptable to stakeholders. Otherwise such strategies would fail. The strategies must also fall within the legal framework of the Department of Quality Assurance and Standards (Simatwa and Omolo, 2010) and they should ensure that they carry out regular monitoring and evaluation of the school plants and the entire environment in general.
Once the DQASOs find that there are schools that have excelled in the implementation of the safety measures, then it would be prudent to reward the head teachers of such schools. This is because like any other employees in any given organization head teachers require some form of appreciation from their superiors. Employee recognition ensures a positive productive and innovative organizational climate thereby motivating him/her. It also encourages attitudes and actions that make the organization successful. Head teachers who excel in the implementation of safety policies should be recognized. Simatwa and Omolo (2010) argued that head teachers who were promoted in the process of implementing safety standards in their schools strived to ensure that they improved in areas they showed weaknesses.

It is regrettable, however, to note that violence in schools and many more catastrophes are on the increase. Such interventions if well undertaken can reduce such bad occurrences, but now that little is being done there was need to assess the status of safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County – Kenya.

2.6 Summary of the Identified Gaps

From the literature reviewed above, it is evident that there is no empirical evidence that supports the implementation of the safety measures in Kilifi Sub-County. Studies have shown that in other areas of Kenya, the safety policy has been implemented although not fully and this explains the presence of rampant school unrest and unnecessary catastrophes. Although it is clearly demonstrated that a safe and secure school for smooth learning must have a well maintained physical infrastructure, it does not show the state of such facilities in Kenya and more
specifically Kilifi Sub-County (i.e. whether the physical infrastructure is fit for learners or not).

Under the Safety Standards Manual Guideline for the Kenyan Schools, it is outlined that inspection of schools should be done at least once a year. Contrary to this, literature has shown that some schools in the country are not inspected at all. This explains the reason behind frequent school calamities because in most cases chances are that some standards have not been implemented.

Several factors may contribute to the implementation of safety measures in schools as mentioned in the literature. They include communication, head teachers, DQASOs and law enforcement by the relevant authorities. However, in spite of the presence of head teachers and DQASOs who are directly charged with the implementation of relevant government policies in schools, the situation as far as safety of the children in schools is concerned is wanting. In addition, although there exists law enforcement agencies in Kenya, little is done when it comes to pupils violating safety measures. In many incidences pupil culprits are left to roam freely after causing a tragic incidence in schools. Should the law enforcers become vigilant in their actions, chances are that the security measures in schools can be improved.

In order to effectively implement safety measures in schools in Kenya, some vital strategies may be adopted. From the literature it is argued that international and regional forums have only been instrumental in the implementation of safety measures in the developed countries and little has been done in the Sub-Saharan Africa where Kenya lies.
It is also, mentioned in the literature reviewed that adherence and implementation of safety policies can help reduce insecurity cases in schools. It is argued that the policemen could assist by bringing into book those who get involved in cases that may jeopardize security in schools. In the Safety Standards Manual for Kenyan Schools, there is no place where the use of policemen especially the manning of school gates is mentioned.

Many other strategies that may be adopted for the implementation of safety measures in schools have been mentioned including, curbing insecurity via security projects/programmes, training and development, monitoring and evaluation, use of DQASOs and head teachers. It is regrettable, however, to note that little has been achieved because insecurity in schools is on the increase hence the need to assess the status of safety measures and its effects on performance in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County – Kenya.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter contains description of the location of the study, research design, target population, sampling procedures and sample size, research instruments, pilot study, data collection procedures and data analysis.

3.2 Study Locale

The study was carried out in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County, Kenya. Kilifi Sub-County is bordered by Kaloleni Sub-County to the West, Indian Ocean to the East, Malindi Sub-County to the North, and Kisauni Sub-County to the South. Kilifi Sub-County was chosen as an area of study because of its close proximity to the researcher. This conforms to Singleton (1993) who avers that an ideal setting of any study must be easily accessible by the researcher thereby enabling quick rapport with the informants.

3.3 Research Design

This study employed descriptive survey research design, which according to Borg and Gall (1989) can be used to produce statistical information about aspects of education that interest policy makers and educators. It was, therefore, adopted because it enabled the researcher to collect data from a sample of informants that was used to assess the state of safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County. Descriptive survey research designs are common in preliminary and exploratory studies (Orodho, 2002). It influences the way things are done thereby offering informative and useful decisions in society (Mugenda and
Mugenda, 2003; Mugenda and Mugenda 1999). Descriptive survey research design can be used to produce statistical information about aspects of education that interest policy makers and educators (Borg and Gall, 1989). It will enable the exploration of the opinions, attitudes and behaviours of school head teachers and quality assurance officers on the state of safety measures in public primary schools.

3.4 Target Population

The study population for this study involved all public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County Kenya. The study population consisted of all head teachers because they are in charge of the implementation of MOE Safety Standards and Guidelines. All standard eight pupils in these schools were also involved because it is their safety that the Safety Standards and Guideline Manual guarantees hence they were able to give details on specific aspects of Safety Standards and Guidelines in their respective schools. They were also the ones who were in a position to understand some of the safety terms because they are the senior most members of a primary school institution. In addition to the above respondents, the District Quality Assurance and Standards Officer (DQASO) took part in this study. This is because the DQASOs are the officers on the ground charged with responsibility of ensuring that all quality standards by the MOE are adhered to and observed to the letter.

3.5 Sampling Procedures and Sample Size

Stratified random sampling technique (Gay, 1992; Orodho, 2002) was used to select 468 (97.6%) pupils and 11 (2.4%) head teachers (1 from the urban set up and 10 from the rural set up), and their schools to take part in the study. This amounted to
10% of public primary school head teachers and standard eight pupils in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County. Table 3.1 presents the sampling matrix.

Table 3.1: Sampling Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School set up</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>4360</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4797</strong></td>
<td><strong>479.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Simple random sampling was then used to select head teachers to be sampled in each category. The lottery technique was applied where a symbol like YES was placed on 11 out of 117 head teachers. Small pieces of paper of equal size, colour and texture were folded into equal size and shape before they were placed in a container, mixed well and then each head teacher was allowed to pick one paper at a time at their respective capacities. In this case, those who picked YES, were automatically included in the sample as shown in the table above. The same procedure was followed to select the pupils proportionately from the 11 schools.

### 3.6 Research Instruments

Questionnaires, interview schedules and observation schedules are the tools that were employed to collect data.
3.6.1 Questionnaires

Questionnaires were used to collect data in this study because they can present stimulus potential to a large number of respondents at the same time and data would be readily generated (Best and Khan, 1999). Questionnaires also have the ability to collect a large amount of information in a reasonably quick space of time, ensure anonymity, permit use of standardized question and have uniform procedures besides being easier to complete (Orodho, 2009). They were used to collect data from head teachers.

The questionnaires for the head teachers comprised of five sections. Part A was used to collect information about the school set up. Part B collected information about the implementation of safety measures in schools like availability of staff houses, the number of fire drills per year, the number of toilets, and availability of fire extinguishers. Part C had questions on safety awareness in primary schools while part D had questions on the factors that influence the implementation of safety measures in schools. Lastly part E presented information on the strategies put forth for the implementation of safety measures in schools. On the other hand, questionnaires for the pupils were made up of four sections. Section A was used to collect information about the school set up. Part B collected information about the implementation of safety measures in schools. Part C had questions on safety awareness in primary schools while part D had questions on the factors that influence the implementation of safety measures in schools.
3.6.2 Interview Schedules

The DQASO interview schedule was used to gather information concerning the strategies in the implementation of safety policies and information on the factors influencing safety policy implementation in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County. The DQASOs are the ones charged with the responsibility of ensuring that all the laid down standard procedures for the purposes of quality assurance in schools are adhered to hence by interviewing them the researcher was able to measure what the officers knew and what they liked or disliked about the implementation of the safety measures in Kilifi Sub-County.

3.6.3 Observation Schedules

Observation schedules were used to assess the extent of the implementation of safety policies, for example, by checking whether fire-fighting devices were available, whether safety notices were prominently posted and whether emergency exits existed. This method is excellent in obtaining information about the quality and quantity of the physical facilities and resources in the school hence it provides reliable information.

3.7 Pilot Study

Before the actual data was collected, the researcher conducted a pilot study in Kisauni Sub-County which is the neighbouring Sub-County to Kilifi Sub-County. 51 head teachers who were not included in the final study population were used. It is from these 51 schools that 36 head teachers and 120 pupils were randomly selected for the pilot study. This number is sufficient for conducting a statistical analysis given that it surpasses 30, which is the minimal recommendation according to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999). The pilot study enabled the researcher to ascertain
the reliability and validity of the instruments, and to familiarize herself with the administration of the questionnaires, improve the instruments and procedures.

3.7.1 Validity

All assessments of validity are subjective opinions based on the judgment of the researcher (Wiersma, 1995). The validity of the instruments in this case was addressed by research method experts in the Department of Educational Management of Kenyatta University. The experts were requested to review the instruments for suitability of format and content. Their recommendations were then used in improving the quality, content and the structures of the instruments. Content validity of an instrument is improved through expert judgment (Borg and Gall, 1989).

3.7.2 Reliability

Test re-test reliability method was used by the researcher to assess the clarity of the questionnaire items so that those items found inadequate or irrelevant were modified to improve the quality of the research instrument or were discarded altogether in order to increase its reliability. Test re-test reliability was estimated by performing the same survey with the same respondents at different moments in time. After the first survey, the second survey was done after one week in order to test for reliability. The closer the results, the greater the test re-test reliability of the survey instrument. The correlation coefficient between the two sets of responses was then computed using the Spearman Brown Prophesy formula (Orodho, 2002). The coefficient indicates the degree to which the two sets of responses provide the same results and hence describe the internal consistency of the test. A minimum correlation coefficient of 0.5 must be achieved for an instrument to be reliable.
However, for the test to be classified as the most reliable, the coefficient should be between 0.7 – 0.8. In this regard, a reliability coefficient of 0.66 was obtained.

### 3.8 Data Collection Procedures

A research permit was sought from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) after approval by the university. The researcher administered the questionnaires to the head teachers and the pupils. The selected head teachers and pupils were visited in their schools and the questionnaires were administered to the respondents. In the process, the respondents were assured that whatever information they provided, would be treated with a lot of confidence. After completion (on the same day the questionnaires were administered), the fully filled forms were collected. Lastly, face-to-face interviews were conducted with the DQASO. It was anticipated that this exercise would take a period of three weeks. The first two weeks were used to collect data for piloting whereas the third week was used to collect data for the final study.

### 3.9 Data Analysis

Once data had been collected, the researcher did “data cleaning”, a process of sorting out data such that identification of incomplete or inaccurate responses would be corrected to improve their quality. Data was then coded and entered in a computer worksheet, EXCEL PACKAGE. Later on, it was transferred to the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 11.5 for further analysis. It was anticipated that this research was going to yield both qualitative and quantitative data. Therefore, qualitative data was analyzed qualitatively using content analysis based on analysis of meanings and implications emanating from respondents’ information and documented data. Qualitative data provided rich descriptions and
explanations that demonstrated the chronological flow of events as well as often leading to chance findings (Gray, 2004). On the other hand, quantitative data was analyzed using various measures of statistics such as measures of central tendency and dispersion. Thereafter, simple descriptive statistics such as the frequency counts, means and percentages were used to analyze this data. All the analysis was done in SPSS Version 11.5 (Martin and Acuna, 2002). The results were then presented using frequency distribution tables and bar graphs.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter covers analysis of data and the findings of the study. The purpose of the study was to assess the status of safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County – Kenya. The following questions were to be tackled. They included: To what extent had safety measures been implemented in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi - County? What were the basic safety and security features of public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County? What was the basic safety and security status of public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County? What factors influenced the implementation of safety policies in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi - County? What were the schools doing to ensure the basic safety and security of their physical environments? And lastly, what strategies had been devised by head teachers and quality assurance officers to enhance the implementation of safety policies in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi - County?

The first section of the chapter presents the school type of the respondents. Section two presents data on the implementation of safety measures in public primary schools. Section three of the chapter covers data on the safety awareness whereas section four presents factors influencing implementation of safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County - Kenya. Finally section five covers data on the strategies for the implementation of safety measures in primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County - Kenya.
4.2 School Type

The study sought data on the school type of the respondents. The study was carried out in public secondary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County, Kenya. The study was conducted among 1 head teacher and 32 pupils for the urban primary schools, 10 head teachers and 436 pupils for the rural primary schools. In total, 479 respondents were interviewed. This translated to 0.3% of the urban head teachers, 6.7% of the urban pupils, 2.1% of the rural head teachers and lastly 90.9% of the rural primary school head teachers as illustrated in the pie chart below.

![Pie chart showing percentage representations of respondents](image)

**Figure 4.1; percentage representations of the respondents in the study**

4.3 Implementation of the safety measures in public primary schools

The first research question sought to assess the extent to which safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County - Kenya had been implemented. To determine this, the headteachers were given several questions to answer. Respondents were asked how often fire drills were held in their respective schools. From Table 4.1 below, it is evident that fire drills were rarely held in these
schools. This is because according to the headteachers (18.2%), irrespective of the primary school type in Kilifi Sub-County, fire drills were carried out occasionally and a whopping (82.8%) of them confirmed that such an important exercise had never been done in their schools (Comolotti, 1999)

**Table 4.1: The extent to which fire drills are rarely held in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, according to the head teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occasions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Frequency</th>
<th>% Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Headteachers were then asked to state whether fire extinguishers were fixed in every class in their respective schools.

![Figure 4.2: Presence of fitted fire extinguishers in each classroom in Kilifi Sub-County](image)

**Figure 4.2: Presence of fitted fire extinguishers in each classroom in Kilifi Sub-County**
The headteachers’ responses were as indicated in Figure 4.2 above where majority of the respondents confirmed that classes were not fitted with fire extinguishers (95%). These results were in agreement with studies that were done in Kisumu Sub-County where it was found that all schools lacked fire extinguishers (Simatwa and Omolo, 2010). Fire extinguishers (Makabila et al., 2006) must be in place in strategic positions such that when there is a fire outbreak, the pupils can easily access them while looking for the exit (Gikandi et al., 2006).

In order to determine how many pupils a single stream of a class held at a given time, the head teachers were required to state the ratio of pupils to one stream of each class. Many of the respondents (90%) showed that one stream of a class held over forty pupils while a small percentage (10%) stated that classes held forty pupils a stream as illustrated in Figure 4.3 on the next page. Such an occurrence in schools poses a great risk in that in case of a calamity such as fire outbreaks, rescuing pupils will be a great challenge because of overcrowding. This kind of arrangement therefore goes against the MoE guidelines which states clearly that one stream of a class must hold forty pupils at most (MoE SSM, 2008). According to Squelch (2000: 138), school facilities such as enough buildings are crucial in any given institution of learning.
Figure 4.3: The ratio of pupils to one class in Kilifi Sub-County

The results of this study were in agreement with Odalo (2001) who reported overcrowding of learners in classes in Kenyan schools, most probably due to the introduction of FPE that saw high enrolment of pupils in public primary schools country wide.

In any institution of learning, social amenities such as toilets and/or pit latrines are essential. In this regard, headteachers were asked to state the ratio of pupils to one toilet that best described their school. As depicted in Figure 4.4 below, 90% of the respondents said that one toilet was shared by more than 50 pupils whereas only 10% of the respondents indicated that one toilet was shared by 50 pupils.

Figure 4.4: Number of pupils to one toilet in Kilifi sub-County
There was no single school in Kilifi Sub-County whose toilet was shared by 30 pupils (Fig.4.4) as by the requirements of the MoE (SSM, 2008). There were few toilets that were shared by a big population of pupils in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County and this would comprise security situation in the schools thereby compromising performance standards. It is argued that a clean and safe environment that is conducive to education and has security of property, well-cared for facilities, furniture and equipment, as well as clean enough toilets for learners makes learning to be friendly to the pupils (Squelch, 2000: 138).

The headteachers were required to indicate whether their schools had a playing ground for their pupils. Their responses were as illustrated in Figure 4.5 in which 90% responded to the affirmative while 10% indicated that they lacked playing grounds.
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**Figure 4.5: Headteachers’ responses on the playing ground**

It was evident that almost all schools in Kilifi Sub-County had good playing grounds which are a requirement. Before a school is set up, among the features that are taken into consideration is the playing ground for the pupils (MoE SSM, 2008).
Apart from the playing grounds, headteachers were requested to show whether their schools were well fenced and from the results it was found that 90% of the schools did not have perimeter fences (Fig. 4.6). This exposed pupils to danger in case of external aggression or attacks.
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**Figure 4.6: Presence of school perimeter fence in Kilifi sub-County**

Among the reasons given for lack of a perimeter fence in a majority of the primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County was that many of the parents in this region were poor such that raising money for its construction was a big task. A perimeter fence in an institution of learning is vital for the safety of the learners. It is reported that in 1993 Hawinga Girls Secondary Schoo was attacked by armed gangsters who raped students because of lack of perimeter fencing that made it easier for them to access the school compound.

Should there be a perimeter fence in a given school, then chances are that such a school has a common secure gate and/or a watchman manning it. The next question for the headteachers then was whether their schools had secure gates.
Half of the respondents said that their schools had secure gates as shown in Figure 4.7 above.

The headteachers were also, asked to state whether their school gates had security guards manning them. Majority of the respondents (90%) confirmed that there were security guards who manned school gates (Fig. 4.8).

**Figure 4.7: Secure gates in Kilifi sub-County**

**Figure 4.8: Headteachers’ response on the presence of a watchman in public primary schools in Kilifi sub-County**
Although earlier responses indicated that fences were rare to come by, 50% of the respondents stated that watchmen were deployed to guard schools gates. To a certain extent, this would imply that watchmen were deployed to secure the whole school compound with or without the gate. According to Squelch (2000: 138), the most visible aspect of the school’s physical environment is the quality of the security and maintenance of school buildings and grounds. This, therefore, implies that a clean and safe environment that is conducive to education has security of property, well-cared for facilities, furniture and equipment, clean toilets, water and green environment and absence of harassment.

Presence of school safety committees are crucial for the purposes of effective management of the school plants. The researcher therefore, sought to know from the headteacher respondents whether their schools had such committees in place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Frequency</th>
<th>% Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the results it was reported that 60% of the schools in Kilifi Sub-County had safety committees in place against 40% which didn’t have as depicted in Table 4.2. Safety committees are important in a school set up because they foresee the execution of safety measures in general in each given school and from the findings it
is evident that over half of the public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County had constituted safety committees.

The safety of the school campus and buildings, according to Schiffbauer (2000: 73), includes: ensuring that school plants are safe for use and safety committees should be present to ensure that some of the measures that have not been achieved are implemented regularly in consultation with the school management. However, according to the 2011 report by Women Educational Researchers of Kenya (WERK) only four in every ten schools have an operational ‘school safety committee’ (Otieno, 2014).

The MoE ensures that all schools in the country are inspected regularly through respective County and Sub-County Officials. The respondents were therefore, required to state how often health inspection was done in their schools. A majority of the respondents indicated that their schools were inspected once a year (33.33%) and thrice a year (33.33%) respectively. The other respondents showed that their schools were inspected twice a year (16.67%) and after every two years (16.67%) as illustrated in the Table below.

Table 4.3: Health inspection of public primary school premises in Kilifi Sub-County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspection</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Frequency</th>
<th>% Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrice a year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After every two years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is worth noting that only six respondents responded to this question as indicated in table 4.3 above. Going by the results, schools in Kilifi Sub-County were inspected regularly, a confirmation that the requirements of the MoE were adhered to. The results of this study were in agreement with other studies that found out that a majority of schools were inspected at least once a year ((Simatwa and Omolo, 2010; Ahinduka, 2005).

The headteachers of boarding schools were asked to indicate how pupils could escape in case of a fire calamity. From the results, 45% of the respondents responded to this question, an indication that 5 schools had boarding facilities. As illustrated in the Table below, it was evident that many (60%) of the boarding schools had no defined mechanism of escaping by the pupils once a fire calamity struck. However, some schools used emergence doors (20%) while others broke (20%) the main door once a calamity struck. According to the MoE, the SSM provides guidelines on how a fire calamity should be handled in case of one. Directions should be erected showing routes of escape and fire assembling points (SSM, 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Exits</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Frequency</th>
<th>% Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergence doors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking of main door</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not defined</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the same breadth, headteachers of boarding schools were asked to state how the
dormitory doors opened and only 27.27% (3) of the respondents responded to this
question.

Table 4.5: Direction of opening of dormitory doors in Kilifi Sub-County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dormitory door opening</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Frequency</th>
<th>% Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outwards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inwards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was reported that 66.67% (2) of the boarding schools headteachers confirmed that
dormitory doors opened outwards whereas 33.33% (1) opened inwards as shown in
Table 4.5 above. This therefore showed that the MoE SSM guidelines had been
complied with in public boarding primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County. According
to the SSM, all dormitory doors must be opened towards the outside to ease escape
during an emergency in cases of a calamity (SSM, 2008). Also, having correct
structures built in line with requirements set out in the SSM reduces incidences of
calamities in schools. Odalo (2001) observed that the absence of emergency exits led
to the high death toll during the Kyanguli Secondary School fire in which sixty eight
boys lost their lives in this incident.

The way classes windows are made in schools play a great role in rescuing pupils in
case of a catastrophe. With this regard, headteachers were supposed to state the
make of the class windows in their schools and their responses were as depicted in
Figure 3.10 below.
Out of hundred percent, only 18.18% of the respondents confirmed that their schools had grills whereas 72.73% indicated that they did not have grills. Of more interest is the fact that 9.09% of the respondents stated that their schools did not have class windows. Lack of grills on the windows is a good strategy in ensuring quick escape in cases of an emergency (Odalo, 2001).

Headteachers were also supposed to state how often painting and white washing of school plants was done in their schools. In most schools in Kilifi Sub-County it was found that such an activity was rarely done because 54.55% of the respondents said that it was not done at all while on the other hand only 27.27% of the respondents confirmed that painting and white washing of the school plant was done after two years (see Table 4.6 on the next page).
Table 4.6: The frequency of painting and white washing of school buildings in Kilifi Sub-County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of paintings</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Frequency</th>
<th>% Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within a year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After a year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After two years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not done at all</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Painting and white washing of the school plant was not done at all within a period of one while only 18.18% of the respondents showed that it was done after a year (figure 4.6 above). The safety of learning institutions according to Schiffbauer (2000: 73) includes: ensuring that buildings are safe for use. Therefore creating and ensuring school building safety revolves around the physical maintenance of buildings, i.e. the repair, replacement and general upkeep of the buildings through painting, and continued use of space for its intended purpose (Carter and Carter, 2001).

The headteachers were then asked to state the direction the classrooms faced in their schools (Table 4.7).
Table 4.7: Direction classes are constructed in Kilifi Sub-County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction classes are constructed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Frequency</th>
<th>% Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East to west</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North to south</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West to east</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>54.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of them did not have any idea as far as the direction of classrooms were constructed (45.45%) while 27.27% indicated that classes were constructed in the North to South direction. Others said that classes were constructed in the East to West direction (18.18%) whereas 9.09% indicated that they were constructed in the North to South direction. School plants should face a North to South direction when constructed to avoid demolition in case of strong wind (SSM, 2008).

On the construction of the school plants, the headteachers were asked to state how they settled on the contractor to carry out such an assignment. The Table below illustrates their responses.

Table 4.8 Criteria for selection of contractors in Kilifi Sub-County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for selection of contractors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Frequency</th>
<th>% Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism and experience</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Almost all the respondents (81.8%) said that they considered professionalism and experience while only 18.2% considered none of the criteria provided by the researcher.

There are several safety policies as provided for in the SSM guideline by the MoE. In order to determine the level of implementation of some of these policies, the researcher sought to know from the headteachers the extent in which safety implementation in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County had been done (see table 4.9 on page 47).

The first policy was whether there are reliable alarm systems in place and 72.7% of the responded stated that this policy had not been implemented while 27.3% were implemented. Another policy that the researcher wanted to know whether it had been implemented was the insuring of the school against fire disasters in which also 90.9% of the respondents confirmed that it was not yet implemented whereas 9.1% indicated that it was implemented. The next policy was whether school plants were constructed in consultation and approval of the MPH. 45.5% confirmed that it had been implemented while 54.5% said it was not implemented.

Headteachers were asked to state whether a site plan for the school was in place and 63.6% said that such a policy had not been implemented while 36.4% affirmed that it had been implemented. The respondents were also asked to state whether sign boards were erected within the school to show direction to various facilities whereby 63.6% showed that it was not yet implemented, 27.3% implemented whereas 9.1% of the respondents said they were not sure of the state of the policy.
With regard to whether grass was planted on the bare areas of the school compound 81.8% of the respondents confirmed that this policy had been implemented while 18.2% stated that it had not.

Headteachers were then asked to state whether the walkways were demarcated with flowers and shrubs rather than wires. From the results it was evident that quite a number of the schools had not abided with this policy because 63.6% did confirm that it had not been implemented while 36.4% said it had been implemented. For effective school safety measures attention should be given to corridors where learners walk to and from classes, and other areas at the school, unused classrooms and outbuildings used for storage, electrical fittings and other service amenities, like plumbing pipes, fencing, lighting at night and sports fields must be well maintained (Stephens, 1995; IPT, 1999; Vienings, Commys and Geyer, 2001; WCED, 2003).

It is a common phenomenon nowadays that many institutions are building storey houses due to scarcity of land. For this reason, the MoE has come up with a policy that ensures that stairways are wide and located at both ends of the building with firmly fixed handrails to ease the movement of people, goods and services with ease. The head teachers were therefore supposed to confirm whether this policy had been implemented and 81.8% said it had not been implemented whereas 18.2% indicated that it had been implemented.
Table 4.9: Headteachers’ response on the extent of safety implementation in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Policy</th>
<th>Implemented (%)</th>
<th>Not Implemented (%)</th>
<th>Not Sure (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliable alarm system in place</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School insured against fire disasters</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School plants constructed in consultation and approval of MPH</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A site plan for the school is in place</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign boards erected within the school to show direction to various facilities</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare areas of the school planted with grass</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkways demarcated with flowers and shrubs rather than wires</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairways are wide and located at both ends of the building with firmly fixed handrails</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms are well lit and ventilated</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The furniture in the classrooms are appropriate for use by the learners</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrines built at least 10m away from tuition and boarding facilities and downward side</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrines are at least 15m away from a borehole or well</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls sanitation areas are separate from the boys’</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next policy was on whether classrooms were well lit and ventilated. From the results, it was evident that almost all schools (90.9%) in Kilifi Sub-County had complied with this policy and only 9.1% of the respondents indicated that it had not been implemented. In addition to this, they were then asked to state whether the furniture in the classrooms were appropriate for use by the learners and 63.3% were of the opinion that they were while on the other hand 34.1% indicated that the policy had not been implemented.

Of great importance is the presence of toilets or pit latrines in schools. The MoE in its SSM provides that pit latrines must be built at least 10m away from tuition and boarding facilities and face downward side. They should also be at least 15m away from the borehole or well. Almost all schools in Kilifi Sub-County (90.9%) had built their latrines at least 10m away from tuition and boarding facilities and faced downward side whereas 9.1% had not. On the other hand, 54.5% had not complied with the policy that states that pit latrines must be at least 15m away from the borehole or well. It was only 45.5% of the respondents who confirmed that primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County had complied with the policy.

The last policy under this category was whether the girls’ sanitation areas had been separated from the boys and 100% of the respondents agreed that this policy had been fully implemented.

From the above findings a majority of the policies had not been implemented in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County. This situation is depicted in other studies that indicated that many schools in Kenya have not implemented a majority of the safety policies in their schools and this is what has contributed largely to so
many calamities (Simwata 2010). In a nutshell therefore, a school safety programme revolves around the school plant and its general surrounding environment (Carter and Carter, 2001).

4.4 Basic Safety and Security Features of Public Primary Schools in Kilifi Sub-County

On safety and security features in their schools, pupils were given eleven statements on which they were to respond by either agreeing or disagreeing. Their responses were as depicted in Table 4.10 of the next page.

Table 4.10: Pupils’ response on the extent of safety and security features in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agreed (%)</th>
<th>Disagreed (%)</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school is fenced to deter unauthorized entry into the compound</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All visitors are screened before entry into the school compound</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has been fitted with sufficient fire extinguishers</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>84.37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils are trained on use of fire extinguishers</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>84.37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has sufficient first aid kits</td>
<td>93.70</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has constituted an effective school security committee</td>
<td>81.30</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desks well arranged for easy movements of pupils in the classroom</td>
<td>90.63</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School management invites fire experts to give a talk to pupils</td>
<td>59.37</td>
<td>40.63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school is inspected by the MOE officials regularly</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school infrastructure is repaired/maintained regularly</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils report on any spotted risk situations in the school</td>
<td>81.25</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Out of the eleven statements, students agreed on the eight items an indication that basic safety and security features were in place. This translated to 72.7%. However, only 15.625% and 15.625% agreed that their school had been fitted with sufficient fire extinguishers and that pupils were trained on the use of fire extinguishers respectively. A few of the pupil respondents (31.25%) were in agreement that their schools were inspected by the MOE officials regularly (see Table 4.10 above).

From the findings above, 84.37% of the respondents confirmed that schools in Kilifi Sub-County had not fitted sufficient fire extinguishers in their schools something that is in agreement with what WERK report of 2011 which found only two in every 100 public primary schools in Kenya had a functional fire extinguisher (Otieno, 2014). On the contrary however, the pupils reported that their schools had sufficient first aid kits which Otieno (2014) reported that one quarter of all public primary schools in Kenya had stocked first aid kits and no wonder high rates of calamities are reported in cases of fire outbreaks (Simwata, 2010).

4.5 Safety Awareness in Public Primary Schools

The researcher wanted to know the level of awareness of the respondents about safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County. In this regard both headteachers and pupils were supposed to state whether they had any knowledge about the MoESSM in schools. From the results, it was clear that a majority of the headteachers (73%) were aware of the manual (Figure 4.10). Going by the headteachers’ responses, these findings were contrary to a 2011 report by WERK, a professional organization of education researchers which showed that only four out of ten primary schools were aware of the safety manual (Otieno, 2014), but somehow in agreement with the pupils respondents.
However, pupils from the rural set up confirmed that SSMs were hard to come by because only 33.26% were aware of them (Fig. 4.11, page 52), something which Otieno (2014) in WERK 2011 report stated that less than half of primary schools in Kenya had the school safety manual.

Figure 4.10: Awareness by headteachers of MOE SSMs in schools in Kilifi Sub-County

Figure 4.11: Awareness by pupils of MOE SSMs in rural primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County
Results for the urban pupils on their awareness about MOE SSMs were somewhat different from those in the rural set up. At least more than half of the respondents (56.25%) confirmed that they were aware of the MoESSMs (Figure 4.12). Like their headteachers, pupils in urban set up confirmed that they knew the existence of the SSM most probably because schools in the urban set up could access information more easily compared to those in the rural set up.

![Figure 4.12: Awareness by pupils of MoESSMs in urban public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County](figure)

The headteachers were then asked to state whether their schools had a copy of the SSM and 63.6% confirmed that they did as shown in Figure 4.13 below. This is contrary to what WERK 2011 report reported i.e. only 10% of Kenyan primary schools were in possession of the school safety manual (Otieno, 2014).
Similarly pupils were supposed to state whether the same copies have been availed to their class monitors in their respective schools as required by the standard safety policy for schools. However going by the previous question in which pupils from the rural set up were asked whether they were aware of the SSM, a majority of the pupils said they were not, something that was contrary to their response in regard to whether their class monitor had a copy of the same document. In fact, 52.52% (Fig. 4.14, next page) confirmed that their class monitor had a copy. This could be as a result of poor understanding by many of the pupils in the rural set up because many a times the research had to read questions one by one and explain to them before answering. Their reading and comprehending of questions was a challenge in some instances unlike when dealing with pupils from the urban set up.

Figure 4.13: A copy of SSM for schools in Kilifi Sub-County
Figure 4.14: Possession of SSM by the class monitor in rural public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County

But results from pupils in the urban set up were consistent with the response they gave in regard to their knowledge on the existence of a copy of SSM in their school. Many of them (90.63%) confirmed that their class monitor had a copy of the manual (Figures 4.15).

Figure 4.15: Possession of SSMs by the class monitor in urban public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County
4.6 Basic Safety and Security Status in Public Primary Schools in Kilifi Sub-County

The headteacher respondents were asked to shed light on the basic safety and security status in their schools. This was to be ascertained either by indicating whether safety measures had been fully implemented, partially implemented, not implemented and whether they were not sure. Their results were 9.1%, 36.4% and 54.5% of the headteachers said they had been implemented, partially implemented and not implemented respectively (Table 4.11).

Table 4.11: State of safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Frequency</th>
<th>% Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully Implemented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Implemented</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Implemented</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the same context pupils were supposed to state how safety measures had been implemented in their schools and those from the rural set up indicated that 21.56% had been fully implemented, whereas 24.08% indicated they were partially implemented and 54.36% indicated that they were not implemented at all as shown in Table 4.12 below.
Table 4.12: State of safety measures in rural public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County as reported by pupils from the rural set up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSM implemented</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Frequency</th>
<th>% Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully Implemented</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>21.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Implemented</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>24.08</td>
<td>45.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Implemented</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>54.36</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>436</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike pupils from the rural set up, pupils from the urban primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County responded differently whereby 40.63% confirmed that safety measures had been implemented and 43.75% indicated that partially implemented and 15.63% indicated that they were not implemented at all. The extent of implementation of safety measures in urban primary schools was high as compared to rural primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County as shown in Table 4.13 on the next page.

Generally speaking, most schools in Kilifi Sub-County had not implemented the safety policies in their schools as depicted by all the respondents. It was only in the urban set up that 40.63% pupil respondents showed that safety measures had been implemented. A majority of the respondents were even unaware of what was happening in their schools. This study therefore was in agreement with WERK report of 2011 that opined that coast province/region had the highest number of ‘unsafe’ schools (Otieno, 2014).
Table 4.13: Implementation of safety measures in urban public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSM implemented</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Frequency</th>
<th>% Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully Implemented</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.63</td>
<td>40.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Implemented</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>84.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Implemented</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apart from the SSMs, the MoE had issued different circulars that are important in ensuring the safety of children in schools. The headteachers were therefore supposed to state whether their schools had such circulars.

Figure 4.16: Acquisition of circular no. 9/1/169 of 10th April, 2001

In this regard the first question sought to know whether Health and Safety Standards in Education (Circular no. 9/1/169 of 10th April, 2001) was available in Kilifi Sub-County public primary schools. This circular provides regulations on physical facilities development, health education, sanitation, expert advice, epidemic response and reporting security issues. Their responses were as depicted in Figure
Out of 100%, 54.5% of the respondents said that their school did not have such a circular while 36.4% did confirm that their schools did possess it whereas 9.1% were unaware of such a circular.

The next question required headteachers to state whether Circular No. G/9/VOL. VII of 28 March 2002 on Banning on Corporal Punishment in Learning Institutions was in place in their schools. Their responses were as illustrated in the graph on the next page (Figure 4.17). A majority of the respondents (72.7%) confirmed that such a circular was present while only 37.3% said that their schools did not have it (Fig. 4.17, next page).

![Figure 4.17: Percent response by respondents on the acquisition of Circular No. G/9/VOL. VII 28 March 2002](image)

The last item under this category was for the respondents to confirm whether Circular No. 9/1/63 of 23rd July 1993 had been acquired by their respective schools and as indicated in the pie chart below (Figure 4.18)
It was evident that 54.5% of the respondents stated that the circular had not been acquired while 45.6% confirmed that their schools had acquired it.

Although results showed that Circular No. G/9/VOL. VII of 28 March 2002, was available in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, other circulars may have not been available and other studies have indicated that basic safety circulars are not in schools probably due to misplacement by the management (Simwata and Omolo, 2010). This therefore, indicates lack of seriousness in the implementation of safety policies in schools hence the state of safety and security in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County was wanting.

4.7 Factors influencing implementation of safety measures in schools

Head teachers were asked to state whether their schools had enough funds to implement all the safety policies as provided for in the SSM. The responses were 95% ‘No’ meaning they had not been acquired enough funds (Figure 4.19).
Figure 4.19: Funds for the implementation of SSM

They were then required to state whether parents paid money promptly to secure safety equipment once in agreement. Their responses were as illustrated in the graph on the next page (Figure 4.20). Only 12% of the parents were ready to pay the money despite the fact that this was an agreement made by themselves. Therefore, 88% of the respondents did confirm that parents didn’t pay the money promptly.

Figure 4.20: Response by headteachers on whether parents paid money for the implementation of safety policies
From the results, there were no financial endowments in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County to assist in the implementation of safety policies. According to Simatwa and Omollo (2010), without sufficient funds implementation of safety standards in schools will be a dream to be desired. Also, Simatwa (2003) noted that lack of enough financial resources is one major reason why safety measures and law enforcement in schools is not being implemented. Implementation of safety measures in primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County could not be achieved because headteachers were not able to buy certain equipment required for safety implementation due to lack of funds.

The period between the onset of the safety policy and the time of assessment was another factor that determined the implementation of safety policies in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County. The headteachers were therefore, supposed to state whether the period between the onset of the safety policy and the time of assessment was enough to implement all the safety policies and 100% of the respondents said that it was not enough (Fig. 4.21 on the next page).

![Figure 4.21: Period between onset of policy and assessment enough to implement safety policies](image)
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The SSM was introduced to the Kenyan schools by the MoE in 2008. To date it is seven years down the line and yet head teachers in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County felt that this period was not enough for them to implement safety policies. This would be attributed to lack of enough funds to assist in acquiring some basic equipment such as fire extinguishers. Because of squeezed budgets in a majority of the public primary schools, it would take time before this is achieved (Simatwa, 2003).

Frequent inspection of the school and the school plant is a key measure towards the implementation of safety policy in schools by the relevant authorities as provided for by the MoE. The headteachers were therefore required to state how often Quality Assurance and Standards Officers visited their schools for inspection. As shown below (Table 4.14 on the next page) 63.6% of the respondents confirmed that they came twice a year whereas 36.4% said that they came once a year. Regular inspections ensure that the school management adheres to the government directive on safety policies and for those headteachers who do not comply are either penalized hence this helps improve security in schools.

Table 4.14: The frequency of QAOs visiting primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County for inspection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of QAOs' Inspection</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Frequency</th>
<th>% Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once after every two years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were then asked to state some of the factors that influenced the implementation of safety measures in schools. Communication was cited as one key factor that could determine the extent of safety measures implementation in public primary schools because no single instruction could be taken in without a proper channel of communication. In this regard poor communication among the education officers would result in poor implementation of safety measures in public schools (Simatwa and Omolo, 2010). According to Rugut (2003) DQASOs are inefficient in their jobs and do not communicate new policies of the Ministry of Education to their subordinates.

According to DQASOs headteachers were the sole implementers of government policies within their respective schools. Therefore one’s competency or negligence while executing his/her duties will to a larger extent contribute towards implementation or lack of implementation of the safety measures in schools. Head teachers as heads of their institutions, have a responsibility of ensuring that their schools are safer (Simatwa and Omolo, 2010).

The factors that were numerated by the respondents as affecting safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County included: communication, one’s competency and/or negligence.

4.8 Strategies for the Implementation of Safety Measures in Primary Schools in Kilifi Sub-County

Having highlighted several aspects of the status of safety measures in Kilifi Sub-County, there was need for the respondents to answer a few questions with regard to the strategies that the primary schools management had put into place to ensure that
the safety of the pupils was guaranteed. The head teachers were therefore, asked to state whether they integrated safety awareness into daily school routine like class time and games time and 81.8% confirmed that they did while 28.2% said they did not (Fig. 4.22).

![Integration of Safety Awareness into School Routine](image)

**Figure 4.22: Integration of safety awareness into school routine work**

They were then supposed to state whether they carried out regular evaluation of the school plant to determine safety needs through regular checks and/or inspections and as indicated in Table 4.15 on the next page, 63.64% confirmed that they did that whereas 36.36% said they did not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of School Plant</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Frequency</th>
<th>% Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>63.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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They were further supposed to state whether they organized training of teaching and non-teaching staffs on emergency preparedness and first aid skills in which 90.1% said they did not while only 9.9% confirmed that their schools did organize (Figure 4.23).

![Organizing of Training on School Staff on Emergency](image)

**Figure 4.23**: Headteachers’ responses on the organization of training of school staff on emergence and preparedness and first aid skills

Now that public primary schools had financial challenges, organizing trainings on school staff on emergency could be farfetched as already indicated above where over 90% of the respondents confirmed that such an activity was not done. This could only be attained if there was a good working relationship among the stakeholders where funds could be raised through ‘harambees’ to finance such arrangements thereby bringing about school effectiveness and improvement (Hargreaves, 2001).

The headteachers were also required to state whether their schools had employed nurses to deal with medical emergencies and from the results it was found that no single school had employed a nurse in Kilifi Sub-County (Fig. 4.24). These findings
may be attributed to lack of sufficient funds to pay qualified medical staff (Simatwa and Omolo, 2010).

Figure 4.24: Headteachers response whether the school employed nurses

The headteachers were then supposed to state whether they conducted regular fire and emergency drills for the pupils and staff and results showed that this did not happen as depicted in the pie chart below (Fig. 4.25).

Figure 4.25: Headteachers response on whether regular fire and emergency drills for pupils and staff is conducted
Fire drill would act as a recommendable strategy for schools in Kilifi Sub-County should there be a fire calamity. However, such a strategy is not enhanced in this sub-county under study. Fire drills are important (Comolotti, 1999) and well serviced fire extinguishers (Makabila et al., 2006) must be in place in strategic positions such that when there is a fire outbreak the children can easily access them while looking for the exit (Gikandi et al., 2006).
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of the main findings of this study, implications of the findings, conclusion and recommendations.

5.2 Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the status of safety measures and their impacts on performance in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kenya. There has been a growing trend about the safety of children in the Kenyan schools resulting in poor performance. Many incidences of insecurity, fire out breaks and pupils unrest have been on the increase. Consequently, the persistent recurrence of safety problems in public schools poses serious questions that demand urgent answers if similar cases are to be avoided in future. This study therefore, sought to answer seven questions namely: To what extent have safety measures been implemented in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi - County? What are the basic safety and security features of public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County? To what extent have the levels of safety awareness been made in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi – County? What is the basic safety and security status of public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County? What factors influence the implementation of safety policies in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi - County? What are the schools doing to ensure the basic safety and security of their physical environments? What strategies have been devised by head teachers and quality assurance officers to enhance the implementation of safety policies in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi - County?
5.2.1 Implementation of the safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County

Going by the findings of the study it was evident that the state of safety measures in Kilifi Sub-County was wanting. For example, 82.82% of the headteacher respondents confirmed that safety measures had not been implemented at all. Such important equipment as the fire extinguishers were lacking in a majority of the primary schools because 95% of the headteachers’ respondents attested to this. In addition to this, it was observed that a majority of the classes were overcrowded i.e. 90% of the headteachers’ respondents confirmed this.

5.2.2 Basic Safety and Security Features of Public Primary Schools in Kilifi Sub-County

Some of the basic safety and security features in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County included school being fitted with sufficient fire extinguishers in which 84.37% of the pupils’ respondents said such a basic safety feature was not in place. Other features such as inspection of the school plant was not done regularly (68.75% of the pupils’ responded said inspectors did come to inspect the school). However, according to the pupils’ respondents such features as sufficient first aid kits, presence of school security committee, desks were well arranged in class to ease movement and that all visitors were screened before entry to the school compound were in place. It was also found that the school compound was well fenced (93.75% of the pupils agreed).
5.2.3 Safety Awareness in Public Primary Schools

In regard to safety awareness in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, the response from the respondents was of mixed reactions. However, it was evident that many of the schools were aware of issues related to safety measures in public primary schools, but the extent of implementation was questionable may be due to communication breakdown and negligence among the headteachers as it was elucidated by the respondents when they were reacting on the strategies that would be employed to ensure that safety measures were implemented in schools. For example, 73% of the headteachers interviewed said they were aware of the SSM for schools in Kenya and that 63.6% of them had a copy of the same. On the same note, 90.63% of the urban pupils’ respondents confirmed that their class monitor had a copy of the SSM while 52.5% of those from the rural set up said their class monitor had a copy.

5.2.4 Basic Safety and Security Status in Public Primary Schools in Kilifi Sub-County

The status of safety in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County was in a compromised state especially in the rural schools set up. This was evident from the results got where 54.36% of pupils in rural schools indicated that safety measures had not been implemented. Headteachers (54.5%), also, indicated that safety measures had not been implemented. However, pupils in urban schools (40.63%) indicated that safety measures had been fully implemented and 43.75% indicated that they were partially implemented. It was also, evident that the status of security in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County was wanting because only 36.4% of the headteachers said that their schools had circular no. 9/1/169 of 10th April, 2001,
which concerns the public health of the school as a whole. However, circular no. G/9/Vol.VII of 28th March 2002 was available (72.7% of the headteachers confirmed).

5.2.5 Factors that Influenced the Implementation of Safety Measures in Kilifi Sub-County

According to the respondents, some of the factors that influenced the implementation of safety measures in Kilifi Sub-County included lack of sufficient funds, lack of commitment from the parents in making payments on agreed sums of money, the period between the onset of the safety policy and assessment was not enough in enabling headteachers to implement all the safety measures, inspection by QAOS in a majority of the schools was done twice. Other factors included communication and competency/incompetency and/or negligence from the headteachers.

5.2.6 Strategies for the implementation of safety measures in primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County

Lastly, some of the strategies if employed according to the respondents would ensure implementation of safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County included integration of safety awareness into school routine work, regular evaluation of the school plant by both headteachers and QAOS, training of school staffs and pupils on necessary first aid skills in cases of emergencies and where possible schools should employ nurses.
5.3 Implications of the Findings

In regard to the main findings of this study, the following are the implications:

5.3.1 Implementation of the safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County

It was clear that pupils in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County are at risk in case of any catastrophe. This is because quite a number of the schools had not implemented the basic safety measures in accordance with the SSM from the MOE.

5.3.2 Basic Safety and Security Features of Public Primary Schools in Kilifi Sub-County

Although many schools in Kilifi Sub-County are characterized by lack of fire extinguishers, some of them have other features such as safety committees are in place and first aid kits. To certain extent then, the pupils could be in a position to counter a calamity should one strike.

5.3.3 Safety Awareness in Public Primary Schools

There were mixed reactions as far as safety awareness is concerned in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County. This means that the schools are not fully aware of the requirements of safety measures more so they are not well informed about the SSM for Kenyan schools.

5.3.4 Basic Safety and Security Status in Public Primary Schools in Kilifi Sub-County

Safety and security status was in a sorry state hence should a catastrophe strike then all the school community is in jeopardy. Having not acquired some vital safety circulars, implied that some school headteachers were complacent on their jobs.
5.3.5 Factors that influenced the implementation of safety measures in Kilifi Sub-County

Communication breakdown was quoted as one of the factors derailing the implementation of safety measures in Kilifi Sub-County an implication that the school authority does not enhance good communication mechanisms amongst its members. Also, lack of funds implies that it would take a long period of time to achieve the desired safety standards in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County.

5.3.6 Strategies for the implementation of safety measures in primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County

Such strategies as integration of safety awareness into school routine work, regular evaluation of the school plant by both headteachers and QAOs, training of school staffs and pupils on necessary first aid skills in cases of emergencies if put into practice then chances are that safety and security status of public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County will be achieved.

5.4 Conclusion of the Study

This study aimed at assessing the status of safety measures and its effects on performance in public primary schools in Kilifi District, Kilifi County – Kenya. From the findings, therefore, the following are the conclusions:

5.4.1 Implementation of the safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County

It was clear that the state of safety in the public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County was wanting. Although there were instances where respondents indicated that they were aware of the existence of the SSM in their schools, little proved this
because a majority of the schools did not have enough classes (Figure 4.3) for the pupils

5.4.2 Basic Safety and Security Features of Public Primary Schools in Kilifi Sub-County

There were mixed reactions on the safety and security features, but the common features were lack of fire extinguishers, presence of first aid kits and majority of the schools had constituted safety committees.

5.4.3 Safety Awareness in Public Primary Schools

Some schools were aware of the safety measures while others were not hence it is concluded that schools in Kilifi Sub-County are not well informed on the safety standard guidelines of the MoE.

5.4.4 Basic Safety and Security Status in Public Primary Schools in Kilifi Sub-County

The safety and security status in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County is in its rudimental stage because many of the schools have not implemented some of the basic requirements as per the SSM of the MoE.

5.4.5 Factors that influenced the implementation of safety measures in Kilifi Sub-County

It was concluded that the unsatisfactory implementation of safety policies was attributable to a variety of factors which included inadequate funds (Figure 4.19) and lack of proper communication. Based on these findings, it was concluded that the implementation of safety policies in Kilifi Sub-County, public primary schools
would have been much better if these factors would have been put in place. Implementation of safety policies would not succeed unless the head teachers considered them significant enough to find value in. When head teachers were supportive of implementation programs, then these programs were likely to succeed. In a nut shell therefore, it is concluded that the pupils in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County were in danger should a calamity strike because the state of their safety was extremely poor (see Tables 4.11 and 4.12).

5.4.6 Strategies for the implementation of safety measures in primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County

It was also concluded that if such strategies as integration of safety awareness into school routine work, regular evaluation of the school plant by both headteachers and QAOs, training of school staffs and pupils on necessary first aid skills in cases of emergencies are the ones that would bring change in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County once put in place.

5.5 Recommendations

In light of the findings and conclusions of this study, it was recommended that:

All headteachers ensure that emergency drills are conducted regularly to enhance preparedness and purchase the required number of first aid kits and fire extinguishers. Head teachers should also ensure that construction and maintenance of fences is done to enhance school safety and facilitate a greater involvement of all the stake holders to ensure a collaborative approach to the implementation of safety policies.
The Ministry of Education on the other hand should ensure that head teachers peg admission to class space to avoid over-crowding in schools, provide all schools in Kilifi Sub-County with funds to implement safety policies and improve on the coordination and follow-up of all the stake holders in the safety policy implementation process.

Such strategies as as integration of safety awareness into school routine work, regular evaluation of the school plant by both headteachers and QAOs, training of school staffs and pupils on necessary first aid skills in cases of emergencies should be enhanced by the school management to boost safety status in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County.

Finally, the DQASOs should provide increased motivation to compliant head teachers, conduct regular health inspections of all the schools and organize safety training for teachers.

5.6 Suggestions for Further Studies

The study dealt with the state of safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County. Based on its findings, it was suggested that further research be carried out:

- To find out pupils’ perceptions on safety and security in primary schools.
- To examine the roles of pupils in the implementations of safety policies.
- To determine the roles and attitudes of parents and teachers towards the implementation of safety policies in schools.
- Lastly, to evaluate the impact of safety policy implementation on the outcomes and quality of learning in primary schools.
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APPENDICE

APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HEAD TEACHERS

This research is solely for academic purposes. It endeavours to find out the status of safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County - Kenya. Kindly you are hereby requested to provide answers to these questions as honestly as possible. Your responses to these questions will be treated with confidentiality. Please tick [✓] as appropriate. Your name and your school’s name is not a MUST.

SECTION A: SCHOOL SETUP

1. What is the set up of your school?
   Urban [  ]       Rural [ ]

SECTION B: IMPLEMENTATION OF SAFETY MEASURES IN PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS

1. How often do you have fire drills in your school?
   More regularly [ ]   Regularly [ ]   Occasionally [ ]   Not at all [ ]

2. (a) Do you have fire extinguishers in each of the classrooms?
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

   (b) If your answer is ‘Yes’ in question 4 (a) above, explain whether they are positioned in strategic positions ..........................................................
       ........................................................................................................................................
       ........................................................................................................................................
       ........................................................................................................................................

   (c) State the ratio of pupils to one class that best describes your school.
   Less 40 pupils to 1 class [ ]   40 pupils to 1 class [ ]
   Over 40 pupils to 1 class [ ]
3. State the ratio of pupils to one toilet that best describes your school.
   30 pupils to 1 toilet [ ]
   50 pupils to 1 toilet [ ]
   Over 50 pupils to 1 toilet [ ]

4. (a) Does your school have a playing ground?
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

   (b) Explain your answer in Q.5 above

5. (a) Does your school have a perimeter fence?
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

   (b) If your answer is ‘No’ in question 8 (a) above, explain

6. (a) Does your school have a secure gate?
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

7. (b) If your answer is ‘No’ in question 9 (a) above, explain how you control
   persons who check in and out of the school compound

8. Does your school have a watchman?
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

9. Do you have a school safety committee in your school?
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

10. How often does your school have health inspection of the premises?
    Once a year [ ]
    Twice a year [ ]
    Thrice a year [ ]
    After every two years [ ]
11. In case of a fire calamity in dormitories in case of boarding school how will the pupils escape?

Through emergency doors [ ]  Breaking of the main door [ ]
Not defined [ ]

12. How do doors open in dormitories in case of a boarding school?

Outwards [ ]  Inwards [ ]

13. How do class windows open?

Outwards [ ]  Inwards [ ]
There are no windows [ ]

14. How are the class windows made?

Have grills [ ]  Have no grills [ ]
There are no windows [ ]

15. How often is painting and white washing of buildings done in your school?

Within a year [ ]  After a year [ ]  After two years [ ]

16. In what direction are the class rooms constructed in your school?

East to west direction [ ]  North to South [ ]
West to East [ ]

17. What criteria do you use in selecting contractors for site selection and construction of buildings?

Professionalism [ ]  Experience [ ]
Professionalism and experience [ ]  None [ ]
18. State the extent of safety policy implementation in your school by using the following key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Feature</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Not Implemented</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i Reliable alarm system in place</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>NTI</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii School insured against fire disasters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii School plants constructed in consultation and approval of Ministry of Public Health (Public Health Department)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv A site plan for the school is in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v Sign boards erected within the school to show direction to various facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi Bare areas of the school planted with grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii Walkways demarcated with flowers and shrubs rather than wires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii Stairways are wide enough and located at both ends of the building with firmly fixed handrails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix Classrooms are well lit and ventilated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x The furniture in the classrooms are appropriate for use by the learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi Pit latrines built at least 10 metres away from tuition and boarding facilities and downward side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii Pit latrines are at least 15 metres away from a borehole or well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii Girls sanitation areas are separate from the boys’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C: SAFETY AWARENESS IN PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS

   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

2. (a) Does your school have a copy of the Safety Standards Manual for schools in Kenya?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

   (b) If your answer is ‘Yes’ in question 2 (a) above, state how it has been implemented.
       Fully implemented [ ]  Partially implemented [ ]
       Not implemented [ ]  Not sure [ ]

   (c) If your answer is ‘No’ in question 2 (a) above, give your reasons as to why your school does not have a copy of the manual.
       ..........................................................................................................................
       ..........................................................................................................................
       ..........................................................................................................................

3. What is your opinion on the implementation of the government policy of safety standards and guidelines?
   ..........................................................................................................................
   ..........................................................................................................................

4. What challenges have you encountered in implementing MOE safety standards manual for schools in Kenya?
   ..........................................................................................................................
   ..........................................................................................................................

5. Does your school have the following circulars issued by the Ministry of Education Science and Technology?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]
Yes [ ] No [ ]

Yes [ ] No [ ]

SECTION D: FACTORS INFLUENCING IMPLEMENTATION OF SAFETY MEASURES IN SCHOOLS
1. Are there adequate funds in your school with which to implement all the safety policies at once?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

2. In cases where parents agree to pay money towards securing of safety equipment, do they pay promptly?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

3. Is the period between onset of policy and time of assessment enough to implement all the safety policies?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

4. What bottle necks do you face in the implementation of the safety policy in your school?

5. How often does the Quality Assurance Officers visit your school for the inspection of the school plant?
   Once a year [ ] Twice a year [ ] Once after every two years [ ]

6. In your own considered opinion, state the possible factors that influence the implementation of safety measures in your school.
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SECTION E: STRATEGIES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SAFETY MEASURES IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS

1. Do you integrate safety awareness into daily school routine like class time and games time?
   Yes   [ ]    No   [ ]

2. Do you carry out regular evaluation of school plant to determine safety needs through regular checks/inspections?
   Yes   [ ]    No   [ ]

3. Do you organize training of teaching and non-teaching staff on emergency preparedness and first aid skills?
   Yes   [ ]    No   [ ]

4. Could you list the safety equipment that your school has purchased so far?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

5. (a) Do you have an employed nurse to deal with medical emergencies in the school at all time?
   Yes   [ ]    No   [ ]

   (b) If your answer is ‘No’ in question 5 (a) above, explain how you handle an emergency.
     ........................................................................................................................................
     ........................................................................................................................................
     ........................................................................................................................................

6. Do you conduct regular fire and emergency drills for students and staff?
   Yes   [ ]    No   [ ]
APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE PUPILS

This research is solely for academic purposes. It endeavours to find out the status of safety measures in public primary schools in Kilifi Sub-County, Kilifi County - Kenya. Kindly provide answers to these questions as honestly as possible. Your responses to these questions will be treated with confidentiality. Please tick [✓] as appropriate. Your name and your school’s name is not a MUST.

PART A: SCHOOL SET UP
1. What is your school set up?
   Urban [ ] Rural

SECTION B: BASIC SAFETY AND SECURITY FEATURES OF PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN KILIFI SUB-COUNTY
1. Select the option that best describes your opinion about the following statements by putting a tick (✓) on the appropriate column using the key provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree (A)</th>
<th>Disagree (D)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>The school is well fenced to deter unauthorized entry into the compound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>All visitors are screened before entry into the school compound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>The school has been fitted with sufficient fire extinguishers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>Pupils are trained on use of fire extinguishers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>The school has sufficient first aid kits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>The school has constituted an effective school security committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>Class teachers ensure that desks are arranged in a manner that facilitates easy and orderly movements of pupils in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii</td>
<td>School management invites local fire department to give talks and demonstrations to learners about fire prevention in a school context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix</td>
<td>The school is inspected by the MOE officials regularly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>The school infrastructure is repaired/maintained regularly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi</td>
<td>Pupils report on any spotted risk situations in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C: SAFETY AWARENESS IN PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

2. (a) Has your school head availed a copy of the Safety Standards Manual to your class monitor?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

   (b) If your answer is ‘Yes’ in question 2 (a) above, state how it has been implemented
   Fully implemented [ ] Partially implemented [ ]
   Not implemented [ ]

3. What is your general opinion as far as safety awareness is concerned in your school?

SECTION D: FACTORS INFLUENCING IMPLEMENTATION OF SAFETY MEASURES IN SCHOOLS

1. State some of the factors that you think do influence the implementation of safety measures in your school

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
APPENDIX III
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE WITH THE DQASO

1. Are there logistical reasons that make it difficult for you to reach some schools for safety inspection and how do you overcome them?

2. Are there cases of uncooperative head teachers who fail to follow safety instructions, avail records and give the required information in time?

3. In such a situation in (2) above what do you do?

4. How do you handle head teachers who feel suscipicious when you go for inspection of their schools?

5. Are there cases where your seniors fail to act on your recommendations and what do you do for such an occurrence?

6. Do you think your area of inspection is too large to be under one officer and what is your advice?

7. How does financial inadequacy from the District Education Office affect your chore functions of school inspection?

8. How frequent do you organize seminars and workshops on school safety implementation for head teachers and other stakeholders?

9. How do you motivate compliant head teachers?

10. What other strategies do you have in place in the implementation of safety measure County – Kenya?
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