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ABSTRACT

The issue of Health and Safety in secondary schools is a growing concern in Kenya. Even after the introduction of safety standards manual 2008 by the government in schools nothing much has changed implying that there is a discrepancy in the way it is offered and implemented. Accidents leading to loss of lives and injuries have continued in Kenyan schools. Hence the need for concerted efforts by all stakeholders, head teachers included in a bid to strengthen health and safety programs for effective learning to take place. This study sought to determine the challenges facing the head teachers in implementing MOE health and Safety Standards and Guidelines in Public Secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County, Mombasa County, Kenya. The study was guided by the following objectives: to find out ways used by head teachers to implement Health and Safety Programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County; Mombasa County, to identify challenges faced by head teachers in creating students' awareness of Health and Safety Programs in secondary schools and to establish major strategies head teachers employ to enhance the implementation of Health and Safety Programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County; Mombasa County. The study adopted Maslow (1954) theory of Human Needs. The target population was 2000 students and 13 principals from 13 registered public secondary schools. Random stratified sampling technique was used to sample 8 principals while purposive sampling was employed to sample 200 students totaling to 208 number of respondents who participated in the study. Data collection instrument used was the questionnaire. The data was organized by the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 computer software and were analysed using descriptive statistics. The following were the findings: challenges faced by head teachers in creation of awareness in students concerning health and safety standards include: lack of conducting disaster crisis, management and fire drills in some schools, ineffective implementing and monitoring organs such Quality Assurance and Standards and lack of adequate financial resources among others. On the strategies, the study found out that principals use registration of all visitors, fencing, conducting fire drills, ensuring strong guidance and counselling departments. Concerning ways principals employ in the implementation of health and safety standards, the study found out that the latter ensure that windows did have grills and wire mesh, reinforced fencing secured gates and provision of adequate fire extinguishers. Also, frequent fire drills in schools were other ways of enhancing implementation of health and safety program. The study made the following recommendations: that principals should create ways of implementing health and safety standards according to MoE’s guidelines, they should also create forums for school stakeholders especially students to create awareness in them concerning safety issues. MoE through Quality Assurance and Standards department should organize in-service workshops to equip principals with skills of implementing health and safety programs.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

From a broad perspective school safety refers to measures undertaken by the school community and other school stakeholders to either alleviate or eliminate any risky conditions that may pose accidents and emotional or psychological distress. The learners, staff, parents and other stakeholders should strive to ensure all round safe living. It is observed that safety in schools is a very important aspect of the teaching and learning processes.

At the global scenario, (Cavanagh, 2004; Soomeren, 2002 and Reuters, 2004) report that hundreds of school children have died in preventable incidents of drug and gun violence. For instance, in American and European schools; including the 2004 Beslan school Massacre in Russia and Chinese school blast. Shocking acts of violence in U.S. schools have caught the nation's attention and made it clear that maintaining the safety and integrity of school climate must be one of the country's highest priorities in education (Eliot, Hamburg & Williams, 1998).

The partial or total lack of the implementation of school safety policies has been a cause of concern in both India and China. Reuters (2004) reports that the Indian school fire of July 2004 which claimed the lives of 90 children was as a result of failure to fully implement safety norms. In this particular case, the building did not have enough exit routes and was overcrowded. Another incidence is where 400 students perished in 1995 school inferno India. These incidences in India are blamed on inspection and failure by regulatory authorities in enforcing safety norms in schools. In addition, In May 2012, 122 girls in Afghan school were hospitalized after
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1.1 Background to the Study

From a broad perspective, school safety refers to measures undertaken by the school community and other school stakeholders to either alleviate or eliminate any risky conditions that may pose accidents and emotional or psychological distress. The learners, staff, parents, and other stakeholders should strive to ensure all-round safe living. It is observed that safety in schools is a very important aspect of the teaching and learning processes.

At the global scenario, (Cavanagh, 2004; Soomeren, 2002 and Reuters, 2004) report that hundreds of school children have died in preventable incidents of drug and gun violence. For instance, in American and European schools; including the 2004 Beslan school Massacre in Russia and Chinese school blast. Shocking acts of violence in U.S. schools have caught the nation's attention and made it clear that maintaining the safety and integrity of school climate must be one of the country's highest priorities in education (Eliot, Hamburg & Williams, 1998).

The partial or total lack of the implementation of school safety policies has been a cause of concern in both India and China. Reuters (2004) reports that the Indian school fire of July 2004 which claimed the lives of 90 children was as a result of failure to fully implement safety norms. In this particular case, the building did not have enough exit routes and was overcrowded. Another incidence is where 400 students perished in 1995 school inferno India. These incidences in India are blamed on inspection and failure by regulatory authorities in enforcing safety norms in schools. In addition, In May 2012, 122 girls in Afghan school were hospitalized after
they were allegedly poisoned in class through a type of spray by suspected Taliban Terrorists. (Paton, 2012, May 23rd), further reports that 170 women and girls drunk poisoned well water at school, hence hospitalized.

The situation is not different in Africa. In Lesotho cases of students carrying weapons, assaulting and bullying each other was reported (Brener, Lowry & Barrios 2005). Mnyaka (2006), observes that violence in South Africa is an issue of the decade. Thus, the incidences discussed above indicate that school are not safe places for school going children. Further, the culture of learning is deteriorating (Matsoga, 2003). Medlen, (2012) postulates that safety issues confronting schools or educational institutions are diverse, sophisticated, frequent and complex.

In a research paper addressing school safety in Uganda, Luluu (2008) states that safety of the learning environment has not been adequately addressed. Fire outbreaks are fierce tragedies in Uganda. For instance, in Budo junior girls boarding secondary school 20 girls lost their lives because of dormitory fire. Investigations revealed that the state of the perimeter wall was wanting as it had gaps through which outsiders found their way to school. The school operated without systems such as attendance register and occurrence book to monitor the performance and effectiveness of the security personnel. It was due to these shortcomings that two security guards were reported absent on the fateful night (Mzungu, 2008).

In Kenya, despite the Government of Kenya’s (GOK) commitment to ensuring safe and secure learning environments for the Kenyan child, many schools, especially in the urban areas, experience safety problems and constraints related to inadequate play spaces; sub-standard, inappropriate or inadequate, and poorly constructed or maintained classrooms (UNESCO,1995). The notion of secondary school as safe
havens for children, as reported by (Simatwa, 2007) is thus shattered by feelings of inadequacy and insecurity emanating from these constraints. According to (GOK, 2008) Health and Safety issues in public secondary schools are of great concern to any societies and authorities. (Otieno, 2013; MOE, 2000), observes that educational institutions have in the recent past become unsafe grounds for students. Further, he postulates that institutions of learning, experience serious cases of insecurity since there has been an increasing trend in number of school children dying or getting hurt in school violence, disasters and emergencies that would have been avoided with proper safety measures put in place.

Specific instances of tragedies that pose insecurity in Kenyan schools include; a fire tragedy which led to the death of 27 girls in Bombolulu girls boarding secondary school in Coast province (Oriang, 2001). Reports indicated that the disaster occurred because the girls were locked in a congested dormitory; windows had grills due to security lapses. In Bungoma East District suspected arson and rioting students in collaboration with support staff burnt down the school administration block in Milo mixed boarding (Obala, 2007). St Mary’s Webuye and St Cecilia Misikhu girls’ boarding secondary schools were invaded by thugs respectively (D.E.O, 2008) due to poor fencing systems and security lapses. Concerning Kyanguli Secondary School fire tragedy in which sixty-eight boys lost their lives, Odalo (2001) reports that the school lacked fire-fighting equipment and emergency exits. He further observes that secondary school principals encounter numerous challenges as they discharge their duties and roles.

The challenges include among others, widespread insecurity issues linked to students’ unrest, lack of adequate resources, lack of adequate and qualified teachers
and drug abuse. In some cases, it is reported that the challenges have grown in intensity and frequency over the years; for instance, in Kenya in 2007, 300 secondary schools were closed following student rampage destroying property and lives (Kirui 2011). Ronoh (2009) observes that there are no awareness programs of school safety needs in Turkana District whereby teachers and students are poorly prepared to respond to fire outbreak and destructive violence; schools in the district strongly relied on reactive prohibitory policies and legislation to curb violence most of which were placed under 'no pardon' category; schools' environmental and architectural designs do not adequately enhance school safety.

In view to mitigate school safety tragedies, Kiumi (2009) emphasizes that students' discipline is critical to the attainment of positive school outcomes. According to Kiprop (2012), head teachers play significant role in maintaining discipline in schools. They achieve this by setting the tone and morale of the school and through their remarkable influence over the teachers and students. Therefore, the principal's role remains critical in the successful implementation of various government reforms (Kamunde, 2010).

The safety standard manual for schools in Kenya holds that head teachers are responsible for ensuring implementation of school safety policies. This is done by rallying all the stakeholders such as the School Safety Sub Committee, teachers, learners and parents to ensure that school is safe or secure and effective utilization of school resources in order to foster school safety. The head teacher also liaises with the teacher in-charge of School Safety and Teacher Advisory Centre (TAC) tutor to ensure the implementation of School Safety measures agreed upon, take necessary corrective measures according to the monitoring and evaluation reports and convene
the meetings of the School Safety Committee either on his/her own or on the chairperson’s request.

In regard to the challenges faced in the implementation of safety in secondary schools, it is worth to note that except for the Schools Manual (2008), the only comprehensive policy guideline on safety standards, GOK policy documents make no direct mention of challenges faced in implementation of safety in secondary schools. The SSMSK (2008), the MOE Circular No G9/1/169 (2001) on Health and Safety Standards in Educational Institutions, and the Child Friendly Schools Manual (CFSM) by UNICEF (2010), focus on guidelines in primary and secondary schools’ safety requirement and challenges and strategies have to be inferred from their recommendations. Studies generally observe that in Kenya the challenge(s) facing implementation of school safety and strategies to mitigate them has not been given much attention and more so in Mvita Sub County in Mombasa County. Thus, the present study focused on challenges that head teachers face in the implementation of health standards in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County; Mombasa county.

In Mvita Sub-County, Mombasa County, Health and Safety is an issue. Most schools are characterized by inadequate play spaces, inadequate or poorly designed and maintained equipment and classrooms, surfaces that restrict children’s spontaneous play. Although children continue to participate in learning in these schools, these challenges may affect their optimal participation and performance in education. It is against such a background that this study examines challenges faced by head teachers in the implementation of health and safety programs in secondary schools in Mvita Sub- County.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Health and Safety aspects in school form an integral part in the provision of conducive learning environment for students. The situation on the ground in many schools is characterized by overcrowded classrooms, many buildings and other facilities are inadequate, sites are poorly planned and there is little or deferred maintenance repairs, unfenced compounds, replacement and renewal and inferno destructions (Cavanagh, 2004; Soomeren, 2002, Oriang, 2001 and Obala, 2007). Schools lack school-based health initiatives and basics such as first aid Kits.

The Kenyan government policy as contained in the Public Health and Safety Act (1986) emphasizes safe learning environment for the children. In regard to this the MoE put in place safety guidelines to be implemented in all the public secondary schools. However, documents for instance SSMSK (2008), the MOE Circular No G9/1/169 (2001) among others indicate that there is hardly any that directly documents the challenges head teachers face in implementing Health and Safety programs. Therefore, the present study explored the challenges that head teachers face when implementing health and safety programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County; Mombasa County.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to establish the challenges faced by head teachers in implementation of health and safety programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County in Mombasa County in Kenya.
1.4 Objectives of the Study

The present study was guided by the following specific study objectives:

i. To find out ways used by head teachers to implement Health and Safety Programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County; Mombasa County.

ii. To identify challenges faced by head teachers in creating awareness in students concerning Health and Safety Programs in secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County; Mombasa County.

iii. To establish major strategies head teachers employ to enhance the implementation of Health and Safety Programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County.

1.5 Research Questions

i. How do head teachers implement Health and Safety Programs in public secondary schools in Mvita County?

ii. What challenges do head teachers face in creating awareness in students concerning Health and Safety Programs in public secondary schools in Mvita County?

iii. What major strategies do the head teachers employ in order to ensure implementation of Health and Safety Programs in secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County?

1.6 Limitations of the Study

The present study envisaged the following limitations:

i. Some of the administrators were not willing to have the study carried out in their institution for fear of negative publicity. Therefore, the researcher developed a good rapport with them so that they can provide the information without fear.
ii. At least not all components of Safety Standards and Guidelines were covered.

iii. Finally, validity of the study relied on students' genuine and thoughtful responses.

1.7 Delimitations of the Study

The study covered public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County. These are the schools likely to have implemented the Health and Safety programs. This reduced the accuracy of establishing why the MOE safety standards and guidelines were not adhered to in public secondary schools. The sub-County is in an urban setting where there is easy accessibility in terms of infrastructure. It was much easier for the researcher to conduct the research study in Mvita Sub-County as the most ideal location; given that it's the economic hub of the country and that most schools have the basic infrastructure and support materials. It was not possible to conduct the research study in the whole country due to logistical and cost implications involved. Private schools were not included in the study as the study's focus was on public secondary schools whereas the former do not receive direct government support in the provision of education. Thus, the study did not cover the opinions of parents and other stakeholders in the private secondary schools. While parents can be important respondents in the research, they were not included due to the logistics of accessing these schools because tracing them required considerable time, resources and other logistics. The study targeted principals and students as the respondents. The study also was confined to four out of thirteen key components of safety standards and guidelines as indicated in MOE Safety Standards Manual (Republic of Kenya, 2008). These included the physical safety components such as safety of school ground; safety in physical infrastructure; safety in school environment and students' health program. Therefore, other physical safety components, were left out for
purposes of obtaining manageable data for analysis and interpretation. The study was limited to only thirteen secondary schools in Mombasa sub-county; these schools may not represent wholly the situation for the rest of the schools.

1.8 Assumptions of the Study

The present study was based on the following assumptions:

i. The respondents involved in the study would be cooperative as respondents in the study.

ii. It is also assumed that respondents would have the required information about the Health and Safety programs in schools. School management is aware of the MOE Safety Standards and Guidelines; implementation of school Safety Standards and Guidelines is hindered by certain constraints.

1.9 Significance of the Study

The findings of the study would contribute to the advancement of knowledge concerning health and safety education in public secondary schools in Kenya.

The study has exposed the challenges faced by head teachers in the implementation of Safety Standards and Guidelines thus assist policy makers at the MOE to develop policy framework on provision of emergency facilities such as firefighting equipment, alarm systems, first aid facilities and training of the school community in disaster management. Further, the findings may enable education stakeholders and policy makers to come up with concrete strategies for preventing disasters in public secondary schools like mobilizing funds from donor communities to supply schools firefighting equipment. Also, the findings may be of immediate benefit to the
ministry of education in regard to formulating Health and Safety Policies aimed at enhancing students’ safety in schools.

The secondary school administrators may find the study’s findings useful in managing students and teachers so as to improve academic performance, student discipline and overall quality of secondary education within schools. Thus develop visionary academic leadership necessary for effective implementation of health and safety programs in public secondary schools in Kenya.

Finally, the study may provide baseline knowledge which may be used by other researchers who may be interested in the same discipline of Health and Safety in schools.

1.10 Theoretical Framework of the Study

The study was guided by Abraham Maslow’s (1954) theory of Human Needs. The Maslow hierarchy of needs is based on a hierarchical model with basic needs at the bottom and higher needs at the top. The basic needs include physiological and safety needs whereas higher needs include love, esteem and self-actualization needs (Okumbe, 2007). Armstrong (2006) presents Maslow’s hierarchy of needs as follows: Physiological needs which include need for oxygen, food, water and sex, Safety needs: protection against dangers and deprivation of physiological needs, Social needs: love, affection and acceptance as belonging to a group, Esteem needs: need to have a stable, firmly based, high evaluation of oneself (self Esteem) and to have the respect of others (prestige) and Self-fulfillment (self-actualization)- the need to develop potentialities and skills, to become what one believe one is capable of becoming.
In regard to Psychological development, Armstrong (2006) observes that people move up the hierarchy of needs, although not in a straight forward progression. He further postulates that the lower need still exists even if temporarily dormant as motivators and that individuals constantly return to previously satisfied needs.

Children need to be protected from anything that can harm them physiologically and psychologically and make them feel safe and secure to actively participate in their learning and developmental activities. They need environments that are risk free and adequately provide well maintained learning and materials that are appropriate to their developmental needs, abilities, age and interests. Safety enhances regularity and predictability in the environment and gives children freedom from fear and anxiety (Seifert, 1983). Safety strengthens participation, increases attention to the learning tasks, mental effort and benefits and to perseverance in the face of difficulty (Petty, 1998). Maslow’s theory proposes that when children feel safe and protected within and around their environments they are motivated to maximize their potential and move towards self-actualization. Failure to provide appropriate learning and play environments for children result in lack of confidence, fear and anxiety and less than optimal participation in play activities. This theory formed an important base for the study because it identifies safety needs as being important to the well-being of human beings.
1.11 Conceptual Framework

**Independent variable**

- Government policies
  - Education act
  - Public health act
  - Public works and building guidelines
  - Safety standards and guidelines manual

- Challenges faced by head teachers in creating students' awareness.
  - Inadequate funds
  - Inadequate time
  - Inadequate training
  - Lack of coordination from MoE

- Strategies
  - Training of teachers and students
  - Regular inspection of schools
  - Purchasing safety equipment
  - Conduct regular fire and emergence drills
  - Integrating safety awareness in school routine

**Dependent variable**

- Implementation of Health and Safety Programs by head teachers
  - Prioritised safety policy for example gate, food etc.
  - Reinforced fencing policy
  - School bus fixed with speed governor
  - Constituted safety committee
  - Fire drill is done twice a term

*Figure 1.1: Conceptual Framework: Independent and dependent variables*

*Source: Researcher, 2015.*

The study was modeled on the conceptual framework involving the independent variables: government policies on Health and Safety standards in schools, challenges faced by head teachers in creating students' awareness and strategies used to enforce.
the Health and Safety programs. The model also presents the dependent variable which is implementation of the health and safety programs by the head teachers as diagrammatically represented in figure 1.11. A conceptual framework is a model of presentation where researchers represent the relationship between variables in a study and show the relationship graphically or diagrammatically. (Orodho ,2006)

The conceptual framework for this study provides an insight into the challenges faced by head teachers in the implementation of health and safety programs in public secondary schools in Mvita sub-county, Mombasa County. It diagrammatically presents the relationship between government policies, challenges faced by head teachers and strategies as the independent variables and head teachers' participation in the implementation of health and school safety programs as dependent variables in the study. School safety is determined by a composite of various variables. The government formulates various policies such as the Education Acts (2012), Public Health Act (1986), Public Works Building Regulation and the MOE Safety Standard Manual (2008) which give direction concerning safety in all educational institutions which must be adhered to ensure school safety. School administrators and in particular the head teachers who are the implementers of government policies should play their role fully and ensure that the MOE safety standards and guidelines are not only adhered but also fully implemented to prevent occurrence of disasters in schools. The head teachers must all the time comply with the provisions of the Education Act (Cap 211), the Ministry of Public Works Building Regulations especially in the development of the school physical infrastructure and as well as adhere to MOE.
Safety Standard Manual (2008). They should also embrace democratic leadership style in the governance of their institutions if they have to avoid security threatening activities in their schools through establishment of sound health and safety programs, establishment of schools' security committees and capacity building of staff members in safety issues through refresher courses.

In addition, the school management and more especially the head teacher is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that teachers, students and support staff are not only exposed to basic disasters management skills such as fire drills, but also involved in the provision of first aid kits, security lighting, and fire extinguishers. However, head teachers face many challenges as they play their role of implementing health and safety policies. Challenges such as inadequate funds, lack of time and support, inadequate resources have hindered their work of implementing safety programs in schools. If these challenges were addressed, then we would have safe schools and head teachers would be motivated to play their role effectively. By and large once safety standards and guidelines are implemented fully by the school management the end result is safe schools.
1.12 Operational Definitions of Terms

**Disaster:** Is a serious disruption of the functioning of a community or society, causing widespread human, material, or environmental losses which exceed the ability of the affected population to cope.

**Guidelines:** Recommended practices that schools in the study undertake to meet the safety standards suggested.

**Head teacher:** Lead teacher in public secondary school under study

**Health and Safety Programs:** Programs aimed at ensuring the Health and Safety of students

**Human-made Disasters:** Calamities caused by the actions of human beings either directly or indirectly, such as wild fires, accidental releases of oil, industrial accidents, pollutions, civil strife, among others.

**Implementation:** Process of putting Health and Safety programs into practice

**Learner:** A child between 13 and 18 years enrolled in public secondary schools under study.

**Natural Disasters:** Are calamities that occur without human causes, such as earthquakes, floods, landslides, volcanic eruptions etc.

**Physical Infrastructure:** Any constructed physical facility in public secondary school used to enhance implementation of the curriculum and Health and Safety standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>School as a Safe Zone:</strong></th>
<th>A legally designated identifiable physical space around the school that is a conducive environment for school children’s safety.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Safety:</strong></td>
<td>Measures undertaken by the entire school community and other stakeholders to either alleviate, prevent or eliminate risky conditions which may cause accidents or emotional and psychological distress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td>These include people or parties such as learners, staff, school committee members, parents, sponsors, NGOs supporting the school, local community, people in charge of security and so on who have specific roles in the running of public secondary schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard:</strong></td>
<td>The level of Quality achievement in relation to a School Safety standards such as environmental safety, quality water, safe buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste Disposal:</strong></td>
<td>Methods used in discarding or destroying items considered being of no value or items that are no longer useful in the school compounds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents detailed review of relevant studies and concepts such as importance of safety in schools and implementation of safety measures and responsibilities bestowed on different stakeholders, challenges faced and strategies are discussed. Finally, Research gaps and summary of the literature reviewed is presented.

2.2 Importance of Safety in Schools

Elliott (1998) postulate that it is a fundamental right of students and staff to engage in teaching and learning process in a safe school environment. The absence of safety in school does not guarantee high academic achievement. Similarly, according to California Constitution (2009), students have a constitutional right to learn in a safe and secure environment. Basically safety ensures learners get the most out of the learning process because it enables learning processes to continue without disruption, harm and danger. It’s actually the foundation for an effective learning environment. A safe school is one that is free from violent and criminal behaviors and allows staff, students and community members to feel connected to the school and able to participate in its major functions of teaching and learning. Violent or criminal behaviors put the school’s health and safety in jeopardy.

School safety is important because for any learning to take place, a child has to feel that he or she is in a safe environment. If their focus is on safety risky issues, their concentration is affected. The students and staff feel safe from any harm when there is safety in schools. Therefore, school authorities and parents should take their
responsibilities of ensuring safety in schools in order to avoid any forms of school abuse or violence such as assaults, bullying, fights, theft, sexual attacks, or use of a weapon. Safety enhances regularity and predictability in the environment and gives children freedom from fear and anxiety (Seifert, 1983). Safety strengthens participation, increases attention to the learning tasks, mental effort and benefits and to perseverance in the face of difficulty (Petty, 1998).

School safety requires all school stakeholders to keep constant vigilance and use school and community resources. When the school is the primary focus of school safety work, it can act as an anchor to mobilize internal and internal stakeholders, and maximize their effectiveness in developing a safe and successful school environment (Astor et al., 2004; Marzano, 2003). Safety is important because it provides administrators with the awareness of the need to know what is allowed, forbidden and acceptable actions in public secondary schools.

2.3 Implementation of Safety Measures by Different Stakeholders and particularly the head teachers.

Within the complex operation of schools in the 21st century, the principal plays a very vital role in bringing about school improvement and effectiveness. School leaders can make a difference in both the effectiveness and efficiency of schooling (Hallinger & Snidvongs, 2008). Consequently, there is need therefore, to ensure that the principal plays this role effectively through providing them with knowledge skills and attributes to enable them run schools effectively and efficiently.

According to the United States Department of Education, (2004) report on A School Survey on Crime and Safety (S.S.O.C.S), ninety percent of the schools reported zero tolerance policies for firearms, whereas visitors had to sign in before entering the
school compound in ninety-six percent of the schools. Further eight percent of the schools had a prohibiting policy that prevented students from leaving the school premises except at specified times while six percent hired policemen and other guards at schools where they kept vigil for thirty hours a week.

Based on the threat of terrorism, Cavanagh (2004) observes that implementation of school safety and security policies in European countries has been greatly influenced by school tragedies and near misses. He further indicates that since the 1993 school hostage crisis in France City of Neuilly-Sur-Seine, police authorities regularly coordinate security with school officials. Police collaborate with school authorities in working out security details of the schools. For instance, in Paris, the police control the entry points of the public schools.

The government as a player on safety implementation on its part has stipulated several safety measures in educational institutions through various legal instruments namely: The Education Act (2012), Public Health Act (Cap 242), Ministry of Public Works building and regulation standards and Children's Act 2001, (Republic of Kenya, 2008). The government also have appointed various task force to look into matters of safety. For instance, Wangai Report (2001) on student discipline and unrest in schools. Its main agenda was to look into incidents of student unrest in secondary schools and in view of the increasing concern over the declining rates of access, retention and completion of both primary and secondary levels. A commission of inquiry was appointed following the Bombululu Secondary School tragedy led by retired Bishop LawiL Mathiu.

In addition, the MoE has developed a school safety manual for use for all schools. The guidelines are aimed at improving the quality of education and training services.
The manual serve as a blueprint for enhancing the safety of schools in Kenya. Circulars too have been issued by the Ministry of Education. Following the Kyanguli Secondary School tragedy which took place on 27th March the Director of Education by then Mrs. Naomi Waangai wrote a circular reference G9/1/169 dated 10th April 2001 on Health and Safety Standards Guidelines in educational institutions. Other circulars on safety measures include G.9/1/VOL VII/28 of 20th March 2002 on Ban on Corporal punishment in learning institutions and circular No. 9/1/163 of 2nd July 1993 on Guidelines on Transport of School children (The Kenya Handbook for Teachers 2008).

A number of studies recognize the importance of using guidance and counselling in the running of schools. Such studies include Maithya (2009) who observes that guidance and counselling helps solve issues related to drugs abuse and other problems that face students. On the same note Nyaegah (2011) reports that there is sufficient evidence that counseling produce positive result even with difficult students. Positive results have also been reported by Kirui (2011). Wachura and Adhulas (2002) in Nyaegah (2011) also indicate that counseling had become something of a remedy for disruptive behavior in British schools.

A school counselor is an important resourceful person with a noble responsibility of guiding and supporting school children. They are closely connected (just like teachers) to students and also acting as liaison between students and internal and external resources that schools can provide to help the students. The school counsellors also help development of the relationship between the staff and students. Furthermore, they also help students to cope or overcome their emotional and psychological problems that may arise from prohibited behaviours such as bullying.
among others. Therefore, seen in this light, school counsellors have a very critical position in the enforcement of school safety norms in schools.

Above all the head teachers are key players to implementation of safety in schools. Kamunde (2010) concurs when he states that head teachers are critical to the successful implementation of reforms at the school level. Everybody, from the head of school to the maintenance staff should be involved in school safety. Safe schools are a shared responsibility with administrators, teachers, support staff, students, and parents (Mississippi Department of Education, 2008). Head teachers in particular are key actors as they are bestowed with much of the obligations pertaining to comprehensive school safety. The school administrators have a responsibility to ensure that the school environment is conducive for learning (Day & Golench, 1995).

To promote safety of students and staff in public schools most head teachers have used a variety of practices and procedures. This include controlling access to schools by locking and monitoring doors or gates, use of metal detectors, security cameras and conducting drug sweeps all done with a view of monitoring and restricting students and visitor’s behaviors on campus ((Dinker, Kemp, Baum and Syder, 2009). Other safety and security measures include: visitors signing in or checking in before entering the schools, wearing of badges or picture identity cards by students and faculty, providing codes of conduct for students.

Omolo (2010) found out that head teachers have done a lot to enhance the implementation of safety policies this includes: integrating safety activities into daily school routine (20%); regular inspection of school plant (36.6%); training staff on emergency preparedness (10%); purchasing the required safety equipment (50%)
and conducting regular emergency drills (3.33%). Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (QASOs) on the other hand have recommended compliant head teachers for promotion 50%, facilitated the provision of funds for purchase of safety equipment 50%, provided communication between stakeholders (50%) and another 50% has gone for regular in-service courses on safety implementation.

Regarding discipline in schools, Kiprop (2012) observes that principals’ role in schools is to maintain discipline. They effectively do this by setting tone and morale of the school and using their immense influence over teachers and students. The principals also provide leadership and spearhead the enforcement of the school safety and health of the students. In this regard, they provide forms and leadership by defining for themselves and staff what their acceptable loses will be in reference to the issue of school safety.

Onderi (2013) on regulated and strict school visitation policy, postulates that the policy controlled unwanted visitors into the school compound on any days except during visiting day. Further, the policy also limited food that is brought from outside save visiting days. This policy also controlled drug trafficking. The study also observes that parents/guardians were involved in monitoring students in regard to any involvement in unacceptable behaviours, for instance drug abuse. They also regularly visited schools to check on progress of their children. The schools also involved religious leaders especially church leaders and guest speakers in dealing with indiscipline cases. However, it is worth noting that ensuring school safety is a collective responsibility of all stakeholders and all must work together to build strong partnerships for sustainable safety.
2.4 Challenges in the Implementation of Safety in Schools

It is imperative of a school administration to provide a safe and orderly school environment. School safety requires planning and constant vigilance and has to be everyone's responsibility. Everybody, from the head of school to the maintenance staff should be involved in school safety. A comprehensive strategy should be employed to address school safety issues. This strategy should focus on prevention and response planning. Safe schools are a shared responsibility with administrators, teachers, support staff, students, and parents (Mississippi Department of Education, 2008). Administrators in particular are key actors as they are bestowed with much of the obligations pertaining to comprehensive school safety. The school administrators have a responsibility to ensure that the school environment is conducive for learning (Day & Golench, 1995).

In the process of discharging this responsibility, head teachers encounter many challenges in line of their duties. They include conflicts and indiscipline among students and challenges regarding financial management. However, the challenges make some principals resilient and prepare them on how to solve future problems of the same nature. This is in accordance with Cunningham and Cordeiro (2006) who note that challenges help leaders to acquire knowledge, growth, order and renewal. This gives head teacher's strength and impetus to undertake their duties effectively, but to a large extent they hinder most of them from being effective in their work.

Tromp (1987) in his study in Ohio, United States established that 16.5% of principals indicated that resistance to change was one of the major challenges that hampered change in implementation and resistance to change was noted among 64% of the principals camouflaged under attitudes. Implementation to safety policy is
about change of several aspects to enhance safety and where there is resistance little or nothing is achieved regarding implementation.

Stroud, Stallings and Korbusieski (2006) study on the implementation of science laboratory safety program in North Carolina Schools indicated that laboratory safety is one area that knowledge of the facility requirements is vital. They observed that nearly 60% of principals had low knowledge in science laboratory safety such as types of goggles and maintenance requirements for eyewashes and showers. In such circumstances, school principals would fail to implement laboratory safety to the letter hence compromising students’ safety.

Elberlein (2009) study regarding “incidents and accidents” in implementing the safety regulations prescribed by South African schools concluded that the Department of Education inadequately supported schools regarding assessment, monitoring and training on school safety legislature. Safety policy implementation requires skills and continued assessment and monitoring to ensure the right procedures are followed in the implementing processes however such limited support was a challenge to the school management.

Uganda has had several of boarding secondary school fire disasters where lives and property has been lost. An inspection report on by the Ministry of Education (MOE) shortly after St Leo Junior Academy in Masaka District, revealed that 50% of secondary schools failed to implement the set minimal operational, safety and security guidelines. Although the Directorate of Education Standards is mandated to carry out inspection at least once in a year, the report indicated that the inspectors were overwhelmed with departmental workload and insufficient resources (Ssenkabirwa, 2012). The fact that school inspectors failed to carry out regular
inspection as required provided an opportunity for school management to fail in implementation of safety and security guidelines in boarding secondary schools in Uganda.

On the state of student discipline in public secondary schools in Kenya, Kiumi (2012) observe that incidences of violent behavior are widespread and frequent. The most common forms of violent behavior range from name calling, physical assault to sexual abuse (Dunne et al., 2010).

The principals face diverse challenges which include intimidation/interference from school sponsors, widespread insecurity issues especially linked to students’ unrest, inadequate responses and qualified teachers and drug abuse. Some of these challenges have grown in intensity and frequency over the years; for instance, in Kenya in 2007, 300 secondary schools were closed.

Wainaina (2012) study on safety measures in secondary schools in Kikuyu district, Kiambu County Kenya established that lack of funds and capacity building was major barriers principals faced in implementation of safety policy. She observed that safety policy implementation requires major modifications of the existing buildings, acquisition of safety equipments such as fire-fighting equipment, and fitting besides capacity building for school community. Inadequate finance has also been noted by Kamunde (2010). The budgetary allocation by the BOG to security issues is below 10% of the total school budgets; only one case allocated 40% of its budget to security management.

Omolo and Simatwa (2010) study of the assessment of the implementation of safety policies in public secondary schools in Kisumu East and West Districts, Kenya
revealed that 86.67% of head teachers decried inadequate funds, 26.67% lack of skills and 6.67% poor coordination from the MOE regarding safety policy issuance. The study further established that 100% of QASOs cited lack of cooperation from head teachers and negative perceptions towards QASOs’ assessment and Monitoring and Evaluation reports. The same views are shared by Otieno et al (2010), who report that the Principal Wayaga secondary school contends that most schools are poor and cannot afford fire extinguishers.

Kukali’s (2010) study revealed that financial resources and its management were cited as factors influencing implementation of safety policy in secondary schools. The category of teachers and QASOs argued that funds may be adequate but management was wanting. To this end, safety policy implementing was not a priority after all. Kiprop (2012) attributes lack of dialogue between school administration and students as a cause of indiscipline in public secondary schools in Kenya. Further Sungtone (2007) observes that disharmonious relationship among teachers and students impacts negatively on the teaching and learning processes in the schools. Thus, the principals should pay special attention to their relationship with teachers and students. The principal should display effective leadership and governance since the latter turns the school to a place of safety and effective learning as compared to schools being centers of violence and disruption. Such leadership is based on firmness, fairness and consistent discipline (Sungtong, 2007 and Kiprop, 2012). Therefore, a safe and disciplined environment in school is critical to effective teaching and learning.

The principals lack adequate healthcare and nutrition. It is observed that good provision of healthcare and nutrition enhance effective learning process. However,
malnutrition and hunger make learners ineffective. The main cause being high poverty levels among the households. Malnutrition may make learners very susceptible to accidents which is compounded by effects of drug and substance abuse among learners. Further the principals also have another responsibility of dealing with dynamic educational policies, curricular and emerging issues such as HIV/AIDS which have negative impact on learners and school community in general. In addition, it is worth to note that principals’ in Kenya are not well prepared to overcome challenges and issues associated with ethnic diversity (Makori, 2004 in Rarieya, 2007). This is in contrary to Harris’ (2003) observation that school administrators are viewed as problem solvers in their schools. This is based on the fact that knowledge and problem solving skills are not innate, but rather learnt through preparation and development of principals.

Drug abuse menace is increasing among learners especially in Mombasa county. Predisposing factors include urge to act grown up, urge to conform to peers/others, influence of family members, media and negative peer influence. Effects of this include poor mental health, violence, withdrawal symptoms health conditions, anxiety and suicidal tendencies and ultimately declining of academic performance of learners.

There are very few leadership seminars and workshops. Most of the seminars and workshops which were available were subject based ones. Kirui (2011) found out that only 37% of school heads had attended any security management course as compared to 21.4% of Board of Governors members and 40% of security guards. This indicated that most school heads and B.O.G members who are responsible for
making decision concerning security may be approaching security issues ignorantly and thereby endangering life and property.

Most schools lack the necessary equipment to implement safety in their schools. It can be noted that there are a number of schools that are still lagging behind in terms of fire drills. For instance, in Kenya, most schools are not ready to deal with fires. Akali 2011 and Otieno 2006 report that fire extinguishers in strategic places such as offices, laboratories, stores are very few and that those available are not frequently serviced for their effectiveness. They further observe that 15.4% of the schools investigated had teachers qualified in disaster preparedness whereas 45% of the prefects can operate a fire extinguisher. On the same note, Ndiangui, Ocharo and Njoka (2006) note that schools lack disaster preparedness plans such as fire drills, first aid kits, basic training on security, fire extinguishers in key areas and emergence exits. The studies further observe that 63% of the principals, view TV/Video shows as sources of insecurity in schools. However, 48.1% of the principals provide TV/Video entertainment shows to their students. This scenario indicates that students are not given crucial skills to help them avoid activities that create insecure environment in schools and yet schools are supposed to be institutions where students learn practical skills of socialization.

Further, about 82% of the schools reported that they do not have qualified security personnel. However, findings from the security guard interviews reveal that 40% of the respondents reported having trained as security guards while 50% had previously worked as security guards before joining the school. This means that some schools hire security personnel with no formal training or experience and this may affect the professionalism with which they approach their work. Most of school heads (67%)
were of the opinion that their security guards are not well remunerated and motivated. This implies that the schools are aware that they do not pay their workers well probably due to budgetary constraints. However, unsatisfied guards are likely to compromise security by being sloppy, engaging in other money making ventures such as supplying drugs to students or even colluding with criminals. Few school heads meet their security personnel monthly (37%), weekly (33.3%), daily (18.5%), yearly (7.4%) and never (3.7%). This needs improvement to allow proper actions at the right time and promptly. To this end, implementing of safety policy was not a priority after all. While these studies addressed various aspects of school safety, none of them looked at challenges faced by head teachers in implementing Health and Safety policy in public secondary schools Mvita sub-county, Mombasa and more so health challenges considering that there is a lot of food hawking in schools in Mombasa.

2.5 Strategic Options for the Implementation of Health and Safety Programs in Secondary Schools

Studies by Makoa (2004) on implementing HIV/AIDS policy in Lesotho and Kiniale (2000) cited in Musomi (2008) indicated that implementation process not only called for investment and expenditure but also for attitudinal and institutional change. Head teachers are charged with the responsibility of changing attitudes of the collaborative group and creating awareness that leads to teamwork. The school management must work out ways and means to change school community attitudes towards safety policy implementation through PTA meetings, education/academic days in school and ensure health standards are implemented to the letter. She called on the government together with other stakeholders to provide adequate funding for the implementation of safety policy.
In Australian schools, communication and distribution of information are fundamental to effectively executing safety programs. Most schools post their emergency management plans on the school’s website and intranet; some schools use emergency management information as screen savers and wallpaper. As a result, the information is easily accessible to everyone. They conduct regular meetings with all stakeholders to ensure that information is given to all, and that resolutions are clear to everyone. Usual channels of disseminating information such as bulletin board notices, home newsletters and announcements at school assemblies are effective in communicating safety related messages to the school and community.

In Uganda, Lulua (2008) observes that Safe Schools Contract (SCC) is one of the interventions aimed at strengthening the roles of teachers, pupils, parents in order to enhance quality learning environment in schools. This is done through the Ministry of Education and Sports collaborating with USAID whereby more than two hundred schools were introduced to SCC so as to enhance Safety in schools. The stakeholders do identify Safety issues in schools and come up with ways of improving safety of children. The study further reports that many of the people who were displaced in 2008 when Uganda experienced insecurity were school-going children. This is because many schools' infrastructure was destroyed. In regard to this 82% of the school principals initiated security management measures in schools. For instance, about 60% of schools, have suggestion boxes, through which students air their grievances, hence enhance communication between students and school administration concerning any safety issues among others and finally the study also reveals that 67% of schools have initiated Safety Programmes while 88.8% of them face implementation challenges.
Migiro (2012) study findings regarding the implementation of safety standards in public secondary schools in Borabu District Nyamira County, Kenya recommended that schools form safety committees, train staff on disaster management and involve the community in school safety programs. The study further recommended that the MOE should up their program on assessment.

According to Mutulis and Oketch (2009), 70% of fire in Kenyan institutions is associated with electric short circuits and this forms basis for the need to use specialists in wiring. To end this, one of the strategies to curb frequent school fires caused by electric faults was for schools to seek for professionals/experts such as individual electricians or companies such as Kenya Power Limited. Kukali (2010) study established that most schools were trying to discourage students carrying lanterns to school for use in dormitories as that was risk. Schools therefore tried to install electricity as a measure to minimize fire disasters.

According to Pudo (1998) students and generally the youth in the society should engage in constructive activities such as drama, sports, music, church activities, reading good books and magazines to avoid being lured into drugs in their idleness. Thus, these recreational activities should be strengthened in learning institutions. On interventions concerning students discipline Kirui (2011) observes that almost (89.9%) had a guidance and counseling department but slightly more than 40% of these departments are run by teachers who are not qualified in guidance and counseling. In order to create awareness on school safety needs, schools should conduct training of staff and students on how to prevent violence in order to improve preparedness; schools should not over depend on reactive policies and legislation at the expense of pro-active programs that seek to involve other stakeholders like
community in management of students' discipline and schools should take into account issues of safety when designing environmental and architectural designs (Rono, 2013). These studies hardly addressed strategies in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County Mombasa, a gap that the study attempted to fill.

As an efficient administrator the principal should systematize all the school possessions to sustain and advance education. Endow with decision-making control. Be able to connect appraisal and control to educator professional improvement. Bestow authority to educators by allowing them to take part when decisions are being made pertaining to all the plans inclusive of disaster management (Kimenyi & Thuo, 2011).

2.6 Research Gap

The safety standards manual for schools in Kenya (2008) also describes safe schools as schools with adequate physical facilities which include classrooms, offices, toilets, dormitories, libraries, laboratories, and kitchen and playground equipment. They can be either permanent or temporary. It is imperative that these physical facilities should be appropriate, adequate, properly located and devoid of any risks to the users (in this case students). Further, they should comply with provisions of the Education Act (Revised 2012), Public Health Act (Cap 242) and Ministry of Public Works Building Regulations on Standards. However, the challenge(s) facing implementation of school safety and strategies to mitigate them have not been given much attention, particularly in Mvita Sub-county in Mombasa County. Therefore, the present study sought to explore challenges that the head teachers face in implementation of health and safety strategies in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County in Mombasa County.
2.7 Summary of Literature Review

From the foregoing discussion, it is clear that the government on its part has come up with several safety measures in educational institutions through various legal instruments namely: The Education Act (Cap 211), Public Healthy Act (Cap 242), Ministry of Public Works building and regulation standards and Children's Act 2001, (Republic of Kenya, 2008).

In addition, the MOE has developed a school safety manual for use for all schools. The guidelines are envisaged to improve the quality of education and training services. The manual serves as a blueprint for enhancing the safety of schools in Kenya. It is very clear that any school that ignores these aspects of learner safety may inflict considerable damage to the physical, social and mental health of school going children.

The literature review also reveals that Kenya has a long history of tragedies and disasters that have hit schools especially in the last decade. These have led to damage of property, injuries, and loss of precious lives. The tragedies and disasters are caused by internal or external factors. Internal factors emanate from within the school while external factors are basically from outside the school.

Despite the government efforts, the available literature revealed that most schools have no capacity to handle emergencies, and are yet to implement Safety Standards Manual produced five years ago (Agwenyi, 2010) hence some schools are sitting on a time bomb should there be an emergency. Certain schools require renovation, electricity, water and sanitation facilities. Priority health safety and security needs include more permanent classrooms, toilets, electricity and fencing.
Schools are found to lack play grounds, school based health initiatives and basics such as first aid Kits. The persistent health and safety problems in public secondary schools raise serious questions that need urgent solutions. The solutions should be sought to avoid future recurrence of the same. Therefore, based on this premise the study sought to examine the issues of school health and safety with a view to establishing the challenges faced by head teachers in implementation of health and safety programs in Mvita sub-county, Mombasa County.

Studies including (Simatwa, 2007), Gicheru (1998), Kirui et, al, (2011) among others have been carried out under different topics on school safety in Kenya but none has been done on the challenges faced by head teachers in implementation of health and safety programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County in Mombasa County. In Kenya the issue of safety is still new compared to developed countries where it's a way of life. This study undertook the challenge to explore challenges that principals encounter in public secondary schools in Mvita sub-county Mombasa with an aim of benefitting educational institutions and come up with recommendations and policies which might be adapted to enhance implementation and effectiveness.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter research design and methodology used in the study is discussed. Locale, target population, sampling techniques, sample size, research instruments, validation procedures, measurement of reliability, data collection and analysis and ethical issues that the study adopted.

3.2 Research Design

The study employed descriptive survey research to find out the challenges faced by the head teachers in the implementation of Health and Safety programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County. The design was appropriate for the study since it guided detailed examination of the challenges faced by the head teachers in implementation of Health and safety programs. This is in line with Mugenda & Mugenda (1999) observation that surveys are excellent vehicles for collecting original data for the purpose of studying the attitudes and orientations of a very large population. Descriptive design guided collection of data from head teachers and students (respondents) and analysis of data on implementation of Health and Safety programs in secondary schools. This in accordance with observation made by Cohen & Manion 1987, Gall, Borg & Gall (1996), Wiersma & Jurs (2005) that descriptive survey design purposely is used to provide detailed description of a phenomenon.

In this study, government policies, challenges in creating awareness in students and strategies employed were identified as independent variables. Implementation of safety standards was the dependent variable. The government formulates policies which give direction concerning implementation of safety programmes in all
educational institutional which must be adhered to. However, head teachers face a lot of challenges as they implement health and safety policies. Challenges such as inadequate funds among have hindered their work of implementation. If these challenges were addressed by putting in place effective strategies, we would have safe schools.

3.2.1 Variables
The present study was based on the independent and dependent variables. The independent variables included government policies, challenges in creating student’s awareness and strategies employed to overcome the challenges. On the other hand, the dependent variable was implementation of Health and Safety standards in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-county. The indicators of dependent variable included reinforced fencing policy, prioritized safety policy in regard to gate, food, school bus, safety sub-committee and fire drills while indicators of independent variables included challenges faced by head teachers, strategies and government policies among others.

3.3 Study Location
The study was conducted in selected public secondary schools in Mvita sub-county in Mombasa County. Mvita Sub-county has 13 registered public secondary schools. Public secondary schools, for the purposes of this study, included all the 13 secondary schools which were sampled for the study. Mvita Sub-county was selected since it has strategic infrastructure, distribution of schools and human resource appropriate for the implementation of health and safety programmes. It was also familiar and accessible to the researcher thus, facilitated distribution of data collection instrument. Mvita public secondary have issues revolving around
implementation of Health and safety programs (Mvita Sub-County Education Report, 2015). There being no other research on implementation of Health and Safety programs in secondary schools, there is need for documentation of information in this locale.

3.4 Target Population

Sekaran (2003) defines target population as entire group of people, events or things of interest to investigate. Therefore, the present study’s target population was 13 registered public schools from which respondents (head teachers and students) were selected. It is worth to note that majority of Mombasa schools are day schools with few scattered boarding schools and that student population in these schools is estimated to be 8,750 while teacher’s population is estimated to be 560 (MOE, 2001).

3.5 Sample and Sampling Technique

A sample is a small part of anything which is intended to stand for or represent the whole, Wellington (2000). Orodho (2005) says that, sampling is a process of selecting a sub-set of cases and draw conclusion from the active set. The schools under study were categorized into 1 Girls’ Boarding, 5 Girls’ Day, 6 Boys ‘Day and 1 mixed Day school hence 8 in total. All these categories formed different strata from which the schools for the study were selected from as indicated in table 3:1. The researcher picked all the two schools in the categories of mixed day and Girl’s boarding since they were few in number. These two categorized schools represented 15% of all the public secondary schools in Mvita Sub County. For the category of Boys’ Day schools three schools were sampled randomly through balloting out of the 6 schools available hence representing 23% of all public secondary schools in
Mvita Sub County. Three schools out of the total 5 representing 23% of all secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County were sampled from the category of Girls’ day schools. Wisker (2001) suggests that a fraction of at least 20% of the total population is acceptable. The 8 selected schools from the four categories in this study represent 62% of the total population of public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County.

Table 3.1: Study Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Category</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys day</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls boarding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 8 principals represent 62% of the total number of principals in the Sub County formed the study sample of the principals. The average population of the students in the schools is 2000. According to Kothari (2007) 10% of the student’s population will form a sample worth representing the views of the rest of the population. The researcher used purposive sampling to select 200 students from the sampled schools and who were available during the time of this study. Thus, a total of 200 students representing 10% of the total population of students were selected as respondents in the present study.
3.6 Research Instruments

The Study used questionnaires as the main instrument of data collection. The researcher designed questionnaires for both principals and students and covered all the study objectives so as to collect adequate data. Orodho (1999) notes that a questionnaire collects large amount of information within a reasonably short time, ensures anonymity, permit use of standardized questions and have uniform procedures and are easy to complete. The instruments contained both open and closed ended items. This included background information, implementation of Health and Safety programs, challenges by head teachers in creating awareness in students concerning health and safety and strategies employed. They were administered to the head teachers and students. The researcher used questionnaires since they are instruments that gather data from a large sample, besides it was the best way to uphold confidentiality and cover wide area Kombo et al (2006). The questionnaires also act as the best tool for collecting comprehensive information about a particular case, Orodho (2005). The researcher also used questionnaires because they are easy to fill and collects much data within short time the researcher had for this study. Since design is descriptive, it collected quantitative data which the questionnaires provided.

3.7 Pilot Study

A pilot study was carried out two weeks prior to the actual study. The researcher conducted a pilot study in order to establish the reliability of the questionnaires that were used in the study (Bell, 1993) observes that piloting is one way of checking the reliability of instruments. The piloting was done with an identical sample population at Makupa Boys and Makande Girls secondary schools which had similar characteristics with the sampled schools in the actual study. Pilot study involved a
small sample of three respondents, that is, four students and two principals. The researcher visited the schools to administer the questionnaires to the respondents and collected them immediately they were duly filled. Piloting provided a good opportunity for the researcher to identify any weakness in the instruments, also the researcher used piloting to check the length of time taken to fill the questionnaire, Bell (2005) and to find out if the anticipated data analysis techniques were appropriate. After piloting, the researcher modified the instruments by changing items that were not clear and deleting unnecessary ones before conducting the actual study. The respondents who participated in the pilot study were excluded in the actual study.

3.7.1 Validity of the Instrument

The instruments that were used to collect data were validated to ensure that they measure what they purport to measure (Best & Khan, 2000). In this study, results of content validity were arrived at through the outcome and comments of the pilot study which was conducted in one of the schools selected through random sampling. Consultations with the supervisors were done in order to establish the content validity. Content validity was used to check whether the questionnaire contents measured what they are intended to measure. The researcher identified items that were inadequate in collecting data.

3.7.2 Measurement of Instrument Reliability

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent result or data after repeated trials. Best and Khan (2001), define reliability as the level of internal consistency or stability
researcher presented questionnaires to the respondents in the schools. The respondents had the options of filling the questionnaires on the spot or drop and pick later. The study recorded hundred percent response making data collected acceptable as (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003) observes that a response rate of 60% is good and 70% or more is even better for a social research like the current study.

3.9 Data Analysis Procedures

Data analysis began first by checking if all the questionnaires were obtained back. Editing of the gathered raw information contained in the completed questionnaires for accuracy, usefulness and completeness followed. Orndho (2005), say that this process involves classifying collected data into some purposeful and usable categories. The organized data was subjected to analysis using descriptive statistics: mean, percentages and frequencies which were presented in tables, graphs and pie charts. All objectives had quantitative data. These were based on the dependent variables; the implementation of health and safety programs and the independent variables; government policies, challenges and strategies.

4.10 Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations in this study operationally refer to the issues regarding the research ethics that the study put into consideration. The researcher also established rapport with the principals in the respective schools by visiting their respective sampled schools to make her research intention known to the respondents. Each respondent was issued with an introductory letter personally by the researcher. Those who could not be reached especially principals, the researcher emailed the letter to them. The letter detailed purpose of the study and anticipated results. The respondents' confidentiality was guaranteed; for instance, names of the respondents were not disclosed anywhere in the questionnaire.
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4.1 Introduction

This chapter describes quantitative presentations and analyses of collected data. The data was collected from 208 respondents comprising 8 principals and 200 students from the selected public secondary schools. To find out how head teachers implements Health and Safety Programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County, Mombasa, to identify challenges faced by head teachers in creating students’ awareness of Health and Safety Programs, and to establish major strategies head teachers employ to enhance the implementation of Health and Safety Programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub County. In addition the research questions that the study sought to answer are stated as follows: what ways do head teachers use to implement Health and Safety Programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County?, what challenges are faced by head teachers in creating students’ awareness of Health and Safety Programs in secondary schools and what major strategies do the head teachers employ in order to ensure implementation of health and safety programs in secondary schools in Mvita Sub- County? Therefore, based on the objectives, the analyses were presented under the following sub-sections: Demographic description of the study sample, ways of implementing Health and safety programs, challenges faced in creating students’ awareness of Health and Safety programs, and strategies used in implementation of Health and Safety programs.
4.2 Demographic Description of Study Sample

4.2.1 Response Rates

Out of the study sample of 8 head teachers and 200 students sampled only 7 and 190 from each sampled school responded to the questionnaires therefore giving return rate of 87.5% and 95% respectively. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), 60% of the respondents are acceptable in research for data analysis.

4.2.2 Demographic Characteristics of Head Teachers

First, the researcher sought to find information on gender of the participants who took part in the study. The descriptive statistics analysis indicated that 85.7% of the head teacher respondents were female while 14.3% were male. This implies that most of head teachers were female as such there was no gender balance of these respondents in the study. Thus, from these findings the study concluded that the implementation of safety programs was being carried out by female teachers as compared to male head teachers and that there is large gender parity among the head teachers. This could imply that there are more Girls’ than Boys’ secondary schools in Mvita sub county.

Second, regarding the academic level of the head teachers, the analysis revealed that 71.4% of the head teachers possessed Bachelor of Education degree (B. ED) while 28.6% of them had Master of Education (M. ED) degree. This can be interpreted to mean that majority of the head teachers in Mvita Sub County possess higher academic qualifications. Thus they are academically knowledgeable to enable them implement Health and Safety standards manual as per the MOE’s guidelines.
Third, on the experience of the head teachers, the findings showed that 42.9% of the participants had been schools principals between 6-10 years, 28.6% of them were both been schools principals between 11-15 years and 16-20 years. This means that most of the schools in Mvita Sub-County were led by very experienced principals.

4.2.3 Demographic Characteristics of Student Respondents

The researcher also sought to establish the gender of the student respondents the analysis showed that 51.6% of the students were male while 48.4% were female. This indicates that both genders were given equal opportunity in regard to gender of student respondents, the analysis showed that 51.6% of the student respondents were male while 48.4% were female. This indicates that both genders were given equal opportunity to participate in the study.

4.3 Implementation of Health and Safety Programs by the Head Teachers

This section analyzes information from the head teachers on how they implement Health and Safety Programs in their respective public secondary schools. This is in accordance with objective one of the study. After subjecting data to descriptive statistics analysis, the results are discussed in the following sub-sections. Note that each sub-section focuses on specific ways through which head teachers use to implement Health and Safety programs.

4.3.1 Registration of Visitors

The study sought to find out information from the head teachers about whether the schools had a policy of registering visitors, the findings are as indicated in table 4.1.
Table 4.1: Registration of Visitors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agreed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Head teachers’ Study Questionnaire

From table 4.1 the results show that 20% of the head teachers strongly agreed with the idea of registering visitors which was an item in the questionnaire presented to them while 80% of them merely agreed with it. This indicates that the safety of students in most schools from outsiders was catered for and this is commendable as it is in line with the current directive from the Government on safe guarding the institutions of learning. These results can also imply that majority of the schools in Mvita Sub-County had complied with this safety guideline therefore creating a safe environment for both learners and staff. This is in agreement with Dinker, Kemp, Baun and Syder (2010), who advocate for monitored gate, that is, visitors to sign in before accessing school buildings this promotes safety of students and staff.

4.3.2 Registration of Schools’ Land

The study sought to obtain information on whether registration of the school’s land has been registered as a way of implementing safety standards in school. The findings are as indicated in table 4.2 below.
### Table 4.2: Registration of schools’ Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Teachers’ Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agreed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Head teachers’ Study Questionnaire**

From table 4.2 the results indicate that 42.9% of the head teachers both strongly agreed and agreed that the schools’ land had been registered while 14.3% of them disagreed. This can be interpreted to imply that most of the schools had legal documents of land ownership. However, only 14.3% had not registered schools’ land hence not having title deeds. This implies that some schools have not complied with this guideline. This is contrary as noted in the background information with the Commission of Inquiry in the Education System (2000), which recommended that ownership of the school or institution land be established before educational institutions may be run. It is important therefore for such schools to liaise with the Ministry of Lands or any relevant authority to secure ownership of the land on which they stand. The boards of management of these schools should make sure that all schools’ lands are registered for the purpose of avoiding land grabbing.

### 4.3.3 Regular Health Inspection of School Premises and Students

The study further sought to find information on whether or not there was regular health inspection of premises and students. The results are presented in table 4.3.
Table 4.3: Regular Health Inspection of Premises and Students: Existence of Regular Inspection of schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agreed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 7 100

Source: Head teachers’ Study Questionnaire

It is observed in table 4.3 that 14.3% and 71.4% of the head teachers strongly agreed and agreed respectively that there was regular health inspection of premises and students whereas 14.3 % of head teachers strongly disagreed that there was regular health inspection of school premises and students. Thus, based on these results it could be deduced that majority of schools in Mvita Sub County in Mombasa County were concerned with safety of learners. This is in line with observation made by Omolo (2010) that school safety policies require that premises and students be inspected at least once a year. The findings provided evidence that a significant number of schools are inspected each year, but a few go uninspected. The failure to inspect schools may impact negatively on safety and security matters in such schools. Therefore, there is need to sensitize other schools on the importance of the safety of learners. Head teachers of Schools that have not been inspected should invite officers from the District Quality Assurance and Standards office to conduct inspections. Inspection reports are a useful starting point for school safety needs assessments.
4.3.4 Window Status in Schools

Regarding status of the windows in schools, the head teachers were requested to give their views whether or not windows in the schools were without grills and wire mesh for the purpose of addressing emergency outlets. They were either to indicate whether they strongly agree, agree or strongly disagree. The findings are indicated in Table 4.4

Table 4.4: Window Status in Schools Windows reinforced with grills/wire mesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agreed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Head teachers’ Study Questionnaire

The results in table 4.4 showed that 42.9% of the respondents strongly agreed and 14.3% agreed that windows in schools were with grills and wire mesh for the purpose of addressing emergency outlets. However, 42.9% of them disagreed with the statement. This could be an indication of some schools adhering to the Ministry of Public Works building regulations and standards and Education Act revised 2012 which state that all grills and wire mesh fixed on the windows should be removed. Another implication of these results is that the safety guideline has been partially implemented in most schools and therefore creating a risky situation to the occupants of such facilities in case of an emergency. The results are in support of Omolo (2010) who revealed that 50% of secondary schools in Kisumu East and West Districts had successfully implemented the policy requirement windows and doors to open outwards and be without grills.
Emergency exits are essential as they provide alternative exits during emergency. It is the opinion of the researcher that schools which have not implemented this guideline could be advised to comply with the guideline. This is in agreement with Ngige (2010), who reported that Fr. Wambugu Dormitory at Endarasha Boys Secondary School where two boys met their untimely death had its windows fitted with grills and wire mesh which made it difficult for the students to have ample escape routes. According to the findings conducted in Kisumu East and West districts, over 55% of the schools had elected emergency doors, where by the researcher recommended that the achievement be replicated in other schools, (Omollo 2010). Lack of emergency exits in school buildings exposed the users of the school buildings to danger in case of disasters, MOE (2008).

4.3.5 Reinforced Fencing Mechanism and Secure Gate

Regarding the security in schools, the head teachers were asked either to strongly agree of strongly disagree regarding existence of reinforced fencing mechanism or secure gate in schools. Table 4.5 illustrates results of the findings.

Table 4.5: Reinforced Fencing Mechanism and Secure Gate: Existence of Reinforced mechanism and secure gate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agreed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Head teachers’ Study Questionnaire
From table 4.5 the results indicate that 71.4% of the head teachers (respondents) strongly agreed that there was reinforced fencing mechanism and secure gate in school and 28.6% of them strongly disagreed. These findings show that the majority of the schools had put in place mechanism of security, however, the schools’ head teachers, that is, 28.6% of them should construct reinforced fencing and gates so as to provide security to the students. This would mean an indication of compliance with Safety guidelines contained in Education Act revised 2012. Omollo (2010) posits that while fences are not 100% tamperproof, they define the extent of the school land and act as a deterrent to intruders. It is worth to note that without this fencing mechanism, the students would be exposed to physical danger. This observation is an agreement to observation made by Nderitu (2009); Omolo (2010) and Kirui 2011) who observe that most schools had made some effort to fence their schools compound with only one entry point. However, the few schools which had not implemented this safety guideline should prioritize fencing as an agenda in school due to its sensitive nature. Head teachers have a basic requirement to safely contain children under their care during school hours and at night. This cannot take place when schools have no fence or have weak and inadequate fences prone to intrusion.

4.3.6 Installation of Fire-Fighting Equipment

This study sought to find out from head teachers information on the installation of fire-fighting equipment as a way of implementing Safety programs in their schools. Their responses inform’ of either I strongly agree, agree or strongly disagree were analyzed as indicated in Table 4.6.
Table 4.6: Installation of Fire-Fighting Equipment: Existence of installation of firefighting equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agreed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Head teachers’ Study Questionnaire

From table 4.6 the findings show that both 40% of the head teachers strongly agreed and agreed that there were installations of fire-fighting equipment. However, 20% of them strongly disagreed. In this regard the study deduced that quite a number of schools were prepared in firefighting. However, the secondary schools headed by the 20% of the head teachers need to be installed with fire-fighting equipment as reported by Akali and Otieno (2011). Having fire extinguishers and training staff on how to use them is one important precaution against fire related disasters. These findings agreed with those of Gikandi, Ogutu and Obwocha (2006) who reported that while some schools had installed fire extinguishers at strategic places like dormitories study rooms and administrative block, others had not done this. The provision of fire extinguishers in most schools is a step in the right direction; however, there is need to keep them serviceable. As Makabila, Ayodo and Ringa (2006) found out, a majority of boarding schools have old fire extinguishers, which had not been serviced. This puts to doubt their usefulness in a fire outbreak.
4.3.7 Setting up of Safety Sub-Committees

The study sought from head teacher’s information on the existence of school safety committees and the findings are as indicated in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Head teachers’ Response on Safety Sub-Committees: Existence of Safety Sub-committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agreed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Head teachers’ Study Questionnaire

The findings in Table 4.7 show that 40% and 20% of the head teachers strongly agreed and agreed respectively that schools had safety sub-committees, 40% of them strongly disagreed.

This may imply that most of head teachers had involved other staffs in implementation of Safety Standards in schools and that 40% of the head teachers who strongly disagreed to the idea of the existence of safety committees in schools should set them up. This also confirms the findings by Nderitu (2009) that most schools had not established schools’ safety committees. Thus if the safety committees are set up in schools, vulnerability of schools to possible disasters will be reduced.
4.3.8 Provision of Source of Water in schools

Concerning ways of ensuring safety of water used in schools, the researcher sought the head teachers to provide information on the main source of water for students in schools. The findings were as indicated in Table 4.8 below.

Table 4.8: Source of water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Teachers response on piped water</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Teachers response on Rain harvested</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Teachers response on water from borehole</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Head teachers’ Study Questionnaire
As indicated in Table 4.8 the analysis of the head teachers’ data shows that 71.4% of the head teachers reported piped water as the main source of water for their schools. Majority of the head teachers 85.7% identified rain harvested water as the major source of water in their schools. In addition, 100% of the head teachers identified boreholes as main source of water in their schools. Thus, from the findings it may be concluded that most schools depend on piped water for use hence safe water supply.

Regarding selling of other food stuffs in schools, the participants were required to state if schools allowed selling of other food stuffs. The findings are as indicated in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Head Teachers’ Response on Selling of other food stuffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Head teacher’s Study Questionnaire

The findings in Table 4.9 indicates that 71.4% of the head teachers indicated that their schools sold food stuffs, besides the food offered to students through the feeding program, 28.6% of them said that they did not allow selling of food stuffs within the school. It is worthwhile to note that allowing selling of other food stuffs other than the official school menu can easily lead to possibilities of food poisoning due to the fact that such foods do not receive very serious monitoring.
4.4 Challenges Head Teachers Face in Creating Students' Awareness of Health and Safety Programs in Schools

In regard to the second objective of the study: to identify challenges head teachers face in creating Students' Awareness of Health and Safety Programs in Schools, the study sought student respondents to provide information on their response to Safety and Health programs and the findings are discussed as follows:

4.4.1 Students' Response on Safety Standards Manual for School

The study sought information on students' awareness of Safety Standards manual from the Ministry of Education for schools. Their responses were analyzed and findings indicated in Table 4.10 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Students' Study questionnaire

The findings in Table 4.10 indicates that 34.7% of the students confirmed that they had come across the safety standards manual for school from the Ministry of Education while as 65.3% of them had not. This is contrary to the Ministry of Education policy which requires that all schools have a copy and implement the standard and guidelines to prevent occurrence of disasters. Therefore, based on these results it can be deduced that some schools were not aware of the manual and therefore may not be implementing the safety standards and guidelines.
4.4.2 Students' Response on Awareness of the Presence of Safety Committee

The study also sought from the students on their response on whether they were aware of the presence of Safety Committee in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County. They were subjected to Yes/No item in the questionnaire and the results are as indicated in Table 4.11

Table 4.11: Students' Response on Awareness of the Presence of Safety Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Students' Study Questionnaire

From Table 4.11 results indicate that 36.8% of the students said in affirmative that they were aware of the presence of the safety committee in schools while 63.2% of them said they were not aware.

Thus, the study concluded that most schools had not constituted Safety Committees to identify the safety needs of the school or had not communicated the same to the students making them vulnerable to accidents. This confirms the findings by Nderitu (2009) that most schools had not established School Safety Committees. There is need to find out reason as to why quite a number of schools in Mombasa County had not constituted safety committees so as to comply with the Revised Education Act (2012).
4.4.3 Students’ Response on Awareness of the Safety Requirements School Holds

On the extent of the students’ awareness of the safety requirement that a school holds, the study sought from them information on safety requirements and the findings are tabulated in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12: Students’ Response on Awareness of the Safety Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To great extent</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Students’ Study Questionnaire

The results from Table 4.12 indicate that 22.1% of the students said that to a great extent they were aware of the safety requirement that the school should hold, 31.6% of them to a fair extent were aware, and 46.3% of them were not aware at all. These results imply that quite a number of students were not aware of the safety requirements in the schools. This indicates that good communication channels between the administration and students were inadequate and that students had not been sensitized enough on safety issues. The learners should be sensitized on the safety requirements the school holds in order to strengthen school safety.
4.4.4 Learners’ Involvement in Upholding Safety Standards and Requirements

The study sought information from the student respondents to establish if they were involved in upholding the required safety standards and requirements by the school’s management. The findings are as indicated in Figure 4.1.

Figure 4.1: Learners’ Involvement in Upholding Safety Standards and Requirements

Source: Students’ Study questionnaire

Figure 4.1 indicates that about 21% of the student respondents said that they had been involved in upholding of the required safety standards and requirements by the schools’ management and 36% of them said that they were rarely involved. In addition, 43% of students had not been involved at all in upholding of the required safety standards and requirements by the schools’ management. This can be interpreted to mean that the majority of the schools’ management authorities ignored
students in the implementation of safety standards and requirements. This could hamper implementation of safety programs in schools.

4.4.5 Students' Response on Procedural Requirements Practiced in Schools

The researcher sought information on the students' responses on whether they were aware of procedural requirements practiced in their schools. The procedural requirements covered in this study included financing of the School, having identification badges, and registration of visitors.

The findings were discussed as follows:

4.4.5.1 Students' Response on the Financing of the School Procedure

In respect to the students being aware of the procedure of financing school, the study sought student respondents to provide information on students' level of awareness of the procedure. The findings are indicated in Figure 4.2.

![Figure 4.2: Financing of the School](image)

Source: Students' Study Questionnaire
Figure 4.2 illustrates that 33.2% and 34.2% of the participants respectively strongly agreed and agreed that financing of the school was a procedural requirement practiced in school. The results further showed that 14.7% and 17.9% of them strongly disagreed and disagreed respectively that financing of the school was a procedural requirement practiced in school. Therefore, on average 33.7% of the head teachers suggested that financing of the school was a procedural requirement practiced. The implementation of Health and Safety Policies involves extensive modification of existing buildings, the purchase of expensive safety equipment and fittings and capacity development at all levels. Without funds, all the safety policies may not be implemented in good time. A negligible number, 14.7% and 17.9%, of the respondents (head teachers) disagreed with the suggestion that financing of the school was a procedural requirement practiced in school.

4.4.5.2 Identification of Badges for Learners and Staff

The researcher sought information on the students' on whether or not badges for learners and the teaching and non-teaching staff were used in schools as a procedural requirement practice for identification. The findings are as indicated in Table 4.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Students’ Study Questionnaire
From the findings indicated in Table 4.13 shows that 43.7% of the students strongly agreed that badges for learners and the staff were used in schools as procedural requirement practice for identification and 31.6% of them too agreed. Moreover 12.1% and 12.6% of them disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that badges for learners and staffs were used in schools as a procedural requirement practice for identification. Thus, the average, 37.65% of the student’s respondents supported that idea of using badges as a way of identification and that most schools had ways of identifying their members. However, there is need for other schools to come up with ways of identifying their members for the purpose of safety as reported by Kirui (2010).

4.4.5.3 Response of Students on Training of Participants on Safety Requirements in School

On the procedure of training of student respondents on safety requirements in Schools, the responses were analyzed and findings indicated in Table 4.14

Table 4.14: Training Learners on Safety in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Students’ Study Questionnaire**

The results in Table 4.14, show that 20.5% of students’ respondents confirmed that they were very much trained, 44.7% of them fairly trained, and 34.7% of them not at all trained. The results could indicate the observation that majority of schools were concerned with safety of learners but, quite a number of them were not concerned.
The findings could also imply that lack of skills on safety hampered implementation of safety programs in most schools. This is in agreement with Okumbe (2001) who points out that an effective safety program should seek to provide members of school's community especially students with required awareness on what to do and how to do it to enhance skills in disaster management training. Therefore, the training program should therefore involve managers as well as members of the school community and especially students so that a healthy and safe environment in schools is enhanced.

4.4.5.4 Impact of the Students' Training on Safety Standards in the Schools

The study sought information student respondents on the impact of training on Safety Standards in their schools and the findings are as indicated in Table 4.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To great extent</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Students' Study questionnaire*

As indicated in Table 4.15 18.4% of the students agreed to great extent that training of students on Safety Standards had impact on Safety Standards in the schools whereas 34.2% of them agreed to a fair extent training had impact Safety Standards practiced in schools. Finally, 47.4% of them reported that training had no impact at all. This can be interpreted to mean that training of students on Safety Standards in the schools was significant. However, a number of schools had not benefited from
training of safety standards. Therefore, there is need to find out reasons why 47.4% of schools had not trained students in safety standards.

4.4.5.5 Provision for Training Student Respondents

The researcher asked students on their awareness of training of students on Safety and Standards in their schools and their responses are as shown in Figure 4.3
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**Figure 4.3: Students’ Response on Disaster Preparedness and Management**

**Source: Students’ Study Questionnaire**

Figure 4.3 shows that 14.7% and 14.2% of the students strongly agreed and agreed respectively that they were trained in disaster preparedness and management. Further the results also show that 38.9% of the students disagreed while 32.1% of them strongly disagreed that they were not trained in disaster preparedness and management. In this regard the mean (35.5%) of those who disagreed may imply that not all members in the schools were aware of disaster management. Thus, all schools need to train members in disaster management so that they can be psychologically prepared in case of any disaster as reported by Njoka, Ndiragu and Ocharo (2006).
4.4.5.6 Response of Students on First Aid Procedures

Concerning Students on First Aid Procedures the researcher sought information from student respondents and findings are shown as indicated in Figure 4.4. The findings are as illustrated in figure 4.4.

![Figure 4.4: Students' Response on First Aid Procedures](chart)

Source: Students' Study Questionnaire

In Figure 4.4 the findings indicate that 35.8% and 36.3% of the students strongly agreed and agreed respectively that there was provision for training of students in first Aid Procedures whereas 14.7% and 13.2% of them respectively disagreed and strongly disagreed that they were trained in first aid procedures. Thus, results may mean that that majority of the learners had knowledge of first aid; however, there is need to organize first aid training to all schools in the County so that all schools could be trained in first aid procedures as requirement in the Public Health Act (Cap 242).
In addition, it is advisable to have First Aid Kits in schools so that students and staff can be equipped to face any circumstance that requires urgent care as Anderson and Craswell (1980) posits that every school building should have at least one fully stocke, conveniently located First Aid Cabinet.

4.4.5.7 Students Response on Guidance and Counseling Services

The researcher sought information on student respondents' response about guidance and counseling services which are offered by their teachers. The findings are as indicated in Table 4.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Students' Study Questionnaire.

The findings in Table 4.16 show that, 65.3% and 28.9% of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively that there were guidance and counseling services being offered in schools.

Further the results show that 2.6% of them both strongly disagreed and disagreed that there were no guidance and counseling services offered in schools while a negligible 0.5% of them did not respond. Based on the mean, that is, 47.1% of the
respondents, the study concluded that the majority of schools were concerned with emotional status of the learners as per Table 4.16 and as supported by Maithya and Nyaegah (2011). However, this is contrary to the findings by Nderitu (2009) in Githunguri concerning Guidance and Counseling services in school which showed that 73% of schools had not adequately responded in establishing Guidance and Counseling departments in their schools while other schools were struggling to make them functional.

4.4.5.8 Students’ Response on Health Services

Regarding Health Education services, the researcher sought from the students concerning their awareness of Health education services. The findings are as analyzed in Table 4.17.

Table 4.17: Students Response on Health Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agreed</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Students’ Study Questionnaire

The findings in Table 4.17 show that 45.3% and 33.2% of the students strongly agreed and agreed respectively that health education was offered in schools while 11.6% and 10% of them strongly disagreed and agreed respectively that there were no health education services being offered in schools. On average 39.25% of the respondents imply that the majority of schools were concerned with the health of students. However, 21.6% of them did not get health services in schools. Therefore,
Education Officers should make sure that all schools are offered with health education services so as to comply with Public Health Act Cap 242.

4.4.5.9 Students’ Response on Security Service Providers

Concerning Security Service Providers, the respondents were asked to state whether security was adequate on the issues and the findings are tabulated in Table 4.18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very adequate</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Students’ Study Questionnaire

As indicated in Table 4.18, 34.2% of the student respondents indicated that security service providers were very adequate, 49.5% of them indicated that security was adequate whereas 15.8% reported that it was not adequate. However, 0.5% did not respond to the question. Based on the mean of 41.85% of the respondents who reported that the security was adequate may imply that quite a number of schools in Mombasa County had adequate security service providers, although some schools did not have. On the same note Day and Golech (2002), posits that schools should provide learners with conducive learning environment. The findings are in agreement with Kirui (2011) who from security guard interviews found out that only 40% of the respondents reported having trained as security guard. This may mean
that some schools hire security personnel with no formal training or experience hence may affect professionalism with which they approach their work.

4.4.5.10 Students' Response on Regular Inspections of Safety Requirements and Facilities

Concerning the regular inspections of safety requirements and facilities, the respondents (students) were asked to state whether or not there was regular inspections of safety requirements and facilities by teachers and other responsible members of non-teaching staff in the school. The findings are indicated Table 4.19

Table 4.19: Students' Response on Regular Inspections of Safety Requirements and Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To great extent</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Students' Study Questionnaire

From the findings it was established that 22.1% and 46.3% of the students indicated that to a great extent and to a fair extent respectively, there was regular inspections of safety requirements and facilities by teachers and other responsible members of non-teaching staff in the school. The Table further shows that 31.6% of them denied. This implies that most of the schools carried out regular inspections of safety requirements and facilities. However, 31.6% of the students indicated that there were no regular inspections of safety requirements and facilities.
In regard to the frequency of inspection of Safety requirements and facilities, the findings revealed that majority of student respondents 47.8% reported that inspection was done on termly basis, 17.7% reported that it was done on weekly basis whereas 16.1%, 9% reported Daily and monthly basis respectively. Thus, based on these findings the study deduced that most schools in Mombasa County are concerned with the Health and Safety of their students. In the same respect Omolo (2010) in his study found out that in Kisumu municipality majority of schools were inspected at least once a year. School safety policies require that premises and students be inspected at least once a year. It is worth noting that failure to inspect schools may impact negatively on safety and security matters in such schools. Therefore, the study recommends that head teachers of schools that have not been inspected may invite officers from the District Quality Assurance and Standards office to conduct inspections since inspection reports are a useful starting point for school safety needs assessments.

4.4.5.11 Impact of Inspection Activities on Safety Standards

In the assessment of the impact of inspection activities on safety standards in schools, the participants were requested to give out best feeling on whether or not there was impact of inspection activities on safety standards in schools. The findings are indicated in Table 4.20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To great extent</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Students’ Study Questionnaire
The above tabulated findings indicate that 36.3% indicated that to great extent there was impact of inspection activities on safety standards in schools while 41.1% of the respondents reported that to a fair extent inspection affected safety standards. In addition, 22.6% of them indicated that there was completely no impact of the inspection on safety standards. This may imply that majority of the schools had benefited from inspection activities on safety standards.

4.4.5.12 Students’ Response on Hygiene Procedures

Regarding the hygiene procedures observation in schools, the respondents were asked to describe best feelings using the likert scale whether or not there was hygiene procedures observation in schools. The findings are indicated in Figure 4.5 below.

![Figure 4.5: Hygiene Procedures Observation](image)

Source: Students’ Study Questionnaire
The results in Figure 4.5 show that 23.2% and 34.7% of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed in that order that there were hygiene observations in schools. Further results indicate that 24.4% disagreed 17.4% strongly disagreed that the hygiene procedures observation in schools were inspected. Therefore, 57.9% as a mean of the student respondents affirmed that there were hygiene procedures observations in schools. This could mean that hygiene procedure observation was partially done in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County. Thus, the study recommends that concerned stakeholders such as Director of Education should follow up and ensure constant inspection of hygiene procedures observation in all schools so that school’s principal could implement them in compliance with Public Health Act Cap 242.

4.4.5.13 Students’ Response on Health and Safety Education

The study sought the students to indicate whether or not students were taught health and safety education and if yes in what ways through special programs or by being incorporated in the school curriculum and Whether or not schools had a sick bay for sick students. The findings are shown in Table 4.21 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Students’ Study Questionnaire
After presenting Yes/No items the results indicated in Table 4.21 revealed that 75.8% of the students affirmed that they were taught health and safety education while as 24.2% of them denied. This may be interpreted to mean that majority of schools taught health and safety education, but 24.5% of the students indicated Health and Safety Education was not taught in their schools.

4.4.5.14 Students’ Awareness of Safety against Drugs

The study sought students to provide information on whether their school had guidance and counseling departments. The findings are presented in Table 4.22

Table 4.22: Students Response on Sensitization of Staffs and Students on Drugs Abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Students’ Study Questionnaire

The findings in Table 4.22 indicate that 93.7% of the students confirmed that staffs and students were sensitized on drugs abuse whereas while 6.3% of them refuted the statement. This may imply that majority of the staffs and students were aware of drugs abuse.

Furthermore, the study also sought to examine if schools involved parents and community in the drugs control. The findings show that 16.6% of the student respondents affirmed their schools involved parents and community in drugs control while 83.7% of them denied. This may imply that most of the schools did not
involve parents and the community in drug abuse control program in their schools. However, some schools had involved them. This can be deduced from the data to mean that, most schools had sensitized their students on drug abuse especially through the Guidance and Counseling. But as noted in literature review, the study recommends that there should be combined efforts and strategies in informing and protecting students against drug abuse. In the researcher’s opinion, failure to involve community in school’s drug abuse control could create a great challenge to control drug abuse in schools, since society acts as the source of these drugs and parents are the best to monitor students especially when they are out of school. These findings are supported by Wanyama (2000) who observed that the main sources of drugs amongst students in schools are slums around school set up, touts and street boys in his study of the causes of drug use amongst secondary school’s student in Kenya.

4.4.5.15 Students’ Awareness of Transport Safety

Last but not least the study sought information from the student respondents if their schools had a school bus. Their responses were analyzed and represented in Table 4.23.

Table 4.23: Students Response on Transport of Students in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Students’ Study Questionnaire
As indicated in Table 4.23, 60% of the students' participants affirmed that schools had buses for transporting them whereas 40% of them denied. This may be interpreted to imply that the majority of the schools had buses which they used to transport students; however, 40% of schools without buses faced a lot of challenges of students' transport. The buses were comprehensively insured, well serviced and maintained and fitted with safety belts and speed governor gadgets. In addition, the researcher noted that among the schools with buses of the students agreed that their schools did not have rules and guidelines for using the bus. Thus, in the researcher's opinion, this would easily lead to students misbehaving and misuse of the vehicle and more likely end up endangering their lives while on board.

4.5 Challenges Facing Creation of Safety Awareness to Students

This section deals with the analysis of challenges that the head teachers face in the creation of awareness of students in Health and Safety programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County. The challenges are discussed in the following sub-sections.

4.5.1 Challenges on Purchase of First Aid Kits

The study sought to determine from the head teachers if their institutions had adequate funds for provision of first aid kits and fire extinguishers. The findings of their responses are indicated in Table 4.24 below.
Table 4.24: Head teachers’ Response on Challenge of Purchasing of First Aid Kits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers’ response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agreed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagreed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Head teachers’ Study Questionnaire

From the analysis of responses of the head teachers on the challenge of purchasing First Aid Kits, the findings show that 28.6% and 42.8% of the head teachers strongly agreed and agreed respectively that purchasing of first aid kits was one of the challenges of implementing safety standards while as 28.6% of them disagreed. This could imply that the majority of school’s head teachers were challenged by funds to purchase First Aid Kits hence hampering the implementation of safety standards as reported by Wainaina (2012), Kukali (2010) and Kamunde (2010).

4.5.2 Challenges in Purchase of Fire Extinguishers

Concerning challenge on purchase of Fire Extinguishers, the study sought the head teachers on the same issue and findings are as shown in Table 4.25

Table 4.25: Principals’ Response on Challenge of Purchasing of Fire Extinguishers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers’ Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agreed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagreed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Head teachers’ Study Questionnaire
From Table 4.25 the findings show that majority of the respondents 57.1% strongly agreed the head teachers of public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-county faced the challenge of buying fire extinguishers as way of implementing safety standard. In addition to this, 14.3% of the head teachers agreed that they faced a challenge of buying fire extinguishers. However, 28.6% of them strongly disagreed. The study interpreted this kind of scenario to mean that head teachers lacked financial resources for implementing safety standards as reported by Wainaina (2012), Kukali (2010) and Kamunde (2010).

4.5.3 Summary of Challenges Facing Head Teachers in the Creation of Awareness in Students of Health and Safety Programs in Public Secondary Schools in Mvita Sub-County

The challenges faced by the Head teachers in the creation of awareness in students of Health and Safety Programs in public secondary schools in the order as per the magnitude of the problem, the study sought the respondents (head teachers) and the findings are as indicated in Table 4.26

Table 4.26: Summary of Challenges Faced by Head Teachers in Creating Students Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial constraints</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of guidance from ministry/safety standards manual</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge on safety issues/ untrained personnel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncooperative students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncooperative staffs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncooperative BOM/PTA/Parent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Head teachers’ Study Questionnaire
From the findings in Table 4.26 the respondents (head teachers’) responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics and results show that all the head teachers (100%) identified financial constraint as the most challenging factor in implementation effort of safety standards in schools. Based on this the researcher deduced that most safety tools and facilities need funds. They include firefighting equipment, training personnel and to organizing capacity building safety seminars.

The challenge of lack of knowledge on Health and Safety standards or untrained personnel was the second, 85.7% challenge in implementation of safety standards in schools by the head teachers.

It is worthwhile noting that implementation of safety standards requires personnel who are trained and as already noted majority of head teachers and teachers had not undergone such training. As Creswell (1993) observes that adequately trained personnel will prepare the school and students to deal with any emergency situations. Still on the challenges facing implementation of school safety standards 85.7% of the head teachers ranked lack of guidelines or safety manual as the third challenging issue in implementing safety standards in school. The fact that some schools had cited lack of MOE’s guidelines, might have made it difficult to implement the safety standards in schools, since the manuals are supposed to act as a guidelines and points of reference on school’s safety measures, MOE (2008).

Also, a good proportion of head teachers (respondents) 71.0% cited lack of cooperation from the students as the fifth challenge in the order of challenges. This may imply that students may hinder the implementation of Health and Safety standards in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-county. In the same vein, 51.0% of the head teachers ranked the identified challenge of uncooperative staff as number
five challenge in their list. These findings show that a few teachers and a few head teachers did not cooperate in the process of trying to implement safety standards in school. Thus, without the full cooperation of both head teachers and teachers, the whole process is doomed to fail since they are the officers on the ground to ensure the ministry's safety standards are fully implemented.

Further, a small number of respondents 42.9% reported an uncooperative BOM / PTA member which acts as a link between school and community. Besides they are supposed to provide resources and even personnel to run the school (Creswell 1993). Thus, if the BOM/PTA is uncooperative then it might be difficult for schools to effectively implement safety standards for the already stated reasons.

In conclusion from the foregoing explanation of the findings, the study observed that financial constraints, lack of guidance from the Ministry safety standard manual and lack of knowledge on safety issues and untrained personnel among others were the leading constraints faced by head teachers in implementation of Health and Safety programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County in Mombasa County.

4.6 Strategies Employed to Enhance Implementation of Health and Safety Programs

This sub-section provides analysis of the research data on strategies head teachers use in the process of implementing Health and Safety programs in their respective schools. The findings are presented under the following sub-sections.
4.6.1 Seminars and Workshops

The study further sought the head teachers on use of seminars and workshops in enhancing implementation of the Health and Safety programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub county. The findings are indicated in Table 4.27.

Table 4.27: Head teachers' Response on Seminars and Workshops on School Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers' response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agreed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Head teachers' Study Questionnaire

From the findings indicated in Table 4.27, 42.9% and 28.6% of the head teachers strongly agreed and agreed respectively that schools organize seminars and workshops on Health and Safety standards in their schools. In addition, another 28.6% of the head teachers strongly disagreed that schools organize seminars and workshops Safety standards. These findings may be interpreted to mean that there is need to organize seminars and workshops on safety for schools by education stakeholders so that all schools are considered. It is worth to note that the strategies of organizing workshops and going for training helps to build capacity that enables teachers and QASOs to cope with the new and expanded demands of their jobs. The importance of training is emphasized by Torrington, Hall and Taylor (2005) who posits that training increases awareness of the rules, improving self-confidence and self-discipline.
4.6.2 Provision of Funds

The study sought to find out from head teachers whether provision of funds for purchasing safety items was a strategy for enhancing implementation of Health and Safety programs or not.

The findings are presented in Table 4.28.

Table 4.28: Head teachers’ response on Provision of Funds for Purchasing Safety Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers’ response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agreed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagreed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Head teachers’ Study Questionnaire

The findings in Table 4.28 shows that 57.1% of the respondents (Head teachers) strongly agreed that provision of funds for purchasing safety items was a strategy for enhancing implementation of health and safety program while a few, 14.3% of the respondents merely agreed. Further, the results in the table show that 28.6% of the head teachers strongly disagreed that provision of funds for purchasing safety items was a strategy for enhancing implementation of health and safety programs. Based on these observations, the study observes that provision of funds for purchasing safety items was a strategy for enhancing implementation of health and safety program.
4.6.3 Communication and Coordination on Safety Policy

Concerning need for communication and coordination in regard to implementation of Health and safety programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County, the study sought to establish whether there was communication and coordination on safety policy put in place in schools or not. The results are indicated in Table 4.29.

Table 4.29: Head Teachers' Response on Communication and Coordination on Safety Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers' response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agreed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Head teachers' Study Questionnaire

The findings shown in Table 4.29 reveal that 71.4% of the respondents confirmed that there was communication and coordination on safety policy in schools while 28.6% of them strongly disagreed. This may be interpreted to imply that the majority of the schools were aware of safety policy. However, there is need to enhance communication and coordination on safety policy in all schools in Mombasa County.

4.6.4 Training of Staff on Disaster and Crisis Management

Regarding conduct of training of staff and other members of the school community on Disaster and Crisis management, the researcher sought to find information on how often training staff on Disaster and Crisis management, the findings are indicated in Table 4.30.
Table 4.30: Head Teachers’ Response on How Often Schools Conduct Disaster
and Crisis Management Training for Staff and Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers’ response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Head teachers’ Study Questionnaire

The findings indicated in Table 4.30 show that 85.7% of the respondents indicated that rarely they conducted disaster and crisis management training for staff and community while 14.3% said that the training was frequently done. Therefore, based on these results this guideline, on training, has not been implemented fully in most schools. On the same note Kirui (2011) who from security guards interview found out that only 37% of respondents reported having trained as security guards. This implies that most schools hire security personnel with no training as security guards hence most schools hire security guards without any specialized training. In line with this observation Migiro (2012) in his study on the implementation of safety standards in public secondary schools in Borabu District Nyamira County, Kenya recommends that schools form safety committees, train staff on disaster management and involve the community in school safety programs.

4.6.5 Head teachers’ Response on Frequency of School Conducting Drills

The study also sought information from the head teachers on the strategy of conducting drills on Health and Safety programs in secondary schools. The findings are contained in Table 4.31.
Table 4.31: Head teachers’ Response on how often School Conducted Drills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers’ response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Head teachers’ Study Questionnaire

From Table 4.31 findings show that 100% of respondents indicated that rarely do schools conduct fire drills. Therefore, the study concluded the schools have ignored this strategy as the results show that schools do not undertake frequent fire drills at least twice a term as recommended by safety standards manual (Republic of Kenya, 2008). The researcher observes that this could be a dangerous trend if not corrected.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter provides summary of the findings, conclusion and recommendations as derived from the analyzed data in the preceding chapter. The study was conducted in Mvita Sub County and the researcher was interested in establishing whether Health and Safety programs were implemented in regard to MOE’s Safety Standards and Guidelines in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-county, Mombasa County, Kenya. The chapter presents summary of the findings, conclusion and then recommendations of the study.

5.2 Summary of the Study

First and foremost, it is worthwhile noting that the present study examined implementation of Health and Safety programs as per the MOE’s Safety and Standards guidelines in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-county, Mombasa County. The objectives of the study centered on how the head teachers in public secondary school’s implement Health and Safety guidelines in their respective schools, challenges facing head teachers in creating student’s awareness on Health and safety programs in schools and finally the strategies that the head teachers employ in regard to implementation of Health and Safety programs in public secondary schools.

To achieve the study’s first objective which was to find out ways used by head teachers to implement Health and safety programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-county, Mombasa County, the data was organized by the aid of a computer program known as Statistical Program for Social Sciences (SPSS) and
subjected to descriptive Statistical analysis. The findings were presented in frequencies and percentages of ways head teachers (respondents) use in their schools. In this regard 20% and 80% of the head teachers of the schools under this study strongly agreed and merely agreed respectively that public secondary schools registered all visitors as way of implementing safety programs as required by Ministry of Education Directive. This shows that the majority of the visitors in the institutions were registered which did not comply with as reported by Dinker, Kremp, Baum, and Syder (2009).

Another way revealed in the findings, through which head teachers implement Safety standards in their schools, is land registration whereby 85.8% of head teachers confirmed that the registration of the schools had been done, but 14.2% of them declined.

The study findings also revealed that regular health inspection of school premises and students was a way of implementing the Health and Safety standards. The analysis of data showed that 85.7% of the agreed that inspection is done while 14.3% of them denied.

Furthermore, the findings also showed that head teachers use windows reinforced with grills. Since 42.9% agreed strongly while an equal percentage 42.9% strongly disagreed. The latter is in line with the Ministry of Education Act Revised 2012 and Ministry of public works which require that building regulations and standards (2008) recommended that schools should not have window grills and wire mesh so that students could escape easy in case of fire.
From the data analysis, 71.4% of the principals mentioned that there were reinforced fencing mechanisms and secured gates in schools, but 28.6% of them denied. In addition, the study found that 80% of the schools had installed fire-fighting equipment and 20% of them had not installed and thus, lack of which may endanger lives of students in cases of emergencies.

Finally, the study established that 60% of the schools had constituted school safety subcommittee as a way of implementing Health and Safety programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-county. However, 40% of them had not constituted school safety sub-committee.

To achieve the study’s second objective which was to identify challenges head teachers faced in creating awareness in students concerning Health and Safety programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-county, Mombasa County, and data on challenges of students’ awareness by head teachers was analyzed and the followings were recorded.

Concerning the students’ awareness on incorporation of safety training in the school curriculum, the findings revealed that 20.5% of the students confirmed that they had been very much trained on safety and 44.7% of them stated that they were fairly trained while 34.8% of said that they were not at all trained. In addition, 18.4% of the students indicated that to a great extent training had impact in on the students’ awareness of safety standards. Another 34.2% of students indicated that training fairly impacted their awareness of safety standards in their schools. However, 47.4% of them stated that they did not realize any impact of training on safety standards.
In regard to students’ awareness of their schools conducting safe and health education teaching, 75.8% of the students reported that they were aware while 24.2% of them denied.

Further, the findings established that 94.8% of the students acknowledged that guidance and counseling services were offered by Guidance and Counseling department whereas 5.2% of them disagreed that their schools had established the department.

On the students’ level of awareness concerning clean food offered by the schools, all student respondents 100% agreed that their schools offered clean food. On the other hand, 87.9% of the students acknowledged their schools do not allow them carry or sell food stuffs outside the official school menu while 12.1% refuted the idea of selling other food stuffs rather than the schools’ official menu.

The study found out that 60% of student respondents affirmed that their schools had buses while 40% denied hence the implication is that majority of the schools had buses which they used to transport students.

In regard to challenges faced by the head teachers in the process of creating student’s awareness in health and safety programs in schools, data was analyzed and the findings revealed that about 71.4% of the principals agreed that purchasing of first aid kits was one of challenges they faced. However, 28.6% of the head teachers disagreed. The findings also revealed that the purchasing of fire extinguishers was another challenge to the implementation of Health and Safety programs in schools. This was confirmed by 71.4% of the principals, although 28.6% of them disagreed.
Moreover, the study also established that financial constraints as reported by Dunnel (2012), lack of guidance from the Ministry safety standard manual and lack of knowledge on safety issues and untrained personnel were other constraints faced by head teachers in implementing Health and Safety programs in secondary schools in Mvita Sub-County in Mombasa County. In this respect the study observed that financial challenges were identified as the most (100%) challenging issue in implementing the safety measures in public secondary schools. Therefore, given that most MOE Safety Standards require financial resources to implement it is important that government considers ways and means of financing safety program in schools.

Other challenges identified by the study included, lack of safety knowledge and skills, lack of copies of safety manuals, uncooperative BOG / PTA members, uncooperative school administration and teachers.

Last but not least, to achieve the study’s third objective which was to establish strategies head teachers employ to enhance implementation of Health and Safety Programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-county, the data was analyzed and findings were as discussed below:

First, Majority of the head teachers, 83.2% of them were of the opinion of fitting schools with adequate fire extinguishers was a strategy for enhancing implementation of health and safety program as required by Public Health Act (Cap 242) though, but 16.8% of them disagreed with the idea. In addition, 42.8% of head teachers supported the study conducted by Akali and Otieno (2011) which states that most of fire extinguishers were not frequently checked.
Second, the study also revealed that organizing seminars and workshops on schools’ safety could enhance implementation of Health and Safety programs which was supported by 71.5% of the principals, however, 28.5% of them denied.

Third the study further revealed that inspection of safety services of the school facilities and equipment could enhance implementation of health and safety program if inspection was constantly done. About 57.2% of the principals stated that frequent inspection on school facilities and equipment would help in enhancing implementation of Health and Safety programs, but 42.8% of them disagreed.

Frequent fire drills in schools was another strategy of enhancing implementation of health and safety programs. The strategy was supported by 38.6% of head teachers; however, 61.4% of them disagreed. These findings show that the majority of the schools lack disaster preparedness as reported by Kimenyi and Thuo (2011).

5.3 Conclusions of the Study

Based on the findings of the study, the study drew the following conclusions that:

Most principals in the public secondary schools in Mvita sub-county had invented ways of implementing health and safety programs in accordance with Public Health Act (Cap 242). The ways used included reinforced fencing, fixing windows without grills and wire mesh, securing gates and provision of adequate fire extinguishers among others. This provided security to the students in the schools.

The main challenges that principals face in creating awareness in students concerning safety standards included: uncooperative Boards of governors (BoMs) and teachers in instilling safety awareness in the students, ineffectiveness of implementing and monitoring organs such as Quality Assurance and Standards
department, lack of conducting disaster crisis, management training and fire drills. Other challenges included lack of financial resources to implement safety standards in schools and lack of training specialized personnel to help in implementation of the health and safety standards in public secondary schools. Therefore, this scenario compromises students’ safety in schools.

Most principals of the schools under the current study, employed various strategies used to enhance implementation of health and safety programs in their schools. Major ones are: fencing school compounds, ensuring registration of all visitors at the entrance of the school, having strong guidance and counselling departments mainly to sensitise students on drug abuse and other health related matters. The principals also provided sick bays and buses fitted with safety gadgets in order to guarantee students’ safety when on board while some occasionally conducted fire drills.

Therefore, the foregoing conclusions imply that unless implementation of safety standards is hastened in schools, more lives of students will continue to be at risk as their health and security will be at risk and also school property will be vulnerable to destruction.

5.4 Recommendations

The current study has established how the head teachers implement Health and Safety programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Sub-county, the challenges head teachers face in creating awareness in students concerning Health and Safety standards in their schools and the strategies employed to mitigate the challenges. Therefore, based on these findings, the present study made the following recommendations:
i. In order to implement health and safety standards in all public secondary schools, according to Public Health Act (Cap 242), guidelines the principals should come up with ways of ensuring that Public Health standards are followed to ensure safety in schools. The stakeholders in education such as MoE, school sponsors among others should specifically provide funds to assist principals implement and maintain health and safety programs in schools.

ii. The principals in conjunction with BoGs should create forums to sensitize and involve all schools stakeholders; teachers, students included in regard to Safety standards in public schools. For instance, training students on health and safety programs and disaster management in schools. This will help overcome challenges that hinder creation of awareness of safety issues by students. Thus students' awareness of safety programs will be enhanced.

iii. In order to enhance the principals' skills in implementing health and safety standards effectively, the researcher recommended that the MoE through Quality Assurance and Standards should organize in-service workshops to equip them with new skills concerning implementation of safety standards in schools.

iv. It is upon education officers to sensitize students on safety standards manual for school from the Ministry of Education as required in safety standard manual for school in Kenya (2008) and follow up government policies to ensure full compliance.
5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher made the following suggestions for further research.

i. A further investigation be done on factors contributing to some schools' failure to incorporate Health and Safety education in the school curriculum.

ii. There is need to conduct a similar study in private secondary schools to establish the challenges that implementation of Health and Safety programs face.

iii. The research should be replicated in other different regions of the country so as to have a larger picture of the situation in the whole country.
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APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

A STUDY ON CHALLENGES FACED BY HEADTEACHERS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF HEALTH AND SAFETY PROGRAMS IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN MVITA SUB-COUNTY, MOMBASA, KENYA.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to carry out a study on challenges faced by head teachers in the implementation of health and safety programs in public secondary schools in Mvita sub-county Mombasa. The research study may help the education administrations in improving the safety standards and to an extent the quality of education in Kenya and the rest of the world. Your identity will be accorded high confidentiality and your response will only be used on the purpose of the study. Kindly express your opinion as freely as possible.

Instructions:
Please indicate your correct opinion by way of ticking against one of the options and filling in the spaces provided in the questions that require your opinion.

I BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Kindly indicate your gender
   Male [ ]  Female [ ]

2. What are your highest academic qualifications?
   Diploma [ ]  Bed [ ]  B SC [ ]  MED [ ]

3. How long have you been Head teacher/Principal?
   1 – 5 yrs. [ ]  6 – 10 yrs. [ ]  11 – 15 yrs. [ ]
   16 – 20yrs [ ]

4. Period served as a head teacher/principal in the present school ............. Years

5. Kindly provide records for population of your institution?
   Less than 100 learners [ ]  100 – 300 [ ]  300 – 500 [ ]
   500 – 700 [ ]  700 – 900 [ ]  900 – 1200 [ ]
   More than 1200 [ ]

100
6. Type of your school
   Boys [ ]  Girl [ ]  Mixed [ ]

7. Status of your school
   Boarding [ ]  Day [ ]  Mixed (boarding and day) [ ]

II IMPLEMENTATION OF HEALTH AND SAFETY PROGRAMS

8. Please indicate how you strongly agree or disagree with the statement using the key printed:
   Undecided [U D]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How head teachers have implemented safety in schools</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>UD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration of all visitors to institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration of the institutions land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular health inspection of premises and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows in the school are without grills and wire mesh to address emergency outlets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforce fencing mechanisms and secure gate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire security personnel from reliable security firms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School bus fixed with speed governor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install fire-fighting equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have constituted a school safety sub-committee and is a member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have identification badges for all employees and learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III CHALLENGES FACED BY HEAD TEACHERS IN CREATING STUDENTS AWARENESS OF HEALTH AND SAFETY PROGRAMS

9. Do your institutions have adequate funds for the provision of the following safety requirements?
   SA – Strongly Agree A – Agree  DA – Disagree  SDA – Strongly Disagree
   Disagree  UD – undecided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety requirement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>UD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing of first aid kits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of fire extinguishers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. What are some of the challenges/problems have you encountered while trying to create student’s awareness in health and safety programs in your school? (Identify the problem in order of magnitude by numbering)

i. Financial constraints [ ]
ii. Lack of, guidelines from the ministry/safety standards manual [ ]
iii. Lack of, knowledge on safety issues/untrained personnel [ ]
iv. Uncooperative staff [ ]
v. Uncooperative students [ ]
vi. Uncooperative BOG/PTA/Parents [ ]

V) STRATEGIES TO ENHANCE IMPLEMENTATION OF HEALTH AND SAFETY PROGRAMS

11. (a) Please select the option that best describes your opinion about the following Statements by putting a tick (√) on the appropriate column using the key provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>UD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school has been fitted with sufficient fire extinguishers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organize seminars and workshops on school safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate the provision of funds for the purchase of safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide better communication and coordination on safety policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. (b) If the school has fire extinguishers where are they located? ..........................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
13. Please indicate how often the following safety services are offered in your School using the key provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very frequently (VF) monthly</th>
<th>Frequently (F) termly</th>
<th>Rarely (R) yearly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Rarely (VR) after 2years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>VR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- How often are school facilities and equipment inspected?
- How often do you conduct disaster and crisis management training for staff and community?
- How often do you conduct fire drills?

14. How can learning institutions be made safer? 

..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
The purpose of this questionnaire is to carry put a study on challenges faced by head teachers in the implementation of safety and health programs in Mombasa county. The research study may help the education administrations in improving the health and safety standards and to an extent the quality of education in Kenya and the rest of the world. Your identity will be accorded high confidentiality and your response will only be used on the purpose of the study. Kindly express your opinion as freely as possible.

Instructions:
Please indicate your correct opinion by way of ticking against one of the options and filling in the spaces provided in the questions that require your opinion.

SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION
1. Kindly indicate your gender
   Male [ ]          Female [ ]

2. Kindly indicate the academic level you are in
   Form 1 [ ]      Form 2 [ ]      Form 3 [ ]
   Form 4 [ ]

SAFETY IMPLEMENTATION AND AWARENESS
3. Have you come across the safety standards manual for schools in the country?
   Yes [ ]          No [ ]

4. Are you aware of the presence of safety committee in your institution?
   Yes [ ]          No [ ]

5. Are you aware who constitutes the safety committee?
   To a great extent [ ]     To a fair extent [ ]     Not at all [ ]

6. Are you aware of the safety requirements that the institution should uphold?
   To a great extent [ ]     To a fair extent [ ]     Not at all [ ]
7. Have the learners in your institution been involved in upholding of the required safety standards and requirements by the schools’ management?
   Often [ ]   Rarely [ ]   Not at all [ ]

8. Are the following procedural requirements practiced in your institution?
   SA – Strongly Agree A – Agree DA – Disagree SDA – Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>UD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financing of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration of all visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having identification badges for learners and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Are the learners trained on safety in your school?
   Very much [ ]   Fairly [ ]   Not at all [ ]

10. Does the training impact on the school’s safety standards?
    To a great extent [ ]   To a fair extent [ ]   Not at all [ ]

11. Have the learners been trained in any of the following areas in your institution?
    SA – Strongly Agree A – Agree DA – Disagree SDA – Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>UD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disaster preparedness and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aid procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire drills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Have you had sessions with your teachers and other service providers availed by your institution in the following areas: -
    SA – Strongly Agree A – Agree DA – Disagree SDA – Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>UD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and counseling services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. How would you rate the adequacy of the following safety requirements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security service providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing of school compound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Do you think funding can be a contributing factor to the adequacy of the facilities?

To a great extent [ ]
To a fair extent [ ]
Not at all [ ]

15. Are there regular inspections of safety requirements and facilities by teachers and other responsible members of non-teaching staff in the institution?

To a great extent [ ]
To a fair extent [ ]
Not at all [ ]

16. How often are the inspections carried out?

Daily Weekly Fortnightly Monthly Termly

17. Are you aware of inspection visits by other external officer other than the members of the school fraternity?

To a great extent [ ]
To a fair extent [ ]
Not at all [ ]

18. Are inspections carried out in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>UD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools physical infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene procedures observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Do the inspection activities impact on the safety standards of the institution?

To a great extent [ ]
To a fair extent [ ]
Not at all [ ]
20. Safety in Health & Safety Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are students taught health and safety education in your school?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What is the source of water in your school?

(a) Piped

(b) Rain harvested

(c) Collected from the river/stream

(d) Any other source (specify) ...........................................

Does the school run a feeding programme?

Does the school allow selling of other food stuffs in schools?

If yes, who runs the food stores/kiosks? (specify) ...............  

21. Safety against Drug Abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the school have guidance and counseling department?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Does the school sensitize the staff and students about drug abuse?

Does the school involve parents and community in drug-control programme?

22. Transport Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the school have a bus/vehicle for student’s transport?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Is the vehicle fitted with safety belts?

Does the school have code of regulation guiding students while using the vehicle?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your school have a safety programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, (a) Does the school conduct a safety evaluation exercise?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) How often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) weekly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) termly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the following participate in monitoring and evaluation of school safety programmes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Head teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) School safety committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) QUASO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do evaluation findings made available to the school members?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. How can your school be made safer for the benefit of learners? ........
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Kenyatta University
P. O. Box 438344, Nairobi.

Dear Respondent,

Re: Challenges faced by Head Teachers in the Implementation of Health and Safety Programs in public Secondary Schools in Mvita sub-county, Mombasa, Kenya.

I am a graduate student at Kenyatta University (KU), in the school of Education. I am undertaking a master’s degree project research on ‘Challenges faced by Head Teachers in the Implementation of Health and Safety Programs in Secondary Schools in Mvita sub-county, Mombasa.

This project paper is a requirement in fulfillment of the master’s degree at Kenyatta University.

Health and safety programs in schools are important to a developing nation like Kenya and there are several benefits to be gained from these programs hence the need to find out how effective their implementation is in secondary schools.

This is to kindly request you to assist in collection of data needed for this research, by filling out the accompanying questionnaire. It is estimated that this will take about 20 minutes of your precious time.

Please note that any information you give will be treated extremely confidential and at no instance will it be used for any other purpose other than the project research.

Yours faithfully,

Jane Njoki Gagawala
M.ED Student
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The Principal Secretary,
Higher Education, Science & Technology,
P.O. Box 30040,
NAIROBI

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION JANE NJOKI GAGAWALA—REG. NO.
ESS/CE/MSA/24054/2011

I write to introduce Ms. Jane Njoki Gagawala who is a Postgraduate Student of this University. She is registered for M.ED degree programme in the Department of Education Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies.

Ms. Gagawala intends to conduct research for an M.ED. Proposal entitled, “Challenges Faced by Head Teachers in the Implementation of Health and Safety Programs in Public Secondary Schools in Mvita Sub-County, Mombasa, Kenya”.

Any assistance given will be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

MRS. LUCY N. MBAABU
FOR: DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL
NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION
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Jane Njoki Gagawala
Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI.

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “Challenges faced by head teachers in the implementation of health and safety programs in public secondary schools in Mvita Subcounty, Mombasa, Kenya.” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Mombasa County for a period ending 6th November, 2015.

You are advised to report to the County Commissioner and the County Director of Education, Mombasa County before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit two hard copies and one soft copy in pdf of the research report/thesis to our office.

DR. S. K. LANGAT, OGW
FOR: DIRECTOR-GENERAL/CEO

Copy to:
The County Commissioner
Mombasa County.

The County Director of Education
Mombasa County.

7th July, 2015
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