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<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGM</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEO</td>
<td>Assistant Education Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIE</td>
<td>Communities in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
<td>Economic Organization of West African States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPE</td>
<td>Free Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARC</td>
<td>National Alliance of Rainbow Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPTAN</td>
<td>National Association for Parents and Teachers of Nigeria</td>
</tr>
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ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to find out the nature and types of community involvement in the development of education, identifying partnership opportunities in school-community partnership and look into issues and challenges in community-partnership in the development of education. There is no unified approach by the government even when so much has been written about its benefits. It is, therefore, not clear how such partnerships should be established. Consequently this study wished to look at the partnership opportunities, nature and type of community involvement in school management and the problems or challenges of community involvement in school management and development. The research employed a descriptive survey study design as a better option for intervening in school-community partnership in the development of education. Out of 19 primary schools, only 10 primary schools were sampled. The researcher used questionnaires and interview schedules to collect data. With a target population of 3,021, simple random sampling was used to select respondents in these groups namely; Head Teachers, Teachers, Pupils, Community Members and Government agents totaling to 935 respondents. Data was obtained and analyzed by use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) computer package to determine the challenges affecting school community partnership in the development of education in Lamu East District. Both qualitative and quantitative data analysis were used to analyze data collected. Responses from questionnaire, interview schedules were organized according to pertinent aspects of the study. The study found that the relationship between teachers and parents was limited to meetings and prize giving days. Most parents felt that school work should be left to teachers. Also there are no guidelines by the government on school – community partnership. The findings were presented through descriptive statistics by use of frequencies, tables, graphs and pie-charts. The research concludes that many parents and community members are reluctant to participate in school activities while teachers and education officials do not involve parents with limited academic qualifications in school affairs. Further research was recommended upon finishing this study in terms of the school-community partnership in the development of education in Lamu East District. The study recommends that the parents should be informed of school – community partnership opportunities as they arise. Areas of co-operation need to be identified and made clear to stakeholders. Guidelines should be developed by the Ministry of Education to assist administrators establish partnership opportunities. Schools should open up communication channels with the community. The study proposes further investigation on the role of teachers in School – Community partnership in public primary schools and parents’ involvement in mobilizing and creating resources in public primary schools.
CHAPTER ONE

1.1 Introduction

This chapter of the research study provides the background to the study, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the objectives of the study, research questions, research assumptions, the limitations and delimitations of the study, significance of the study, the conceptual framework and definition of operational terms.

1.2 Background to the study

Education is the main single factor strongly associated with the probability of reducing poverty. Improving education performance should, therefore, form a core element in the Poverty Reduction Strategy (Barbour, 2008). Recognizing that community involvement in education is a major contributor to the success of children in Schools Eagle, (1989) observes “Thirty years of research confirms that family involvement is a powerful influence on children achievement in schools.”

Clifton (2006) reports on education and equivalent legislation in the USA has drawn attention and emphasized the potential of collaboration between professionals and parents to enhance children’s development and learning. Each report indicates that parental involvement in education has an entirely positive influence upon the child. Fiore (2011) also shares that research and experience over the past 20 years have provided compelling evidence that some strategies for parent and community involvement in the educational process substantially improve the quality of student’s educational experiences and their achievement in elementary and secondary schools. The task now confronting educational reformers and researchers is to refine our
understanding of the characteristics of effective parent and community involvement and of the related conditions in educational systems and communities under which such involvement has the most beneficial impact.

Guillaume and Yee (2009) observe that in Africa the teacher appears not to accommodate and entice parents to become more involved. Some of these provide fewer instructions for parents, vary meeting times for parents, find less effective communication mechanisms and do less or none home visits. In most cases the family-community are not given chance of doing the business of schooling, create site-based decision making that involves parents and recreate a school structure that is less bureaucratic, less impersonal and less budget-driven and in general overcoming barriers to parent involvement in the broad context of needed systemic changes (Katherine, 2010).

In their study Greenwood and Hichman (2008) indicate that teachers tend to view students, parents and community, through their own cultural prism and may not be ready to understand or address the learning needs and issues of the students and families of the communities in which they teach. Such experiences cannot allow preservicing teachers the opportunity and challenge of examining their own cultural views and beliefs and developing openness to new ways of understanding and thinking.

According to Davies (2009), helping teachers to become open to working with parents and fostering parent involvement beyond educentric borders means more than just mandating curriculum additions to include a parent involvement component at the pre-
service level. Weaving university course work and classroom/community experience together seems most promising for bringing about a visceral understanding of the value of the school-parent-community relationship.

The East and Central Africa still suffers from almost the same factors namely; first, the schools leadership do not attempt to establish partnership with the parents, believing that parents were irrelevant to the schooling process, since they did not even know what is being taught. Secondly, since a number of parents are illiterate or have low educational background shows that anything to do with school is intimidating to them. Thirdly, the long distances between home and schools, and the cost of travelling inhibit parents from checking on their children at school. Fourthly, most parents believed teachers could do it all alone, and do not see the need to get involved (Lasibille, 2007).

Otwoma (2006) showed that, school-community partnership enables the school and the community to share the responsibility of running the schools and helping the child to achieve the aim of education without which neither the school nor the community can benefit. In Kenya, the Kenya Education Sector Support Program (KESSP 2005-2010) envisages community involvement in providing support in improving and maintaining existing infrastructure. Kenya adopted Cost Sharing Policy in the education sector in 1988 following recommendations of Report of The Presidential Working Party on Education and Manpower Training for The Next Decade and Beyond: popularly called The Kamunge Report and Sessional Paper No. 6, where parents were to meet the cost of tuition, textbooks and activity fund. In 2003 the
National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) Government re-introduced Free Primary Education (FPE) where the parents play the role of providing for facilities, uniforms and other individual essential needs that their children require.

School committees were established by Education Act Cap. 211(1971) Section T (1, 2), which is also emphasized by the report of The Commission of Inquiry into Education System of Kenya (Koech Report, 1999) and Kamunge Report (1988). This is the only formal partnership between the school and community in Kenya. There is need for the parents and community at large to be involved not only in the provision of funds but also in the control of the expenditure of the same funds they provide. Parents should be involved in decision making process in schools where their children learn. Epstein (2008) envisages 6 types of school-community partnership i.e. parenting, communication, volunteering, decision making, and home learning and collaborating with community.

The government of Kenya spends 40% of its recurrent expenditure on education (KESSP, 2005-2010). International Aid agencies and other development partners have put so much effort in finding and supporting programmes such as, text book provision, ICT and infrastructure development to enhance access and retention in education. Though the government has endeavoured to address challenges in the education sector, the situation is not conducive. Issues of access, equity, wastage, teacher shortage, are still a challenge. Community involvement in education has largely been in the provision of finances and facilities in primary schools. Parents are involved in Annual General Meetings (AGM) and prize giving. There is no national policy about
community and school partnerships. Lamu District is among the least developed districts educationally. The performance in national examination has been dismal among other challenges.

The major concern of this study is to find out the nature and types of community involvement in the development of education, identifying partnership opportunities in school-community partnership and look into issues and challenges in community-partnership in the development of education.

1.3 Statement of the problem

In Kenya, a number of education reports emphasize the need for community-schools partnership in the development of education. However, to date the only participation of parents and community in school affairs is under Parents Teachers Association (P.T.A.) and Board of Governor (B.O.G.). The role of parents has remained to be the provision of finances for infrastructure development, attendance of Annual General Meetings and provision of security and healthcare to their children (Otwoma, 2006).

Studies world-over have stressed the need for the community and schools to cooperate in a more meaningful manner so as to achieve the goals of education. The community needs to play a role in the curriculum implementation, monitoring of school and out of school activities of teachers and students, communicate more often (Alatore, 2009). The community should be treated as an integral part of the school and their roles seen more as complementary rather than supplementary. Gardner (2007) rightly observes that we have entered a demanding new age for those charged with building strong communication and successful working relations between schools and
the many communities that they serve. Accountability issues, funding pressures, increasing competition and expanding expectations are just a few items in the growing list of communication pressures facing schools today.

School-community partnerships have the potential of developing education in relation to access, retention and quality if well established and nurtures. In Kenya this partnership is left to individual schools and administration to come up with own initiatives and models which works by experimentation. There is no unified approach by the government even when so much has been written about its benefits. It is, therefore, not clear how such partnerships should be established. Therefore this study examined the partnership opportunities, nature and type of community involvement in school management in primary schools in Lamu East District.

1.4 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to assess critically and examine the level and nature of school-community partnership and its implication in the development of primary school education in Lamu East District.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The study focuses on the following objectives:-

a) To find out nature and types of community involvement in the management of schools in the development of education, in Lamu East District.

b) To identify partnership opportunities in school-community partnerships in the development of education in Lamu East District.
c) To identify problems and challenges of school-community partnerships in the development of education in Lamu East District.

d) To determine the possible solutions in enhancing the school-community partnerships in development of education in Lamu East District.

1.6 Research Questions

The study is guided by the following research questions:-

a) What is the nature and types of community involvement in the management of schools in the development of education in Lamu East District?

b) What are the partnership opportunities in school-community partnerships in the development of education in Lamu East District?

c) What are the problems and challenges of school-community partnerships in the development of education in Lamu East District?

d) What are the possible solutions in enhancing the school-community partnerships in development of education in Lamu East District?

1.7 Significance of the Study

The study findings is important to the following groups;

Schools:

- Strengthen schools agents to formulate policies that will involve parents and community
- Assistance for improved performance in exams
- Healthy children are generally receptive to new learning experiences
- Provision of school physical infrastructure will be guaranteed
• Teachers, committee and the community live in harmony for the development of education in the district

Parents/Community:
• They are likely to appreciate the use of the resources they provide and inspired to provide more
• They will own the decisions they participated to make
• Are enabled to provide for infrastructure and give resources according to priorities and capability
• Take charge of discipline of their children
• Guide children in their school work

Education officials:
• Assist in monitoring and evaluation of policies.
• Will understand unique challenges to enable formulation of intervention measures.
• Enhancement of curriculum delivery and quality education.
• Formulate policies on partnerships.

1.8 Delimitations of the study

a) The study assesses the nature and level of school-community partnership and how it affected the development of education in primary schools in Lamu East District.

b) Though there were various other factors affecting development of education including infrastructure, teaching and learning resources and learners’ attitude, these were outside the scope of this study.
c) The study was carried out in public primary schools in Lamu East District only thus its findings were not to be generalized to other Districts in the country.

1.9 Limitations of the study
a) The study relies mainly on three methods of data collection, questionnaires, and interviews and focused group discussion.
b) The respondents especially head teachers’ failed to give accurate information thus it was difficult to establish their role in establishing school-community partnership.

1.10 Assumptions of the study
The study assumed that:
a) Enhanced school-community partnership leads to success of pupils on national examinations enhance access and retention.
b) School-community partnership is very essential in the development of education.

1.11 Theoretical Framework
Social System Theory
Systems are divided into two main classes: “open” systems which interact with their environment, and “closed” systems, which do not interact with their environment. Social systems theory generally deals with so called open systems. A school is an example of an open system because it constantly interacts with its environment. All organizations can be viewed as open-systems which take input from other systems and through a series of activities transform or convert the significance inputs into outputs (inputs of other systems) to achieve some objectives.
In terms of this social system model the school, for example takes its resources such as people, finance, material and information; transforms and converts these and return them to the environment (*society*) in the form of changed individuals. In this sense it is impossible for a school to be a closed system. Using this system model the same form of analysis can be applied to all types of organizations. Viewing organizations as systems provides a common point of reference and enables us to take a general approach to the study of organizations, to analyze them and to decide general principles and prescriptions.

The increasing rate of change in major environment factors (*technical, economic, social and governmental*) has highlighted the need to study the total organization and to adopt a system approach. In order to understand the operations of organizational performance, it is necessary to consider how they achieve an internal and external balance and how they are able to adapt to changes in their environments and the demands placed upon them.

All organizations need clear aims and objectives which will determine the nature of inputs, the series of activities to achieve outputs and the realizations of organizational goals. Feedback about the performance of the system and the effects of its operations on the environment are measured in terms of achieving the aims and objectives. Basic principles of organization and management apply in any series of activities in any organization. The common elements of management planning, organizing, directing, coordinating and controlling apply in all cases. These essential administrative functions must be carried out in all types of organizations.
While general principles and prescriptions apply to all organizations, differences in their aims and objectives influences in the input – conversions – output process and is the series of activities involved in this process. The nature of inputs, the conversion process, and the forms of outputs will emphasize characteristic features of a particular organization. These features highlight alternative forms of structure, management methods of operations, and behavior of people employed by or working in different types of organizations.

The study of organization as system serves, therefore to indicate both the common features of organizations and also the main distinguishing features between different types of organizations. The systems view of organizations enables managers to view their own organizations in perspective and to compare it in meaningful terms with other types of organizations.

1.12 Conceptual Framework

School-community partnership tends to be complimentary like spokes in a wheel, for the development in education to be realized. School administrators and managers should relate well with parents and other members of the school community including learners for the ultimate goals of education to be realized. It is envisaged that, qualified and receptive school managers who co-operate with parents and provide a good environment for community participation in school affairs, will bring about respect motivation and therefore success in national examination, confident children who are enrolled and retained in schools and ultimately molded into disciplined and competent individuals with ability to face life challenges effectively. Figure 1.1 below
shows the relationships between dependent variables, independent variables and the outcome variables in this research study.

**Figure 1.1 Conceptual Framework showing school – community partnership**
1.13 Definition of Operational Terms

Administrator : Refers to the head teacher, education officials, and school communities.

Community : Refers to parents, neighbours, caregivers, sponsors, guardians, elders, leaders.

Enrolment : Refers to number of students admitted in a school.

Human resource : Refers to the teaching and non-teaching staff and teachers.

Ministry : Refers to the Ministry of Education.

Partnership : Refers to co-operation/working together.

Performance : Refers to achievement in national examination.

Public schools : Refers to government sponsored school which is under the Ministry of Education.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter contains review of literature, directly or indirectly related to the study. The literature focused on the challenges facing school-community partnership in the development of education. Literature is reviewed under the following headings:-

(i) School-Community Partnership in Developed Countries.

(ii) School-Community Partnership in Africa.

(iii) The Concept of School-Community Partnerships.

(iv) School Community Partnership in Kenya.

(v) Summary

2.2 Schools-Community Partnership in Developed Countries

Wright and Dolores (2009) say that in the European countries the teachers unanimously recognize the value of parent involvement for many of the same reasons that leads to student academic success, garnering parent support in matters of discipline and school attendance and in general fostering parent-school cooperation. The family- community oriented teachers discuss parent involvement from the perspective of benefits accruing to parents, family and community, not just the students. They deal with issues of fostering parent self-esteem and getting parents involved in nonacademic activities such as sports. Barbour (2008) observed that when parents are involved, their children behave better because parent presence creates accountability at school and in the community.
In Germany Gardner (2007) points out that teachers agree that their expectations focus on specific ways that parents can support their efforts in school-reinforce academic achievement, support teachers in matters of discipline and help students understand the need and value of education. Additionally, family-community oriented teachers link their expectations of parents to the family-parent commitment to the well-being of the child by giving time to the child and in general being involved in the child's life.

In South America Clifton (2006) points out that the teachers commonly believe that parents place great responsibility and expectations on them and the school. In addition to providing a high quality of education for their children, teachers feel that other expectations included solving all the child's and the family's problems-and that includes health, drug problems, discipline and psychological problems. Grant (2009) in contrast, family-community oriented teachers understood the parents' expectations of them within the parents' cultural perspective. They talk about differences of the concept "teacher" across cultures, particularly as they differ between a North American versus a Latino perspective, and that Latino parents view the teacher with respect and deference. They further recognized that many of the parents have little formal education and use teachers as resources for problem-solving.

Effective school-community relations raise student persistence and achievement (Eccles and Harrold, 2009) contents that student achievement is positively associated with involvement in school, and that schools that encourage high levels of parent involvement outperform their counterparts where there are lower levels of involvement. Perrone (2008) argues that although every community has persons with
experience who could further enrich life in schools, many schools do not utilize community resources to their full advantage. Schools that have depended on teachers alone, he continues, have always been limited by the experience base that teachers bring to their classrooms. To understand the school-community relationship one needs:-

a) Address the nature of the relationship that exists.

b) How parents and teachers can work together for school improvement.

c) How teachers can be integrated into the community.

Karen and Warren (2011) suggest that the extent of partnership between home and school are mostly influenced by teachers’ and parents’ practices, attitudes and beliefs. He says that the extent of family school collaboration is affected by various school and teacher practices, characteristics related to reporting practices, attitudes regarding the families of the children in the school, and both interest in and understanding of how effectively involve parents. Although there is increasing recognition of the specific role that the parent involvement in schools plays in the achievement of students, historical analysis indicates that parent-teacher relations are more characterized as those of dissociation (Donbusch and Glasgow, 2009). In other words, schools and homes seldom collaborate as closely as maybe expected.

Sanders, (2007) argues that structural factors such as governance, curriculum, group-memberships, and ethnic-specific parenting styles have more serious implications for links between home and school than beliefs and attitudes of parents and teachers. These authors believe that parents are more likely to involve themselves in the primary
grades than in the middle and high schools because middle schools teachers have neither the time nor the resources to closely monitor the performance of each student and keep parents informed of ways in which they can assist their children.

Lareau, (2006) contends that the status identifies shaped by class or profession have a serious impact on links between the home and the school. She believes that working-class and lower class parents do not usually tend to be involved in their children’s schooling. According to Lareau middle-class parents are much more likely to see themselves as having shared responsibility for the schooling process. Working-class and lower-class parents, however, appear to turn over responsibility for education to the school. Advocates for school community relations believe that:-

(a) Parent involvement will mobilize and create resources that schools may not be able to generate.

(b) Parents and teachers are willing partners in home-school links.

(c) Parents and families will be able to pool together those local resources that are relevant to the education of their children.

First, the assumption that parent involvement will mobilize and create resources that schools may not be able to generate implies that the community possesses a wealth of resources in the form of local traditions and customs that could be useful to students. Rogovin (2007) argues that there are vast untapped educational talents within the family and opportunities outside the traditional formal classroom structure that could be useful to schools. Families are among the greatest resources a teacher will encounter, she writes, and no matter where you teach, families are guaranteed
resources of human experience. Perrone (2008) also believes that when teachers establish close working relationships with a family, little by little, we get to know the whole child. Family observations and insights about children inform our teaching and help us better understand children’s behavior.

The second assumption that parents and teachers are willing partners in home-school links implies that parents and teachers are eager to work together as partners in education. However, teachers can be resentful of parent participation (Epstein, 2008). For example Chadwick (2006) found that teachers overwhelmingly said they did not want more parent-initiated contact. Indeed teachers were often resentful of parent-initiated contact, and teachers welcomed contact when there was a problem and when they asked the parent to come in for a conference. According to Alatorre (2009), parent-teacher contacts usually operated in a context of teacher control, with parents asked to assist the teacher.

The third assumption, that parents and families will be able to pool local resources that are relevant to the education of their children, implies that teachers and parents share equal power, and parents have the empowerment, information, and know how to influence important decisions. However, Fiorre (2011) argues that advocates overemphasize family-school links because they overlook the power relations that exist between home and school. Lawson (2007) believes that there cannot be real home-school partnerships because partnerships thrive on equality of power, but parents do not have a power base from which to influence important decisions. As she writes, working-class and lower-class parents perceive educators as ambassadors for
dominant institutions and, in many instances, as a possible threat to their family. This looming and possible threat of educators creates a context within which family-school relations are created. In Oppenheim (2008) view, parents, educational skills are often quite weak and therefore, parents, especially parents of working-class and lower-class children, are not always an educational resource.

2.2.1 Power as a contested factor in school-community relations

Power relations have a critical effect on parent involvement in schooling (Neito, 2006) offer an understanding of how power relations created by the mechanisms of the mainstream of North America school system work to exclude minority parents from involvement in schools. McLaren (2009) terms a power relationship as hegemony. He defines hegemony as a struggle in which the powerful win the consent of those who are oppressed, with the oppressed unknowingly participating in their own oppression.

Darner (2010) argues that for centuries, Eurocentric cultures have used power relations to achieve domination over minorities. Darner believes power relations in minority schools are in three basic forms: cultural hegemony, cultural invasion and language domination. Cultural hegemony, according to Zuniga (2011), refers to the idea of assimilating minority students into Eurocentric cultures. Cultural invasion is where the dominant group uses social practices, social forms and social structures produced in schools and churches to generate, process, and assimilate knowledge and information to students and parents’ in order to socialize them into Eurocentric ways of life. According to Greenwood and Hichman (2008) cultural invasion is a way of maintaining continuous economic, political, social and cultural power over minority
groups. Finally, language domination is where schools downplay the cultures and languages of minority students and further, explain minority students’ failures in terms of inadequacies created by these cultures and languages. For Dader (2010) language takes two forms:

(a) Schools increasingly reject minority languages in favour of English and teach students beliefs and values that perpetuate the inferiority of minority languages, and

(b) School adopts teaching styles that deprive minority students of critical thinking and allow them to support the ideological interests of the dominant groups.

Similarly, speaking to relations of domination, Giroux (2007) argues that the process of traditional education do not provide opportunities for empowering students in society. He points out that traditional education does not teach important issues regarding knowledge, power, and domination in so far as education based on the mastery of pedagogical techniques and the transmission of knowledge instrumental to the existing society. Giroux further argues that public school offers limited individual mobility to members of the working class and other oppressed groups, and that public schools are powerful instruments for the reproduction of capitalist relations of production and the legitimating ideologies of everyday life.

Oakes and Lipton (2008) also attempt to locate race and socio-economic orientations within the contexts of school-community relations, contending that ugly racial histories in communities make some parents of colour reticent to be a visible presence at school. They also believe that because low-income parents’ do not have ready
access to information about schools, these parents lack the confidence that would enable them to involve themselves in schools. Community representatives, Miller (2010) suggests that can inform discussions around curricular and extracurricular issues and the process develop more democratic relationships with the professional staff.

2.3 Schools-Community Partnership in Africa

Guillaume and Yee (2009) in Africa teacher appears not to accommodate and entice parents to become more involved. Some of these provide fewer instructions for parents, vary meeting times for parents, find less effective communication mechanisms and do less or none home visits. In most cases the family-community are not given chance in doing the business of schooling, create site-based decision making that involves parents and recreate a school structure that is less bureaucratic, less impersonal and less budget-driven and in general overcoming barriers to parent involvement in the broad context of needed systemic changes (Katherine, 2010).

In their study Greenwood and Hichman (2008) indicates that teachers tend to view students, parents and community, through their own cultural prism and may not be ready to understand or address the learning needs and issues of the students and families of the communities in which they teach. Such experiences cannot allow preservicing teachers the opportunity and challenge of examining their own cultural views and beliefs and developing openness to new ways of understanding and thinking.
According to Davies (2009) says that helping teachers to become open to working with parents and fostering parent involvement beyond educentric borders means more than just mandating curriculum additions to include a parent involvement component at the pre-service level. Weaving university course work and classroom/community experience together seems most promising for bringing about a visceral understanding of the value of the school-parent-community relationship.

Berger (2007) believes that building and maintaining a genuine partnership with parents is a process of continually seeking to understand assumptions and to share meanings and expectations. Partnerships can only grow when they are based on mutual trust and respect for the other's values, perspectives and experiences. It is not uncommon, however, for minority parents and families to feel alienated from the school. But Comer (2009) points out that minority parents may lack knowledge about school protocol and may feel inadequate or unwelcome due to differences of income, education or ethnicity compared to school personnel. This difference may result in the perception that the school is indifferent or even cold. In turn, the school then judges parents as uninterested in school involvement. Additionally, the psychological distance between minority group parents and teachers is compounded when school personnel do not see themselves or the school as a part of the surrounding community and the families (Oppenheim, 2008).

In his research Epstein (2008) shows that a correlation of increased levels of parent involvement is an increase in student achievement as well as improved student attendance and reduced dropout rates these are desirable outcomes from an
"educentric" perspective, however they fall short of fully addressing the National Educational Goal to increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of children. Clearly, schools should not be expected to single-handedly undertake this task. Educators and parents together must promote the well-being of students within family and community contexts (Greenwood & Hickman, 2008).

Gaitan (2007) agrees that school collaboration with other institutions and agencies provides rich and varied possibilities and realities. Additionally, collaborating with parents and communities, while capitalizing on their resources and strengths, promotes social and emotional growth for children. This simultaneously promotes parent, family and community empowerment and well-being. This is supported by (Berger, 2007) who argues that successful parent-school collaborations must include opportunities for parents to recognize and value their skills and knowledge, utilize those strengths and resources present among the parents and the community and create multiple opportunities for parents to expand their abilities. This is particularly true for low income parents whose only access to education may be through their children's school. Collaboratively promoting the well-being of the student and the family develops human and social capital that strengthens families and communities.

In his view Davies (2009) says a new definition of parent involvement is that one not limited to traditional parent activities in the school building where families are viewed not as deficient, but as sources of strength. The guiding principles help parents: -

(1) Value their own knowledge,
(2) Share their knowledge with others,

(3) Learn new skills and talents to benefit themselves and their families,

(4) Become involved on their own terms in the life of the school.

In developed countries parents are encouraged to be self-assess their strengths, talents, and set the collaborative school-parent agenda by voicing their needs and wants to guide and shape the nature of their involvement in the school.

2.3.1 School-Community Relations in Uganda

In the early years of educational development in Uganda, schools were characterized by limited formalized contacts with parents except in the event of being invited for speech days, sport day and soon. The parent had no say in what was taught or how the schools were run. According to (Lasibille, 2007) cites a number of factors were responsible for this situation:-

a) Firstly, the schools leadership did not attempt to establish a partnership with the parents, believing that parents were irrelevant to the schooling process, since they did not even know what was been taught.

b) Secondly, since a number of parents were illiterate or had low educational background at that time, anything to do with school was intimidating to them.

c) Thirdly, the long distances between home and school, and the cost of travelling inhibited parents from checking on their children at school.

d) Fourthly, parents believed teachers could do it all alone, and did not see the need to get involved.
The relationship between parents and teachers however changed for the better from the 1980’s to date. The cause of changed attitude and circumstances was the reduction of government funding in schools, which consequently created financial crisis in the schools. The government right from the time it took interest in education in 1925 had been heavily funding education in the country. However, due to the wars, civil strife, dwindling exports, and increased number of schools, government funding in schools shrunk considerably, in the 1980’s to date (Lewin, 2006). Schools found themselves unable to run effectively anymore, with shortages of scholastic materials, and basic infrastructure in some cases. Teachers, who are poorly remunerated, resorted to teaching in two or more schools to make odd ends meet. Some teachers left the country to seek for greener pastures, while others who remained, resorted to coaching as a means of earning extra income. It is against this background therefore that parents became key players in the management of schools since the 80’s. The financial contribution (support) of parents are faced with such financial crisis and shortages as described above, the school managers decided to apply for financial assistance from Parents. Parent Teacher Association (PTA) were thus born, with the aim of building a partnership between parents and teachers, for the purpose of improving the quality of education in schools. One way of improving quality was to provide the funds the schools badly needed in order to run effectively (Laboke, 2007). Within a short space of time from their formation, the PTA’s had become the major financiers of school expenditure and this is true even today. Currently, government contribution to any one school can be as low as 15 percent or even less of the total income of the school, while
the rest is contributed by parents. Therefore, this parent’s contribution is utilized to meet various school expenditures, some of which are described here:-

a) Purchase of scholastic materials, games and music facilities, foods, and medicine.

b) Purchase of machinery like lawn mowers, generators, computers and others.

c) Purchase of vehicles such as buses, lorries and others.

d) Construction of buildings such as classrooms laboratories, libraries, teachers houses and many others.

e) Payment of salaries of non-teachers such as cooks, watchmen, laboratory attendants, typists, library assistants, and salary of teachers who have not yet accessed the government payroll.

f) Payment of a top-up allowance to all teachers, to supplement the low salaries received from the government.

g) Teachers’ lunches, teas, house rent, transport fares, loans, medical facilities and many others.

Laboke,(2000) notes that although there has been positive advance in establishing parent-teacher partnerships in Uganda, there are still problems that defer further growth such that; Some parents still think that they are irrelevant to the schooling process, and it should all be left to the teachers who are the specialists. Parents have been on the periphery of the schooling system for too long, that it will take time to change their attitude as most of them are contented with this peripheral position. Others fail to play their partnership role because of such deterrents as lack of time due to a busy schedule, expense of travel, having children in several schools and cultural differences such as language. Because PTA’s executive committees participate in
decisions concerning fees charges, parents when invited for meetings, are suspicious that the meetings are for the purpose of increasing school fees and this stops many from attending. Those who turn up get surprised when there is no mention of Budget or extra payments. Other parents are just irresponsible and do not want to be bothered with extra parenting.

2.3.2 School-Community Relations in Nigeria

According to Mariam,(2008) the steering committee in developing the Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF) strategy in Nigeria identified the National Parents Teachers Association of Nigeria (NAPTAN) as one of its strategic partners in the effort to ensuring that civil society supports government to ensure that all Nigerian Children have access to good quality education by 2015. This is based on the realization that in the delivery of education there are four principal actors; the state as the duty bearer, the child as the right holder, the parent as the first educator and the teacher as the professional instructor. It is common knowledge that for rights to be enforced there is need for advocacy or demand for the implantation of such rights. The Parents Teachers Association has been known to be one of the earliest civil associations advocating for the rights of children, especially within the school environment.

According to the United States’ National Parents Teachers Associations mission and purpose statement, the PTA seeks to promote the welfare of the child and youth at home, in the school, and in the community (Chadwick, 2006). The PTA has also sought to raise standard of life at home, secure laws that protect children and youth, bridge the gap between home and school, and to build and develop efforts connecting
educators with the public in securing the highest standards in mental and physical, social and spiritual education. The Common Wealth Education Fund therefore organized a round table with Parents Teachers Association in Nigeria to determine the role of PTA in Education for All planning Process. The meeting ensured the responsibility of education delivery was that the government and the PTA’s role to be supportive, specifically one ensuring the welfare of the child within school environment and the home (Fiore, 2011). In carrying out the role the PTA will need to develop its capacity in the area of policy and advocacy, it will need to increase its understanding of the Education for All frameworks and other education standards to be able to partner with the government. To support this the Economic Organization of the West African States (ECOWAS) as part of the activities marking the 2004 Global Week of Action requested the Secretary General to use his good office and request presidents and heads of states within West-African Sub-region to:-

a) Expedite action in developing National EFA Plans and commit them to its implementation.

b) Ensure that all hidden costs of education (user fees, PTAs Subscriptions, development levies and others) are removed and education is free in the real sense.

c) Ensure a clear and improved national budgetary allocation to education that reflects commitment to achievement the education for all (Mariam, 2008).

2.4 The Concept of School – Community Partnerships

Teklemariam, (2008) rightfully observed that, several educationists have tried to explain the meaning of school – community relations. The underlying consensus is that it refers to sharing of responsibilities, cooperation, working together for the
promotion of educational progress. There is need for a two way communication in school community. Information gained through school-community contact will help the teacher to co-ordinate school activities with those of other agencies thus avoiding conflict as well as endorse appropriate supervision to ensure a smooth liaison of the two. Lawson (2007) says that where parents have become involved in their own children learning, the children’s school performance has invariably improved quietly significantly. The community is the source of learners that is the catchment area, there is every need for teachers and education officials to understand the children’s background, environment and cultures for them to appreciate the learners in order to improve other process of teaching and learning. Lewin (2006) says children who do not have access adequate housing, health care and nutrition do not learn well.

Giroux, (2007) points out that teachers who lack an understanding of their students culture or meaningful relationships with their families, do not teach well. This is supported by Pogorin, (2007) who argued that the inevitable contact and influence between schools and the community should be consciously planned so that maximum benefit can be delivered. McLaren (2009) in his presentation of the CIES conference in USA identified the following as avenue for partnership. The community can participate:-

(a) Taking care of buildings and maintaining school plant.

(b) Planning school policies.

(c) Employment of staff

(d) Monitoring performance

(e) Safeguarding school finances
(f) Discipline of students.

It can be pointed out that school – community partnership enhances education achievement and others improve education standards to the benefit of the community. Schools cannot isolate communities and it is this knowledge and conviction that has created interest researchers to find out what exactly is the partnership situation in Lamu East District, and how can it been improved.

Laboke, (2007) in his report he cited neighborhood conditions and strategies employed by the administrators as some of the factors influencing school – community partnership in Uganda. It states that neighborhood function as the social and culture webs linking families and children to a set of norms, routines and traditions. What the child knows, experiences in the neighborhood, will have an impact on his/her behaviour and learning in school.

Barbour, (2008) confirms that school cannot afford to ignore the child’s immediate environment. School administrators need to understand the child’s upbringing, values he/she enroll on school. The kinds of families, economic status, single parents and divorce cases all influence behavior. Chunga, (2006) concurs by saying that educational success even in schools serving poor and working class families’ rests on the ability of school administrators and others to activate personal, family and community resources. Strategies of partnerships, employed by school administrators are also a factor that enhances or inhibits successful partnership. By moving closer to the people and interacting with them fruitfully, institutions will be making themselves better understood by the communities (Kinyanjui, 2009). School administrators should
provide avenues that encourage parental involvement. They should see the community and partners in education. Otieno, (2006) notes that most school heads in Kenya involve the community in fund raising activities only. The community is not involved in spending even the funds they have helped to raise.

Kegan, (2007) also found that community low level of formal education as another factor that influences co-operation. According to him, most teachers feel that community members would not be able to assist as required because they lack knowledge. The community members themselves also have resigned to the thought that they are not able to provide assistance. What he doesn’t clarify however is the kind of assistance. Do parents need to have gone to school for they to be able to supervise cleaning of schools? Cook for the students during national examinations and strategies for the security of the school property. But Kinyanjui, (2009) agrees that it is wrongly assumed that the community support should be only academic like giving lectures on topics given. There are varied avenues for partnerships where every member of the community has something to offer as assistance, if provided the opportunity.

There lack a model of deliberately involving the community in affairs of the school which this research seeks to find out and recommend possible strategies. In his research Chunga (2006) points out that the fact that co-operation between schools and communities need to be consciously established. It is not a relationship of chance but each group is supposed to understand its role and an enabling environment provided.
The partnership is not a one off thing, but rather a cultivated effort that should be reviewed and improved continuously.

2.4.1 The home context of the child

Mahoney and Read, (2008) emphasize that the child is a member of a biological family and a home is the first contact before he comes to school. When children go to school they are also combine with the home and therefore these two institutions should be complementary.

Bell, (2006) says that through the years the many factors those contribute to excellence in learning have proved that no school can fully compensate for failure at home. The home context of the child is one of the important factors that determine his/her achievement in school. Bowlby, (2006) presented a considerable amount of evidence that illustrated the negative effects of early experience. He showed that, children brought up in institutions who are not given the opportunity to develop stable emotional bonds failed to thrive and develop in the same way as children brought up in a family home. Here it should be noted that achievement is not only in passing examinations but rather achievement in becoming fully developed, emotionally, socially, academically. The world is not in short of people who have achieved highly in school but are socially misfits.

The Michigan Department of Education (Alatorre, 2009) in a research found out that, where there is parental involvement, there is:-

(a) Higher grades and graduation rates

(b) Better school attendance
(c) Increased motivation
(d) Fewer instances of violent behavior.

Fiore, (2011) agrees that the home of the child serves as the child’s induction phase to the school. Mutual understanding and partnership between school and community would help teachers, parents and other community members to identify areas in which they can work together for the benefit of the child.

2.5 School – Community Partnership in Kenya.

2.5.1 Evolution of Parent Teachers Associations (PTAs)

According to Otwoma, (2006) the PTA started in USA with the kindergarten developments which were engineered by the Mothers meetings in Chicago in 1855, taking off effectively in 1894 through the Mothers’ Congregations. In the USA the PTA is a national organization enshrined in the constitution with each PTA serving a locate state. In Kenya it started featuring in 1978 when the then President of Kenya, Daniel T. Arap Moi issued a directive that each school should have a Parents Association for secondary schools. However, the PTA concepts within Kenya had started in 1960 when State House Girls School formed their own. Though the PTA is recognized by government, it has never been given a legal mandate like the BOG in school management (Kenya Education Commission, 1964).

Besides the Session Paper No. 6 of 1988 on Education and Manpower Training for the next decade and beyond, no other concrete significant move has been made towards this end legalizing PTA. This implies that PTA was established through administrative rules and has no legal status up to now except for those registered under the Societies
Act. According to the Kiarie, (2004) the then Director of Education J. M. Kamunge asked schools not to register their PTAs with the Societies Act as PTA was to be included in the Education Act.

### 2.5.2 Constitution of PTA

Membership in PTA is open to all Parents and Teachers of a given school and according to (MOE, 2004):-

a) Members of PTA are elected during parents’ general meetings every year. Each class is represented by a parent elected by parents or guardians with students in that class. The size of the PTA committee depends on the size and nature of the school e.g. a single stream, double stream, mixed e.t.c. Hence a PTA committee could have 4 teachers and 4 parents for a single stream or 4 teachers and 8 parents for a double stream.

b) Due to affirmative action all PTAs have now to include female representation in their committee by at least a third.

c) The representatives then elect a chairman from among them. The members to be co-opted into the BOG are also elected (Education Act, Cap. 211, 1988).

### 2.5.3 Operational Guidelines for PTA

a) PTA members are elected annually during the annual general meetings.

b) Members serve for a minimum of one year a maximum of 4 years or within the period of their valid parenting in the schools.

c) Their activities are mainly limited to approval and financing of development activities in the school.
2.5.4 Functions of PTA

According to Kinyanjui (2008) the functions of PTA are as follows:-

i. Integrating the schools activities into those of the community within which the school is located.

ii. Providing the necessary financial support to the school by organizing Harambee for school development projects. This was supported by the former President Moi when he stopped the collection of school building and development funds.

iii. Providing for the necessary equipment and other teaching/learning resources. In line with this they build staff houses. This was supported by the then Education Minister, S. Kalonzo Musyoka as reported in the (Kenya Times of Saturday, February 13th 1999) when he called on BOG and PTA to plan for improved facilities in their respective schools. By so doing they supplement government efforts to provide facilities, hence cost sharing in schools.

iv. Ensuring maintenance of discipline amongst students. The former President Moi while addressing teacher-students at Kisii Teachers’ College directed that all educational institutions in the country should have parents’ days to enable the parents to visit the schools and know the problems facing the students and teachers in instilling discipline. This was supported by KNUT, who indicated that BOG and PTA members should be involved besides teachers.

v. Maintaining a conducive teaching/learning environment to raise academic standards in the schools. They have a duty to make sure that their schools are equipped with computers and other information technology facilities to enable students catch up with the rest of the world. In this case they’re supposed to propel
the schools to greater heights of academic excellence. This can be achieved through co-operation with concerned parties.

vi. Participates in management of the school through their representatives in BOG. Under this they participate in pre-planning and budgeting for the institution.

2.5.5 A Critique of the PTA

Otieno, (2006) points out that there are continued conflicts between the BOG and PTA in financial management.

1. PTA feels that they are contributing but cannot be fully involved in the process of expenditure. They view BOG as a clique of people selected to “eat where they have not sown”. This is more so when the membership of BOG has been interpreted to imply a form of employment or possible source of material gain.

2. PTA is an illegal entity as such it has no legal basis for existence except once registered under the Societies Act and in that case still their roles in school management are quite limited.

3. The PTA itself does not also include the views of the largest consumer (students) in their leadership (Sagini Report, 1991). The parents and teachers act as though they are representing the learners’ interests e.g. a case whereby PTA decides that a school should not pay more than Kshs. 4,500.00 for a whole years’ fees. This could be convenient to the parent but detrimental to the learner in the long run.

4. Because of non-existence of concrete structures and guidelines e.g. qualifications academic or any other specific criteria, for the appointment to be a PTA official, it is open to manipulation by Principals during selection. By and large such PTAs will operate at the wishes of the head teacher.
5. There is also a strong perception that the agenda in most cases is controlled by a few for specific purposes.

6. PTA members are not normally serviced or trained to carry out their duties and responsibilities hence bringing about incompetence and discretionary decisions in the management process. It depends mostly on whose opinion overrides the others.

7. In some cases the PTA has over-stepped its role by actively interfering with the running of schools e.g. on headship choices.

8. The PTA is currently the main financier of school programs through fees and donations. They also sponsor school education days. Some have invested positively to supplement the regular school income e.g. staff houses.

**Summary**

The building of a realistic expectation of what the schools can do in a community represents one of the major tasks of any school administrator. Only with such understanding can school procedures make sense to citizens and lead to significant advances in school performances. It is generally said that a school is not an island, but a partnership of the community in which it is located. Members of the community are now or partially involved in the school affairs than ever before. School-community relationship requires particular attention, considering that the 8-4-4 system calls for the participation of parents and the community as a whole in providing funds, facilities and supplies through self-help efforts. As such the head teacher has to be accountable to the community. Despite of the above points it is very important to know how many schools adhere strictly to the school community relations in order to succeed in their educational endeavours.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This section deals with various procedures and strategies that were useful in the study. It focused on research design, study locale, target population, sample and sampling techniques, data collection instruments, pilot data collection and data analysis techniques.

3.2 Research Design

The study employed a descriptive survey research. Kombo (2006) argues that before much progress can be made in solving educational problems, descriptive phenomena must be obtained by means of descriptive research. Descriptive research attempts to describe what is in the social system such as a school. Instruments such as questionnaires and interviews were used in this survey study. The data was gathered from 10 primary schools through administration of various instruments to a cross-section of respondents drawn from Head Teachers, Teachers, Pupils, Community Members and Government agents. Qualitatively the data was obtained, and description was chiefly emphasized. Quantitatively the study used numerical data to explore the traits and situations. Statistical methods like graphs, tables, and pie-charts were employed in trying to summarize the independent and dependent variables in order to understand the relationship between the variables. This helped in analyzing data to arrive at results which were interpreted to give meaning to the study.
3.3 Location of the Study

The study was conducted in Lamu East District, Coast Province, Kenya. It is about 370 kilometers north of Mombasa. It is an area where 90% is an Island. It consists of three administrative divisions and six electoral wards. It covered 60% of the primary schools that is 20% in each division since the area share economic activities, religion, culture and social set up. Economically the area is one of the tourist attraction centres with good and natural beaches. The location was chosen because of the low education standards in relations to retention, performance in national examinations, and completion rates. Because of this, the findings were expected to contribute in helping to improve the situation.

3.4 Target Population

3.4.1 Schools

Lamu East District has nineteen public primary schools.

3.4.2 Respondents

There are 19 school head teachers and deputies, 82 Teachers, 1,550 students, 5 government agents (AEOs, DEOs, and QASO), 380 Community members or elder, 985 parents. Therefore the total target population was 3,021 respondents.

3.5 Sampling Design

3.5.1 Schools

The researcher uses the simple random sampling technique to get the number of primary schools for this study. Out of 19 Schools in Lamu East District 10 were sampled for this research study.
### 3.5.2 Respondents

The respondents were drawn from the following categories of target population. Head teachers, Teachers, Students, Parents, Community members and Government agents. Purposive sampling was used on Government agents (DEOs and AEOs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sample Population</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Teachers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Agents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,021</strong></td>
<td><strong>935</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher used the simple random sampling technique due to various limitations that did not allow researching the whole population. Out of 19 Head Teachers the sample was 10. Out of 82 Teachers the sample was 50. Out of 1,550 pupils, 450 were sampled. Out of 985 Parents 300 were sampled. Out of 380 Community Members 120 were sampled. Therefore the total sampled respondents were 935 which were 31% of the target population.
3.6 Research Instruments

The research employed the following three types of research instruments:-

1) Questionnaires

The questionnaire was important for this purpose in order to obtain comparable responses. According to (Kombo, 2006), questionnaires measures likelihood of straight, even and blunt answers. This can be superior to an interview because social communion operates strongly in a face of situation that may prevent the person from expressing what he feels to be socially or professionally unacceptable views. The questionnaires contained unstructured open-ended and structured close-ended questions. The following were the types of questionnaires that were used to collect data from the respondents in this study:-

a) Questionnaire for Head Teachers

This instrument was structured to seek information on the challenges and problems facing relationships between the community and primary schools in Lamu District. Head Teachers and their Deputies are in-charge of the daily administration and management of education institutions and therefore provided information on management issues. This is shown in Appendix A.

b) Questionnaire for Teachers

This instrument was structured to seek information on the development of relationships between school and the community. Teachers execute tasks within teaching and learning environment at school level. They were therefore to give data on
issues pertaining to management of teaching and learning within the community environment. This is shown in Appendix B.

c) Questionnaire for Students

This instrument was structured to seek information on the academic environment of pupils in both the school and community environments in Lamu District. Information gathered showed challenges facing pupils. This is shown in Appendix C.

2) Focus Group Discussions

Group discussions were held with head teachers, committee members, parents, elders and educational officials. This enabled the researcher to tap deeper feelings of the target population towards the topic. Discussions were held at the convenience of the respondents and in confidential manner.

3) Interview Schedule

The interview schedule was used to get information from the government officials concerning the government efforts to address the issues of primary school-community partnerships.

3.7 Pilot Study

Questionnaires, interview schedules were piloted in at least one selected centre for the study. The piloting ensured clarity and sustainability of the language used. Furthermore, expert opinion from my supervisors helped to check on the content and constant validity of the instruments. The purpose of this pre-testing assisted to find out any weakness that might be contained in the instruments. The piloting also determined
whether the instruments are reliable and valid, thus checking whether the items had covered enough range of data required, test whether there were identifiable ambiguity in the structure of the questions in order to make improvement and reveal flaws in the questions and inadequacies in coding systems.

3.7.1 Validity of instruments

Validity is the degree to which test measures what is supposed to measure (Kombo, 2006). Validity of the content of the study was sort out. The research instrument should be able to depict what it is supposed to measure. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, the supervisors’ opinion was sought after, to determine the relevance of the content used in the questionnaires. They each examined the questionnaires, the interview schedules and provided a feedback to the researcher. Essentially validity in the above context was concerned with establishing whether the questionnaire content measured what it was supposed to measure.

3.7.2 Reliability of instruments

The reliability of the study was able to address the similarity of the results through repeated trials. Reliability is the degree to which a question consistently measures (Orodho, 2009). The identified problems were supplied with the instruments and scored manually by the researcher for the consistency of results. The responses were analyzed after which one week period was allowed to pass before the same treatment is applied to the same respondents and analysis done. The results were recorded accordingly. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient formula given below was used to calculate the correlation coefficient in which: the X values was the
data points that is number of respondents of corresponding questions for the first trial and the Y values were data points obtained in the second trial. Upon calculation, a correlation coefficient of +0.56 was obtained which indicated a perfect relationship between the first and the second results.

\[
R = \frac{\sum XY - \frac{(\sum X)(\sum Y)}{n}}{\sqrt{\left(\sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{n}\right) \left(\sum Y^2 - \frac{(\sum Y)^2}{n}\right)}}
\]

Where: \(\sum XY\) = Sum of the gross products of the values of variables X and Y

\((\sum X)(\sum Y)\) = Product of the sum of X and the sum of Y

\(\sum\) = Sigma (meaning sum of) sum of the values obtained in piloting

\(\sum X^2\) = Sum of squared values of X

\(\sum Y^2\) = Sum of squared values of Y

3.8 Data Collection Techniques

The researcher made sure that the research instruments were complete and readily available. The questionnaires, the interview schedules were to be error free, the number of the copies to be supplied were adequate. Other agents subscribed to supply the copies to the respondents were given well in advance. To be orderly, the researcher designed a schedule representing actual dates and time framework of each activity and event in this research study. The researcher sought permission from the Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies in Kenyatta University and the Ministry of Education, prior to arrangements with selected schools. Distribution of the research instruments were made by the researcher in advance through making
appointments with the Head Teachers, Teachers, Students, Parents, Community Members and Government agents for distribution of research instruments. Before data collection, the researcher pre-tested all the research instruments. The researcher piloted the questionnaires with a small representative sample. This helped the researcher to find out if the selected questions were answering what they were supposed to measure.

3.9 Data Analysis

The data was gathered from 10 out of 19 sampled primary schools through administration of various instruments to a cross-section of respondents drawn from Headmasters, Deputy Headmasters, Teachers, Students and Parents. The research sites were sampled in Lamu East District, Lamu County. Standardized instruments such as questionnaires and interviews were used in this survey and the examination of the existing records. Qualitatively, the data was obtained, and description was chiefly emphasized from numerical data terms. Quantitatively, the study used numerical data to explore the traits and situations.

The researcher examined all the coded data and critically made inferences. In this relation data became information only when it becomes relevant to the problem identified by the researcher and made sure that the information becomes facts when data can support it. Facts were important to this study because they relied on the revelations of the data. Facts led to new information, new experiences and new views before analyzing the collected data; the researcher ensured that data was well organized. After the data collection exercise, the researcher was in possession of all
the filled forms of questionnaires from the respondents. Before starting the compilation and coding of the data, the researcher made sure that each question had been answered and the answers were properly recorded, that is, he was checking the completeness, accuracy, and the uniformity of the research instruments. From here the researcher developed a coding scheme.

The researcher familiarized himself with the text (field notes, interview scripts) by reading many times as he made the notes, drew diagrams and also brain stormed. This helped the researcher to know well the data and this made it easy to locate information that supported the interpretation. This helped in drawing out relevant themes that were used in the study. The researcher used numbers assigned in to represent attributes, statistics in order to summarize the scores. The researcher used the statistical analysis in data organization, that is, he needed to interpret using descriptive statistics, frequencies, tables, graphs and charts in this study. In a nutshell the study relied on what analytical framework intended to show, the scale by which variables were measured, number of variables that were analyzed, relationship between variables, the number of samples that were involved and the nature of data.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The main purpose of this study was to assess and examine the level and nature of school–community partnership in the development of education in Lamu East District. This chapter presents demographic data of the respondents and the research findings based on;

- The nature and types of community involvement in the development of education in Lamu East District.
- Partnership opportunities in school – community relations.
- Challenges of school – community partnership in the development of education in Lamu East District.
- Possible solutions in enhancing School – community partnership in Lamu East District.

4.2 Questionnaire return rate

Questionnaire return rate is the proportion of the sample that participated as intended in all the research procedures out of the ten head teachers, all of them (100%) returned the questionnaires. Out of fifty teachers all of them (100%) returned. Five government officials were interviewed while 120 community members responded.
4.3 Demographic Characteristics

Respondents’ demographic data is presented below. It includes students’ gender and class, head teachers gender, age and academic qualifications. The data was solicited to enable the researcher to get the background information on the schools in the study sample. This background information assisted the researcher in generalizing the study findings.

Figure 4.1 presents the various types of schools from which the respondents were drawn from.
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**Figure 4.1 Type of Schools**

Figure 4.1 Pupils from the 10 primary schools were sampled. The findings indicate that majority, 337 (75%) of the respondents were from mixed day schools while 45 (10%) were from mixed boarding schools. Another 45 (10%) came from girls/boys
boarding schools and only 23 (5%) were from mixed day/boarding schools. The study gives a good representative sample of all the different types of primary schools in the district.

Gender of teachers and head teachers respondents is presented in Figure 4.2.
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**Figure 4.2 Teachers and Head teachers by Gender**

Gender issues are central to all themes in education. The study wanted to find out if the difference in gender of the Teachers and Head Teachers had an impact on the school community partnerships or used different approaches.

Figure 4.2 above shows that 8 (80%) of the head teachers were male while only 2 (20%) were female. 26 (53%) of the teachers were female and 24 (47%) were male. While the ratio of male to female teachers was almost at par, the gap in head teachers’ gender was noticeable. Generally school community partnership activities were similar irrespective of the gender of teachers and head teachers.
Teaching experience of both head teachers and teachers is presented in Figure 4.3.
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### Figure 4.3 Teaching experience for both teachers and head teachers

Figure 4.3 indicates that 9 (90%) of the head teachers had headship experience of 10 years and below while only 1 (10%) had experience of 11 – 15 years while 20 (40%) of the teachers had teaching experience of between 6 – 10 years. For the head teachers, this experience was based in headship capacity and not necessarily their teaching career. Age is generally associated with experience and maturity which is regarded as crucial to responsibility. However the study did not find any remarkable experience in the way schools related to the community and vice versa in the school headed by the more experienced head teachers and those headed by the less experienced ones.
Figure 4.4 presents the level of education for teachers and head teachers.

Figure 4.4 indicates that 6 (60%) of head teachers were diploma holders, 2 (20%) had B.ED degrees while 2 (20%) had P1 certificates though had been promoted to S1 level. As for teachers, 35 (60%) were Diplomas holders and 15 (40%) had P1 certificates.

The study found that although head teachers with higher level of education were aware of the benefits of school-community partnership, they had not initiated such relations. They only carry out activities as prescribed by Ministry officials such as election of school management committee.
Table 4.1 shows the education background of the parents.

Table 4.1 Parents’ Education Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents education background</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 above shows that 180 (60%) of the pupils did not know the level of education of their parents while 45 (15%) of the respondents said their parents had attained secondary school education, whereas 30 (10%) said their parents had primary school education and another 30 (10%) said their parents had college education. Only 15 (5%) of the respondents said their parents had university education.

The parents with some level of education i.e. secondary, college and university were mostly involve in school affairs as members of PTA and SMC. The parental involvement in this case was relegated to being members of such committees and fund raising though they were capable of being engaged in more meaningful ways.
4.4 Nature and types of community involvement in the management of schools in the development of education.

The study sought to establish the nature and types of community involvement in the management of schools in the development of education. This includes the parents’ involvement in school work, means of communication, meetings frequencies, parents’ visit to schools, teachers’ home visits and government officials’ visits. The findings are presented below.

Figure 4.5 shows how checking of books and school work is carried out by teachers.

Figure 4.5 Checking of books and school work

On how often teachers checked the pupils’ books and school work figure 4.5 indicates that 180 (40%) of the pupils said this was done every day, 158 (35%) said it was done most sometimes while 68 (15%) said the checking was done sometimes. Only 45 (10%) indicated that teachers never checked their work. In this case the checking of
school work was inadequate. Reasons cited for this were such as; high number of enrollment, inadequate teachers, regular absence of teachers from duty and lack of ‘home’ support from parents.

According to Fiore, (2011) Students whose work is constantly checked, assistance from teachers and parents will most likely be obtained and that improvement in school work will be guaranteed.
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**Figure 4.6 Means of reaching out to parents**

Figure 4.6 shows that 39 teachers (78%) and 7 Head teachers (70%) of the head teachers reached out to parents verbally while 2 (20%) and 8 (16%) of head teachers and teachers respectively used phones. Only 3 (6%) of the teachers and 1 (10%) of the head teachers used circulars. In verbal communication the message is easily distorted or sometimes never reaches the parent. Children can ignore to relay messages
especially if it is about something that they feel the parent should not know. Communication is key in obtaining a sustainable partnership.

Figure 4.7 presents information on teachers and parents meetings.
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**Figure 4.7 Teachers and parents meetings**

Figure 4.7 indicates that in 35 (70%) of the teachers respondents said school meetings were held annually, while 25 (30%) said they held these meetings termly. The meeting frequency was very minimal. This, compounded with limited other avenues between parents and teachers, was one of the shortcomings in the establishment of vibrant school community relations. In countries such as Britain and Nigeria research shows that though meetings are minimal they use other techniques such as monthly report cards, home calls, family get together in order to maintain contact with parents and the society.
Table 4.2 rates regularity of the attendance by parents to school meetings.

Table 4.2 Rating Parents’ Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regularity of parents attendance</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that 270 (90%) of the respondents indicated that the regularity of parents attending meetings was low while 30 (10%) said it was very low. This level of parents’ attendance to meeting is both inadequate and worrying. Berger, (2007) says that building a genuine partnership with parents is a process of continually seeking to understand assumptions and to share meanings. In this case teachers need to find alternative means of encouraging parents and community’s involvement.
Figure 4.8 presents response of head teachers’ invitation to community activities.
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Figure 4.8 Head teachers’ invitation to community activities

On whether the head teachers have ever been invited to any community activity, 8 (80%) of the respondents said they had never been invited. Only 2 (20%) said that they were invited. Those who were invited specified the nature of these invitations which included membership to dispensary committee in the village, fundraising for needy students in secondary schools and also secretary to various social organizations. They also listed other members of the community (non-teachers) whom they work with in schools. Some are former students of the schools and those outside the village and who are employed somewhere else, officers in other government departments, area Chiefs and area councilors, youth in secondary schools and youth groups.

Other community members who were non-parents were invited to school for such occasions like prize giving days, fundraising, Annual General Meeting, resource
person to talk to children especially candidates and assistance in providing books and exams.

Education officials also visited schools. They included Zonal Education Officers, TAC Tutors, DQASO and DEO. The purposes of their visits were assessment of learning progress, attending AGM and prize giving ceremony, normal meeting attendance, routine inspection, and routine assessment of curriculum delivery and during the election of School Management Committee.

The trend points out to a system deficient of deliberate attempts to foster school-community co-operation outside the traditionally known areas. There is a need for establishing a system that will provide opportunities for interaction and support in education matters so as to improve education standards.

Respondents were asked how often teachers, parents and community meet. The responses are indicated in Figure 4.9
Figure 4.9 Teachers, Parents and community meetings

Figure 4.9 shows majority of the respondents consisting of 446 (93%) indicated that teachers, parents and community met occasionally while 34 (7%) said they met often. Otwoma, (2006) reported that, school-community partnership enables the school and the community to share the responsibility of running the schools and helping the child to achieve the aim of education without which neither the school nor the community can benefit. In Kenya, the Kenya Education Sector Support Program (KESSP 2005-2010) envisages community involvement in providing support in improving and maintaining existing infrastructure. The study indicated that most of the meetings are done occasionally therefore it is very difficult to implement the formulated policies since contact is limited and by extension; co-operation and support.
Teachers were asked to rate parents’ response to invitation. The responses are presented in figure 4.10
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**Figure 4.10 Parents’ response to invitation**

Figure 4.10 shows that 37, (73%) of the respondents indicated that parents’ response to invitation was fair while 10, (20%) said it was poor. Only 3, (7%) indicated that their response was good. Other members of the community were invited to school during closing days, prize giving days and graduation days, open days, during games and sports competition, election of School Management Committee. Invitations were also extended to parents when discipline issues arose which affected their children. Other times resource persons were identified to give lectures on topical issues like drug abuse. Community members were also involved in discussing development agenda for their schools. Guitan, (2007) points out that collaborating with parents and communities, while capitalizing on their resources and strengths, promotes social and
emotional growth for children. This calls for parents to be responsive to invitations to school to enable them bond with their in school activities.

Figure 4.11 captures information on teachers’ awareness of pupils’ background.
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**Figure 4.11 Awareness of pupils’ background**

Figure 4.11 indicates that majority 47,(93%) of the teachers were aware of the background of only a few of their pupils while 3,(7%) were not aware their pupils background at all. This points out to a situation where teachers are not aware of the background of the children they are supposed to mentor. This inhibits the teachers ability to explain why the children behaves the way they do. Perrone, (2008) believes that when teachers establish close working relationships with a family, little by little, we get to know the whole child. Family observations and insights about children inform our teaching and help us better understand children’s behavior. Teachers who lack an understanding of their students’ culture and home background are most likely
unable to establish a meaningful relationship and hence to appreciate strengths and weaknesses which are essential in the formulation of remedial strategies.

Respondents were asked on frequency of Education official visits. The responses are presented in figure 4.12
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**Figure 4.12 Education officials’ visits**

Figure 4.12 shows that majority 7 (70%) of the schools were frequently visited by education officials while 2 (20%) were rarely visited. Only 1 (10%) was visited very frequently. The purposes of the visits were official especially during meetings like Annual General Meeting, election of School Management Committee, inspection of records and assessment of curriculum implementation.

In the Kenyan education set up, education officials by large, Ministry Education is responsible for policy formulation and implementation. Officials visits are essential
both as advisory and monitory. In this case visits are far apart and thus there is no support given to teachers. The programmes are not effectively monitored. There is limited input from the government officials.

Table 4.3 presents the frequency of parents visit to school. Education officials are essential in supervising programmes and enforcing compliance. Reasons they gave for the failure to visit schools frequently, were lack of transport and that the officials were fewer. Also because the area is far from the national office, at any given point two officials were out of the District on officials duties. This takes a whole week.

**Table 4.3 Frequency of parents visit to school**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents visit schools</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very frequently</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 indicates that majority 258 (86%) of the parents said they visited school occasionally while 42 (14%) said they visited schools frequently. Purpose of their visit included payment of levies or pledging on when to pay levies. This agrees with Laboke, (2007) who says that one way of improving quality was to provide the funds the schools badly needed in order to run effectively. Parents also attend meetings like AGM, prize giving, closing days or occasionally when called upon for discipline case.
The parents played this role very well. They however need to follow up on the usage of the funds and be given opportunities to participate in decision making especially on how these funds are used.

Mostly parents cooperated with school administration in giving prizes during prize giving day ceremonies, fundraising, guidance and counseling of pupils, provision of facilities and resources, volunteering skills and labour, provision of stationery, rehabilitation of school classes, volunteer work especially manual work like digging of latrines, payment of levies, helping children at home and sending them to school and taking responsibility over guidance of their children. Epstein (2008) envisages 6 types of school-community partnership i.e. parenting, communication, volunteering, decision making, and home learning and collaborating with community.

4.5 Partnership opportunities in school-community partnerships in the development of education

Introduction

The partnership opportunities in school – community partnership are presented here. These include the types of projects undertaken by parents, teachers’ home visits and education officials’ support.

The respondents listed down the projects undertaken by parents and also by non-parents in the school in the last five as presented in Table 4.4.
Table 4.4 Projects undertaken (2007 – 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects undertaken by parents</th>
<th>Projects undertaken by non parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Painting of classrooms</td>
<td>Tree planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree planting</td>
<td>Donating computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising in aid of classroom roofing</td>
<td>Buying termly exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building of a classroom</td>
<td>Giving prizes and awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building a kitchen</td>
<td>Building a classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing kitchen utensils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing furniture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying exams and books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some projects like tree planting, building of a classroom and other school projects have been undertaken jointly by parents and non-parents especially where funds were needed. Apart from teachers/pupils, there are others who teach pupils as resource persons drawn from the community. They include former students, Chiefs, Doctors. Community representatives as Miller (2010) suggests can inform discussions around curricular and extracurricular issues and the process develop more democratic relationships with the professional staff.

Areas of school administration that parents and non parents assist are curriculum implementation, discipline of pupils, give advice on management, share experiences in their work place, career talk and motivation, and supervise class work and home work. Every parent and community member can participate in one way.
In Figure 4.13, information on how teachers make home visits is presented.
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**Figure 4.13 Teachers home visits**

Figure 4.13 above indicates that 47 (94%) of the teachers’ respondents said they occasionally visited pupils’ homes while 3 (6%) had never made any home visit while 6 (60%) of the head teachers had never visited pupils’ homes and only 4 (40%) had occasionally made visits. Home visits are a good way of creating rapport. Parents and teachers build understanding that is helpful to the child’s education. In this study this is found to be insufficient.

Barbour, (2008) confirms that school cannot afford to ignore the child’s immediate environment. School administrators need to understand the child’s upbringing, values he/she enroll on school. The kinds of families, economic status, single parents and divorce cases all influence behavior. Berger (2007) believes that building and
maintaining a genuine partnership with parents is a process of continually seeking to understand assumptions and to share meanings and expectations.

Figure 4.14 presents data on the support of education officials.
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**Figure 4.14 Education officials’ support**

Figure 4.14 rates management support by the education officials. 53 (82%) of the respondents indicated that the support was inadequate, only 8 (12%) said the support was adequate and 4 (6%) felt the support was very inadequate.

On whether teachers have been involved in community activities, most indicated they had been involved in social activities like weddings and other celebrations; others are member to various committees in the village while other take part in village sports activities football referee and women groups. Parents and other community members have also been helpful to school in provision of books, buying pupils examinations
and motivating them, providing prizes and construction of classes and water supply, payment of levies, fundraising for projects of schools, assisting in the provision of facilities to schools and providing security for school property. The role of parents has remained to be the provision of finances for infrastructure development, attending annual meetings and provision of security and healthcare to their children

Figure 4.5 Information on checking of pupils’ books by parents
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**Figure 4.15 Checking of pupils books by parents**

Figure 4.15 indicates that 306 (68%) of the pupils interviewed said that their parents did not check their books while 144 (32%) said their parent checked. There is need for all parents to be actively interested in their children’s school work. Checking of pupils books will help parents to monitor progress and identify areas of weaknesses which will in turn form basis for parents/ teacher discussion and remedial strategies.
Lawson, (2007) says that where parents have become involved in their own children learning, the children’s school performance has invariably improved quiet significantly.

Figure 4.16 presents data on parents and pupils discussion of school matters
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**Figure 4.16 Parent/Pupil discussions of school issues**

Figure 4.16 shows 234 (52%) of the pupils indicated that they sometimes discussed school issues with their parents while 167 (37%) had never held such discussion. Only 49 (11%) said that such discussions were often.

The study found out that very few parents held discussion with their children on school work. Discussion is the only avenue where parents can offer encouragement and mentorship to their children. It also helps in the identification of gaps so that they can be pointed out to the teachers.
Respondents were asked on the parents’ assistance in school work the responses are presented in figure 4.17
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**Figure 4.17 Parents’ assistance in school work**

Figure 4.17 above shows that 315 (70%) of the pupils indicated that they did not get parents’ assistance in school work while 135 (30%) said their parents assisted them. The study reveals that a very high percentage of peoples do not get help from parents, this is unhealthy because parents are considered to be the first teacher in the life of a child. Some activities listed down as areas where parents assisted included; supervising homework, buying books, teaching them at home. Other than parents and teachers, pupils were also assisted with school work by brothers and sisters, older students and neighbours. According to Davies, (2009) helping teachers to become open to working with parents and fostering parent involvement beyond educentric borders means more than just mandating curriculum additions to include a parent
involvement component at the pre-service level. Parents should be taken through the areas in which they can assist. This include providing an enabling environment for studying at home, hold talks with their children on the importance of education and give moral support.

4.6 Problems and challenges of school-community partnerships in the development of education

Introduction

This section highlights the challenges facing the establishment of school – community partnership in the development of education. These were given by head teachers, teachers. Parents and education officials.

Challenges facing teachers in trying to involve the community in school affairs are several. They include teachers isolating themselves and not receptive to ideas from parents. Parents and community members don’t attend meetings and are reluctant to participate in school activities and others are not interested in participating in school affairs. Many parents believe school work is for teachers. Opportunities for co-operation are also limited. Hindrances to parents’ participation in their children’s school management are;

- Lack of knowledge,
- Lack interest in school work or are very busy,
- Have not realized their roles,
• View teachers as masters and feel that it’s their work. This agrees with Lasibille, (2007) who noted that most parents believed teachers could do it all alone, and do not see the need to get involved.

Greatest challenges faced by head teachers in establishing partnership with parents and other members of the community include the following;

• The attitude that is school work is for teachers.
• Parents are absent in the villages.
• Parents’ unwillingness to participate in school activities as they view school affairs as belonging to teachers and the educated few.
• There are no people initiating this. It has never featured in their discussions.

Challenges given by Government officials that school-community relations face

• Lack of uniform approach on issues
• Lack of official policy
• Parents view school affairs as exclusively belonging to teachers and education officials
• Bureaucracy in school management locks out parents
• Co-operation opportunities are not identified
4.7 Solutions in enhancing the school-community partnerships in development of education

Introduction

This part carries the suggested solutions in enhancing school–community partnership as given by head teachers, teachers, parents, education officials and community members.

Pupils were asked on what they wish their parents did in their school life. The following was gathered from the respondents. Helped in school work, talked more with me about school, provided reading materials, attend prize giving days, give guidance in careers, assist in homework, buying drawing books and colour pens, play together, come to school regularly to see the teachers, assist in providing rooms and tables for studies.

Some of the areas the respondents thought; parents and other members of the community can assist in the management of the school include enhancing access and retention, provision of infrastructure, advisory and support in finances and other resources, games and talking to students on topical issues.

Head teachers wished education officials did more in establishing school-community by

- Initiating dialogue between parents and teachers.
- Visiting more often.
- Giving reports back to the teachers.
- Having regular advisory visits.
• Producing reports on school assessment.
• Conducting sensitization workshops between parents and teachers.
• Establishing avenues to involve parents in school activities.
• Supporting the schools posting adequate teachers.

Ways in which parents and other community members could be of help in relation to school – community partnership is to provide feedback on the child’s needs, aspirations so that remedy can be sought, motivating students and teachers, giving moral support to children, assisting in modeling children’s behavior, help in giving suggestions on how programs can be improved.

Suggestions by teachers towards fostering school-community relations included; holding regular meetings, involving parents not only in fundraising and discipline issues but also in school activities regularly such as in games and sports days, teachers and parents hold regular meeting and those parents who failed to attend should explain. Skilled parents should be allowed to participate in volunteer work like painting. Community members should be given roles in the school such as managing tuitions and preps. Parent should be involved in more meaningful ways like making major decisions in the school. They can also be involved in planning and policy formulation. Design roles that each member can have a role to play not just the educated ones. A handbook on school-community relations should be produced to provide guidelines.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter the results of the summary of the study is discussed, conclusions submitted and recommendations given for further research.

5.2 Summary of the Findings

The purpose of this research study was to assess critically and examine the level and nature of school – community partnership and its implication in the development of education in Lamu East District. Four research questions were formulated to guide the research. Question one was designed to look into the nature and types of community involvement in the management of education in Lamu East District. Question two looked at the partnership opportunities while question three was designed to identify the problems and challenges of school – community partnership and finally question four was asking about the possible solutions in enhancing school- community partnerships in the development of education in Lamu East District. The study employed a descriptive survey design where 10 out of 19 schools were sampled. Questionnaires and interviews were used to collect data.
5.2.1 Nature and types of community involvement in the management of schools in the development of education.

i) Majority of the teachers and head teachers, 39 (78%) and 47 (71%) respectively reached out to parents verbally while 2 (21%) and 8 (16%) head teachers and teachers respectively used phones. Only 1 (10%) and 1 (6%) head teachers and teachers respectively used circulars.

ii) In majority of the schools 7 (70%), meetings were held annually while 3 (30%) said they held these meetings termly.

iii) Majority of the respondents 270 (90%) indicated that the rate of parents in attending meetings was low while 30 (10%) said it was very low. Majority of the respondents 240 (80%) said they had never been invited with only 60 (20%) saying they were. Those that were invited specified the nature of these invitations. Majority of the respondents 279 (93%) indicated that teachers, parents and community met occasionally while 21 (7%) said they meet often.

iv) Majority of the respondents 219 (73%) indicated that parents’ response to invitation was fair while 60 (20%) said it was poor. Only 21 (7%) indicated that the response was good.

v) Other members of the community are invited in school during closing days, on prize giving days and graduations, open days, during games and sport competition, elections of School Management Committees.

vi) Majority of the teachers respondents 46 (93%) were aware of the background of only few pupils while 4 (7%) were not aware their pupils background. Majority of the schools 68% were frequently visited by education officials while 18% were
rarely visited. Only 14% said they were visited frequently. Majority of the respondents’ 86% said the parents visit school occasionally while 14% said they visited schools frequently.

5.2.2 Partnership opportunities in school-community partnerships in the development of education

Majority 47 (94%) of the teachers’ respondents said they occasionally visited pupils’ homes while 3 (6%) had never made any home visit while 6 (60%) head teachers had never visited pupils’ homes while only 4 (40%) had occasionally made visits. Most (82%) respondents indicated that the support was inadequate, 12% said the support was inadequate and 6% felt the support was very inadequate.

5.2.3 Problems and challenges of school-community partnerships in the development of education

i) Majority 306 (68%) of the pupils said that their parents did not check their books while 144 (32%) said they did.

ii) Majority 234 (52%) of the pupils indicated that they sometimes discussed with their parents on school matters while 167 (37%) had never had such discussion. Only 49 (11%) said that such discussions were made often and 315 (70%) of the pupils indicated they did not get parents assistance in school work while 135 (30%) said their parents assisted them.
5.2.4 Solutions in enhancing the school-community partnerships in development of education

Respondents think parents and other members of the community can assist in the management of the school include enhancing access and retention, provision of infrastructure, advisory and support in finances and other resources, demanding to know the affairs of the school, finance, games and talking to students.

Parents and other community members can be of help in relation to school – community if they are to provide feedback on the child’s needs, fears and personality so that remedy can be sought, motivating students and teachers, giving moral support to children, instilling morals to the children to enhance behavior modeling, help in giving suggestions on how programs can be improved, head teachers to provide avenues for cooperation. Parent should be involved in more meaningful ways like making major decision. They can also be involved in planning and policy formulation.

5.3 Conclusion

This arrived at certain conclusions about school-community partnership in the development of education in primary schools in Lamu East district.

1. Most of these schools experienced challenges as most teachers isolated themselves from parents and other members of the community. They were not receptive to ideas from parents.

2. Parents and community members didn’t attend meetings and were reluctant to participate in school activities while others were not interested in participating in school affairs. Many parents believed school work is for teachers.
3. Efforts to counter these challenges as suggested were; to hold regular meetings, involve parents not only in fundraising and discipline issues but also in school activities regularly like in games and sports day, teachers and parents hold regular meetings and those parents who failed to attend should be followed up in their homes. Skilled parents should be allowed to participate in volunteer work like painting.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings the research recommends;

i) Schools should open up communication channels with the community.

ii) The parents should be informed of school – community partnership opportunities as they arise. Areas of co-operation need to be identified and made clear to stakeholders.

iii) Guidelines should be developed by the ministry to assist administrators establish partnership opportunities.

iv) Parents should be assigned more roles including planning and day to day running of the schools.
5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

This study has handled school – community partnership in the development of primary school education. There are many other aspects of school – community that can be discussed.

i) The role of teachers in School – Community partnership in public primary schools.

ii) Parents’ involvement in mobilizing and creating resources in public primary schools.

iii) Factors affecting School – Community partnership in public primary schools.
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APPENDIX A

Questionnaire for Head Teachers

I am a post graduate student in Kenyatta University pursuing a Masters Degree in Education (Educational Administration). I am collecting data on School – Community Partnership in the Development of Education. A Case of Lamu East District, Kenya. I kindly request you to assist with some information by filling this questionnaire. The information you will give will be treated with utmost confidentiality and will be used for this study only. Do not write your name or the name of your institution. Please answer the questions as honestly and truthfully as possible by ticking in the spaces provided.

SECTION A: General Information

Name of the school .................................................................

1. Type of school (A) Boarding ( ) (B) Day school ( ) (C) Mixed Day ( )

2. Date of appointment to the current position ........................................

3. Gender Male ( ) Female ( )

4. Experience as a Head Teacher
   
   (a) Less than 5 years ( )
   
   (b) 6 to 10 years ( )
   
   (c) 11 to 15 years ( )
   
   (d) Above 15 years ( )
5. Indicate the highest level of Education .................................................................
   P 1 ( )  Diploma ( )  B. Ed ( )  Masters ( )

SECTION B: Nature and type of Community involvement in the management of schools in the development of education

6. Which means of communication do you use to reach to parents (May tick more than one).

7. Means of communication   Tick(√)
   Circulars
   Phones
   Verbally through pupils

8. How many times do you meet the Parents?
   a) Termly ( )  b) Annually

9. Generally, how would you rate parents’ attendance?
   a) Too high ( )  b) High ( )  c) Moderate ( )  d) Low ( )  e) Low ( )

10. a) Have you been invited to any community activity?
    a) Yes ( )  b) No ( )
    b) If yes to the above, kindly specify: ......................................................................................
    ................................................................................................................................................
    ................................................................................................................................................
11. Who are other members of the community (non-teachers) do you work with?

12. When do you usually invite other community members (non-parents) to school?

13. Which education officials visit your school?

14. For what purpose(s) do education officials visit the school?

SECTION C: Partnership opportunities in school-community partnerships in the development of education

15. What projects have parents undertaken in the school in the last five years?

16. What projects have non-parents undertaken in the last five years?
17. How frequently do parents visit the school?
   a) Very frequently  (  )  b) Frequently  (  )
   c) Occasionally   (  )  d) Never   (  )

18. Mostly, what is the purpose of their visit?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

19. What areas of school administration can parents and non parents assist?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

20. How often do you visit pupils’ homes?
   a) Very often (  )  b) Often (  )  c) Occasionally (  )  d) Never (  )

21. How would you rate education officials’ support in your management of the school?
   a) Very adequate (  ) b) Adequate (  ) c) Inadequate (  ) d) Very adequate (  )
SECTION D: Problems and challenges of school-community partnerships in the development of education

22. In your opinion, what hinders parents’ participation in their children’s school management?

...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

23. What are the greatest challenges you face in establishing partnership with parents and other members of the community?

...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

SECTION E: Solutions in enhancing the school-community partnerships in development of education

24. In what areas do you think parents and other members of the community can assist you in the management of the school?

...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

25. What would you wish education officials did more in establishing school-community partnership?

...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................
APPENDIX B

Questionnaires for Teachers

I am a post graduate student in Kenyatta University pursuing a Masters Degree in Education (Educational Administration). I am collecting data on School – Community Partnership in the Development of Education. A Case of Lamu East District, Kenya. I kindly request you to assist with some information by filling this questionnaire. The information you will give will be treated with utmost confidentiality and will be used for this study only. Do not write your name or the name of your institution. Please answer the questions as honestly and truthfully as possible by ticking in the spaces provided.

**Section A: General Information**

Name of the school_____________________

1. Type of school
   (a) Boarding ( )  (b) Day school ( )  (c) Mixed Day ( )

2. Gender
   Male ( )  Female ( )

3. Teaching experience
   a) Less than 5 years ( )
   b) 6 to 10 years ( )
   c) 11 to 15 years ( )
   d) Above 15 years ( )

4. Indicate the highest level of Education ..............................................................
   P1 ( )  Diploma ( )  B. Ed ( )  Masters ( )
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SECTION B: Nature and types of community involvement in the management of schools in the development of education

5. How do you reach out to parents when you need them? (May tick more than one).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of communication</th>
<th>Tick (√)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circulars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbally through parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. When do you meet with parents and other members of the community?
   a) Very often ( )   b) Often ( )   c) Occasionally ( )   d) Never ( )

7. How would you rate parents’ response to your invitation?
   a) Very Good ( )   b) Good ( )   c) Fair ( )   d) Poor ( )

8. When do you invite other members of the community around your school?

   ......................................................................................................................

   ......................................................................................................................

   ......................................................................................................................

9. Are you aware of your pupil’s background?
   a) Yes ( )   b) No ( )   c) Few ( )   d) All ( )

10. How frequent do education officials visit you?
    a) Very frequently ( )   b) Frequently ( )   c) Rarely ( )   d) Never ( )
11. Mostly what is the purpose of their visit?

12. In what areas do parents mostly cooperate with school administration?

SECTION C: Partnership opportunities in school- community partnerships in the development of education

13. How often do you visit your pupils in their homes?
   b) Very often ( )  b) Often ( )  c) Occasionally ( )  d) Never ( )

14. How have you been involved in community activities?

15. In what areas have parents and other community members been helpful?


SECTION D: Problems and challenges of school-community partnerships in the development of education

16. In your opinion what challenges do you face in trying to involve the community in schools affairs?

..............................................................................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................................

SECTION E: Solutions in enhancing the school-community partnerships in development of education.

17. In what ways can parents and other community members be of help to you as a teacher?

..............................................................................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................................

18. What are your suggestions towards fostering school-community relations?

..............................................................................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................................
APPENDIX C

Questionnaires for Pupils

I am a post graduate student in Kenyatta University pursuing a Masters Degree in Education (Educational Administration). I am collecting data on School – Community Partnership in the Development of Education. A Case of Lamu East District, Kenya. I kindly request you to assist with some information by filling this questionnaire. The information you will give will be treated with utmost confidentiality and will be used for this study only. Do not write your name or the name of your institution. Please answer the questions as honestly and truthfully as possible by ticking in the spaces provided.

1. What are your parents’ education backgrounds?
   a) Primary school ( )
   b) Secondary school ( )
   c) University ( )
   d) Don’t know ( )

2. How often do your teachers check your books or school work?
   (a) Every day ( )
   (b) Most times ( )
   (c) Sometimes ( )
   (d) Never ( )

3. At what times do your parents come to your school or class?

   .............................................................................................................................
   .............................................................................................................................

4. Do your parents check your books?
   (a) Yes ( )
   (b) No ( )
5. How often do you discuss with your parents on school matters?
   (a) Often (   ) (b) Sometimes (   ) (c) Never (   )

6. Do your parents assist you in school work?
   (a) Yes (   ) (b) No (   ) (c) Sometimes (   )

7. If Yes, which activities? (List them)
   .................................................................
   .................................................................

8. Apart from parents and teachers, who else assists you with school work?
   .................................................................
   .................................................................

9. Apart from teachers, who else has ever come to teach you in class?
   .................................................................
   .................................................................

10. What do you wish your parents did in your school life?
    .................................................................
    .................................................................
APPENDIX D

Interview Schedule for Government agents and Community Members

1. Your Designation .................................................................................................................

2. Your Gender  
   (a) Male ( )  
   (b) Female ( )

3. Age of the respondent
   (a) Less than 30 years ( )
   (b) 31 to 40 years ( )
   (c) 41 to 50 years ( )
   (d) 51 and above ( )

4. In what capacity are you related to the school?
   ..............................................................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................................................

5. How often do you visit the school?
   ..............................................................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................................................

6. Mostly when you visit, who initiates the visit?
   ..............................................................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................................................
7. How do teachers view your relationship?

8. What projects have you initiated or participated in the school?

9. How many times do you meet the other stake holders?

10. How do you rate thee School-Community relationship?
    a) Very Good  b) Good  c) Poor  d) Very Poor

11. In your opinion, what are the challenges that school-community relations face?

12. What more can teachers; administrators and you do in order to strengthen school-community relations.
## APPENDIX E

### Budget Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Proposal writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desk Research, from various libraries</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stationary, Computer, Photocopy, Printing and Binding</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td><strong>6,200</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Research Instruments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaires(Typing &amp; Copies)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion Guide</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td><strong>11,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiring of 3 research assistants@ 3,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td><strong>9,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Data Analysis (SPSS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td><strong>7,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>Final Draft Printing and Binding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typing, Photocopy, Binding</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td><strong>10,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>Transport/Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Services/Internet Services</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td><strong>14,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>57,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Permission Letter

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY,

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT,

POLICY AND CURRICULUM STUDIES,

P.O BOX 43844-00100 GPO,

NAIROBI. DATE______________________

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I am a Post-Graduate student at Kenyatta University pursuing a Masters in Education degree. I am undertaking a research study in the field of Educational Administration. My research topic is: - School-Community Partnership in the Development of Education: A Case Study of Lamu East District, Kenya. You have been chosen to participate in this study.

Your co-operation in answering the questions faithfully will be appreciated. All data collected will be treated with utmost confidentiality and will be used only for the purpose of this study.

Yours faithfully,

ABDULHAKIM ABOUD BWANA,

MED. STUDENT - RESEACHER

REG. NO. E55/CE/10134/07
APPENDIX G

Map of Lamu East District