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SUMMARY

The KHRC seeks to introduce an equality storybook that tackles issues of tolerance of ethnic, gender, disability, age and economic status differences to primary school students. The book is conceptualised to bring equality and human rights discourse to school children and their teachers. A study of the Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice (KAP) of pupils in 12 schools targeted for the pilot use of the equality storybook was carried out prior to the introduction of the book; the survey focused on the 5 equality themes (ethnicity, gender, disability, age, economic status).

The study used both quantitative and qualitative approaches; a self-filling questionnaire was used to collect information on KAP from students in classes 6 and 7, one class from each stream was randomly selected and the students were taken through the tools by a moderator. In each school 2 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with an average of 5 boys and 5 girls moderated separately were carried out. Key informant interviews (KIIs) were carried out with the patron or the proposed patron of the Human Rights club to understand the school environment in relation to discrimination issues. A total of 844 self-filling tools, 24 FGDs and 24 KIIs were completed. The majority of the schools (10 out of 12) had pupils from different tribes.

School environment

- All schools had extra-curricular programmes in the form of clubs and only a third of the 844 do not belong to any clubs. There are other popular clubs the activities of which are more in line with the human rights clubs such as debating club, Islamic club and the PPI (Pastoral Program Intervention).
- 20 out of 24 teachers interviewed mentioned forums such as clubs, school assemblies and during some subjects where inequality issues are discussed; the most common fora being within social studies, Christian Religious Education (CRE) and Islamic Religious Education (IRE) subjects.
- 13 out of the 24 teachers cited lack of resources to effectively guide discussions on equality (guidebooks, work-plans, specialised teachers and financial resources).
- At least 20 out of the 24 teachers interviewed have dealt with cases of discrimination within the school. Isiolo had higher mentions of tribalism which is more evident outside the school environment; In Marakwet gender inequalities seemed the greatest concern, while in Nairobi there were minimal mentions of gender inequalities or tribalism.
- Two unique forms of discrimination are apparent in some schools; older students can be stereotyped as being slow learners while students who perform poorly academically might be isolated by their peers.

Discrimination

Knowledge;
- Discrimination - There was high claimed awareness (79%) of the word “discrimination/ubaguzi” across all regions. However, when the pupils were asked to actually pick out the statement that describes the word only a half (49%) ticked ‘it is treating someone negatively from the way you would treat another person in the same situation.’ However, with probing in the FGDs, students recorded high awareness levels not only of the phrase discrimination but also the description.

- Dimensions of discrimination - Only about a third (38%) readily recognise that when you don’t listen to the old because you feel they have no new ideas it is discrimination. Only 41% correctly associate treating the disabled negatively as discrimination. Generally discrimination is more likely to be associated with gender or tribe than with the other aspects (age, disability and economic status). Only 29% of the students got 4 out of 7 statements on discrimination correct; Nairobi leads (39%) while Marakwet lags behind at (18%). From the FGDs, students’ recognise different types of discrimination and include religious, inequality within a family (favouring one child over the other children), discrimination at the corporate level (hiring people from one tribe); a total of 6 FGDs out of the 25 noted that discrimination is on the increase in their communities.
UN statutes
- When presented with a selection of statutes to rate who has a right to each, students readily recognise that all children have a right to education (92%), fewer (62%) recognise that all children have a right to participate in decision making. A third (33%) of the students correctly indicate that all children have a right to all the 9 UN statutes tested during the self-filling questionnaires, Ugunja recorded the lowest proportion (11%) while Taveta recorded the highest (58%).

Stereotype
- Only 33% had ever heard of the word stereotype, and Isiolo records a particularly low understanding at 19%. However, students were unfamiliar with the term as only 1% chose the correct options in multiple choice questions across all dimensions i.e. it is not a type of music but it is assuming that; all people of a certain tribe behave the same way, people of a certain age group have similar likes and dislikes or a disabled person cannot go up to university.

Ethnicity
- Knowledge; 8 in every 10 students (88%) have heard of the term tribalism with high recognition across all the regions. Concepts associated with tribalism such as gossiping about people from other tribes (38%) or having songs that portray other tribes negatively (31%) are not readily linked to tribalism compared to 50% who readily recognise that speaking in mother tongue amongst those that do not understand as tribalism. Students might be familiar with overt tribalism such as speaking mother tongue when some present don’t understand but more subtle forms such as gossiping or negative songs might not be too familiar. Only 1 in every 10 students (11%) had the correct description relating to discrimination consistently across all the four statements tested using the self administered tools. Most teachers interviewed noted that the pressure to discriminate on tribe emanated more from outside of the school than within. Qualitatively tribalism was well understood and pupils could give examples within their own neighbourhoods/communities.

- Attitudes;
  Ethnicity and relationships - 38% agree that their tribes are superior to other tribes. 37% agree that it is best to keep to friends from ones tribe. Tribalism is clearly a serious problem. Nevertheless, most children value spending time with their peers irrespective of their tribes. Parents at times try to prevent their children from interacting with peers from other tribes or warn them against it.

  Ethnicity, decision making and leadership - On the issue of electing a councillor, largely homogeneous regions are more likely to vote along tribal lines than the cosmopolitan regions. For presidential candidates; there is a tendency to vote for candidates linked to ones tribe or a candidate who is closely aligned even in cosmopolitan Nairobi. The tribal-card plays a more important role in the largely homogenous communities.

  Ethnicity and resources - 58% disagree (30% disagree strongly and 28% disagree) that a ‘tribe that lives together can accomplish more than a tribe that lives with other tribes (mixed).’ Most children thought that skills and certificates were more important than tribe when giving someone a job but a minority would want to employ someone from their own tribe.

  Ethnicity stereotypes – from the FGDs there exists some stereotypes; some tribes are perceived as better than others in certain roles, or are associated with negative attributes (they are dirty, love money, etc), while others are seen as aloof and are perceived as viewing themselves as superior. Despite the perceived superiority complex of some ethnic groups, the majority felt that different tribes can live harmoniously together only a minority felt that close proximity between tribes that don’t get along would foster tension.
- **Behaviour:** Whilst 74% of the students have shared a meal with someone from another tribe in the past 3 months, a half (51%) have also shared a funny story about people of a certain tribe with a friend. These subtle forms of tribalism are very apparent. Only 42% have stood up against their parents to defend those from other tribes in the past 3 months. Over a third (36%) have conversed in their mother tongue amongst others who were not familiar with the language in the past 3 months. Few (12%) are as radical as having had discussions to have some tribes kicked out of the area. However, Wajir records the highest average for having had discussions to have some tribes kicked out of the area at 24%.

**Gender discrimination**
- **Knowledge:** 18% associate one of the 9 UN statutes with boys rather than with all children, this is mainly driven by the 7% who are of the opinion that rights to decision making are an exclusive right to boys and not to other children and a number of children who feel boys are the only children who need the right of protection from war. 15% are of the opinion that girls are entitled to certain rights that boys and all children do not have. This was largely because girls were seen as having the right to protection from harm which arose from there perceived vulnerability. From the FGDs there was a consensus that boys and girls have equal rights. However, due to certain rights being exclusively allocated to either boys or girls this disadvantages both sexes but in different ways.

- **Attitudes:**
  - **Gender stereotypes and roles** - A quarter of participants felt that boys are better than girls. Only 55% agree that girls are as brave as boys. From the FGDs, roles that require bravery and not necessarily physical strength are more closely associated with boys. A fifth (20%) specifically associate the domestic chore of buying groceries with girls. Although many students (43%) felt that all children have a role to play in protecting community resources, 23% did not see children playing any role in such activities. Children have a perception that they do not really have any roles within the greater community.

- **Gender, decision making and leadership** - 25% of the students did not feel that children (those that said none) have a role to play when it comes to contributing to community decision making. Leaders are judged based on their contribution to society; however there is a tendency to vote for women based on their domestic roles and perceived nurturing qualities or as an affirmative action as opposed to their capabilities. 75% are in agreement that a woman can take on leadership positions like chiefs.

- **Gender and resources** - Excluding Nairobi (this question was not posed in Nairobi), 62% of the students felt that it is appropriate to use community resources to send girls to schools. However, given a hypothetical choice between educating a boy or a girl where there are limited resources; most pupils in the FGDs would choose to educate the boy. In the hiring of employees most respondents would consider qualifications over gender.

- **Behaviour:** Boys and girls have friends of both sexes; however, mixed gender friendship could result in a boyfriend-girlfriend situation. A fifth (20%) have refused to carry out certain tasks that are typically done by females. 70% have friends that are both girls and boys. In Wajir only 51% have friends that are both girls and boys.

**Age discrimination**
- **Knowledge:** Only 38% associate not listening to the very old with the phrase discrimination.

- **Attitudes:**
  - **Age, decision making and leadership** - 68% disagree with the statement that old people cannot contribute effectively to community decisions and 60% disagree that young people cannot contribute to community decisions. From the FGDs many students have negative perceptions about the old- 65 years (lack the experience and “appropriate” wisdom to lead, lack the physical stamina and do not empathise with the
youth). The young (19 years) are dismissed for inexperience and inability to handle the responsibilities that come with leadership.

- **Behaviour:** 67% indicated that they have friends who are much younger than them. 17% have dismissed a younger person on the grounds of being “irrelevant”.

**Disability discrimination**

- **Knowledge:** Only 4 in every 10 students (41%) agree that discrimination is when one treats someone negatively because they are disabled. Most of the pupils felt that children with disability should have the same rights as all children. 66% disagree that disability is as a result of a curse/witchcraft. However, in Ugunja 22% could not comment on this issue which is particularly high and demonstrates confusion on the issue.

- **Attitudes;**
  - **Disability, decision making and leadership** - 72% of respondents were in agreement that a disabled person can take on a leadership role. However, students doubt the leadership skills of disabled people and their ability to contribute effectively to community decisions since such individuals need a “guide” to help them with their day to day activities. That “guide” is perceived to become a third party in the decision making process. Children need to be exposed to successful leaders with disabilities to change these negative perceptions.

  - **Disability and relationships** - From the FGDs, a majority cannot fathom getting married to someone with a disability. Their main concern is their over dependency, their inability to participate in household chores and discrimination from the family. Those that choose to have a relationship with a disabled person ought to be rewarded through for example faithfulness or respect which suggests that the disabled person is always the “lesser person” in the relationship.

  - **Disability and resources** - 78% agree with the statement that the community should use their resources to support disabled people. However, FGDs showed that resource allocation for disabled people should not be at the expense of those without disabilities. For example, with pressure on resources they would favour supporting a child without disabilities over a child with disabilities as the former is more likely to get a job than the latter.

  - **Disability stereotypes** - From the FGDs, the disabled people are stereotyped as being unable to live independently; they always need assistance and cannot carry out basic chores. Disabled people were viewed as non-sexual.

- **Behaviour:** Most pupils freely relate with children with disability in school and out of school; 40% of the students have a friend who is physically disabled. The majority though do not have the courage to ask the friend about the circumstances under which they became disabled. 51% and 64% respectively have played or shaken hands with a child with disabilities in the past 3 months which indicates regular contact with disabled children. 78% have reprimanded a friend who said unkind things about a disabled person in the past 3 months. Students take on a charity/pity approach to disabled children rather than a rights based approach.

**Economic status discrimination**

- **Knowledge:** Discrimination based on wealth or economic status within the school setting is minimal; children though do recognise cases of such discrimination based on wealth in the greater community.

- **Attitudes;**
Economic status, decision making and leadership - Asked to choose between a rich and a poor leader, the majority of students would chose the poor one because they assume that he/she would empathise more with their situation. The children participating in the research have a stereotype that that those with money/wealth are “bad leaders.” An average of 70% of the students disagree that a rich leader is better than a poor leader with consistently high proportions across all the regions.

Economic status and resource allocation - Faced with a situation where one can offer a job; there are those who would give it squarely to a poor person and sometimes even with disregard to their qualification; this is mainly out of sympathy. This can be seen as affirmative action.

- Behaviour; 57% of the students indicated that they have friends who are from much poorer backgrounds; however the reverse of having friends who are much wealthier was not explored in this study. However, one teacher commented about different economic status groups staying apart within the school environment, although this was a minimal problem.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background
The Kenya Human Rights Commission (KHRC) envisions a Kenya that respects, protects and promotes human rights and democratic values. Their objective is to enable the society to attain equal and accessible rights and opportunities for all; to be more specific they endeavour to prevent discrimination across all levels of society including in the school setting.

It is on this basis that the KHRC seeks to introduce an equality storybook that tackles issues of tolerance of ethnic, gender, disability, age and wealth differences. The book is conceptualised to bring equality and human rights discourse to school children and their teachers; it transforms human rights theory on equality/non-discrimination into a storybook that is appropriate, educational and entertaining for children in primary class seven and above. Currently the book is available in English; plans are underway to translate the book into Kiswahili. This book will be used to lobby the relevant authorities to amend the current curriculum to include content on human rights, responsibility and respect for diversity in schools with the ideal being to introduce the book as one of the literature set-books for class 7 children.

At the preliminary phase, the book will be introduced through the clubs in pilot primary schools that have partnered with KHRC in the past for other programmes. It is envisaged that the members of these clubs will go through the book under the guidance of their patron and then engage in the subsequent discussions at the end of each chapter. Training will also be provided to the teachers in equality so they can effectively guide discussions.

To help the KHRC to understand the Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice (KAP) of pupils in schools targeted for the pilot use of an equality storybook with regards to gender, disability, ethnicity, age, and economic status a baseline study was carried out in a total of 12 primary schools prior to the introduction of the book. The schools were drawn from Nairobi, Taveta, Isiolo, Wajir, Marakwet and Ugenya. This study provides benchmark indicators against which follow up surveys (post survey) will be measured. By tracking the impact between pre and post, the KHRC will provide justification for the introduction of the equality book into the annual school textbook list and, the empirical data can be used to fundraise for future equality capacity building programmes.

1.2 Objectives
The goal of the KAP baseline study was to determine the benchmarks across five equality themes; ethnicity, gender, disability, age and economic status. Specifically, the study provides:-

- KHRC with benchmarks for indicators that will be used to assess the impact of the equality story book.

- Information that supports the lobbying for the equality story book to be included in the school curriculum.

- Guidelines aligned to the specific equality thematic areas to inform future developments and improvements in equality education content for schools.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Study approach

Qualitative; A self-filling questionnaire was used to collect information on the KAP of students in classes 6 and 7. One class from each stream was randomly selected for this purpose and all students except for those who were to participate in the qualitative component filled the questionnaire. A moderator took the students through the self-filling
tools, he/she read out the questions and the options in English and Kiswahili. This tool was not translated into mother-tongue since local vernacular would require detailed explanations for terms like discrimination (there are no single phrases for such terms) and this would bias the knowledge measures. This approach was altered in one school which had a well functioning Human Rights club; the 17 students who participated in the self-filling questionnaire in Njoro Primary school (Taveta) were all members of the said club, and they were drawn from class 6 to 8.

**Qualitative:** This involved two focus group discussions (FGDs) per school with an average of 5 boys and 5 girls drawn from the same class 6 and 7. The boys’ and girls’ groups were moderated separately. The FGDs participants were selected to be representative of local diversity with regards to ethnicity and disability; fellow students also identified those that they felt would represent them in such discussions. Guided by a structured tool, all sessions were moderated in either mother tongue or Kiswahili, these sessions were audio recorded for transcribing and reporting purposes.

In each of the selected schools, key informant interviews (KIIs) were carried out with the patron or the proposed patron of the Human Rights club for those schools where such clubs were nonexistent. Another interview was carried out with the school head or deputy. These discussions focused on discrimination within the school environment and availability of teaching resources to address equality. A semi-structured tool with an average interviewing time of 40 minutes administered in either English or Kiswahili was used.

The total sample is as per table 2.1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Primary School</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FGDs</td>
<td>KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>Muguga (Westlands)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kangemi (Westlands)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marakwet</td>
<td>Tot (Marakwet East)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sangach (Marakwet East)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugenya</td>
<td>Markuny (Sidiindi)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambira (Ungunja)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taveta</td>
<td>Timbila (Timbila)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Njoro (Mboghoni)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isiolo North</td>
<td>Akili (Burat)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elsa (Burat)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wajir East</td>
<td>Got Adea (Jogbaro)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICF (Jogbaro)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Study management

The tools were guided by the contents of the equality book; a structured tool with multiple choice questions was used for the self-filling component. Semi-structured tools were used for the qualitative components (FGDs and KIIs). Development of the study tools was a consultative process with KHRC providing comments on the preliminary tools that guided in the finalization.

For formality purposes, a letter outlining the purposes of the study was sent to the director at the ministry of education for them to cascade the same to the district educational officers (DEOs) so as to increase the cooperation from the schools.

The field team comprised of four FGD moderators and four class moderators; this team was taken through two day training on the tools and logistics; these sessions also included dummy runs of the FGDs. At the end of the exercise, the entire team participated in fieldwork in the Nairobi schools and this resulted in further modification to the tools and debriefing of the team to ensure uniformity in the administration across all schools.

The FGDs moderator handled the two gender specific FGDs separately, while the class moderator handled the self-filling component (separately administering class 6 and class 7) and interviews for the KIIs. The ideal would have been to administer the tools outside the school hours (after 3.20pm); however owing to the length and the multiple activities/tools this was not possible. A number of schools agreed for the self-filling tools to commence at around 2.30pm.

Fieldwork ran from 27th February to 8th March 2012; there were challenges encountered during fieldwork which have been highlighted in the field report. A key challenge was insecurity in Isiolo which resulted in a change in the previously selected schools and hostility from one head-teacher who had no prior knowledge of the survey. A concern expressed by teachers and especially in Nairobi was that owing to the length of the activities children had to leave school later than is usually the case.

The entire process was consultative with the KHRC who was involved in the conceptualization of the tools, provision of field logistics, accompanying the teams to the schools to observe fieldwork and reviewing the various deliverables.

2.3 Data management

The self-filling questionnaires were captured using the double entry EPIDATA software which means each question was keyed in twice, this process ran concurrently with fieldwork. Once data capture was completed, it was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Appropriate analysis including basic frequencies was done to establish the strength and direction of relationships between variables under investigation. The data collected from key informants and FGDs was transcribed in verbatim and keyed into grids for ease of analysis. Verbatim comments from the two components are included in the report.

2.4 Study limitation

With the self-filling tool administered in English and Kiswahili without the option of defining concepts like discrimination, some of the students might be unfamiliar with the “term” but knowledgeable of the concept; this is evident from the qualitative FGDs where these concepts were explored in more detail. However, the quantitative data is valid as with the use of the equality book they will be knowledgeable not only of the concepts but also the terminology.
3. Study Findings

This KAP study brings to the fore an understanding of inequality in different places and particularly among school children, beckoning the need to focus on incorporating equality into the Kenya school curriculum if the country is to reduce discrimination.

Most teachers and children noted that the pressure to discriminate on ethnicity emanated more from outside of the school than within and singled out parents as a key source of pressure to discriminate across the board. Many parents try to prevent their children mixing with children from other ethnic communities.

It is notable that while 6 in 10 children recognise open ethnic discrimination, very few recognise more subtle forms as tribalism such as songs that portray other ethnic communities negatively or even gossiping about people from other communities.

One third of the children in the study sample think that their ethnic community is superior to others while 37% think it is best keep to friends from their ethnic community.

They study also shows disparities between places: in Marakwet and Ugunja upto 56% feel their ethnic community is superior, compared to only 13% in Isiolo who hold the same view. In Wajir, the study found that religion matters more than ethnicity.

The tendency to want to prefer to vote for someone from ones ethnic group, was more pronounced in areas that are fairly homogenous or have one dominant community. The study results show that when it comes to presidential elections children in even the most cosmopolitan schools expressed that they would vote for someone from their own ethnic community.

Nevertheless, the study found that majority of school children feel that different ethnic communities can live harmoniously together, and value spending time with others regardless of ethnicity.

Interestingly, 12% school children in the study sample admitted to have discussed having some ethnic communities sent out of the area of residence.

School children are aware that boys and girls are differently disadvantaged, although they exclusively gave boys the right to decision making and the right to protection from war, although a number of children afforded girls, and not boys, the right to protection from harm.

With regard to rights, the study shows awareness that human rights are universal to all children. But 7% were of the opinion that rights to decision making are an exclusive right to boys.

One out of every four children in the study felt that boys are generally better in performing tasks than girls, although more than half, 55%, agree that girls are just as brave as boys.

The study results show that 25% of school children feel that children do not have a role to play in community decision making. They also hold the opinion that people 65 years and over are poor leaders lacking “appropriate” wisdom to lead. On the flip side though, 17% of school children dismiss young people – 19 years – as inexperienced and unable to handle leadership responsibilities.
Most children felt that leadership should be based on performance not gender, although they perceive women in leadership as an affirmative action as opposed to their capabilities.

On the matter of disability, the study results show children’s overall attitude towards people with disability as largely compassion, welfare and pity rather than a rights based.

The study shows that 34% of school children think that disability is as a result of witchcraft.

Further children are doubtful of leadership skills of people with disability (PWD) and their ability to contribute effectively to community decisions since such individuals need a “guide” to help them with their day to day activities. That “guide” is perceived to become a third party in the decision making process.

In terms of relationships with PWD, majority school children said they cannot marry someone with a disability. Their main concern is their over dependency, their inability to participate in household chores and discrimination from the family.

An overwhelming majority of children - 78% agree that community resources should be used to support disabled people but not at the expense of those without disabilities.

Forty percent of the students have a friend who is physically disabled and most pupils interviewed said they freely relate with children with disability in school and out of school and are protective of them. 78% have reprimanded a friend who showed hostility to a person with disability.

School children in the study sample said economic discrimination exists but is minimal compared to other forms of discrimination. In school clubs, children said there was a strong preference for children from low economic status to take leadership positions, but as a way of empathizing with them. The study found that in a few cases children might form social circles that exclude the poor – but rarely is this evident in the school setting.

4. SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

4.1 Self-filling sample

Out of the 12 schools, a sample of 844 was achieved from the self-filling tools; Wajir had the most (198) pupils participating due to the large number of students in the classes selected while Isiolo had the least (77) due to the fact that one of the schools had been a feeder school with students moving on to other schools in upper classes. Akili primary (Isiolo) had only 11 students in classes 6 and 7 participating in the self-filling questionnaire, although the school register had a much higher number, it was indicated that the rest of the students were away for a sports’ tournament. However this was not verified and it could be purely due to cases of school absenteeism. This potentially affects the follow up survey at this school as the KHRC will need to ensure that at least the 11 students are captured at the post-survey.

Students were drawn from class 6 (58%) and 7 and above (42%); the “above” applies only for Njoro Primary School (Taveta) with 12 students (out of 17) in class 8 who were members of the Human Rights club (Kings and Queens of Change).

Clearly the number of students drops between class 6 and 7 probably as a result of drop-out or repetition. This could have an impact on the follow-up survey as the approach seeks to follow the same students when they are in class 7.
and 8 subsequently. Some of them might not have proceeded to these classes if they have repeated then we can find them in the same class but if they have left it will not be possible to follow up with them.

Whereas at the total column the gender ratio is close to 1:1 (though there are more boys) there are notably differences across the regions; the two schools in Wajir only have a ratio of one girl to every two boys such that only a third (35%) of the students that participated in the self-filling questionnaire were girls.

The average age of the pupils sampled was 13.1 years with a significant lower median in Nairobi (12.4 years). In Wajir a tenth (12%) of the students were 15 years and above, which could bring about a new kind of discrimination, where the older children are looked down upon by their peers, which is evident (though minimal) from the key informant interviews.

### Table 3.1 Sample profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample (N)</strong></td>
<td>844</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 6</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 7 or above</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 15 and above</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Taveta some children were in class 8 as members of the club acted as participants rather than class 6 and 7.

### 4.2 Clubs in schools

All schools had extra-curricular programmes in the form of clubs; a third of the students participating (31%) in the self-filling do not belong to any club, and this is especially the case in Nairobi (50%). As indicated previously, only one school (in Taveta) had an operational Human Rights clubs; a school in Ungunja indicated likewise, however, upon further probing the club was not active despite having students who indicated they were members. The intervention is focused on introducing the book through the Human Rights clubs but there is the option of exploring how to integrate the book into other active and popular clubs that have mandates or activities that are broadly within the human right “scope” such as the debating club, Islamic club or the PPI (Pastoral Program Intervention), this might be a more sustainable approach. The KIIs findings which are discussed below go into details about the clubs where equality is discussed.

### Table 3.2: Clubs within the schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School clubs</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Club</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debating Club</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scouting Club</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing/Music Club/Choir</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Clubs</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI Club</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4K Club (an agricultural club)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Taveta when the Njoro school patron for the Human Rights club was probed as to what activities their clubs are involved in, they mentioned discussions on cleanliness, FGM and self awareness; it is unclear how the human rights concepts fit in. This club meets once a week, and it is important to review whether the book can be covered within an academic year (excluding the exam week and holidays and the fact that the clubs might be engaged in other activities).

Ambira primary (Ugunja) indicated they had a Human rights club that met once a month or less often (this is a sign of inactiveness) and one of the challenge has been lack of resource materials, a bigger problem was that the patron teacher was no longer availed to guide the club. With frequent teacher transfers it might be important to cascade the equality book to at least two teachers per school.

### 4.3 Ethnic composition of the schools

The majority of the schools (10 out of 12) had a multi-ethnic makeup, only Wajir had schools that were homogeneous in terms of ethnic composition. The ethnic composition of the Nairobi schools as indicated in the table 3.3 below only shows the main tribes, there are numerous minority tribes and schools in Nairobi have more ethnic groups than the other schools. In Wajir and Marakwet the issue was “clanism” however the breakdown of the clans within the schools was not followed up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>KII Respondents</th>
<th>Ethnic Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>Muguga Primary</td>
<td>DHT - Samuel Nderitu, Patron - Benson Otieno</td>
<td>Cosmopolitan – Majority - Luhiya, Luo, Kikuyu, Somali, Kamba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kangemi Primary</td>
<td>HT – Margaret Wangui, Patron – Victoria Kioko</td>
<td>Cosmopolitan – Majority - Kikuyu, Luhiya, Luo, Kisii, Kamba, Kalenjin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tot Primary</td>
<td>DHT - Daniel Murkomen, Patron – Jeremiah Kimaiyo</td>
<td>Marakwet, Pokot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sangach Primary</td>
<td>HT – Edward Kisang, Patron – Mr. Bernard</td>
<td>Marakwet, Pokot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugunja</td>
<td>Markuny Primary</td>
<td>HT – Ernst Onyango, Patron – Helen Odindo</td>
<td>Luo, Luhiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambira Primary</td>
<td>HT – Vincent Oduor, Patron – Getrude Okonya</td>
<td>Cosmopolitan – Luo, Luhiya, Kikuyu, Masai, Turkana, Kuria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Equality discussions in schools – Key Informant Interviews

The schools currently provide forums where discriminations can be discussed and deliberated on. 20 out of 24 teachers interviewed mentioned forums such as clubs, school assemblies and during some subjects when issues of equality are discussed. (The four interviewees that indicated that they do not have such forums were Muguga (Nairobi, head teacher and patron), Tot (Marakwet patron) and Sangach (Marakwet head teacher). For the two schools in Marakwet the other interviewee in the same school indicated that there are forums to discuss equality which indicates some level of confusion. From the teachers’ perspective, the most common fora for discourse on equality were within the syllabus for social studies, Christian Religious Education (CRE) and Islamic Religious Education (IRE) which are examinable subjects within the current curriculum. It is worthwhile investigating which aspects of equality are captured within these subjects.

Looking at clubs in more details, the following clubs engage in discussions on equality; the guidance and counselling clubs, peace and reconciliation club (Kangemi), the girls forums which also discuss sexuality issues such as FGM (Taveta), Christian union, games, breaking barriers for the vulnerable and orphans (where pupils are given food to grow and support poor peers) (Ugunja); PPI club (Isiolo); debating clubs, Islamic clubs and “tuseme” “lets talk” club (Wajir). There are also informal discussions on Sunday after church (Marakwet) where issues on equality are featured. Such forums are more likely to tackle tribalism, discrimination against disabled children and gender but will not focus on age or economic discrimination.

“We deal with all types of discrimination that may arise in school in regards to gender, tribe, age, family background and that all are equal none is special than the other” (Isiolo, Head)

Muguga is the only school where both head teacher and patron spontaneously indicated that there were no forums dealing with equality discussions, however on further probing they indicated that there were guidance and counselling sessions – though not necessarily through a club. This school could be more willing to set up a human rights club since there wasn’t anything suitable.

However, there are limited resources, 13 out of the 24 teachers interviewed cited either lack of guidebooks, work-plans, specialized teachers and financial resources to actively engage students in equality discussions.

“We do not have trained personnel to tackle the issue of discrimination” (Wajir, Patron)

“Provide seminars for teachers to become empowered and to better enlighten the students on these issues. Inset courses where by teachers can be trained to be more knowledgeable, few teachers to be selected at zonal and divisional level trained so as to train the rest at the grassroots. (Isiolo, Head)

“Provide resources like visual aids, Electronic study materials, Guest speakers” (Taveta, Deputy)

These head teachers and patrons felt that the discourse of discrimination has to extend beyond the school boundaries to the greater community.
“(how do you address discrimination) there has to be discussions with parents and whole community to encourage proper relationships and respect to all in society.” (Isiolo Patron)

“There …bring peace talks within the community as it's the only way these communities will get along.” (Isiolo Patron)

The types of discrimination that exist in most schools were gender, tribe, age, economic background and disability. At least 20 out of the 24 teachers interviewed have dealt with such cases within their schools, however they remain minimal.

Of all the regions, Isiolo had more mentions of tribalism, teachers are trying to address it, and however, it is a daunting task owing to the hostility amongst the various tribes outside the school environment. Parents perpetuated tribal hatred they go to the extent of trying to block the admission of children from certain tribes into the school, acceptance has to be taught in the home.

We encourage them to love each other. Most pupils are Turkanas so we find it hard telling them to be at peace with Boranas who are fighting them. (Isiolo, Patron)

“No, school pupils have no tribes. The parents are the issue especially due to the war in neighbouring areas, parents instigate their children. In admitting children of different tribes a case point being a Borana parent who wanted the child admitted in the school and the parents of the other children were against it.…..home teaching is hard and this is what fuels the problem.” (Isiolo, Head)

In Marakwet the main aspect of discrimination is along gender lines and is perpetuated by the parents. There was also a mention of clanism.

“Boys tend to feel superior.”(Marakwet, Head)

“Discrimination is mostly from parents; on gender…they favour boys “(Marakwet, Head)

“There is clanism and pupils from the same tribe tend to help each other.” (Marakwet, Head)

In Nairobi, issues of gender and tribalism, (though minimal) were mentioned though minimal.

“…cultural settings where girls are mostly considered weak.” (Nairobi, Patron)

“we have handled tribal, gender discrimination in the past….. but it is a cosmopolitan area.”

In Taveta it was more an issue of child about where children miss school to engage in casual work during the market days, gender discrimination was also an issue in Taveta.

“We address roles sharing for girls vs boys at home. Sometimes girls are overworked; Boys are also used as potters during market day. “ (Taveta, Head)

In Wajir since tribe is homogeneous, the issue was that they boys feel superior to girls.

“Boys feel more superior than girls.” (Wajir, Patron)

In Ugunja, they dealt with inequalities on age, gender and economic status.
“Age and ability that is performance in tests and education. Well performers avoid grouping with poor performers as they feel they’ll be pulled down. Tribal; fight for other tribes who may feel segregated and discourage name calling.” (Ugunja, Patron)

“The girls themselves feel inferior from home since parents treat boys better.” (Ugunja, Patron)

“At times the rich stay on their own and the poor lack confidence.” (Ugunja, Head)

Initiatives such as school uniform and feeding programmes are positively linked with minimizing discrimination on the basis of economic status. Generally, from the perspective of the patron and head teachers, discrimination on the five dimensions (tribe, age, gender, disability and economic status) is minimal within the school environment.

“No one knows what type of background one is from as all the children wear uniform; all children are feeding in the school as equals. Parents though are the ones who fuel the problem by influencing their children” (Isiolo, Head)

“We try and handle poverty level since most pupils attend classes due to free feeding programme. (Nairobi Head)

Teachers will go out of their way to create an environment that ensures equality amongst gender; boys and girls are given equal roles in the school setting, both take on leadership (prefects) positions. However, in a few cases there is an underlying inferiority complex amongst girls which inhibits their full participation in school activities, for some teachers such behavior is simply branded as laziness. Further, when dealing with gender inequality they have to tackle cultural views where girls are perceived as the weaker sex.

“For girls and boys we deal with equality between boys and girls …We try to incorporate all in same duties; fetching water, leadership and seating arrangements”. (Isiolo, Patron)

“….Yes we do emphasize that girls are as good as the boys, however, girls feel inferior to boys. I think girls are also lazy, they don’t want to work as hard as the boys.” (Taveta, Patron)

“Those who have older parents still feel certain duties should be done by a specific gender, but children from younger generation parents have no issues.” (Ugunja, Head)

A new dimension of discrimination on age became apparent during the research. Some schools, especially, Markuny (Ugunja) have much older students and there is an assumption that they are slow learners. There is also the occurrence of “isolating” students who underperform academically which is a form of discrimination.

“We counsel the older pupils and encourage others to support them since they may be slow learners.” (Ugunja, Patron)

“To avoid discrimination on age….we give older pupils more responsibilities so as to retain in school and to make younger ones appreciate them.” (Isiolo, Patron)

“Age and ability (performance in tests and education) where well performers avoid grouping with poor performers as they feel they’ll be pulled down and we also have tribal issues” (Ugunja, Patron)
5. DISCRIMINATION

5.1 Understanding the phrase and description

There was high claimed awareness (79%) of the word “discrimination” among the students in both class 6 and 7 across all regions. In all the schools the word was translated into Kiswahili “ubaguzi.”

However, when the pupils were asked to actually pick out the statement that describes the word, there is a gap in the knowledge of the actual meaning and description. Derived from those that said “yes” they know the word then expressed as a percentage of the total, only a half (49%), correctly ticked the statement associated with discrimination; (it is treating someone negatively from the way you would treat another person in the same situation). There are notable differences across the regions. In Ugunja (34%), Marakwet (36%) and Wajir (36%) only about a third had the correct description. Taveta records the highest incidence on this measure (70%), probably as a result of the human right clubs. There are those that out rightly do not know what the term means (asking someone to do one a favour (11%) or don’t know (3%)) and then there are those who confuse it with the concept of “equality” (treating all persons the same (16%).

Graph 4.1 Knowledge of the phrase discrimination (by region)

The same measures above on claimed awareness and actual description are presented in graph 4.2 across gender and there are no differences between male and female students.
The focus groups though recorded high awareness level not only of the phrase but also the description; the students correctly associating discrimination with excluding other deserving persons. As opposed to the quantitative, the FGDs allowed for probing of the actual meaning.

“It means preferring someone else to another”, (Marakwet, Boy)

“It means to be secluded or sidelined by others” girl, Taveta

“Discrimination is choosing one person and leaving out the other yet they all are deserving”, girl, Ugenya

Children have heard the word discriminations discussed on radio, TV, churches, social studies lessons, in English and Kiswahili lessons and in other forums within the school environment; some have heard it used at the chief barazas and from their parents.

5.2 Dimensions of discrimination

Students were presented with 7 statements on discrimination to rate as either “true”, “false” or “don’t know” as indicated in table 4.2 below; statements (b), (d) and (f) are reversed such that the correct answer is “false”; Of interest is the statements with significantly lower proportions with the correct answer; Slightly over a third (38%) ticked correctly on statement (e) which deals with discrimination on age, however there are notably lower proportions in Ugunja (29%); females are more likely to correctly rate this statement (43%) than their male counterparts (34%). Only 41% correctly associate treating the disabled negatively as discrimination with Marakwet (18%) recording a significantly lower proportion than the other regions. Females (44%) are more likely to recognize discrimination based on disability than males (38%), and this difference is statistically significant.

Generally discrimination is more likely to be associated with gender or tribe than with the other aspects age, disability and economic status. (It is difficult to ascertain the validity of statements posed in the negative given the differences in the correct responses when the same statement is presented in reverse, such as is the case with statements (e) and (f)) Negative phrasing should be avoided in the follow-up survey.
To arrive at a composite score, every statement that is answered correctly is scored as one, the incorrect ones receive a zero, total scores are then expressed as a percentage of the highest possible score which is 7. Overall, the average score is only 41% which is below the 50% mark, Nairobi had the highest average at 45%, while Marakwet had the least at 37%. Focusing on those students that score 4 out of 7 statements correctly, the trend is the same; Nairobi leads (39%) while Marakwet lags behind at (18%). There are no significant differences in these overall scores across gender.

Table 4.1: Dimensions of discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/district</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a: Discrimination is when you treat someone negatively just because of their tribe (true)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b: Discrimination is when you don’t treat someone negatively just because they are a girl or a boy (false)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c: Discrimination is when you treat someone negatively just because they have a disability (true)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d: Discrimination is listening to the young because you feel they have something to say (false)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e: Discrimination is when you don’t listen to the very old because you feel they have no new ideas (True)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f: Discrimination is when you treat a poor child the same way you would treat a rich child (False)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g: Discrimination is when you treat someone negatively just because they look physically strong (True)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scored 4 out of 7 or more</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through the qualitative sessions, the students’ descriptions of persons who are discriminated against are broad; it includes discrimination owing to behavioral traits, religious discrimination and inequality within a family.

“Disabled are locked indoors and not given opportunities and things like others….Uneducated can be sent away from village. …Disabled are not given a chance in public transport. ….Drunkards are asked not to go near some places because they are drunk.” (Isiolo, boys)

“Boranas since they attend church on Fridays and others go on Sunday.” (Isiolo, girl)

“Disabled children are seen as less of a human being at home... Old people, young people discriminate old people because they are weak... At home parents prefer to educate boys since they believe that girls are bad mannered and may get pregnant while young.” (Marakwet, boys)

“And even individual…like there is a friend of mine his dad just hates him. Sometimes he even sleeps outside…. The last borns. They are loved so much than the others.” (Taveta, boys)

Students also cited the five concepts of discrimination specific to this study (age, tribe/clan, disability, economic status and gender).
“During sports some big children are always chosen to play while the other ones will not play because they are still young.” (Marakwet, girl)

“Some pupils choose to sit near their fellow tribes and some pupils choose to share books with friends and leave out others.” (Nairobi, boy)

“Initially there was a problem but after counselling to reduce name calling related to tribe it reduced.” (Ugenya, Patron)

From the FGDs discrimination on disability exists and most pupils interviewed felt that children with disability are an additional responsibility and may not be of much benefit later in the family. The majority would choose to educate a child without disability over the disabled one.

“I think it’s better to take the able one to school because she/he will get a job and will support the one with disability.” (Nairobi, girl)

A total of 6 FGDs out of the 25 noted that discrimination is on the increase; 2 of them are from Wajir and the main issue is there is less interaction between boys and girls and more girls are dropping out to get married (this could point to increased adherence to strict Islam doctrine). One group was from Isiolo and they cited that the killing of a person from one tribe has heightened tension; one was in Marakwet and the issue is that in the school setting girls are favoured; another was in Taveta and the issue was escalating food prices which are discriminatory to the poor and vulnerable; while the last one was in Nairobi and the issue was discrimination at the corporate level.

“It has increased because the teachers at school discriminate by giving books to the girls first before boys are given.” (Marakwet, boy)

“It has increased, because the prices of goods have gone high and the disabled people who don’t work cannot afford them. It has also increased in the government; they don’t care about the other people but themselves.” (Taveta, girl)

“It has increases by 20%, some companies are still discriminating (recruitment along tribal lines).” (Nairobi, boy)
5.3 UN statutes – universal rights

The equality book lists the UN statutes without necessarily illustrating how each is operationalized. When presented with a selection of statutes to rate “who” has a right to each, students readily recognize that all children have a right to education (92%). On the other extreme less than two thirds (62%) know that all children have a right to participate in decision making which could be as a result of socialization where decisions making is the exclusive mandate of adults. This measure records the lowest proportion in Ugunja, only 41% felt that all children have a right to decision making. Only 64% indicated that all children have a right to identification which could be as a result of the association of issuance of identity cards at age 18 years. On religion, only 69% felt that all children have a right to choose their own religion, as typically children adopt their parents’ religion. Rather than ticking ‘all children’ have the rights to make decisions and to be protected from harm 10% indicated that specifically children with disabilities have these rights. Such children are actually expressing positive discrimination geared towards protecting the disabled.

The attribution of the right to make decisions particularly to disabled children is interesting. Most comments about children with disabilities from research participants indicate that they take a welfare/charity approach but this indicates that perhaps 10% of children take a rights based approach to disability.

To arrive at a unitary measure that can be tracked over time, this indicator is derived for students who consistently indicate that all children are entitled to all the 9 rights and this stands at 33% with notable differences across the regions; students in Taveta (58%) are 5 times more likely to score correctly on all 9 UN statutes than their counterparts in Ugunja (11%).

If there are children who assume that some rights are entitled to children from certain tribes, that is a worrying trend, however the numbers are minimal 7% and with the introduction of the book these should reduce to zero.

Table 4.2: Knowledge of the UN statutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who has a right to each</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Disabled children</th>
<th>All children</th>
<th>Children from certain tribes</th>
<th>None of these</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a: Education</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b: Food and Shelter</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c: Right to participate in decision making</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d: Right to be treated fairly in a just way that respects your rights</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e: Right to live</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f: Right to an identity an official record of who you are</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g: Right to choose your own religion and belief</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h: Right to be protected from harm</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i: Right to protection and freedom from war</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate all children for all the 9 rights</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicated “All children”</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the FGDs, a great number of students mentioned various rights but not necessarily using the language as per UN statutes, for example, under the right to protection from harm they specifically mentioned the “actual danger” that they should be protected from.

“We have a right to education, right to healthcare, shelter, right to all basic needs, right to play, food, right to clothing, religious education.” (Isiolo, boy)

“We have a right to be protected from rape.” (Nairobi, girl)

“Children have a right to education, health, life, shelter, food and freedom.” (Ugunja, boy)

5.4 Differentiating Ethnicity and Nationality

9 out of 24 groups could not even attempt to distinguish between ethnicity and nationality. Those that did seemed to have a general perspective as to what it means as illustrated by the verbatim below; one is perceived to relates to tribe while the other relates to the nation. However, understanding which of the two the students feel more closely associated to was not explored in the survey.

“Nationality means which nation you come from, and ethnicity means tribe. Like I am a Kenyan, and I am a Taita.” (Taveta, girl)

“Ethnicity is the community and nationality is the whole country.”(Marakwet, girl)

“Nationality means which country you are from.” (Taveta, boy)

“Nationality is belonging to a certain country, like I am a Kenyan and ethnicity is belonging to a certain tribe, like I am a Kikuyu.” (Nairobi, boy)

The above verbatim indicate a misunderstanding of what the term means; Ethnicity could mean tribe, it is linked to the identity and community you feel most affiliated with. Therefore, it can be at different levels such as clan, region, tribe, housing estate etc. Nationality may not be the country you are from. It has a legal connotation. It is where you are a recognized citizen.
6. STEREOTYPE

Only 33% had ever heard of the word stereotype, and Isiolo records particularly low recognition at 19% while Nairobi recorded the highest. Since this word does not have a Kiswahili equivalent it was not translated.

Students were then presented with a number of statements on stereotype to rate them as true or false. Analysis as per table 5.1 below on the individual statements excluded those that did not answer in the affirmative in an earlier question of whether or not they have heard of the term stereotype. Clearly students were unfamiliar with what the term means, as 17% of those that had heard of the word stereotype thought it was a type of music. Further even those that correctly describe the term also go on to tick that it is a type of music. As such a composite score based on false to statement (a) and true to statements (b), (c), and (d) as per table 5.3 results in a negligible 1% that score correctly across all the 4 statements. Stereotype (without any translation) is definitely an unfamiliar term.

Table 5.1: Knowledge of the phrase stereotype

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/district</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim have heard the term stereotype</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Stereotype is a form of music from a certain area (True)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Stereotype is to assume that all people of a certain tribe behave the same way (True)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Stereotype is to assume that people of the same age group have the same likes and dislikes (True)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Stereotype is to assume disabled people cannot study up to university level (True)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scored correctly on all 3 statements and no misconception that it is a type of music</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfamiliarity is evident from the FGDs; there was little understanding of the word and even with probing few pupils could give valid examples. Yet the same students use phrases to describe certain tribes such as “Kikuyus like money”, etc. They might use such language to stereotype particular groups but they do not associate it with the term “stereotype.”
7. ETHNIC DISCRIMINATION

6.1 Knowledge

Ethnicity is a real social issue in Kenya given that there are over 40 tribes with different values, cultural beliefs and languages.

Using the self-filling questionnaire, student were asked whether they have heard of the term tribalism (translated to *ukabila* in Swahili) and then presented with statements to rate as true or false. Those that did not answer in the affirmative on the previous question on awareness of the term are cleaned out of the subsequent questions on rating of the true/false statements. 8 in every 10 students (88%) have heard of the term tribalism with high recognition across the regions. However, concepts associated with tribalism such as gossiping about people from other tribes (38%) or having songs that portray other tribes negatively (31%) are not well understood. In fact, 24% thought that tribalism is praising persons from other tribes, which is the total opposite.

As was the case with the other knowledge measures discussed previously, a composite score is derived based on those that got the correct answer to the four statements, (true for all except for statement (b) which is false). Only 1 in every 10 students (11%) had the correct description relating to discrimination consistently across all the statements; Nairobi (21%) had the highest incidence while Marakwet (2%) had the lowest. Ugunja (8%), Isiolo (9%) and Wajir (9%) all record a single digit proportion on this measure. Whereas students might be familiar with overt tribalism, subtle forms such as gossiping or negative songs might not be too familiar.

Table 6.1: Knowledge of the phrase tribalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/district</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim to have heard the term tribalism</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalism is talking mother tongue when there are other people who cannot understand the language (True)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalism is praising people from other tribes (False)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalism is gossiping about people from other tribes (True)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalism is singing songs that say bad things about other tribes (True)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scored correctly on all 3 statements and no misconception that it is praising people from other tribes</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the schools (10 out of the 12) covered by this study had multiple tribal groups. Tribal inequality did feature in the discussions, however, most teachers interviewed noted that the pressure to discriminate on tribe emanated more from the outside community which also includes parents than from within the school. Most of the children within the school perceived each other as equal and have healthy competition in class and in extra-curricular activities regardless of the ethnic background.
Tribalism was well understood and pupils and teachers could give examples within their own
neighbourhoods/communities;

“Boranas, Turkanas, and Samburu are always fighting. We have to put in extra efforts to make these pupils
accept each other even when their parents are at war. At times the community tries to intervene on who
should be enrolled in school but the management is strict and has never given them a chance to.” (Isiolo,
Patron)

“In our plot we had 4 families, 3 kikuyu and 1 Luo. The landlord came and told the Luo family to vacate
because they were late to pay rent yet it was all people or tenants who had not paid in time.” (Nairobi, girl)

Probed as to whether all ethnic groups have rights; the majority felt that all have equal rights.

“We are equal and all are born to two parents.” (Ugenya, girl)

“We are Gods’ creations and need to be cared for by our parents and all in the community.” (Isiolo, girl)

“We all have the same rights and there is nothing special about the tribe.” (Marakwet, girl),

However, from one group in Marakwet (2 out of the 5 boys) it was pointed out that access to education is not
necessarily a universal right given the low school enrolment in certain communities.

“No. Because many children in Marakwet have gone to school unlike Pokot children who don’t.” (Marakwet,
boy)

“No rich and poor do not have equal rights, the rich children don’t go to school they inherit their wealth from
their fathers but the poor the read hard so as to get a job.” (Marakwet, boy)

Although this was not explored extensively in the FGDs, there seems to be confusion between ‘having’ a right and
‘realizing’ a right. For example, all children have the right to education but all children do not realize this right. For
example, the second quote above does not imply that these children do not have a right to education but rather that
refusal to take up ones right is tantamount to denial of the right. Many children seem to confuse ‘achieving’ the right
with ‘having’ a right.

6.2 Attitudes

Ethnicity and relationships; The statement ‘My tribe is superior to other tribes’ was presented to the students
though the self-filling tool to rate on a scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree. 62% disagree that their tribes are
superior to other tribes (34% strongly disagree and 28% disagree). One third of the children involved in the research
think that their tribe is superior to other tribes. There are notable differences across the regions; Nairobi which is the
most cosmopolitan region recorded 88% that disagreed with the first statement. Yet Marakwet which had both
Marakwet and Pokot speakers and Ugunja which had the presence of at least two ethnic groups in the schools
sampled, both record that 56% feel that their tribe is superior to other tribes.

63% disagree that ‘it is best to keep to friends from ones tribe;’ here too Nairobi records the highest proportion for this
appropriate attitude at 75%, while Marakwet and Ugunja record the lowest at 51% respectively.

Interestingly, schools in Isiolo which had at least two ethnic communities scored highly with 87% disagreeing that ‘my
tribe is superior to other tribes’ and 85% disagreeing that ‘it is best to keep to friends from ones tribe.’ This is a region
that was noted as having tribal tension but these results do not indicate this in the schools.
The two statements are interrelated; of the 524 students that disagreed to the first statement (my tribe is superior) 70% of them disagreed to the second statements on keeping to friend from ones’ tribe. When students perceive all tribes as equal they are more likely to embrace friends from all ethnic backgrounds.

There are no gender differences in terms of boys and girls in relation to the two statements.

Table 6.2: Attitudes towards ethnicity and relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/district Students</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My tribe is superior to other tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| If you can, it’s best you keep to friends of your own tribe | | | | | | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 13% | 3% | 23% | 21% | 15% | 1% | 13% | 14% | 12% |
| Agree | 22% | 21% | 25% | 26% | 17% | 12% | 25% | 24% | 20% |
| Disagree | 31% | 33% | 28% | 27% | 30% | 36% | 34% | 31% | 31% |
| Strongly Disagree | 32% | 42% | 23% | 24% | 37% | 49% | 24% | 29% | 35% |
| Don’t Know | 2% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 4% | 2% | 2% | 2% |

From the FGD, students from the cosmopolitan communities had no problem relating with children from other tribes, though they cited facing opposition from their parents at home. In Wajir, religion mattered more to the students than tribe and therefore in cases of marriage, religion takes precedence.

“IT’s ok for two people of different tribes to relate and they can promote peace.” (Nairobi, boy)

“I think if their parents are against it, they should stop, if your mother tells you that you cannot be married in another tribe, then you have to stop.” (Nairobi, girl)

“They’ll show others to love each other and reduce hate, they are not the ones who hate each other and others will learn from their example, their parents are the ones who hate each other so problem should not be transferred.” (Isiolo, girl)

“People from any tribe can marry each other as long as they share same religious belief and are Muslims” (Wajir, girl)

The majority of the pupils felt it would be important for their parents to encourage tribal integration and friendships.

“When these children grow up they may get employed in other areas and therefore must learn to mix with other tribes earlier.” (Isiolo, girl)

Ethnicity, decision making and leadership; this was explored mainly through the FGDs; election of national leaders seemed to be highly influenced by the national politics. Most children are likely to vote along tribal lines at national level yet on issues like employment opportunities they did not show preferences towards their tribesmen. This became apparent when probed on presidential candidates; there is a tendency to vote for candidates linked to ones tribe or a candidate who is closely aligned even in cosmopolitan Nairobi.
In areas where there is one dominant tribe, there is distrust of other minority communities. This is apparent in Marakwet and Ugenya; where it was pointed out that a leader outside their community would not prioritise their concerns/needs.

“No I can’t vote for outsiders….. because he can take all the funds to his community.” (Marakwet, boy)

“I would vote for my tribe because, he is same language like myself.” (Ugenya, boy)

“When he gets money he may use in projects that may not develop others since he comes from a different community” (Marakwet, boy)

On the issue of electing a councillor, there are differences between schools that are largely homogeneous and those that are cosmopolitan; the latter are less likely to vote on tribal lines than the former. The tribal-card plays a more important role in the largely homogenous communities.

“I would vote my tribe to bring harmony and peace and also he will employ our people.” (Marakwet, boy)

“I will vote my tribe, because he can be able to represent my community well and can communicate easily with my tribe.” (Isiolo, boy)

“We should not be tribal but should look at whoever will bring developments.” (Nairobi, boy)

“I will vote for the one who is honest and generous.” (Taveta, boy)

“So long as he has respect towards the old and young, he can be a leader.” (Ugenya, girl)

In Wajir, where the tribe is homogeneous, religion came out as an important variable in determining which leader to elect.

“He can be a leader if he is a Muslim what matters to us is religion not tribe.” (Wajir, girl)

Clan based issues with regards to leadership and decision making were not deeply pursued but it is likely that in Wajir this would have been a key determinant in choosing a leader.

Ethnicity and resource sharing: The self-filling tool had only one statement relating to this issue, A tribe that lives together can accomplish more than a tribe that lives with other tribes (mixed). Proportions that disagree were only 58% (30% disagree strongly and 28% disagree). Here too Nairobi records the highest proportion of students with positive attitudes (78%), followed by Isiolo (71%) while Marakwet and Ugunja lag behind at 43% and 41% respectively. Of interest is Isiolo which in the recent past has been in the media owing to tribal conflict; there could be local initiatives which are working to bring warring communities together which could be evidenced by the consistently positive attitudes amongst the Isiolo students to tribalism issues. Note that in the FGDs there were several mentions of tribal tension in Isiolo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugenja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tribalism did not feature strongly in the choice of employee in the hypothetical situation where the students had the ability to hire staff during FGDs. However, there was a small minority that would prefer to hire people from their tribe.

I would hire the …..other tribe because when you give him a job he will thank you with ‘something small’ but your own tribe will not even remember that you ever helped him (Marakwet, girl)

I will give my tribe because another person can steal my money (Wajir, boy)

Ethnicity stereotypes: Stereotypes about different ethnic groups do exist and a majority believed that some tribes are better than others in one area or the other. The Kikuyu were seen to be better in business and making money while the Giriama were said to be good at dancing or the Luo good at fishing. The context here is that certain tribes are perceived to be superior in certain things yet that tribe might not have made claim to the same. Some of the stereotypes are driven by the economic activities that certain groups tend to engage in.

“Turkanas are good at charcoal selling, the Meru are good at farming and getting food, the Samburu slaughter and sell us goats so that we eat meat, Kikuyus are good in business.” (Isiolo, girl)

“I will hire a Kamba because if I hire a Luo and he feels he has been defeat in one way or the other Luo might start fighting and they are very violent people.” (Nairobi, girl)

From the FGDs there exists some tribal biases that could lead to tension; some tribes are perceived “negatively” as they are seen as feeling superior to others based on various factors such as the length of time their kinsman have been in top leadership and their business acumen. These tribes have not claimed to be superior; it is a perception by other tribes. The resulting tension is not purely as a result of the proximity of two tribes or competition for resources but the perception that one tribe is perceived as doing better and feeling superior and is personified as aloof by the other. The fact that these students assume that certain tribes “feel superior” is a misconception that can breed resentment.

“Some tribes [tribe unspecified] have very learned people and leaders always come from there.”(Marakwet, boy)

“They are superior their leader guides and supports them [Boranas] and they are also united unlike the Turkanas” (Isiolo, boys)

“The Kikuyus are the ones who have ruled the country for all those years up to now and now they think the country is theirs.” (Taveta, boy)

“Kikuyus are more advanced than other tribes since in Nairobi they are many and do well in their businesses, when Kikuyus get money they open shops and many businesses to help the poor.” (Isiolo, girl)

“In our plot there was a family that was told by the landlord to vacate just because they were from Luo community and I felt was very bad. So the Kikuyu who mostly are the landlord feel they are superior to other tribes.” (Nairobi, girl)

These students had other stereotypes about certain tribes as illustrated by the verbatim below; some of the stereotypes might be triggered by a recent occurrence.
“The Pokots are dirty people” (Marakwet, girls)

“Luos do things better than other tribes.” (Ugunja, boy)

“The Giriamas are good at sewing.” (Taveta, girl)

“In our plot where I live there are 2 girls one a Kikuyu and the other one is a Luhya and the Kikuyu girl tells the Luhya that they are dirty and unhygienic which make the Kikuyu girl feel she is more superior that Luhya.” (Nairobi, girl)

Despite the perceived superiority complex and other stereotypes, there are those that felt that different tribes can live harmoniously together and reconcile whenever there is tensions. However, others felt that close proximity will only foster further tension. The latter is, however, a minority opinion expressed by a few of the participants in three FGDs; Njoro (Taveta, girls), Tot (Marakwet, girls), Tot (Marakwet, boys).

“Tribes that hate each other should live together to help bring Kenya together, say we had tourists and they were going to a specific tribe, the others might feel bad and might even start killing each other. So they should live together and promote peace.” (Nairobi, boy)

“Tribes that don’t like each other should not live together, because the children will always grow up knowing about the hatred and they will hate each other.” (Marakwet, girls)

6.3 Behaviour

Children value spending time with their peers irrespective of their tribes, this close association with “others” is actually encouraged as others might adopt the same behaviour.

“They can set an example to others and you can learn about other tribes and interact with different tribes.” (Nairobi, boy)

Parents greatly influence how children interact with peers from other tribes. In one of the FGDs there was a boy who had been cautioned for socialising with a friend purely because of his tribe and despite efforts to win his parents over, they were adamant. There are others who take caution from parents about people from other tribes seriously as it could be a sign of some “hidden” danger.

“Friend from another tribe, I tried talking to parents but they are still reluctant to change their mind.” (Nairobi, Boys)

“If a parent doesn’t want a particular friend you must follow their advice.” (Marakwet, boys)

“Children from different tribes …yes they can make good friends but there are parents who may not approve the friendship.” (Nairobi, girl)

“No (parents should not encourage children to be friends with other children who are not from their tribe)…because you don’t understand them well for example he or she can be a thief…he or she can food-poison you.” (Marakwet, boys)

The table 6.4 below presents behaviour relating to children from other tribes; in interpreting this it is important to note that the situation might not be applicable to all children, they might not have peers from other tribes within their classes. Whereas many students have shared a meal with someone from other tribes (74%), or asked a friend not to
talk negatively about other tribes (77%), subtle or less well known forms of tribalism are apparent, a half (51%) have shared a funny story about people of a certain tribe with a friend, and this is most apparent in Marakwet (66%). Across gender it seems that girls (55%) are slightly more likely to share funny stories about other tribes than the boys (48%).

Children might find it difficult to stand up against their parents and defend those from other tribes as only 42% have done so in the past 3 months; (there is the possibility that the situation did not arise). As discussed previously from the FGDs, parents are influential when it comes to friends from other tribes and students might not have the skills to negotiate tricky situations on tribalism with their parents.

Over a third (36%) have conversed in their mother tongue amongst others who were not familiar with the language with Taveta (41%) which was one of the most cosmopolitan localities recording a high proportion on this. The schools sampled in Wajir were homogeneous in terms of tribal mix, and it is unclear on which context students answered in the affirmative for the statement on language; it could be talking mother tongue amongst traders and other community members who are unfamiliar with Somali.

Few (12%) are as radical as having had discussions to have some tribes kicked out of the area. However, in Wajir (24%) or nearly a quarter of respondents had held such a discussion. This is twice as high as the total average which is indicative of underlying tribal/clan tension. Despite sampling schools that are homogeneous in terms of the tribes of the school population in Wajir, the same might not be the case for the greater community. Ugunja (15%) had a notable proportion that had discussed possibilities of kicking out other tribes in the past 3 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. I have a friend who is not from my tribe</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Shared a meal with someone who is not from my tribe</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Talked to my parents positively about a child who they do not like because of his tribe or disability</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Talked my mother tongue amongst other people who could not understand my language</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Told a friend a funny story I heard about people of a certain tribe</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Asked a friend not to say bad things about people from a different tribe</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Discussed with others the possibilities of kicking out people who do not belong to my tribe from this community</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. GENDER DISCRIMINATION

8.1 Knowledge

One way of understanding knowledge on gender equality is to look at proportions that associate any one of the 9 statutes discussed under discrimination with either boys or girls. 18% associate one of the statutes with boys and this is mainly driven by the 7% who are of the opinion that rights to decision making is an exclusive right of boys and not of other children. Further, 6% are of the opinion that boys have a right to be protected from war more so than other children since they are the more likely to be recruited as child soldiers. The 18% could be described as the proportion that has incorrect knowledge that favours boys over girls and other children in general when it comes to rights. 15% are of the opinion that girls are entitled to certain rights that boys and all children in general do not have.

Therefore, boys and girls are disadvantaged in different areas due to misconceptions on rights. By not affording all children all rights this disadvantages both boys and girls in different ways. For example, the tendency to allocate the right to protection from harm exclusively to girls makes boys more vulnerable. At the same time the tendency to allocate the right to decision making to boys alone disadvantages girls in leadership and politics at every level. This is a serious infringement of rights as without a say in decisions girls rights can more easily be infringed in many different areas of their lives. The misconceptions also make girls more vulnerable during war as there is a tendency to allocate the right to protection from war exclusively to boys.

In Marakwet and Wajir, there is a particular tendency to allocate more rights exclusively to boys.

Table 7.1: Association of any of the 9 rights to one gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/district</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate any one of the 9 right with boys only</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate any one of the 9 right with girls only</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rights to boys - Education 2%, Food and Shelter 1%, Right to participate in decision making 7%, Right to be treated fairly in a just way that respects your rights 2%, Right to live 2%, Right to an identity an official record of who you are 4%, Right to choose your own religion and belief 3%, Right to be protected from harm 3%, Right to protection and freedom from war 6%

From the FGDs there was a consensus that boys and girls have equal rights. In Nairobi there was a minority opinion that girls need more protection especially from sexual harassment.

“No girls have more right they must be protected and also they should not be maids for the elder people at homes. It is not good to see a small girl suffering when she is pregnant.” (Nairobi, girls)

8.2 Attitudes

Gender stereotypes and roles: Two statements relating to gender roles were presented to the students; although the majority disagree that boys are better than girls (75%), ideally this proportion should be much higher; Marakwet records the lowest proportion on this measure at 68%. Fewer students though agree that girls are as brave as boys (55%) and in Ugunja only slightly over a third (36%) agree likewise. There is the possibility that students equate bravery to physical strength.
### Table 7.2: Gender personification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys are better than girls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girls can be as brave as boys</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the FGDs, gender inequalities were expressed differently; when students were asked to personify themselves as an animal, their responses are representative of how they perceive their gender roles. Such sentiments are uniform across gender.

“*I would want to become a dog because it guards people. It represents man because it guards people like a man.*” (Taveta, girl)

“A cow because it is a domestic animal at home and it has no problem and it is friendly and it is like a girl because it is taken care at home just like girls but boys are usually left to go out and fend for themselves” (Marakwet, boy)

“I would want to become a cheetah because it is the bravest animal. It represents a man.” (Taveta, boy)

“I would be a peacock since it’s beautiful and it likes to show off or just be seen like a woman.” (Nairobi, girl)

The above sentiments show that both boys and girls have pre-set notions of their roles in society; roles that require bravery and not necessarily physical strength such as protecting the community with some degree of agility are associated with males while females are tasked with the domesticated chores. Bravery of girls is further complicated by the fact that they are more vulnerable to sexual harassment. There was though a minority opinion amongst some boys that women have more difficult roles which makes them more enduring.

“No, a girl cannot be brave because as she talks in front of people she is shy and she fears people.” (Marakwet, girl)

“If girls are left to watch over property at night, they can be raped and may get fearful when thugs attack.” (Isiolo, girl)

“Yes they can also be brave, women have also passed through difficulties so they are able to cope with difficulties.” (Taveta, boy)

There is an underlying perception that girls might not be as hard working as boys and there are many more distractions that retract them from achieving their full potential.
“Women are not hard working and they spend too much time competing on petty things like dressing and make up but a man will work hard and focus on the job, so I would employ a man.” (Nairobi, girl)

“At home parents prefer to educate boys since they believe that girls are bad mannered and may get pregnant while young.” (Marakwet, girl)

The effects of socialisation are apparent in table 7.3 which is based on the self-filling tools. Whereas the majority associate the domestic chore of buying groceries with all children (59%), a fifth (20%) specifically indicated that this is a role for girls and this sentiment is shared more strongly by the girls (23%) than boys (18%) though the difference is marginal.

Most of the pupils interviewed agreed that boys should learn domestic skills such as cooking so that they can be self-sufficient in future. However, the view tended to be that this skill is only needed for men who do not have a woman in close proximity to cook for them. The activity of cooking is perceived as primarily a woman’s role.

“Yes, in case the mother travels to somewhere the man will be forced to cook for the children.” (Marakwet, boy)

“No, utaonekana mume bwege” which meant “you will be perceived as useless man.” (Taveta, boy)

“Yes, if they are not yet married and don’t have someone to cook for them, you cannot eat everyday in a hotel.” (Taveta, girl)

Table 7.3: Gender roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who should:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Disabled children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the shop to buy groceries</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to decisions about the area</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect area resource such as rivers or water points</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender decision making and leadership** There exists minimal bias favouring men when it comes to leadership positions; both boys and girls felt that a leader should be judged by their contribution to the community and less by gender. However, the reasons provided for why they would vote for a woman still had a lot to do with their domestic roles and perceived nurturing qualities. There are those who feel that they would vote for a female leader more as an affirmative action as opposed to her leadership qualities.

“I will vote for any of them according to what he/she can do for the community, I won’t look at the gender” (Taveta, girl)

“Women are merciful, she will help the needy.” (Marakwet, girl)
“A woman is always at home she knows what is good and bad within the community.” (Wajir, girl)

“I would choose a woman because they have been left behind.” (Marakwet, boy)

A small minority of the male FGD participants would vote for a man owing to the belief that men are superior leaders, while in Wajir voting for women leaders was seen as contradictory to local norms.

“I will vote for the man, men are the leaders.” (Taveta, boy)

“In our community people believe women’s work is to take care of the house and children.” (Wajir, girl)

From the self-filling tools, 7 in every 10 (75%) agree that a woman can take on leadership positions like chiefs and all regions recorded high proportions on this; notably though only 60% are in agreement with this statement in Wajir. There is room to push the 75% to 85% and above.

Table 7.4: Women in leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A woman can be the leader of this area like a chief</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14% felt that community decision making is the mandate of the boys (see table 7.3). An even higher percentage (25%) did not feel that children (those that said “none”) have a role to play when it comes to contributing to community decision making. This pressing negative attitude has serious repercussions for children's rights as a whole. Although many students felt that all children have a role to play in protecting community resources (43%) a notable proportion (24%) associate this role with boys; and this is more strongly expressed by the actual boys (28%) than the their female counterparts (20%). A significant proportion though indicated “none of the children categories” (23%) on the role of protecting resources. In additional to promoting gender equality there has to be a sense of ownership of and responsibility for community assets at an early age.

Gender and resources Given a hypothetical situation where a mother has enough resources to support either a boy or a girl in school; most pupils in the FGDs would choose to educate the boy. A boy was perceived as valuable to the household while a girl would get married and “leave” with her education. Educating a boy provides continuity as he can support the entire family – even the married girl.

“I will educate a boy because a girl can be married to another tribe and take all the wealth there.” (Marakwet, boy)

“I would take the boy, and then send the girl to get married (Laughter) then the boy after school he will come help me. Now if I don’t have the money, instead of the girl just staying at home, she would rather just get married.” (Taveta, girl)

“The boy is going to help his sister while the girl will get married and forget her family.” (Wajir, girl)
Some, however, felt that both should be treated equally and choosing one over the other is a daunting task, and some would consider educating the girl since she is likely to readily reciprocate and support the family than the boy.

“You share the money equally for both of them and then you get extra money to finish the rest. They will stay at home, get extra money then take the two of them to school.” (Taveta, girl)

"Girl, Girls are more hard working and are able to help their parent.” (Taveta, boys)

“Let all stay out and save enough cash first or pay for the girl.” (Isiolo, girls)

When presented with the decision of whether or not to hire a man or a woman, the majority would consider looking at academic qualifications, morals and ownership of legal documents regardless of gender.

“I would hire the one good dressing, better certificates than others…. ” (Isiolo, girl)

Excluding Nairobi, 62% of the students felt that it is appropriate to use community resources to send girls to schools, however, a significant proportion disagree (35%) with Ugunja (51%) and Marakwet (46%) having the highest proportion of those that are in disagreement. Taveta has by far the lowest proportion of those that disagree (19%) and subsequently the highest proportion of those that support affirmative action towards girls and education (76%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>661</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is okay for the community to use its money to send girls to school</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This statement was not posed in Nairobi; it was one of the statements introduced after a review of Nairobi fieldwork.

8.3 Behaviour

Boys and girls related well and have friends of both sexes. However, at this age with the onset of puberty they seemed quite shy about admitting having friends of the opposite sex as there is an underlying perception that a mixed gender friendship could result in a boyfriend-girlfriend situation.

(Laughter) “Yes, but people will think she is your girlfriend.” (Taveta, boy)

“My friends who are boys are sometimes good in Math and can help me.” (Marakwet, girl)

Interestingly despite being in co-ed schools there are boys and girls who do not have friends from the opposite sex, (only 70% have friends that are both girls and boys) only a half of those in Wajir have friends that are both girls and boys.
As a biological fact, boys are usually physically stronger than girls, however refusal to play/socialise with girls purely based on their physical strength is discrimination. These statements are based only on the responses of the males. Slightly over a quarter (28%) have cautioned their peers about playing with girls and this is more so in Wajir (57%), which also had the lowest proportion of students who had friends from both genders. A fifth (20%) have refused to carry out certain tasks that are typically done by females; and here Wajir (28%) is not any different from Ungunja (26%).

Table 7.6: Behaviour -interacting with girls and participating in roles set out for women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities past 3 months</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Told a friend not to play with girls because they are not as strong as boys</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Refused to do a certain task because that is a woman’s only job</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. AGE DISCRIMINATION

9.1 Knowledge

Although traditional values emphasise listening to the elderly, the reversal (not listening) is not spontaneously associated with discrimination. This can be seen by the low proportion that rated the statement presented in table 8.1 as a true (38%). It is important to consider ways of integrating “new” forms of discrimination into the young people’s vocabulary, for example failure to listen to elders is rudeness and might not be considered discrimination.

Table 8.1 Discrimination is when you don’t listen to the very old because you feel they have no new ideas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2 Attitudes

Age, decision making and leadership; 68% disagree with the statement that old people cannot contribute effectively to community decisions, 39% are on the other hand in agreement – the latter was also apparent in the FGDs “old people are not knowledgeable enough to make community decisions.” Ugunja (49%) records the lowest proportion of those that disagree, though from the FGDs they did not expressed negative perceptions towards the old more strongly than the other regions.

60% disagree that young people cannot contribute to community decisions; Ugunja (47%) records the lowest proportion of those disagreeing with this statement. Isiolo too records a low of 49% that disagree. This points to regions where students do not have faith in the ability of young people to make decisions for their communities.

Table 8.2 Age as basis for decision making and leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The very old do not have much to contribute to the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people should not contribute to area decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the FGDs many students have negative perceptions about the old and the young; they perceive the old (65 years) as less knowledgeable and the very young as immature for leadership. The very old are seen as not capable of contributing to today’s leadership since they lack the experience and “appropriate” wisdom to lead, plus they lack the physical stamina and might not empathise with the youth. A minority though would vote for the old given their rich experience.
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“I also won’t vote for her, she is supposed to have retired by now. We should vote for younger people who are just seated back at home without jobs.” (Taveta, girl)

“The young will not respect her since she’s past the age of being a councillor or any leader.” (Isiolo, girls)

“I would vote for the old lady, she knows about the land disputes in the village wisely.” (Marakwet, boy)

The young (youthful leaders aged 19) were also dismissed for inexperience. It was felt that people of this age would not adequately handle the responsibilities that come with leadership.

“Such a young person will become too arrogant and just become rude to the voters due the money that comes with his position.” (Nairobi, girl)

“A 19 year old...I will not elect such a leader because she still has the mind of a child.” (Taveta, girl)

“No would not vote for him, a 19 year old is too young, he is not mature in mind to lead.” (Isiolo, boy)

The pupils felt that students like them do have a right and ability to contribute to community decision making. Most felt that children like them can bring about change in their communities. However, earlier findings indicated that only 62% felt that all children have a right to contribute to decision making (from the UN statutes rating). Overall it seems that they think they have a right to participate in decision making but it is difficult to operationalise. Also if they lack confidence in young leaders, they themselves might shy away from contributing ideas.

“The chief will help the children learn basic leadership skill.” (Isiolo, boy)

“It’s helpful because children are also part of the community and the child will learn what is good and bad and they will be good leaders tomorrow.” (Wajir, girl)

The KHRC should seek to upscale the pupils leadership skills and provide some mentorship. For instance involving them in the chief’s barazas and providing role models may help.

9.3 Behaviour

When students were probed on how they relate with their peers from lower classes, they agreed that they do socialise with younger students but will filter which content or discussion to follow up or which ones can influence their decisions, that is, in their position (older) they are able to discern the usefulness of information from the younger students. This is consistent with the self-filling data as 67% have friends who are much younger than them and a lower proportion (17%) have dismissed a younger person on the grounds of being “irrelevant.” The trends in Wajir are consistently different from the other regions; fewer have friends who are significantly younger than them (56%), and relative to the other regions many (35%) have dismissed a younger person as they did not value what they had to offer.

The KHRC should seek to upscale the pupils leadership skills and provide some mentorship. For instance involving them in the chief’s barazas and providing role models may help.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. I have a friend who is much younger than me</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. In the past 3 months, ignored a child younger than me since I know such children have nothing much to offer</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION

10.1 Knowledge

Specific to the tools, disability was described as physical or sensory impairment such as blindness. With the exception of the Timbila Primary school (Taveta) which had a unit dedicated to children with disabilities, other schools had these children integrated within the regular programme. Most schools though had very few children with disabilities and students might not have opportunities to interact regularly with such children within the school setting.

Only 4 in every 10 students (41%) agree that discrimination is when one treats someone negatively because they are disabled; there is the possibility that the term “discrimination” might not be associated with negative treatment of the disabled but they do know that it is unacceptable behaviour. The range across the regions is huge, in Marakwet only a mere 18% scored correctly on this statement, yet in Ugunja the proportion is 58% possibly suggesting some localised activities to sensitisise students on disability issues in that region.

Table 9.1 Discrimination is when you treat someone negatively just because they are disabled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the pupils felt that children with disability should have the same rights as all children. However, they also recognise that society struggles to accommodate them in day to day activities.

“All children need to be loved and cared for, to have freedom, and to be clothed just like other children.” (Nairobi, boys)

“I find disabled children discriminated, they are not taken as anybody else, some people dislike them.” (Taveta, girl)

“They deserve to have rights but need special care since it's not their wish to be disabled.” (Ugenya, girl)

“….you find maybe he is on a wheelchair and he wants to board a matatu to a certain place and the conductor refuses, sometimes they even beat them because they know they cannot fight back.” (Taveta, girl)

One of the factors that contributes to discrimination of the disabled is the misconception that it is unnatural and as a result of a curse/witchcraft. In Ugunja (22%) a significant proportion of the students could not comment on this issue. This high level of uncertainty could indicate some misconceptions. Overall 66% have the correct knowledge, they disagree that disability is as a result of a curse/witchcraft, Nairobi records the highest proportion on this measure (88%) and it is not surprising that only 51% disagree in Ugunja given the high proportions of don't know (22%).
Table 9.2 Disability is as a result of a curse/witchcraft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.2 Attitudes

Disability, decision making and leadership; The spontaneous reaction of the children involved in this study is to feel sympathy for the disabled and doubt their leadership skill and their ability to contribute effectively to community decisions. The reason given for these views is that such individuals need a “guide” to help them with their day to day activities. This over reliance on a third party is perceived negatively. Interestingly the students do not seem confident that a disabled person can be totally independent.

“I don’t think she can lead properly since she needs a guide and she can be misled.” (Nairobi, girl)

“I won’t vote for her, she is blind, how now? How will she see?” (Taveta, girl)

With further probing though, students acknowledge that disabled people can be talented leaders; however it is not a spontaneous response.

“She is able to think just like normal people and she can have a guide to assist her.” (Ugenya, Girl)

“The blindness does not matter as long as she can rule.” (Taveta, boy)

Most of the students felt that people with disabilities can be good in sports and can also be as talented. However, such talent is suggested as being restricted to activities that deal with the disabled, such that they can be competitive amongst themselves, but not within the greater community.

“Some can sing very well and I even in the TV I saw people on wheelchairs racing.” (Nairobi, boy)

From the self-filling tools, 72% are in agreement that a disabled person can take on a leadership role; Marakwet (62%) and Wajir (63%) recorded the lowest proportions on this measure. Whereas on probing most FGD participants agreed that a disabled person can be elected as a leader there are some nuances that they might not be “effective.” Students will need to see more leaders with disabilities who have successfully implemented their mandates; there is the possibility of inviting such leaders to schools as guest speakers.

Table 9.3 A disabled person can also be elected as the leader of my community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Disability and relationships:** On marriage and relationships, students do discriminate against the disabled. The majority cannot fathom getting married to someone with a disability. Their main concern is the over dependency of persons with disabilities and their inability to participate in household chores. Further there is fear that this person might not be accepted by the family especially the parents. Those that indicated that they would marry a person with disability are more likely to do so out of sympathy, a number of those that said “yes” to this scenario could not substantiate their answers.

“Me I can’t, let’s say a blind person, how now? (Laughter) or maybe the deaf, how will you talk to him, he can’t hear you, so how do you communicate?” (Taveta, girl)

“No I can’t, maybe if you marry a blind person she may be discriminated by your parents or relatives.” (Taveta, boy)

I would not get married to physically challenged person, the disabled person may not be able to do anything for himself like washing clothes, utensils and I may end up doing everything for him. Which means that the person will be very dependent on me?” (Nairobi, girl)

“it depends also with parents, one may have parents who are very bad they may even tell you “if you bring that man here again you will see” and that may lead to the end of the relationship. But there are other parents who may support both of them and at the same time they may end up knowing that the disabled person is very useful to the community despite disability.” (Nairobi, girl)

In a few cases, relationships with a person with disability are driven by other factors other than love such as material gain or some perceived guarantee of “fidelity” as illustrated by the verbatim below.

“Yes I would marry him [a person with disability], if am married by a deaf white man and he has a lot of money then he may end up helping the family and the community at large. But when we allow parents to decision we may do the wrong decisions.” (Nairobi, girl)

“For me I can get married to a blind person because he will not cheat on me and cannot have a mpango wa kando because he cannot see.” (Taveta, girl)

**Disability and resource allocation:** Most pupils felt that it would be good for the community to set aside resources to support children with disabilities. Generally there is a positive inclination towards using community resources to support the disabled as 78% agree with the statement that the community should use their resources to support the disabled and this is consistently high across the regions. However, as evidenced in the FGDs this should not be at the expense of other children without disabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.4 It is okay for the community to use its money to send the disabled to school
However, with pressure on resources and given a choice participants in the research would favour supporting a child without disabilities rather than a child with disabilities to attend school. The argument was that a child without disability is more likely to get a job than a disabled one owing to prejudices of the employment market. There is a minority that feel that with pressure on resources they would educate the disabled child over a child who is not disabled, this though is driven by sympathy and a perception that the former will be more committed to education. Ideally they should have used ability and willingness of the child in making the decision and this was not the case.

“Sometimes it is very confusing, if one of them is in the wheelchair might succeed in future or not but the normal might be in a better position to succeed easily.” (Nairobi, girl)

“I will educate the one on a wheelchair, because he will work harder unlike the one who is physically ok.” (Taveta, girl)

“Will take the one on the wheel chair since the other one is able to walk and look for some casual jobs but the one in a wheel chair will always be home from morning to evening.” (Marakwet, boy)

There was a perception that children with disability can be supported best by charities or the Government through special schools, this in itself is discriminatory as they seek to "pass on" the responsibility to a third party. This also implies that some of the young people do not support the integration efforts in primary schools. However, this was a minority opinion and it was not clear whether the reason for preferring special schools is due to discrimination or simply that currently regular schools are not capable of integrating children with disability into their system.

“The disabled can get help from NGOs.” (Wajir, girl)

“The disabled have a lot of problems and they need special schools.” (Wajir, boy)

“You know when you take a child on a wheelchair to a normal school, the others might discriminate him, so its better you take him to the special school.” (Taveta, boy)

Disability stereotypes; Disabled people are clearly stereotyped as being unable to live independently; always needing assistance and unable to carry out basic chores. There is a subtle assumption that since they are disabled they should be good natured and appreciative of persons who get into a relationship with them. One verbatim even suggests that blind people are non-sexual.

“... I will not marry such a person, maybe the person is not able to do anything for himself that means that I will be doing everything for him. While he is either sitting or laying there doing nothing.” (Nairobi, girl)

“You can marry a person with disability that you will be able to help him, despite the fact that he’s disabled he might be respectful.” (Isiolo, boy)

“...No you cannot marry a person with disability, she cannot cook.” (Marakwet, boy)

“For me I can get married to a blind person because he will not cheat on me and cannot have a mpango wa kando because he cannot see.” (Taveta, girl)

10.3 Behaviour

Most pupils freely relate with children with disability both at school and out of school. However, some teachers cited cases where the disabled are bullied by the other children.
“They could sometimes laugh at them, out of being childish but once they get used to being with them they improve and begin to support them.” (Taveta, Deputy)

Depending on the nature of their friendship, some pupils are able to talk freely with children with disability and are comfortable asking them about their condition which is a sign of a true bond – but this is rare. The majority do not have the courage to ask about the circumstances under which the person become disabled, as they are afraid that it would be interpreted negatively.

“I asked my friend what happened to him and he told me he fell from a second storey building, he survived but he become a stammerer.” (Nairobi, boy)

“They may feel I want to laugh at them,… it may make them cry and some were created like that by God.” (Ugunja, boy)

“Asking them is It's like you are abusing them…” (Marakwet, girls)

40% of the students have a friend who is physically disabled which is exceptional given the low incidences of disabled children in the schools sampled. 51% and 64% respectively have played or shaken hands with a child with disabilities in the past 3 months which might seem inconsistent with the numbers that have friends with disabilities; children don’t only play with friends but also with distant acquaintances. An impressive 78% have reprimanded a friend who said unkind things about a disabled person in the past 3 months and this is consistently high across the regions.

Taveta (91%) scored highly in terms of the proportion of children that had reprimanded a friend who said unkind things about a disabled person and those that had shaken hands (81%) with a child with disability in the last 3 months. This could be as a result of the special unit which is part of the Timbila primary school which provides an environment for free interaction.

Table 9.5 Behaviour in relation to children with disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Nairobi Male</th>
<th>Nairobi Female</th>
<th>Marakwet Male</th>
<th>Marakwet Female</th>
<th>Ugunja Male</th>
<th>Ugunja Female</th>
<th>Taveta Male</th>
<th>Taveta Female</th>
<th>Isiolo Male</th>
<th>Isiolo Female</th>
<th>Wajir Male</th>
<th>Wajir Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I have a friend who is physically disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities past 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Played with a child who is physically disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Hugged or shook the hand of a disabled child</td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Asked a friend not to say bad things about a disabled person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. ECONOMIC STATUS DISCRIMINATION

10.1 Knowledge

Discrimination based on wealth or economic status within the school setting is minimal. Most schools have some measures to foster “uniformity” such as school uniforms, having a school feeding programme where all children eat similar food, strict rules about bringing electronics, bikes, to school, etc. However, there will always be the child who cannot afford a full uniform or one who comes in with tattered clothes.

However, the children see discrimination based on economic status clearly in their communities.

“The poor/beggars are sometimes chased away by the rich people.” (Marakwet, girl)

“The rich people cannot carry the poor in their cars…” (Marakwet, girl)

Most of the FGD participants felt that all children regardless of their economic background have similar rights. However, rich people have more access to resources and better opportunities, which leads to the perception that wealthy people have more “access” to these rights. As was indicated previously, there is the confusion of seeing rights as not existing if they are not accessed; this is a misperception by the children.

“The rich have more [rights] since they live better lives and can get whatever they want from their parents.” (Ugenya, boy)

“All children have equal rights, both poor and rich.” (Nairobi, boy)

“All children can get free education and are God’s creation.” (Isiolo, girl)

10.2 Attitudes

Economic status, decision making and leadership; Asked to choose between a rich and a poor leader, the majority of the students would chose the poor one; they assume that he/she would empathise more with their situation. There is also a minority opinion that a poor person will not use money as a platform for their campaign and one has an opportunity to truly understand what the person stands for. Though a minority there are those who would choose a rich leader purely based on the prospects of receiving “hand outs.” This menace of bribery and buying votes has filtered even to the very young. Generally there is a stereotype that those with money/wealth are “bad leaders.” Choosing capable and honest leaders needs to be emphasised more than their economic status.

“The poor leader knows and understands the life of a poor person.” (Marakwet, boy)

“Poor man knows what to tell people while rich will only give them money.” (Nairobi, boy)

“The poor will help the others because he knows how they suffer.” (Wajir, girl)

“We can always work at rich man's place to get paid, we can sing for rich man and he'll pay us.” (Isiolo, girl)

In Nairobi one of the boys FGDs came out in support of looking for leaders that can deliver irrespective of one’s economic status.

“I will look at the ability to lead and not the wealth…” (Nairobi, boy)

“You don’t have to be rich for you to become the president.” (Nairobi, boy)
Using the self-filling tools, 70% of the students disagree that a rich leader is better than a poor leader with consistently high proportions across all the regions; the range is from 62% in Nairobi to 80% in Taveta. From the FGDs discussed above it is clear that the basis of preferring the poor leader is not necessarily his/her skills.

Table 10.1 A rich leader is better than a poor leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
<th>Marakwet</th>
<th>Ugunja</th>
<th>Taveta</th>
<th>Isiolo</th>
<th>Wajir</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic status and resource allocation; Faced with a situation where one can offer a job; there are those who would give it squarely to a poor person and sometimes even with disregard to their qualification; this is mainly out of sympathy.

“*I would give the job to the poor because he has gone through problems and he understands. He will also help improve his village to be better.*” (Marakwet, girl)

10.3 Behaviour

Although only 57% of the students indicated that they have friends who are from much poorer backgrounds than themselves, it should not be interpreted literary, some could be in circumstances where they do not think others are poorer them.

Table 10.2 A rich leader is better than a poor leader

| Have a friend from a poorer background |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                | Total (661)     | Marakwet (137)  | Ugunja (136)    | Taveta (113)    | Isiolo (77)     | Wajir (198)     | Male (380)      | Female (281)    |                  |
| 0%                            | 57%             | 47%             | 43%             | 67%             | 73%             | 60%             | 58%             | 54%             |                  |
| 20%                           |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                  |
| 40%                           |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                  |
| 60%                           |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                  |
| 80%                           |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                  |

In a few cases children might form social circles that exclude the poor – but rarely is this evident in the school setting.

“...*At times the rich stay on their own and the poor lack confidence.*”(Ugunja, Head)
12. DISCUSSION POINTS

- There are popular clubs whose activities might be more in line with the human rights mandate and these include the debating club, Islamic club and the PPI (Pastoral Program Intervention). It is important to explore ways of integrating the equality book into such clubs as the sustainability of a purely Human Rights club might be difficult, especially since its success is highly dependent on the patron and with frequent transfers it could result in under-utilisation of the book. Specifically, the following existing clubs could be engaged:

  o Guidance and counselling club or peace and reconciliation club – Nairobi
  o The girls’ forums and kings and queens of change clubs – Taveta
  o Christian union and breaking barriers for the vulnerable and orphans club – Ugunja
  o Debating club, Islamic clubs and “tuseme” club - Wajir
  o Debating club, PPI or Sunday after church informal discussions - Marakwet
  o PPI – Isiolo

- Even the Human Rights Club in Njoro primary (Taveta) covers other broader concepts such as sexuality to enrich the discussions and interest from their members. The timing of the follow up KAP Study needs to consider whether the book can be covered in an academic year given that other activities may be done by the clubs. Also the planned release of the book in June/July means that if the research is repeated in March 2013 the children won’t have had a full year with the book.

- In addition to at clubs the schools currently provide forums where discrimination is discussed, such as school assemblies and during class subjects. From the teachers’ perspective, the most common fora for discourse on equality are within the syllabus for social studies, Christian Religious Education (CRE) and Islamic Religious Education (IRE). Although the equality book is not in the official booklist, it is important to review the curriculum to ensure there is no contradiction with the story book, to see how the book can be incorporated in these subjects and to identify how the syllabus can be strengthened.

- School clubs or forums currently are more likely to tackle tribalism, discrimination against disabled children and gender but will not focus on age or economic status discrimination. These forms of discrimination need to be incorporated into club discussions. This could be achieved by training patrons on these forms of discrimination.

- There is an underlying perception that young people (students) might not have much say in community decisions or in protecting community resources; which suggests that young people need some confidence building to take on basic community challenges including changing the perceptions of their parents on tribalism and gender roles. Although it might not fit squarely within the discourse of discrimination, these would be efforts to empower club members to, for example, air opinions during a chiefs’ baraza, mobilise the community to carry out equality campaigns, etc. The club activities would include not only discussions on discrimination but also activities geared towards developing the skills of “equality champions.”

- Students do not live in a vacuum, they go home to communities and especially parents who are polarised along tribal lines and this influences the children’s views. Club activities, therefore, should include some community level activities (besides in-school discussions). There is the possibility of collaborating with the chief and other local administration to bring about change to the greater community and to change the perceptions especially of their parents. For example, celebration of international women’s day or the international day for people with disabilities could help.
Discussions on gender should show how boys and girls are differently disadvantaged given that society tends to exclusively afford some rights, responsibilities or traits to one or the other. This should move discussions away from a combative/zero sum type debate.

Besides Nairobi and Taveta, the localities selected are those that have struggled academically based on the KCPE results; this in itself is a more difficult group to deal with given the possibly lower comprehension of English or Kiswahili (the languages in which the book will be available) which then has a bearing on the impact of the equality story book. Although discussions can be lead in local languages, this will whitewash the secondary purpose; the book should contribute towards the academic excellence (especially in English language). The choice of a “more difficult” sample could result in minimal changes at the repetition of this research to review progress.

Students broadly understand discrimination as “secluding other deserving persons.” However, there are common day practices that are not readily associated with discrimination. For example, children know that it is unacceptable behaviour to talk negatively about disabled people, but they would not use the term discrimination to describe it. Clarity is needed on what the book seeks to achieve. Is the book trying to ensure that children readily recognise discrimination (correctly noting which practices are discriminatory) or is it trying to get children to recognise behaviour that is unacceptable without necessarily using the term ‘discrimination/ubaguzi’ to describe it?

Subtle practices linked to discrimination especially tribalism such as telling funny stories about other tribes are not readily recognised as being discriminatory. To achieve change the school management has to be involved by coming up with ground rules on these behaviours. For example, the school management can set rules around the use of mother tongue in the school environment or make jokes about other tribes.

Discussion around certain forms of inequality and particularly disability related inequality need to be moved from a charity/welfare/pity approach to a rights based approach (RBA).

It would be useful to invite guest speakers and especially those that are disabled and successful and young people in leadership; students have limited exposure to such individuals and as such negative attitudes are evident.

There are limited resources, 13 out of the 24 teachers interviewed cited either lack of guidebooks, work-plans, specialised teachers and financial resources to actively engage students in equality discussions. As there are frequent teacher transfers to have an impact in target schools at least 2 teachers per school need to be trained in equality.

Teacher training needs to clearly outline what a right is and that ‘having’ a right is different to ‘achieving’ that right.

The research focused on the types of discrimination covered in the story book (gender, disability, ethnicity (narrowly interpreted as tribe), age and economic status). However, given the types of discrimination raised by research participants or witnessed by the research team first hand, training should also be provided to teachers on religious and clan based discrimination.

The study tools were fairly straight forward and use of self-filling questionnaires allows for quantifying indicators. Future tools should avoid negative phrasing of statements as this was confusing to the students.

The repeat study should capture information with regards to age discrimination (resource allocation and stereotypes) and discrimination based on economic status (relationships and stereotypes).
The KHRC seeks to introduce an equality storybook that tackles issues of tolerance of ethnic, gender, disability, age and economic status differences to primary school students. The book is conceptualised to bring equality and human rights discourse to schoolchildren and their teachers. A study of the Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice (KAP) of pupils in 12 schools targeted for the pilot use of the equality storybook was carried out prior to the introduction of the book; the survey focused on the 5 equality themes (ethnicity, gender, disability, age, economic status).

The study used both quantitative and qualitative approaches and revealed that children are practising discrimination to please their parents from whom they learn the practice. There is not much difference between children living in urban areas that are large cosmopolitan compared to those who live in the largely homogenous rural areas. The study had revealed that there is an urgent need for cohesion to be integrated in the Kenyan education system in order to deconstruct the negative ethnicity and other forms of discrimination from children and change the society beginning with the children.