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Abstract

Education is a critical correlate of a country’s development process. Kenya’s secondary level of education prepares learners for further education and training. However, there is a general feeling that parents are not fulfilling their role expectations in regard to enhancement of goal attainment in the country’s secondary schools. The paper presents findings of a study on level of parental support in public secondary schools in Nyahururu and Laikipia West Districts, Kenya. Parental support was investigated in relation to school-type (i.e., single sex vis a vis co-educational) and school category (i.e., whether a school was boarding, day or day and boarding). Data were collected from 40 principals through a self-administered questionnaire. Nominal scale data were analysed through frequency counts and percentages, while ordinal scale data were analysed through $\chi^2$ at .05 alpha level. Relationship between parental support and the selected school characteristics was statistically insignificant ($p>.05$). However, the highest rating of parental support was in girls’ schools, boarding, and day and boarding schools, while the lowest rating was in boys and day schools. The study offers insights to the Ministry of Education and principals in regard to upgrading parental support in secondary schools. Moreover, other researchers may be motivated to determine why parents in boys and day schools are less likely to partner with their respective schools.

Introduction

Formal education is the most effective medium through which a nation can achieve its aspirations in the socio-economic and political realms of human development (Psacharopoulos and Woodhall, 1985). This observation is based on the fact that formal schooling enhances workers productivity, social mobility, distributional equity and individual capacity to participate effectively in the political affairs of a nation (Kiumi, 2012).

The foregoing intimates that for national development to make meaningful progress, the society has no option but to invest in education. It is for this reason that the government of Kenya placed high premise on education immediately after independence in 1963 and thereafter. This is reflected in sustained public spending on education which averaged at 20% of total government expenditure between 2008 and 2012 (World Bank, 2011). The effort by the government to increase learning opportunities and the high demand for education occasioned by increase in population has led to a high
rate of expansion at all levels of education. At the secondary level for instance, enrolment rose from 30,120 students in 1963 to 882,000 students in 2003 representing nearly 3000% increase in four decades (Kiumi, 2008). In 2008, enrolment stood at 1,382,211 students in this education cycle (Republic of Kenya, 2009).

Phenomenal growth in secondary education weighed heavily on the exchequer. Consequently, the government was compelled to introduce cost-sharing policy in 1988 in which parents were to meet the cost of text books, stationery, equipment and consumables (Gogo and Othuon, 2006). The cost-sharing strategy however was an antithesis as far as access to secondary education is concerned. In other words, the policy turned out to be an access barrier as the subsector came to be characterized by high dropout rate and poor performance in the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education Examination (Republic of Kenya, 2006). The most affected were children from low-income families. It is an established fact that education is the greatest social equalizer in the sense that apart from increasing one's income it enhances social mobility in the society (Psacharopoulos and Woodhall, 1985). Therefore, the cost-sharing strategy, it can be argued denied learners from the low-income families’ opportunities for further education and training and by implication gainful occupation in life. This was tantamount to promoting social apartheid in favour of the rich which in the long run would have generated social instability in the country.

To reverse the declining trend in access to secondary education, the government introduced tuition free secondary education (FSE) programme in 2008. The FSE initiative was a two-pronged strategy. On the one hand it aimed at forestalling demands on parents, a factor that the government envisaged would improve students’ attendance, progression and transition rates to post secondary institutions. On the other hand, the strategy was predicated on the conviction that it would enable the country produce human resources capable of pushing its growth agenda of becoming a middle level economy by 2030 (Republic of Kenya, 2007).

Although the FSE drive was a step in the right direction, there has been a general misconception among parents that they have been relieved of the burden of contributing to their children’s education. Due to this attitude, some parents have abdicated their responsibility, thereby denying the affected schools the much needed school/home partnership (Kweyu, 2009). It
is instructive to note that under the FSE programme, the government meets the cost of tuition, operation and general improvement of schools. Parents on the other hand are still responsible for uniforms, lunches in day schools and residence cost in boarding schools (Ministry of Education, 2008). Moreover, parents are expected to render social support to schools since this aspect of input is a critical correlate of successful school outcomes. Specifically, parents have to play their role expectations in areas relating to learners’ character and academic development (Macneil and Patin, 2005; Dean, 2001).

Based on the foregoing, it can be reasoned that failure by parents to appreciate their role in secondary education may have detrimental effects on the desired socio-academic outcomes in this level of education. This scenario if unchecked has a high likelihood of undermining governments’ efforts to churn out secondary school graduates who are trainable at the tertiary level of education.

Existing literature (research based and otherwise) indicates that school culture or climate for that matter has a bearing on parents’ willingness to support their children’s education (Kiumi, 2008; Mishra, 2012). Thus, schools with an inclusive climate are more likely to attract a higher level of parental support compared to schools that place low premium on parents’ contribution towards a child’s education. Despite support for this association, much information remains unknown about how parental support may be influenced by type of school (i.e., whether a school is single sex or co-educational) and school category (i.e., whether a school is boarding, day, or day and boarding). This is the gap that this study sought to address.

**Literature Review**

For all intents and purposes schools are social organizations whose principal participants are teachers, students and parents. The latter are key allies in a child’s education. This is because they are not only principal agents of socialization but also providers of child’s material needs in a school (Rose, et al, 1978; Pugh, 1989). Moreover, parents’ attitude towards their children’s education is one of the factors most closely associated with the relative school achievement of learners (Reid, 1986). Indeed, Mishra (2012) has rightly observed that parental involvement in a child’s education helps to broaden the child’s horizon, enhances social relationships and provides a sense of self-esteem and self-efficacy. Several studies render support to this observation. For instance, parental involvement has been associated with
higher grade point averages (Gutman and Midgley 2000). Rumberger (1995) also established that parental involvement is negatively related to dropout rate among learners.

It is also worthwhile to mention that there are also several mutual benefits that accrue from a strong school/home partnership. First, teachers understand their learners better, generate unique rather than routine solutions to classroom problems and reach a shared understanding with parents and learners (Dean, 2001; Reid, 1986). Second, parents who are involved develop a greater appreciation of their role expectations in a school (McBride, 1991).

While the value of home/school linkage is universally accepted, it is not always easy to promote all maintain. This is because of the tendency by educators to be dismissive of parents potential for assisting a school to attain its goals, lack of awareness by parents on their role in a school and a general feeling that since they are non-professionals, they have little to offer on educational matters (Crozer, 2000; Pugh, 1989; Laboke, 2000).

The foregoing intimates that sustained efforts should be made to address hindrances to school/home linkages. This is the most effective way of nurturing productive engagement between parents and teachers. First, schools should view parents as clients or customers rather than outsiders. Second, schools have an obligation to sensitize parents on their role expectations in a child’s education. Third, school/home association should be a two-way communication and as a matter of fact should reflect a co-equal partnership (Vuzi, 2012). Thus, parents’ views on ways to improve school outcomes should be valued by educators (head teachers and teachers). These initiatives are more likely to match teachers and parents views and values. Such a consonance has a motivational value to educators and parents, a factor that may lead to increased student achievement (Kiumi, 2012).

**Purpose and Objectives of the Study**

The overall purpose of this study was to determine whether type of school (i.e., whether a school is single sex or co-educational) and category of school (i.e., whether a school is boarding, day, or day and boarding) have any influence on parental support in a schools effort to attain its goals. Specifically, the study sought to achieve the following objectives
1. To determine whether type of school has any influence on parental support in a school’s effort to attain its goals.
2. To determine whether category of school has any influence on parental support in a school’s effort to attain its goals.
3. To establish ways in which Kenya’s public secondary school principals can enhance parental support in their institutions.

Research Questions

In order to achieve the intended objectives, the study sought answers to the following questions.

1. Does type of school influence parental support in a school’s effort to attain its goals?
2. Does category of school influence parental support in a school’s effort to attain its goals?
3. How can Kenya’s public secondary school principals enhance parental support in their institutions?

Conceptual Framework

Successful teaching–learning process is contingent upon the level of parental support towards a child’s education. The study conceptualized that level of parental support in a school is a function of two school characteristics: school-type - in terms of whether the school is co-educational or single-sex, and category of school, that is whether the school is boarding, day, or day and boarding.

Studies have shown that principals personal characteristics, specifically headship experience (Koehler, 1992; Howley et al, 2007) and gender (Herndon, 2002; Eagly et al, 1992) have an influence on principals willingness to enlist the support of parents and teachers in regard to management of school activities. The two personal characteristics were taken to be the intervening variables in this study. Specifically, it was hypothesized that principals’ gender and headship experience may moderate the relationship between parental support and the two school characteristics focused by the study. However, in order to enhance external validity of the findings, the intervening variables were controlled by selecting all principals (N=40) in the study area. This ensured that all principals (irrespective of gender and years of headship experience) took part in the study. The
The conceptualized relationship between the variables subsumed in the study is presented in figure 1 below.

**Figure 1:** Relationship between school characteristics (independent variables), principals’ personal characteristics (intervening variables) and parental support (dependent variable).

**Methodology**

The study utilized survey research design of the *ex-post facto* type. *Ex-post facto* design is applied in a situation whereby the independent and dependent variable(s) have already interacted. Therefore, the investigator cannot manipulate the independent variable(s) with a view to establish the effects of this interaction on the dependent variable(s). In this regard, the influence of the independent variable(s) on the dependent variable(s) is determined retrospectively (Kerlinger, 1973). The design was deemed ideal since the study sought to determine retrospectively the effect of school-type and school category on parental support in public secondary schools in the study area.
**Instrumentation**

Data were collected through a questionnaire which was self-administered to all public secondary school principals (N=40) in the study area. The questionnaire was divided into three sections labeled A, B and C. Section A gathered data on principals personal characteristics (i.e., gender, age, headship experience and professional qualifications) and school characteristics, specifically type and category of school.

Section B had 30 five-point likert scale items which elicited data on level of parental support (as perceived by the principals) on various aspects of school activities. The items yielded respondents’ mean scores which were obtained by dividing an individual’s total score in the 30 items by 30. Based on the mean scores, level of parental support (LPS) index was generated whose value ranged from a possible minimum mean score of 1 to a possible maximum mean score of 5. The mean scores were grouped into four quotas which were categorized as ‘very low’, ‘moderately low’, ‘moderately high’, and ‘very high’ LPS as shown in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean perception Score</th>
<th>LPS category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 – 3</td>
<td>moderately low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 – 4</td>
<td>moderately high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 – 5</td>
<td>very high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C sought respondents opinion on strategies that Kenya’s public secondary school principals can initiate with a view to enhance parental support in their institutions.

**Validity and Reliability of the Instrument**

One of the major problems in social science research is the measurement of human behavioural attribute with accuracy. Yet, it is a vital component in scientific research (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999). In view of this observation, the instrument was validated through extensive literature review.
on school/home partnership. This made it possible to identify the relevant content areas and thus indicators of parental support to be captured during the itemization stage of the instrument. Besides, utmost care was taken to ensure that the items were prepared in line with the objectives of the study. Furthermore, the instrument was piloted in the neighbouring Laikipia East District. Items that were either unclear or open to misinterpretation were rephrased before the main study was executed.

Using Cronbachi’s alpha, the 30 closed items generated a reliability coefficient of 0.94. This implied that the items had a high level of internal consistency and, therefore reliable in collecting the targeted data (Marcysk, et al, 2008).

Nominal scale data were analysed through frequency counts and percentages while ordinal scale data were analysed through arithmetic mean and chi-square (χ²) at .05 alpha level. Computation of χ² coefficient was based on respondents’ distribution in the four ranges of mean perception scores presented in Table 1. It was expected that the distribution would be even. To generate the χ² value, a comparison was made between the actual and the expected distribution of respondents in the four ranges of scores. If there was no discrepancy between actual and expected distribution of respondents, the effect of the independent variable in question on the dependent variable was held to be statistically insignificant and vice versa.

Results and Discussion

The results herein are presented in three sections. Section one covers questionnaire return rate and respondents characteristics. Results of χ² test on responses in the 30 closed question items is covered in section two. The final section gives a summary of respondents’ opinions on ways in which secondary school principals in Kenya can enhance parental support in their institutions.

Questionnaire Return Rate

All respondents returned their duly filled questionnaires. The 100% response rate was probably because the study focused on a critical aspect of school management. Therefore, respondents might have seen it prudent to participate in the study since their input can go a long way in enhancing school/home partnership which is a core input in learners’ performance.
Respondents Characteristics

This section highlights respondents’ personal characteristics. These are summarized in Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5 with respect to gender, age, headship experience and academic qualification respectively.

Table 2: Distribution of Respondents by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 2 shows that 78% of respondents were males while 22% were females. This gives the impression that principalship position in the study area was skewed in favour of males. Male domination (or androcentricity) of education management has been noted in other studies in Kenya (e.g. Kiumi, 2008; Gachoki, 2006). This phenomenon has been associated with the ‘male’ image of management whereby management is perceived as a field that is less appealing to women (Bush, 2003). This perception is predicated on the belief that management demands masculine behavioural characteristics such as aggressiveness, domination and competition rather than feminine qualities such as shared problem solving, negotiation and collaboration (Alkhaifa, 1992). Hall (1999) has, however argued that the association between management and masculinity has not been established as a fact. Therefore, perpetuating this traditional stereotype only serves to discriminate women in the allocation of leadership positions in education.

Table 3: Age – wise Distribution of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (in years)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 – 60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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An examination of the data displayed in Table 3 shows that the highest proportion of respondents (45%) were in the 46-50 years age bracket followed by those (35%) who were in the 41 – 45 years age range. Very few respondents (5%) were below 41 years. This implies that nearly two-thirds of respondents (60%) were above 45 years of age. Reys (1990) has observed that older principals are more focused and committed to their administrative duties than their younger counterparts. In this regard, majority of principals in the study sample are likely to be dedicated to the day-to-day operations in their institutions.

**Table 4: Distribution of Respondents by Headship Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headship Experience (in years)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data displayed in Table 4 shows that half (50%) of respondents in the study sample had worked as principals for a period ranging between 6 – 10 years. Proportion of principals who had worked as school heads for less than 6 years was 20% while those who had more than 10 years of headship experience constituted 30% of the entire sample. All in all, it can be said that principals who participated in this study had requisite exposure to school management tasks.

**Table 5: Distribution of Respondents by Academic Qualification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic qualification</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree in Education</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree in Educational Administration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate Diploma in Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Influence of School Type & School category on Parental Support in Public Sec. Schools …*
The data in Table 5 indicates that an overwhelming majority of respondents (73%) had a Bachelors degree in Education (B.Ed.). Fifteen per cent of respondents had Master’s degree in educational administration followed by those with Diploma in Education (10%) and Post Graduate Diploma in Education (2%). Based on the respondents’ academic profile it can be argued that they were academically and professionally qualified to head their respective schools.

Results of $\chi^2$ test on Responses in the Closed Items

Analysis of the 30 closed items aimed at answering the two research questions which were germane to this study. This analysis is presented below.

Research Question 1: Does type of school influence parental support in a school’s effort to attain its goals?

The influence of type of school on parental support was investigated through arithmetic mean ($\bar{x}$) and $\chi^2$. The result of this analysis is summarized in Table 6.

Table 6: Respondents’ Mean Rating of Parental Support and $\chi^2$ Coefficient by School-type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls-only school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys-only school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-education school</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on parental support schema formulated in Table 1, it can be reasoned that global parental support (mean = 3.08) as shown in Table 6 was moderately high. However, the data in Table 6 shows that the highest LPS was in girls-only schools (mean = 3.90) followed by co-educational schools (mean = 2.96) and lastly boys-only schools (mean = 2.38).

The foregoing observation seems to suggest that parental support decreased with increase in the proportion of boys in a school. Specifically, the higher the number of boys in a school, the data in Table 6 seems to show the lower the likelihood that parents will partner with the school within the child’s education. Nonetheless the relationship between type of school and LPS was
not statistically significant (p > .05). This implies that statistically, type of school and LPS were independent.

**Research Question 2:** Does category of school influence parental support in a school’s effort to attain its goals?

The influence of school-category on LPS was similarly analysed through arithmetic mean (\(\bar{x}\)) and \(\chi^2\).

The results are presented in Table 7.

**Table 7:** Respondents’ Mean Rating of Parental Support and \(\chi^2\) Coefficient by School-category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>(\bar{x})</th>
<th>(\chi^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boarding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day and Boarding</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td><strong>3.11</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drawing from the formulated parental support framework in Table 1, it can be said that generally, LPS displayed in Table 7 (mean = 3.11) was moderately high. Nonetheless, the data in Table 7 depicts a pattern (in regard to LPS) worth noting. Parental support was highest in boarding schools (mean = 3.35) followed by day and boarding schools (mean = 3.15) and lastly day schools (mean = 2.85). This implies that parental support decreased from schools where all students were boarders towards schools in which all students were day scholars. This seems to suggest that boarding schools were more likely to attract parental support compared with day schools. The relationship between parental support and category of school was however not statistically significant (p > .05). This indicates that statistically, category of school and parental support were independent.

**Respondents’ Suggestions on how Kenya’s Public Secondary School Principals Can Enhance Parental Support in their Institutions.**

Responses from the open-ended items on strategies that principals can initiate to enhance home/school partnership were broken down into themes which were subsequently coded and summarized in Table 8.
Table 8: Strategies for Enhancing Home/School Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating an inclusive managerial climate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitizing parents on their role expectations in the school</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing transparency in the management of school finances</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing students’ achievement in the academics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a high level of students’ discipline</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A look at Table 8 clearly shows that majority of respondents (75%) were of the opinion that principals can enhance parental support through creation of an inclusive managerial climate in their schools. Another pertinent suggestion put forth by 63% of respondents was the need to sensitize parents on their role expectations in their children’s education. Other suggestions which were endorsed by a sizeable proportion of respondents were: transparency in management of school finances (38%), enhancement of learner’s academic achievement (30%) and nurturing discipline among learners (25%).

Summary of the Findings and Conclusions

(i) Majority of principals who participated in the study (78%) were males, implying that there was no gender parity in principalship positions in the study area.

(ii) A significant proportion of principals (60%) were above 45 years of age. Based on Reyes (1990) contention, it can be reasoned that a significant proportion of principals in the study sample were committed to their administrative duties.

(iii) An overwhelming majority (80%) of principals had worked as school heads for more than five years. This suggests that on average, principals who took part in the study had requisite experience in school management.

(iv) All principals in the study sample were professionary qualified in education implying that they had the requisite capacity to manage their institutions.

(v) Although the influence of school-type on parental support was statistically insignificant, girls-only schools had the highest level of support followed by co-educational and boys-only schools in that...
order. This seems to suggest that students gender may have had an influence on parents willingness to support a school or their children’s education for that matter.

(vi) The influence of school-category on parental support was statistically insignificant. However, LPS increased from day schools towards boarding schools. This suggests that boarding factor may have had an influence on parents’ willingness to partner with schools in the study area.

(vii) Based on respondents suggestions, principals can enhance parental support by: creating an inclusive managerial climate in their institutions, sensitizing parents on their role expectations in school, ensuring that school finances are managed transparently, and enhancing student’s discipline and academic gains.

**Recommendations**

Findings generated by the study have important implications and lessons on home/school partnership. A major observation is that boys-only schools and day schools are less likely to attract parental support compared with girls only schools and boarding schools.

In view of the critical role that parental support plays in the overall school outcomes, the Ministry of Education (MoE) should determine why parents in boys only schools and day schools may be less motivated engage with their respective schools. Educational researchers can be hardy in such an undertaking.

Principals heading boys-only schools and day schools should also be proactive in regard to strengthening school-home partnership. According to proposals put forward by respondents, principals can achieve this task by nurturing an inclusive managerial climate in which parents are actively involved when making key decisions touching on their children’s education. Furthermore, educationists (i.e., school administrators and teachers) should educate parents on their role expectations in their children’s education. Since parents are significant financiers of school activities, transparency in management of school finances will go a long way in motivating parents to engage positively with teachers and school administrators to the benefit of children progression through the school curriculum.
Finally, educators must invest their time and energy in students learning - both academic and otherwise. The ultimate aim is to make parents perceive schools as places where their children get value out of the resources they (parents) invest in education.
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