



ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
MSW PROGRAMME

RUNNING HEAD: CHILD PROTECTION: THE SYSTEM AND PRACTICE IN NGOs

**CHILDREN AND STAFF PERCEPTIONS ON THE SYSTEM AND PRACTICE
OF CHILD PROTECTION IN NGOs: THE CASE OF SELECTED NGOs IN ADDIS
ABABA**

BY
EYOB TEGAFW

DECEMBER, 2016
ADDIS ABABA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

**CHILDREN AND STAFF PERCEPTIONS ON THE SYSTEM AND PRACTICE
OF CHILD PROTECTION IN NGOs: THE CASE OF SELECTED NGOs IN ADDIS
ABABA**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK OF
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR A MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK (MSW) DEGREE**

BY
EYOB TEGAF AW

ADVISOR
ABEBE ASSEFA (PhD)

DECEMBER, 2016
ADDIS ABABA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

**CHILDREN AND STAFF PERCEPTIONS ON THE SYSTEM AND PRACTICE
OF CHILD PROTECTION IN NGOs: THE CASE OF SELECTED NGOs IN ADDIS
ABABA**

BY
EYOB TEGAF AW

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINORS

Abebe Assefa (PhD)

Advisor



Signature

27/12/2006
Date

Emebet (PhD)

Internal examiner

Signature

Date

Yitayew (PhD)

External examiner

Signature

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My deepest and sincerest gratitude goes to my advisor Dr. Abebe Assefa whose guidance, constructive and critical comments from the onset to the final stages of my thesis was paramount. His unrelenting support was a great learning experience; for which I am forever indebted.

Participants of the study also share this gratitude. Everyone who has facilitated the data collection process provided data and made the journey smooth shares my gratitude. Without their cooperation, none of this would have happened and for that I am forever in their debt.

Last, but not definitely least, I am enormously grateful to my friends and family who have always been there for me through “hell and high-water”. You bear with my faults and flaws and are an everyday testament to the human-all too-human. Thank you.

Eyob Tegafaw

Contents

Acknowledgement	
Abstract	
Acronyms	
List of tables	
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Rationale and Significance of the Study.....	5
1.3. Objectives of the study.....	6
1.4. The Research Problem.....	6
1.5. Delimitation of the study.....	8
1.6. Organization of the paper	9
2. Conceptual Considerations: System and Practice of Child Protection in NGOs	11
2.1. Child Protection: Definition and understanding	11
2.2. Child maltreatment	15
2.3. Perspectives on Child maltreatment.....	16
2.4. System	18
2.5 System approach to Child Protection	24
2.5.1. Components of Child Protection System	28
2.6. Child Protection in Ethiopia.....	30
2.6.1. Protection issues of children in Ethiopia.....	32
2.6.2. NGOs in child protection.....	35
2.6.3. NGOs legislation.....	37
3. Operationalization, Research Design and Methods.....	40
3.1. Operationalization.....	40
3.1.1. Independent variables.....	40
3.1.1.1. Structure.....	40
3.1.1.2. Function	41

3.1.1.3. Capacity.....	41
3.1.2. Dependent Variable.....	42
3.1.2.1. Efficacy	43
3.1.2.2 Sustainability.....	43
3.2. Research Design and methods.....	44
3.2.1. Data Sources and Sampling.....	45
3.2.2. Procedures and Instruments of Data Collection.....	46
3.2.3 Data Analysis Techniques	47
4. Findings and Analysis	49
4.1. General Characteristics of Respondents.....	49
4.1.1. Demographic Characteristics of children.....	50
4.1.2. Characteristics of Staff Respondents.....	52
4.2. Availability, Accessibility and Use of services.....	54
4.3. Child Protection System.....	56
4.3.1. Structure.....	57
4.3.2. Function.....	60
4.3.2.1. Governance.....	60
4.3.2.2. Management.....	62
4.3.2.2.1. Human resource management.....	62
4.3.2.2.2 Financial Management	63
4.3.3. Capacity.....	64
4.4. Child Protection Practice.....	68
4.4.1. Efficacy.....	68
4.4.2. Sustainability.....	72
4.5. State of the Child Protection System and Practice in NGOs.....	75
4.5.1. Structure vis-à-vis Efficacy and Sustainability.....	75
4.5.2. Function vis-à-vis Efficacy and Sustainability.....	79

4.5.2.1. Management vis-à-vis Efficacy and Sustainability.....	81
4.5.3. Capacity vis-à-vis Efficacy and Sustainability.....	82
4.6. Convergence and/or divergence in child protection practices among the agencies...	84
5. Discussions and Conclusions.....	88
5.1. Availability, accessibility and use of services.....	88
5.2. Child protection system in NGOs.....	90
5.2.1. Structure.....	90
5.2.2. Function.....	91
5.2.3. Capacity.....	92
5.3. Child protection practice in NGOs.....	93
5.4. State of the Child protection system & practice in NGOs.....	94
5.5. Methodological reflections.....	96
5.6. Conclusions and implications of the study.....	98
5.6.1. Implications of the study.....	101
5.6.2. Implications for social work practice.....	102

References

Appendix 1. Interview Guide for Key Informants

Appendix 2. Questionnaire for staff

Appendix 3. Questionnaire for children

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 3.1** Questionnaire response rate
- Table 4.1** Demographic characteristics of children respondents
- Table 4.2** Age, Educational Level and the number of years children have been receiving services
- Table 4.3** Characteristics of staff respondents
- Table 4.4** Staff years of service by agency
- Table 4.5** One sample t-test for the mean ratings of staff satisfaction with their agency's child protection system structure
- Table 4.6** Nature of agency cooperation with various actors as perceived by staff
- Table 4.7** Frequency of children's participation in trainings by agency
- Table 4.8** Agency functions as perceived by staff
- Table 4.9** One sample t-test for the mean ratings of children's satisfaction with agency functions
- Table 4.10** Staff ratings of management functions
- Table 4.11** Agency human capacity as perceived by staff
- Table 4.12** Agency capacity as perceived by children
- Table 4.13** Agency socio-cultural capacity as perceived by staff
- Table 4.14** The state of implementation of child protection activities as perceived by staff
- Table 4.15** Staff rating of agency services
- Table 4.16** One sample t-test for the mean ratings of children's satisfaction with efficiency
- Table 4.17** One sample t-test for the mean ratings of children's satisfaction with the protective competencies gained
- Table 4.18** One sample t-test for the mean ratings of staff satisfaction with the protective gains of beneficiaries

Table 4.19 Correlation matrix of Structure variables with Efficacy (Cross-sectional data)

Table 4.20 Correlation matrix of Structure variables with Sustainability (Cross-sectional data)

Table 4.21 Correlation matrix of child variables (Cross-sectional data)

Table 4.22 Correlation Matrix for Governance variables with Efficacy

Table 4.23 Correlation Matrix for Governance variables with Sustainability

Table 4.25 Correlation Matrix for Management variables with Efficacy

Table 4.26 Correlation Matrix for Capacity variables with Efficacy

Table 4.27 Correlation Matrix for Capacity variables with Sustainability

Table 4.28 ANOVA on the differences of perceptions of staff concerning efficacy and sustainability of services by Structure

Table 4.29 ANOVA on the differences of perceptions of staff concerning efficacy and sustainability of services by governance

Table 4.30 ANOVA on the differences of perceptions of staff concerning efficacy and sustainability of services by management

Table 4.31 ANOVA on the differences of perceptions of staff concerning efficacy and sustainability of services by Capacity

Table 4.32 ANOVA on the differences of perceptions of children concerning efficacy and sustainability of services by agency

Acronyms

4KILLO: 4killo child support and community development association

ANOVA: Analysis of variance

CBOs: Community based organizations

CP: Child protection

CSA: Central statistics agency

EDA: Emmanuel development association

FDRE: The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia

FSCE: Forum for Street Children in Ethiopia

IFSO: Integrated family services organization

ILO: International labor organization

MoWCYA: Ministry of women, children and youth affairs

NGOs: Nongovernmental organizations

OVC: Orphan and vulnerable children

UK: united Kingdom

UNCRC: United Nations convention on the rights of the child

UNICEF: United Nations international children's emergency fund

Abstract

This study was initiated to explore the system and practice of child protection in non-governmental organizations operating in Addis Ababa. In line with this, the structure, function and capacity of their child protection system, the efficiency and sustainability of services, the relation between child protection system and practice and the convergence or divergence of child protection practices among the agencies were aimed to be explored. To achieve these objectives, different type of data collection methods were used. These include; survey questionnaire, key informant interview and document analysis. The survey questionnaire was filled by 135 respondents; out of which 117 were children and 18 officials/experts from NGOs selected through the use of random and convenience sampling techniques respectively. Key informant interviews were conducted with selected individuals from the three groups. The data collected through the above methods was analyzed and presented descriptively. The findings revealed that: the agencies have established strong cooperation with government agencies, other NGOs, CBOs and beneficiary children, families and communities. Their child protection system is also well governed and managed; and, they have ample human, financial and socio-cultural capacity. Beneficiary children and staff are also satisfied with the efficiency and sustainability of services. Moreover, strong correlations are found between the structure, function and capacity of services and the resulting efficiency and sustainability of services. Finally, no significant differences are found among the agencies in terms of their child protection system and practice. Hence, adopting a systems approach to child protection is confirmed as having an immense importance in improving the efficiency and sustainability of services. Ways of further improving practices have been identified including: strengthening the child protection system in agencies and participation and capacity building of beneficiaries in protecting children among others.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1. Background

This study attempts to critically assess the child protection system in the Ethiopian NGOs context and examine the practice of child protective services vis-à-vis promoting the protection of children. The term “child protection” is very broad and can encompass a wide range of issues. “Custody and support, child abuse and neglect, violence against children, child prostitution, child pornography, sex tourism, child labor, and trafficking (UNICEF, 2010)” in children are just some of the issues that arise when discussing child protection.

It is reasonable to argue that the way a society nurtures children has important insinuations on its future. Children, ideally, “should enjoy life with time to imagine, play, learn, and develop in safety and love; but many children's lives fall short of that ideal (Cannan & Warren, 1997)”. Children are amenable to a myriad of economic, social, psychological and physical predicaments. In his study of 2006, Dessalegn writes, the most common ones are “child rights violations, child trafficking, child labor, exploitation, child prostitution, street children, child abuses and neglects”.

Children’s exposure to multiple, accumulating risks, often in a context in which supports and protective factors have been weakened or are absent, according to Willeis (2009), “shatters children’s rights, impedes children’s healthy development and well-being, and causes enormous suffering”. Consequently, the care and protection of children is predicated upon the insurmountable attention and collaboration of families, communities, the state and organizations.

At the global stage, the systems and approaches of service provision vis-à-vis child protection and care have gone through profound controversies, isms and schisms. Hereunder is a brief overview of this evolution.

In the western European tradition, child protection concerns centered more on children who were orphans and paupers than on their maltreatment. By the mid- to late 1900s, agencies had been established to protect children from excessive harm in their own homes (Cree & Davis, 2007). In the 1960s, more libertarian approaches to children's rights which sometimes stressed the repressive aspects of the family and argued for "alternative modes of communal living for children's liberation were prominent" (Rogowski, 2011). Built in the late nineteenth century or early twentieth century were residential children's homes, "they were solidly bounded institutions where dangerous or damaged children spent their childhoods, quite removed from their families" (Mizrahi & Davis, 2008). It is held in the literature (Cree & Davis; 2007, Mizrahi & Davis; 2008, Rogowski, 2011) that the rediscovery of poverty in the 1960s and the emergence of articulate pressure groups such as the Child Poverty Action Group also fuelled radical community movements leading to the emergence of a complex network of private and public agencies developed to protect children from harm at the hands of their caretakers.

A relatively recent development is that children and parents are better helped by supporting them in their public sphere rather than by attempting to treat their private world. "While there will always be a small minority of people for whom compulsory social intervention or clinical treatments are necessary, the vast majority of children in need suffer from poverty" (Cannan & Warren, 1997). "Given that poor people tend to live in poor areas where the social infrastructure and environment are also impoverished, it is evident that any attempt to support such children must start by helping local people to shape that environment" (Cree, 1997).

There is wide recognition among international child protection agencies that traditional approaches don't sufficiently prevent or respond to child protection issues. They now "accept the need to shift away from issue-specific, responsive programming towards a systems approach that includes a strong focus on prevention (Medrano & Tabben-Toussaint, 2012)". This approach aims to move the child protection sector away from small scale and isolated projects towards a more systemic, efficient approach that considers the child and family in a more holistic fashion. The CP system approach "looks at the circumstances that challenge children's wellbeing as a web of threats rather than taking them one by one" (Wessells, 2009). It "addresses all of the issues that children in multiple circumstances might face and the structural and root causes of gaps in prevention and response" (Wessells, 2009 p. 10).

A distinct feature of child protection is that it involves multiple risks which are interrelated in complex ways, but which are not always fully researched and quantified (UNICEF, 2012). In particular, "one major risk which strongly covariates with most child protection vulnerabilities, and yet whose impact is not straightforward, is material deprivation and poverty" (Cannan & Warren, 1997). Families who face economic hardship might find it more difficult to "protect their children because of more transient residence, poorer education, and a higher likelihood of substance abuse and emotional disorders, as well as greater difficulties of access to parental care support systems" (Wulczyn & Daro, 2010).

Ethiopia is one of the epitomes of poverty and deprivation in the world. From this, it can be inferred that the aforesaid hardships of children are exacerbated both in number and intensity. Considering the "higher level of unemployment, growing cost of living and administrative and planning issues" (Blau, 1999), urban areas are more vulnerable. According to Blau (1999), in many developing countries, many urban parents and children "bear the additional burdens of

absolute poverty, insecurity of tenure, poor or nonexistent infrastructure, as well as inadequate and diminishing social, educational and health services”.

This is also true for Addis Ababa, which “comprises 37.74 percent of the country's total urban inhabitants, children making almost half of its population with an annual growth rate of 4.3 percent” (CSA, 2000). This entails the necessity of a concerted effort by and among state, non-state and community level actors.

Ethiopia is among the signatories of CRC and it is stipulated in article 36 of the FDRE constitution that every child has the right to: “life, know and be cared for by his or her parents or legal guardians, Not be subject to exploitative practices and inhumane treatment in institutions responsible for the care of children”. Nonetheless, Ethiopia is yet to develop a strong national child protection system.

According to Forum for Street Children in Ethiopia (2001), “In Ethiopia in general and Addis Ababa in particular, most of the direct actions to support children have been largely undertaken by the nongovernmental actors”. The focuses of these interventions usually differ from one another. Some of them focus on delivering basic services, others on providing health care or educational services, and some others on promoting and protecting the human rights of these children. The intervention mechanisms of both governmental and nongovernmental organizations, to deal with the problems of children in Addis Ababa, have not so far shown a visible result in reducing the intensity (FSCE, 2003).

Shortage or lack thereof social services and protection mechanisms coupled with the prevalence of absolute poverty, spreading of HIV/AIDS, recurrent drought and rapid urbanization will place children in adamant vulnerability. Governments could not have the

capacity to address all social problems by themselves. Usually, “the gaps that are left out by governments are filled by NGOs (West, 2005)”.

According to UNICEF (2014), Because of its complexity, Child protection must be multidisciplinary and multi-sectored. Effective child protection involves working with a wide range of formal and informal bodies: governments, multilateral agencies, donors, communities, caregivers and families. A successful child protection system “strengthens the capacity of all these actors to protect children for the long term, addressing root causes of maltreatment such as chronic poverty, insecurity, power imbalances (gender inequality, for example) and harmful traditional attitudes and behaviors” (UNICEF, 2014 p. 5) .

1.2. Rationale and Significance of the study

This study is about the system of child protection service delivery in NGOs. The reason for undertaking research in this area in the Ethiopian context is: First, the use of a systems approach in the provision of child protection services is an area of ongoing debate. How NGOs deliver their services in a changing agency environment requires an understanding of their current practices and systems for assuring the protection of children based on empirical research.

The need for such a study emanates from the following facts. (1) Rigorous, systematic evaluations of the effectiveness of child-focused services, particularly from children’s perspective, are rare; and many evaluations have struggled even to develop appropriate indicators and measures. This situation may be due in part to the high levels of complexity associated with child protection issues, the challenges of developing appropriate measures of child protection, and the difficulties in collecting hard numbers in situations such as family violence that are a source of shame and stigma. Despite these challenges, the collection of

rigorous evidence about the effectiveness, cost, scalability, and sustainability of interventions is essential if the field of child protection is to develop and attract the resources needed to address child protection issues. (2) Child-focused community services have the potential to become essential components of a national child protection system; the fulfillment of this potential, however, requires having strong evidence that they are effective, scalable, low in cost, and sustainable. (3) A stronger evidence base is needed also for purposes of identifying, further improving and disseminating best practices

1.3. Objectives of the study

The general objective of this study is to assess the system of child protection services in selected nongovernmental organizations operating in Addis Ababa and examine their practices.

The specific objectives are:

- To explore the availability, accessibility, use and effectiveness of protective services as viewed by children.
- To explore children and staff perceptions of the existing child protection systems in NGOs vis-à-vis the structure, function and capacity of services.
- To explore children and staff perceptions on the practices of child protection in NGOs as per their effectiveness and sustainability.
- To explore the convergence and/or divergence in child protection activities among the various organizations.

1.4. Statement of the problem

As stated above, the provision of child protection services requires the coming together of a myriad of parties; as a result, neither governments nor agencies can solely and fully address the

issues of child protection. In the case of NGOs, the focus and type of services has been varied; nonetheless, there is wider global recognition that child protection, rather than a statutory focus, can best be conducted with a wider structural focus using a systems approach. Furthermore, the environment in which nongovernmental organizations operate is changing at multiple levels. On the one hand, the hitherto prevalent poverty with its changing forms and victims produces a growing demand for services. On the other hand, there are changes in policy direction and NGOs are, more often than not, accused of ineffectiveness (fostering dependency). These coupled with financial bottlenecks associated with competition for funds and donors' demand impede the provision of services in general and child protection in particular. The question of whether NGOs are actually implementing a systems approach to child protection vis-à-vis this changing environment, is not clear.

Thus, the research problem of this study could be stated as: *first, what is children's perception of the availability, accessibility and use of child protective services? Second, how do children and staff perceive the structure, function and capacity of those services? And to what extent they are effective and sustainable?*

The fundamental research problem is further broken down into basic research questions.

1. *What is children's perception of the availability, accessibility, use and effectiveness of child protection services and systems?*

As this study comprises analyzing the impacts of organizational level services in the protection of children, it uses terms and concepts such as: child protection system, effectiveness and sustainability. Hence, the second research question is:

2. *What is the perception of children and staff regarding what the NGOs are actually doing in terms of protecting children and the structure, function and capacity of their services?*
3. *What is children and staff perception on the actual practice of child protection in NGOs and the extent to which services are effective and sustainable?*
4. *What is the relation between child protection system and its implementation in NGOs? What is needed for improvement? And how can that happen?*
5. *Are there similarities and/or differences among NGOs regarding their child protection systems and practices?*

1.5. Delimitation of the study

The empirical focus of this study is limited to the analysis of the systems and practices of child protection services in NGOs. This is owing to the fact that the type and magnitude of child protective services provided by government agencies in the Ethiopian context are minimal.

According to Dessalegn, Akalewold & Yoseph, (2008), Non-state organizations working with children may be divided into two broad areas: those engaged to promote the welfare of disadvantaged children and those whose main objective is the protection of children against abuse, sexual and physical exploitation. On occasions the same organizations may be engaged in both activities at one and the same time. Many organizations here have an exclusive child-focus, while in some cases organizations may combine child focused work with other programs. Accordingly, this study deals with organizations that combine promotion of welfare and protection of children against abuse, sexual and physical exploitation; and those that combine child focused work with other programs. Moreover, the new charities and societies proclamation makes a distinction between various non-state developmental actors based mainly on their

sources of funds (foreign or local). Since foreign NGOs are not allowed to partake in rights based activities, this study is limited to those that are Ethiopian residents' charities.

Furthermore, participants were only from the intervention areas of the NGOs. Focus will also be on activities contributing to the protection of children not other developmental activities or emergency services.

1.6. Organization of the paper

This thesis is organized in five chapters. The next chapter which follows this introductory one deals with the conceptual framework of the study. It deals with the two major concepts of the study, child protection and system; as such, it begins with an explanation of what child protection is and the plethora of isms and schisms on the *why* and *how* of child protection. It then proceeds to discuss what a system is, what it is comprised of and its various characteristics. It presents the arguments for a systems approach to child protection: its components and manifestations. Finally, the type of NGOs working on child protection in Ethiopia and their nature of activities along side with the legislation to regulate their activities is presented.

Major elements of the conceptual framework of the study are operationalized in chapter three. The efficacy of child protection practices in terms of improving the protection and wellbeing of children constitutes the dependent variable of the study. Components of the child protection system make up the independent variables. The chapter also presents the research paradigm and design, methods, data sources and sampling, instruments and procedures, and data analysis techniques. It clarifies the arguments regarding the use of a mixture of methods (qualitative, quantitative and case study) in this study.

Chapter 4 provides the empirical findings of the study based on analysis and interpretation of data. It begins with analysis of data on the availability, accessibility and use of child protective services. This is followed by analysis of data on the child protection system in agencies as per their structure, function and capacity. The effectiveness and sustainability of child protection practices is also analyzed in tandem with the nature of relationship with the aforementioned components of a child protection system. Analysis of data on the convergence and/or divergence in child protection activities among agencies is also presented. Finally, conclusive remarks and discussions based on the empirical findings are provided in chapter 5.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review: conceptual considerations on the system and practice of child protection in NGOs

2.1. Child Protection: Definition and Understanding

The study uses definition of a child as: every human being below the age of 18 years as stipulated in child rights convention (CRC) of the United Nations. Child protection: consists of reducing risks to children's holistic well-being, making children's rights a reality, restoring hope and a dignified living where abuse has occurred and creating an enabling environment that supports children's positive development (UNICEF, 2014).

Child protection is a broad term used for efforts to safeguard children from actions or situations that place their healthy development and well-being at risk. The dimensions of CP are measures and structures that prevent and respond to physical, sexual, emotional or psychological abuse (Cree, 2007). Children need to be protected, because they are physically, mentally and emotionally immature and unable to adequately protect themselves.

Children who are maltreated are at increased risk of lifelong developmental challenges, HIV infection and other physical, emotional and social problems (Dessaiegn, 2007). Moreover, these outcomes compromise the economic and social development of societies, so protecting children from harm should be a vital aspect of development programs.

Pivotal conventions and legislations, both local and international (UNCRC and the FDRE constitution among others) stipulate that every child has the right to be protected from violence and exploitation. Violations of the child's right to protection, in addition to being human rights

violations, are also massive, under-recognized and underreported barriers to child survival and development (Getnet, 2000).

Child protection is an issue for every child in every country of the world: this assertion can be justified by the following facts:

- at any given time, more than 300,000 child soldiers, some as young as eight, are exploited in armed conflicts in over 30 countries. More than 2 million children are estimated to have died as a direct result of armed conflict since 1990 (Machel, 2001).
- approximately 250 million children are involved in child labor, with more than 180 million working in hazardous situations or conditions (ILO, 2002)
- an estimated 1.2 million children are trafficked every year. (ILO, 2002)
- forty million children below the age of 15 suffer from abuse and neglect, and require health and social care (UNICEF, 2002)

According to UN committee on the rights of the child (2012), “Protection and adequate care can only be provided in an environment which promotes and protects all rights, especially the right not to be separated from parents, the right to privacy, the right to be protected from violence, the right to special protection and assistance by the State”. According to UNICEF (2012), a protective environment is one where “all actors — from children and health workers to governments and the private sector — live up to their responsibilities to ensure that children are protected from abuse and exploitation”. Moreover, according to UNICEF (2012), a protective environment is held to be composed of eight elements:

1. ***Attitudes, traditions, customs, behavior and practices:*** children are more likely to be protected in societies where all forms of maltreatment of children are taboo and where the rights of children are broadly respected by customs and tradition.
2. ***Governmental commitment to fulfilling protection rights:*** governments need to show commitment to creating, enforcing and implementing strong legal frameworks that comply with international legal standards, policies and programs.
3. ***Open discussion and engagement with CP issues:*** above all, children need to be free to speak up about CP concerns affecting them or other children.
4. ***Protective legislation and enforcement:*** an adequate legislative framework designed to protect children from abuse must be not only adopted but also implemented and enforced.
5. ***The capacity of people in routine contact with children to protect them:*** health workers, teachers, police, social workers and many others who interact with children need to be equipped with the motivation, skills and authority to identify and respond to child protection abuses.
6. ***Children's life skills, knowledge and participation:*** children are less vulnerable to abuse when they are aware of their right not to be exploited or of services available to protect them.
7. ***Monitoring and reporting of child protection issues:*** an effective monitoring system records the incidence and nature of child protection abuses and allows for informed and strategic responses.
8. ***Services for recovery and reintegration:*** child victims of any form of neglect, exploitation or abuse are entitled to care and nondiscriminatory access to basic social services.

All parts of society — families, communities and governments have important roles to play in ensuring children’s safety and wellbeing. Children have roles, too, appropriate to their ages, maturity levels and capacities. “One of the best ways to protect children is to empower them to protect themselves through knowledge and skills for self-care” (Cree, 2008).

Families are the first safety net for children. Families’ primary social, moral and legal responsibility in society is to care for children and meet their basic needs (Butchart & Harvey, 2006). However, some families are overwhelmed by social and economic problems and can’t fully protect their children. Communities are the second safety net for children. Informal networks of kin, friends and neighbors usually step in to help children in need (Cannan & Warren, 1997). Communities also provide more formal responses through groups such as churches and grassroots organizations. Community oversight is especially important in countries where national child protection systems are weak or nonexistent. In these countries, communities play a vital role in supporting children and families in need of protection (Cree & Davis, 2007). However, although community stakeholders usually have the will and commitment to help, sometimes they lack the resources and expertise necessary to meet the needs of all those at risk adequately.

The state has the main responsibility for securing children’s right to protection. Governments should establish national CP systems and make sure they work well. The governments of poor and underdeveloped countries are, nonetheless, often unable to fulfill all of these responsibilities, hampered by such obstacles as inadequate budgets and lack of qualified staff (Cannan & Warren, 1997).

Thus, an appropriate response to child protection involves understanding it both as an issue in its own right and as a consideration with regard to other issues. It also requires that every actor plays his or her part in ensuring a protective environment for children (Cree, 2008). The discussion so far presented a brief understanding about the “*what*” of child protection; the next section will be concerned with *why* children need protection from abuse and neglect generally referred to in the literature as “maltreatment”.

2.2. Child Maltreatment

Child maltreatment has been defined as “all forms of physical and/or emotional ill-treatment, (sexual) abuse, neglect or negligent treatment or commercial or other exploitation, resulting in actual or potential harm to the child’s health, survival, development or dignity in the context of a relationship of responsibility, trust or power” (Butchart & Harvey, 2006). Maltreatment of children is internationally recognized as a serious public health, human rights, legal and social issue.

There are four major categories of maltreatment: physical abuse, sexual abuse, psychological maltreatment, and neglect. Although each form of maltreatment can occur by itself, children are often the victims of more than one type of maltreatment (Higgins, 2010).

Physical Abuse

Physical abuse of children includes any non-accidental physical injury caused by the child’s parent or a non-parental caregiver. Much physical abuse against children is inflicted at home or in school as a form of discipline (UNICEF, 2010).

Emotional or psychological abuse

Emotional or psychological abuse often accompanies physical abuse. Children who experience it are “hit” with words that demean shame, threaten, blame, intimidate or frighten them (UNICEF, 2014).

Sexual abuse

Sexual abuse involves forcing or enticing a child to take part in sexual activities. Activities may involve physical contact, such as genital fondling and sexual intercourse, and noncontact activities, such as indecent exposure, making children look at pornographic materials or encouraging children to behave in sexually inappropriate ways (UNICEF, 2010).

Neglect

Neglect is the persistent failure of a parent or adult caregiver to provide appropriate care to a child. Neglect involves the caregiver’s inattention to the basic needs of a child, such as food, clothing, shelter, medical care, and supervision. There are numerous categories of neglect, including physical, emotional, educational, developmental, medical, prenatal, environmental, or nutritional (Crosson-Tower, 2002).

2.2.1. Perspectives on Child Maltreatment

The law enforcement approach

The law enforcement approach to child maltreatment emphasizes the criminal aspect of the problem and calls for the investigation of incidents, the arrest and trial of those responsible, and imprisonment, if the parties are found guilty (Higgins, 2010).

The Medical/Psychological approach

The medical approach to child maltreatment originated, appropriately enough, with the development of accurate and reliable diagnostic indicators of non-accidental injuries to children. After physicians developed reliable ways to diagnose non-accidental injuries to children, they moved toward trying to understand and treat the underlying causes of injuries, causes they assumed to be psychological (Cree, 2008).

The structural perspective

The structural perspective looks at factors external to the child and parents to explain the problem. Structural theorists identify poverty as the primary cause of child maltreatment. Poverty, they say, relates to child maltreatment on two levels: societal and individual. At the societal level, *social exclusion*, meaning the poor are excluded from participating as full members of society, with too little access to activities and resources necessary for adequate child rearing (Cannan & Warren, 1997).

Poverty is seen as a causative agent in child maltreatment on the individual level. Poor people often cannot afford the things necessary for adequate child care and thus are accused of maltreatment, even though they are doing the best job possible. The parent gets angry and frustrated, perhaps to the point of abusing the child. The structural perspective maintains that this abuse could be prevented if the community provided more support to its poorest families (Cannan & Warren, 1997).

In conclusion, risk factors for the maltreatment of children are discussed. According to Higgins (2010), in all parts of society there are characteristics of children, their families, and/or their communities that increase the likelihood of child maltreatment occurring, including:

- economic factors (poverty, unemployment, overcrowding or unstable housing)
- social factors (racism, discrimination)
- community factors (dangerous, disadvantaged or socially excluded communities)
- parental problems (mental health, substance abuse, poor parenting skills or family/domestic violence)
- challenging child characteristics (low birth weight, disability or other special needs)
- family characteristics (poor relationships, large number of children, single parenthood or early parenthood)
- previous experiences of abuse/neglect (of either parents or children).

(Higgins, 2010 P, 3)

2.3. System

System is a favorite concept and perhaps an overused metaphor in social work.

References to systems are ubiquitous; many if not most endeavors refer to systems in one way or another. To focus the presentation, the discussion here is based on key cross-cutting themes that emerged from the literature

A system can be viewed, most fundamentally, as an arrangement of entities, things that interact to achieve a shared purpose or fulfill functions as a whole and its interrelated parts. Its guiding principle is organization (Hardina, 2002, pp, 49–50; Netting & O’Connor, 2002; Payne, 2005, pp. 142–180). The common purpose is critical to how one defines the system because the purpose is related to how one identifies the structures, functions, and capacities needed to meet the purpose (Hardina, 2002). Systems come in various forms including mechanical,

transportation, and biological. Systems also operate at different levels, with each level made up of components that are specific to the level in question (Payne, 2005).

System as a collection of components

Generally, the systems literature defines a system as a collection of components or parts that are organized (i.e., connected to each other) around a common purpose or goal (Save the Children, 2009; EAPRO, 2009). The outcomes one uses to assess how well a system is doing are also derived from its purpose. In the case of social systems, the purpose attached to the system serves to legitimate the system within a particular normative framework of “laws, policies, and commitments” (EAPRO, 2009). Ideally, because system components are assembled with goals in mind, system adequacy (i.e., is the system working?) can be assessed by determining whether the goals are accomplished. The latter feature helps to establish the logical need for a knowledge base and accountability mechanisms within a system (UNICEF, 2010).

The connection between system components and their adequacy relative to a set of goals is also tied to the question of change. Where the in-situ system fails to meet normative expectations, efforts to change the system may be more easily justified (Netting & O’Connor, 2002). The manner in which change is pursued depends to a very large extent on the nature of the goal and what systemic failure means within a given normative context. When outcomes fall far short of expectations (typically expressed as a goal or purpose), the level of effort expended to close the perceived gap will differ depending on whether one is talking about sanitary conditions in a refugee camp versus the failure to meet caseworker visitation requirements for children placed in out-of-home care. Senge (1990) in his treatise on system thinking refers to this condition as *creative tension*.

Nested, interacting structures

All systems are nested within other systems (Mizirahi & Davis, 2006). That is, a given system (e.g., the child protection system) has embedded within its boundaries other systems (e.g., foster care, child protective services reporting, case management). The nested quality of systems may vary by discipline, but the central idea remains: subsystems exist at various levels and are embedded within the larger system environment (Mulroy, 2004; Lemke & Sabelli, 2008). A primary assumption underlying systems theory is that a well-integrated, smoothly functioning system is both possible and desirable (Hardcastel, 2010).

Reciprocity and Reverberation

Systems and system components interact with each other, with the effects of these interactions reverberating throughout the system as a whole. Social work, as a field of practice, has long emphasized the extent to which agents in a system behave in ways that continually affect one another (Stevens, 2008).

Systems components interact with each other and other systems, which make up the environment or context of a given system. The interaction between parts of the system requires coordination and other actions that are organized or formed in relation to the goals of the system (UNICEF, 2008). Given the nested, interacting nature of systems, there has to be an integration of values across systems. That is, the work of each system has to be mutually reinforcing with respect to the purpose, goals, and boundaries of the other systems.

An important question in this context has to do with basic boundaries; for a social system to exist, it must be separable from other systems and from its surroundings. It must have boundaries. Systems can be open and have exchanges with their environments or closed with no

interactions with their environments. No human system can exist without relating to its environment, a proposition that defines the essence of an open system (Hardcastel, 2011). At the same time, some degree of closure is necessary for a human system to function and remain intact or coherent.

Thus we can say that every human system must negotiate its environment. Consequently, it must remain open to some degree, and it must manage some degree of uncertainty from external sources (Hardcastel, 2011). If a human system cannot negotiate its environment, if it cannot process information well enough, then it must either exist in a protected milieu or die (Juba, 1997).

Functions, Structures and Capacities

Systems do “things” in accordance with their purpose and goals. A system accomplishes its work through functions, structures, and capacities. System functions are generally thought of as organized activities that promote the achievement of system goals. In the particular case of human service systems, some examples of system functions include the delivery of particular services; provision of technical support to system actors; monitoring of various system activities; and establishment of standards of care or professional behavior, among others (Cohen, 2002; Begun, Zimmerman & Dooley, 2003; Hmelo-Silver & Pfeffer, 2004; Bennett & Eichler, 2006; Glisson, 2007).

With specific respect to child protection systems, system functions have been described as falling into one of two categories: those related to case decision making (e.g., assessments, gate-keeping, investigation, placement, etc.) and those designed to support system performance (e.g., capacity building, research and evaluation, allocation of resources, cross-sector

coordination, etc.; Save the Children, 2009). Although child protection systems typically serve a wide variety of functions, the effective and efficient operation of the system hinges, at least in part, on a clear statement of how functions and systems are related (Skinner & Bell, 2007).

The definition of structure is somewhat less precise. Whereas system functions refer to what a system does to achieve its goals, system structure sometimes refers to how the fundamental elements of the system are connected—that is, the framework or context within which system functions (e.g., services) are carried out (Hmelo-Silver & Pfeffer, 2004; Green & Ellis, 2007).

For the field of child protection, the structure of the system has been described as including laws, policies, standards, regulations, and the mechanisms to facilitate coordination across service sectors (Save the Children, 2009). More fundamentally, the structure of the child protection system has been discussed in terms of “the organization or structure of institutions . . . They include the different departments and agencies and their capacities” (UNICEF, 2009, p. 14). This latter definition comes closer to definitions of structure that regard structure as the relationship between components within the system (Senge, 1990).

System functions and structures are, in many ways, interdependent. The ability of system functions to be faithfully executed rests, in large part, on the strength of system structures (Gaad, 2006). Indeed, scholars have discussed system functions and structures such that one function of the system is to monitor and promote the enhancement of system structures (Begun, Zimmerman, & Dooley, 2003).

Capacity refers to the facilities, material resources, skilled personnel, and funding needed to operate the system. These capacities have to be allocated in relation to the purpose of the

system. One important capacity is decision making. At an organizational level, decision making is used to allocate capacity to meet the purpose of the system. Procurement of capacity is another important aspect of what an organization has to do. Structures and capacity for monitoring, management, and decision making are especially critical, particularly in view of the need to interact with and adapt to any externalities present in the environment.

Arguably, the extent to which a system is able to achieve its goals is more heavily dependent on capacity than any other factor. Although child protection systems across the world often struggle to build and maintain adequate capacity, there is consensus among scholars, advocates, and program planners that this particular feature of child protection systems is critical to the achievement of system goals and the protection of children (Save the Children, 2009; UNICEF, 2008; Mathew & Bross, 2008; Keeping Children Safe Coalition, 2006; Allen Consulting Group, 2008; Darlington, Feeney & Nixon, 2005; Kernan & Lansford, 2004).

Context and Adaptation

It is important to note that systems do not exist in a vacuum; rather systems are embedded within a broader context or environment (Rothery, 2007). Glisson (2007), discussing social work systems, stresses that systems are inextricably linked to the social, economic, religious, and other contexts in which the system is located. The literature emphasizes that the systems environment is in a state of “constant and discontinuous change” (Stevens, 2008; Leischow et al., 2008; Begun, Zimmerman, & Dooley, 2003). Mulroy (2004) argues that it is the structures within the system that allow them to adapt to changing conditions, although specific structures, functions, and capacity have to be built into the system in order to detect the need for change and promote positive adaptations.

Systems adapt to their multilevel context (environment) in ways that are generally favorable to their continued operation and success. However, the context in which the system operates poses certain risk and protective factors relative to the system. The influence is bi-directional: Changes to the system, for whatever reason, change the environment; changes to the environment alter the system (a process known as feedback in the systems literature). Contextual influences include children, the family, and the community as well as larger socio-economic and political influences. The structures, functions, and capacities used to meet the various environmental challenges are specific to the nature of the challenge.

2.4. A Systems Approach to Child Protection

According to this model, children's protection and healthy development depend critically on the care and protection provided by caretakers, typically family and extended family. However, families' ability to provide care and protection for children depends on having a secure, protective environment and access to child and family supports at the community level. Communities are a key point of intersection between the government and civil society; to provide adequate protection for children and families, however, communities need wider supports organized by the government, which bears the primary responsibility for children's protection and well-being (Csaky, 2009).

It is important to develop effective child protection systems that include interconnected protective mechanisms at different social levels. Ideally, child protection systems bring together formal, statutory elements and non-statutory or non-formal elements in a comprehensive, coordinated manner (UNICEF, 2010).

According to Save the Children UK, 2008, Child protection systems are defined as: “comprehensive approaches to the protection of children from abuse, neglect, exploitation and violence and to the fulfillment of children’s rights to protection.” Csaky, (2009) states that a child protection system can also be considered as: “all the activities whose primary purpose is to prevent or respond to the abuse, neglect, exploitation and violence of children.” The overall purpose of child protection systems are: “to strengthen the protective nature of the environment around children and to strengthen children themselves, in order to ensure their wellbeing and fulfill their rights to protection from abuse, neglect, exploitation and other forms of violence Csaky, (2009).”

A systems approach to child protection, according to Forbs, Luu, Oswald & Tutnjevic (2011),: “requires a considerable conceptual shift from the traditional stand-alone programming focus on particular groups of children in need of protection, to the achievement of more sustainable, comprehensive and long-term responses to child protection issues.” Furthermore, A systems approach “addresses child protection more holistically, brings greater focus on prevention, and strengthens the critical roles and assets of the key actors responsible for child protection. (Forbs, Luu, Oswald & Tutnjevic, 2011)” These key actors include: government, civil society, parents, caregivers, families and other community structures – which together provide formal and informal child protection mechanisms and services (UNICEF, 2010).

Adopting a systems approach does not eliminate the need for some specific issues-based programming targeting the most vulnerable children. A systems approach to child protection is sufficiently flexible and robust to implement a wide range of interventions for the benefit of all children in various situations, while simultaneously addressing, promoting and advocating for the interests of significantly under-represented, marginalized or vulnerable children in a

particular situation or context (Forbs, Luu, Oswald & Tutnjevic, 2011; UNICEF, 2010) .

According to Forbs, Luu, Oswald & Tutnjevic, (2011), even when focusing on a particular child protection issue, a systems approach seeks to do the following:

- address child protection issues in a comprehensive and sustainable manner
- affirm the role of parents and caregivers as the first responsible for care and protection of children
- affirm the responsibility of states to guarantee the care and protection of children, through respecting, protecting and fulfilling children's protection rights outlined in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and other international human rights instruments
- strengthen the protective environment for all children.

By definition, a child protection system has certain structures, functions, and capacities, among other components that have been assembled in relation to a set of child protection goals (Save the Children, 2009; UNICEF 2008). Each child protection system is unique and made of formal and informal elements appropriate to its context. According to UNICEF (2008), *Formal elements* are established or sanctioned by the government and guided by laws, regulations and policies. *Informal elements* do not have state/government mandates for protective functions. Instead, they are shaped by attitudes, values, behaviors, social norms and traditional practices in society. Medrano & Tabben-Toussaint (2012) state: The CP system approach looks at the circumstances that challenge children's wellbeing as a web of threats rather than taking them one by one. It addresses all of the issues that children in multiple circumstances might face and the structural and root causes of gaps in prevention and response.

Wulczyn, Daro & Fluke (2010) note that: “with regard to child protection, the systems approach starts with a purpose or goal. Goals are seen as starting points in large measure because actors within the system are joined together through a sense of common purpose.” Child protection goals in turn emanate from the normative framework embedded in the context in which the child protection system operates. The normative framework need not be codified in law or other formal instruments, although that is increasingly the case in part because of increasing acceptance of the CRC (UNICEF, 2010). Among other things, the consensus behind the expressed rights of children legitimates the pursuit of child protection as a deliberate aim of the state; Without such legitimacy, advocates for child protection systems may lack the institutional (i.e., political) leverage needed to define its scope, except by some other, less formal means. The symbiosis between legitimacy and system structures, at any level (i.e., formal or informal) is dynamic and an inextricable feature of the systems approach (Wulczyn, Daro & Fluke, 2010 pp.28). The authors also point out the placement of the child protection system within an economic, social, political, and cultural context that shapes not only the normative context but also the relationship of the child protection system to the broader system of social protection.

In essence, child protection systems do not exist in isolation. Nor are child protection systems the only system working to influence the well-being of children. According to UNICEF (2010), Within a given context, the boundary between (i.e., the structural relationship or embeddedness) the child protection system and those other systems (e.g., education, health, mental health) is an important feature of the child protection system that has implications for how one goes on to define functions, capacities, the process of care, governance, and accountability.

Wulczyn, Daro & Fluke, (2010) place externalities and emergencies within the context that influences the child protection system; in large measure, from the system perspective, the central issue is one of interaction with and adaptation to the context within which the system exists. The influence is bi-directional (i.e., reciprocal); such that, the context defines the system even as the system shapes the context. Well-designed systems (i.e., those with strong infrastructure) will be better prepared to manage externalities and emergencies; externalities and emergencies may lead to stronger systems in the long run, provided the actors involved respond to such challenges in a cooperative manner (Save the Children UK, 2009).

To the extent that systems take shape around the goals of the system, the impact of the child protection system on the status of children (i.e., the well-being of children) is a central dynamic that affects how the system evolves through time. Where there is a gap between the goals of the system and whether children are being protected, efforts within the system will turn to bringing what the system accomplishes into line with system goals (Save the Children UK, 2009).

2.4.1. Components of a child protection system

The child protection system operates at several levels (ranging from the formal to the less formal), involves several nested contexts, and relies on different actors (Wulczyn, Daro & Fluke, 2010). Key actors include, among others, the family, the community, and the state. Children are also included to reflect the fact that children have an important voice in the child protection system.

Structures, functions, and capacities are the basic building blocks. Wulczyn, Daro & Fluke, (2010) also note that continuum of care delineates the specific ways in which the system

responds to rights violations whereas the process of care specifies the procedures that are followed when the system engages children, families, and communities. The process of care clarifies the myriad ways children and families may come to the system's attention, including those ways that rely on voluntary engagement and those that rely on some type of reporting mechanisms. The process of care also incorporates assessment strategies, case planning, treatment, and follow up, with the specific processes shaped by whether the underlying services are promotion, prevention, or response (Wulczyn, Daro & Fluke, 2010 pp.30).

The holistic view of children, families, and communities that is one hallmark of the systems approach to child protection expands what it means to respond to protection needs by adding promotion and prevention as points along the service continuum depending on how other systems are structured in relationship to the child protection system (UNICEF, 2010). Each point along the service continuum is a subsystem within the larger system and therefore subject to the same design considerations as the larger system: structures, functions, and capacities have to stand in symmetry with the purpose of the subsystem (UNICEF, 2010).

In system terms, structure is often thought of as the relationships between components of the system. The components, within the context of the community and the state, may include formal (e.g., NGOs) and informal organizations (neighborhood watch groups) dedicated to protecting children. How the relationships are formed and how they are maintained (or changed) is a matter of local context, efficacy, and other factors affecting child protection (Wulczyn, Daro & Fluke, 2010 pp.32).

As noted above, systems do things. How the activities are bundled or organized can usually be interpreted through a functional lens. In the child protection system, certain functions

are essential to the basic operation of the system, although the observation alone is not unique to the child protection system. Governance, management, and enforcement are the listed functions (Wulczyn, Daro & Fluke, 2010).

As an organization, the child protection system has to maintain a level of capacity commensurate with what the system requires. Capacity refers to human resources, funding, and infrastructure. A coherent child protection system has the means by which to compel the use of resources towards the goals of the system. Staff complements management in that staff implements policy and practice directives (i.e., direct the use of resources) through interactions with children and families in a community setting (UNICEF, 2010).

How children, families, communities, states, and formal and informal organizations are assembled around a common purpose is fundamentally a question about the past and the future, and whether the system in place today meets the goals set forth (UNICEF, 2010). Within the highly contextualized approach to supporting child protection systems, the most important question is: Are children being protected in a manner consistent with their rights? If not, then the focus shifts to why not and how the existing system can be strengthened so as to fulfill those grander expectations (Wulczyn, Daro & Fluke, 2010).

2.5. Child Protection in Ethiopia

According to the Ministry of Women, Children and Youth Affairs (MoWCYA), a vulnerable child is one whose survival, care, protection or development might have been jeopardized due to a particular condition, and who is found in a situation that precludes the fulfillment of his or her rights. The Ethiopian Constitution, in line with international and regional conventions on the rights of the child, stresses the responsibility of the state to provide special

protection for different categories of such children. This includes victims of violence, abuse, child labor, trafficking and harmful practices such as female genital mutilation and early marriage. It also encompasses children who are living with disabilities, in conflict with the law, children working and living on the street, or victims of commercial sexual exploitation.

The revised Criminal Code (2005) defines the following criminal offenses with respect to children: harmful traditional practices; enslavement of children; trafficking of children for prostitution and forced labor; sexual abuse; corporal punishment in schools and institutions; rape, maltreatment and neglect of children

The national coordinating body for multi-sectoral and integrated response to violence against women and children was launched in 2009; with a view to addressing juvenile justice and violence against women. In Addis Ababa and in regional capitals, special benches within the courts deal with offences committed against children and women. The Federal First Instance Court has introduced closed-circuit television monitors to protect child victims from facing the perpetrator and public at the time of testimony.

According to Save the Children (2008), Ethiopia is yet to have a single comprehensive policy dealing with the rights of children. However, child rights concerns are addressed in the various policy documents on related matters. One among these instruments is the Developmental and Social Welfare Policy (1996) which, among other objectives, aims at implementing international standards relating to the welfare of children. The cultural policy of Ethiopia also addresses the issue of eradicating harmful traditional practices affecting children. Similarly, the National Youth Policy (2004) and the National Education Policy (1994) deal with issues of direct relevance to children's rights. In addition to these policy documents, a set of national action plans

relevant to the promotion and protection of rights of children are in existence. These include the National Program of Action for Children and Women (1996 - 2000), the National Plan of Action on Orphans and Vulnerable Children (2004 – 2006), the National Plan of Action for Children (2003 – 2010) and the National Action Plan on Sexual Abuse and Exploitation of Children (2006 - 2010). Other issues on which the development of national action plans is reportedly underway include child labor and Civil Registration and Vital Statistics Systems. Two guidelines developed and published by MoWA recently on alternative care for children deprived of family environment and quality standards for OVC care and support, are also important for the realization of the rights of children to be protected from abuse, neglect, exploitation, and violence.

2.5.1. Protection issues of children in Ethiopia

Child labor

The International Labor Organization (ILO) defines child labor as (a) all economic activities undertaken by children under age 11; (b) all economic activity undertaken by children aged 12 to 14, excluding permitted 'light work' in the sense of convention 138; (c) all economic activity carried out under 'hazardous conditions' by children aged 15 to 17; and (d) 'the worst forms of child labor' carried out under age 18.

Ethiopia has one of the highest rates of child labor in the world. In 2001, a survey by the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, the Central Statistics Agency and the ILO showed that about 84 per cent of the country's children are engaged in activities that may be regarded as child labor. The survey found that 52 per cent of children are involved in productive activities, more than 80 per cent of them (12.6 million) below the age of 15. Almost 90 percent of them come

from the rural areas. More girls than boys do housekeeping work, and more boys than girls participate in economic activities.

Street children

The term 'street children' refers to both children on the street and children of the street. The former denotes those children who work on the streets to earn money for themselves or their families. While the later refers to those children who are homeless and live on the street.

In 2007, the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs in a study supported by UNICEF estimated the overall number of children on or of the street at around 150,000 with about 60,000 living in the capital. In 2003, the Forum on Street Children in Ethiopia conducted a study on the situation of street children in eight towns (Addis Ababa, Shashemenie, Hawassa, Bahir Dar, Dessie, Diredawa, Makalle and Nazareth). The study revealed that poverty, family disintegration, neglect and violence at home, lack of educational opportunities, the death of parents and sexual abuse were among the factors that pushed vulnerable children onto the street. There was also evidence that children venture into street life as early as four years of age. The same study found that the interventions of government and civil society organizations have not significantly reduced the magnitude of the problem. In late 2010 and early 2011 further surveys indicated that there are an estimated 12,000 street children in Addis Ababa and nearly 4,000 in Adama; the children identified in these studies are highly mobile.

Commercial sexual exploitation

In 2002, the Women's Affairs Department in the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs estimated that 90,000 females were involved in commercial sex work; approximately 20

percent of them were aged between 12 and 18 years. Since then, the engagement of children in commercial sex work appears to have increased in urban areas.

Violence, exploitation and abuse

According to the National Plan of Action for Children (2003-2010 and beyond) a large number of Ethiopian children suffer from the ills of poverty and illiteracy. They are also victims of several harmful traditional practices such as early marriage, FGM, physical punishment and labor exploitation. Most children are engaged in productive and household activities such as: herding cattle, weeding, harvesting, cooking, taking care of siblings, and various household chores. The Child Friendly Rehabilitation/Treatment Guideline for Sexually Abused and Exploited Children by the MoWCYA (2008) states that in Ethiopia the problem of sexual abuse and exploitation of children is a growing phenomenon as it is illustrated by few indicative studies undertaken in the country. The most common types of child sexual abuse and exploitation include early marriage, abduction, FGM, rape, incest and trafficking.

Trafficking

The International Office of Migration estimates that at least 1.2 million children are victims of trafficking in Ethiopia every year. Children and women between the ages of 8 and 24 years are the most vulnerable to such abuse and exploitation and the violence associated with them. The research also indicates that over a quarter of nearly 50,000 women and children involved in prostitution are victims of trafficking.

Table 2.1 Victims of trafficking by sex and year

Sex	2004	2005	2006	2007	Total
Male	49	79	378	230	736
Female	164	327	547	464	1502
Total	213	411	925	694	2243

Source: Addis Ababa Child Protection Unit (CPU) (2007)

Children in conflict and contact with the law

The Addis Ababa Rehabilitation Centre is the only institution in the country that caters for the needs of children in conflict and contact with the law. Two other specialized rehabilitation and reintegration centers were built in Hawassa and Bahir Dar, but other departments are now using them. The Addis Ababa centre is capable of hosting only 150 children. Initially established to accommodate boys, it started admitting girls in 2000, even though it was not built to meet their special needs. In March 2010, 76 male and 20 female children had been placed in the center. The centre suffers from acute shortages of human and financial resources. The supervision and inspection of the centre that is envisaged by Article 3(3) of the CRC is spasmodic and inadequate. The services available are far from ensuring the right of child (MoWCYA, 2008).

2.5.2. NGOs in Child Protection and Welfare

Dessalegn, Akalewold & Yoseph, 2008, state: non-state organizations working with children may be divided into two broad areas: those engaged to promote the welfare of disadvantaged children, and those whose main objective is the protection of children against abuse, sexual and physical exploitation. On occasions the same organizations may be engaged in

both activities at one and the same time. Many organizations here have an exclusive child-focus, while in some cases organizations may combine child focused work with other programs.

The main activities pertaining to children's welfare are the following:

- Support and fostering orphaned and destitute children through various schemes.
- Providing shelter, safe homes and rehabilitation to children in distress.
- Managing specialized children's villages. These are centers for children without parents, and children in distress.
- Providing health, education and material support to children from very poor families or destitute children
- Working with street children to improve their life conditions.
- Sponsorship programs to enable such children to attend school or vocational training institutions
- Working with juvenile delinquents, and children with anti-social behavior
- Managing special youth homes and supporting and preparing youngsters for employment opportunities
- Child-family reunification programs
- Daycare programs for needy parents; children feeding centers, and outreach programs.
- Capacity building for communities, relevant government bodies to enable them to support children in difficult circumstances. Training and sensitization programs also included.

The work of protection of children from abuse and exploitation depends largely on advocacy work and public awareness of the rights of children. This means raising awareness among communities, law enforcement agencies, school administrations and health care providers. CSOs/NGOs work closely with many government bodies, in particular with the

police, the courts, the prosecutor's office, schools, and government bodies such as social affairs and women's affairs agencies, and others concerned with children's protection. Very often they provide training to staff of these institutions, capacity building, material and financial support. They also work with Iddirs, CBOs, informal neighborhood community groups, youth groups, school children and Kebelles. In many urban areas, child rights organizations and their partners in the community support a large number of iddirs.

The main objective in this endeavor is to promote child rights and the protection of children from abuse, exploitation and risks and dangers that may be posed by harmful traditional practices and beliefs. This involves undertaking awareness programs based on the federal and regional constitutions and laws, international conventions and agreements approved by the Ethiopian government, as well as training and support.

2.5.3. NGO legislation

In February 2009, the House of Peoples' Representatives adopted Ethiopia's first comprehensive law governing the registration and regulation of non-government organizations. The Proclamation to Provide for the Registration and Regulation of Charities and Societies (CSP) has incorporated a number of provisions with significant implications for the operation of child rights actors and the adoption of a child rights-based approach in the work of NGOs in Ethiopia. The new law, in defining the nature of 'Charities and Societies' under Article 2, distinguishes between three categories of Charities and Societies: Ethiopian Charities or Societies, Ethiopian Resident Charities or Societies, and Foreign Charities, based on where the organization was established, its source of income, composition of membership, and membership residential status. Ethiopian Charities or Societies are Charities or Societies formed under the laws of Ethiopia, whose members are all Ethiopians, generate income from Ethiopia and are

wholly controlled by Ethiopians. These organizations may not receive more than 10% of their resources from foreign sources. Ethiopian Resident Charities or Societies, on the other hand, are Ethiopian charities or societies that receive more than 10% of their resources from foreign sources. Finally, Foreign Charities are Charities formed under the laws of foreign countries, or whose membership or management includes foreigners, or receiving their funds from foreign sources.

Under Article 14 (j-n) of the Proclamation, only Ethiopian Charities and Societies may engage in activities geared towards the advancement of human and democratic rights and the promotion of the rights of disabled and children's rights, among other advocacy and human rights related areas. In addition, article 68 of the Proclamation, which stipulates mandatory registration for all Charities and Societies, requires foreign organizations to obtain a letter of recommendation from the Ethiopian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The regulatory body, the Ethiopian Charities and Societies Agency, is also given extensive discretionary mandates including the power to deny or cancel registration.

The implications of the current law for the establishment and operations of child rights organizations are manifold. At the outset, almost all of the child rights actors operating in Ethiopia will find it hard to qualify for registration and operate as 'Ethiopian Charities and Societies' due to reasons related to foreign funding and nationality. To further complicate matters, there are several restrictions relating to domestic funding including limits on the solicitation of money before registration, need for permission from the Agency to conduct public collections, and limits on engagement in income generating activities (Save the Children, 2008). These organizations will thus be forced to narrow down their operations in line with the limited availability of local funding, taking focus away from child rights mandates to continue using

foreign funding, or even close in the case of foreign organizations having failed to secure the permissions of the Agency. More specific to child rights-based organizations, they could maintain their profile only where they have opted to and been accepted by the Agency as Ethiopian and by limiting their funding to local sources. In light of the current trends in local funding and the role of international and foreign child rights actors in introducing and promoting rights-based approaches, this amounts to a reversal of achievements in the adoption of child rights programming and creation of rights-based organizations (Eman, 2012).

CHAPTER THREE

Operationalization, Research Design and Methods

3.1. Operationalization

The variables under study are operationalized in this section based on the main constructs of the conceptual framework presented in the preceding section.

3.1.1. *Independent variables*

The child protection system in NGOs is the independent variable of the study. Structure, function and capacity are the basic components of the system.

3.1.1.1. *Structure*

In system terms, structure is often thought of as the relationships between components of the system. Within the agency setting, child protection system can have formal and/or informal components.

Formal: This is operationalized as: Government and other NGOs. To this end, government legislations relating to the operation of and cooperation with NGOs will be reviewed

Informal: This is operationalized as: community based organizations, children and families. This will be measured as per the number and effectiveness of community based child protection mechanisms formed, strengthened and supported by NGOs and children and families' level of participation in child protection activities..

3.1.1.2. Function

The core activities and processes of agencies are contingent on their specific circumstances. Governance, management and enforcement are listed as the major functions of a child protection system. In this study, governance and management will be used as variables.

Governance

Any system of child protection incorporates a 'results chain', which translates specific inputs (material and financial) into outcomes; Aspects of the system which define this process of translation of inputs into outputs are often identified as the system's governance. Governance systems could be analyzed in terms of 'governance inputs' (or 'determinants') and 'governance outputs' (or 'performance').

Determinants: are operationalized in terms of the number of professionals with expertise on child protection hired and organizational policies on child protection

Performance: is operationalized in terms of the enforceability of agency policies

Management

This refers to critical processes related to the management of financial, human and information resources. This will be assessed both empirically and through document analysis.

3.1.1.3. Capacity

Capacity refers to human resource, funding and infrastructure.

Human resource is operationalized as: Is the workforce trained? Do family members and community residents have the knowledge and capacity to protect children? Is the physical plant

(bricks and mortar) attached to the system suited to the work it is asked to do? Does the physical structure of the community provide children basic protection? Do workers have the equipment they need to perform the job?

Capacity is further operationalized in terms of protection culture, donors and socio-cultural issues. *Protection culture*: refers to the shared perspectives, values, procedures and approaches of child protection practice. It is operationalized in terms of the extent to which (1) family support and community development is valued, (2) the values, beliefs and expectations of effective protection are shared, (3) staff, children and communities are committed and engaged in child protection activities, (4) the agency values contentious monitoring and evaluation and uses feedback to improve services. These indicators will be measured through perceptual questions in interviews and questionnaire.

Donors: are national and/or international organizations providing financial support for agencies. This is operationalized in terms of their influence on child protection services in agencies. Perceptual questions for agency leadership, staff, donors and program evaluation reports will be assessed to this end.

Socio-cultural factors: this dimension is operationalized in terms of the extent to which the beliefs, values, attitudes and ethos of the wider community affect practice. Perceptual questions, document review on access and program evaluation reports will be assessed to this end.

3.1.2. Dependent Variables

The practice of child protection in agencies is the dependent variable for the study. It is conceptualized as: reducing risks to children's holistic well-being, making children's rights a

reality, restoring hope and a dignified living where abuse has occurred and creating an enabling environment that supports children's positive development. This is operationalized to focus on reducing risks and creating an enabling environment. For this purpose, two indicators will be measured: *efficacy* and *sustainability*.

3.1.2.1. Efficacy

This is operationalized based on three aspects. The first deals with the extent to which the child protection practice has been formalized, made workable and is being implemented. The intention here is to see if there are functional mechanisms for improving the protection of children. The second aspect compares actual practices of child protection in agencies with good practices in child protection which include (1) existing local supports for children are incorporated and built upon (2) there is genuine child participation (3) ongoing, contextually appropriate quality training and capacity building and of material support are provided (4) there is support from community leaders. The third aspect examines children's evaluation of agency services in terms of: ensuring a better quality of life for families through the developmental services, deterring the abuse of children through education and community awareness, equipping children with the tools to improve chances of finishing school, providing child abuse prevention and treatment services and creating and promoting well-being and fostering children's participation in society among others. Perceptual questions for agency leadership, staff, beneficiaries and program evaluation reports will be assessed to this end.

3.1.2.2. Sustainability

This is operationalized based on the extent to which, as a result of agency services, (1) children are better aware of their rights (2) children are active participants in child protective

activities (3) families are better able to provide for their children and avoided violence, (4) communities implement child protection activities and (5) institutions such as schools have adopted protection systems. These will be examined by the relationship between the duration of service reception and children's awareness and participation in child protection.

3.2. Research Design and Methods

The research design of the study consists of desk research of documents related to child protection and data collection from the field. The secondary data from documentary review were generated using evaluation synthesis, which systematically reviews existing documentation on community based child protection program evaluations in agencies. This was vital to develop a typology of child protection services and their efficacy.

Participants of the study are children who are targeted by the agencies and agency staff. Agencies were selected based on their organizational characteristics. I.e. that is Ethiopian residents' charities. According to Charities and Societies Agency (2012), there are 1235 Ethiopian residents' charities operating in the country. Three cases (agencies) were selected from this population. Stake (1995) describes a case as a "specific, complex, functioning thing," that is, a bounded system. A system may be bounded by space (an organization), time and purpose (child protection). This study employs a collective case study; a collective case study, according to Stake (1995) "involves a comparison of several related cases, such as a comparison of several corporate organizations". According to Vanderstoep & Johnson (2009), the purpose of a case study is to understand the characteristics that define a particular bounded system, and perhaps to describe an event or process occurring within that system. The sampling rationale for the selection of cases is based on the similarity of organizations (Ethiopian residents' charities

working on child protection). Three cases instead of one is preferred in this study for the reason that including more than one case gives more power to the analysis in terms of getting comprehensive and rich data regarding the child protection system and practice in NGOs. After selecting cases, data was collected from (1) managerial staff (Directors, program managers) (2) project officers and (3) document review of program evaluation, project proposal and the like were conducted.

In relation to procedures and instruments, the study employed survey method to collect data on characteristics attitudes and perceptions of various subjects regarding child protection practice. This included both self administered questionnaire and interviews. Structured interviews of key informants from the organizations were conducted to get further information and documentary analysis was used for contextual understanding of policy and practice.

3.2.1. Data sources and sampling

The sources of data for this study comprise two categories of respondents. The first group consists of NGOs and staff; and the second group consists of beneficiary children. The organizational characteristics of the NGOs were used as a basis for selection. According to Desallegn, Akalewold & Yoseph (2008), non-state organizations working with children may be divided into two broad areas: those engaged to promote the welfare of disadvantaged children, and those whose main objective is the protection of children against abuse, sexual and physical exploitation. On occasions the same organizations may be engaged in both activities at one and the same time. Many organizations here have an exclusive child-focus, while in some cases organizations may combine child focused work with other programs. Moreover, the new charities and societies proclamation classifies CSOs based on their source of funds; Ethiopian

resident's charities and societies with more than 10 percent of their fund from local origin and foreign with more than 10 percent of their fund from foreign sources.

For this study, three NGOs that are Ethiopian resident's charities and that combine child focused work with other programs were randomly selected: 4 killo Child Care and Community Development, Integrated Family Services Organization and Emmanuel Development Association. After selecting the three cases, data were gathered from 1) key persons working at the organizations, (2) beneficiary children, (3) project documents, children's records, and monitoring and evaluation tools. Agency staffs were purposively selected based on their pertinence to child protection; as a result, managerial, sponsorship and counseling departments were selected. Depending on the agency, two managerial, three sponsorship and three counseling staff were selected. Moreover, forty children from each agency were selected using systematic random sampling. The list of selected children was obtained from the record offices of the respective agencies.

3.2.2. Procedures and instruments of data collection

In this study, the survey approach and documentary analysis were employed to generate data from the three cases. The survey method is employed with the intention to collect data concerning the characteristics, attitudes and perceptions of a wide range of subjects towards the practice of child protection. The survey method of data collection involves both self-administered questionnaire and interview. The documentary analysis was employed to provide a contextual understanding of policy and practice environment that underlie the child protection system in the agencies. Moreover, a case study method is employed with a view to describing the context of cases (the structure, function and capacity of services and the resulting efficacy and

sustainability). Furthermore, analysis of the major themes that emerged from the cases were used to generate interpretations and recommendations. The data collection instruments employed in this study are discussed here under.

Questionnaire: two versions of semi-structured questionnaires were developed and administered. The first version was developed to capture cross-sectional data from beneficiary children. The second version was developed to gather data from agency staff. The purpose of the questionnaire is to gather quantitative data. The response rate of questionnaires is summarized below.

Agency	Staff		Children	
	Distributed	Returned	Distributed	Returned
IFSO	7	7	40	39
EDA	7	7	40	39
4Killo	4	4	40	39
Total	18	18	120	117

Document analysis: relevant documents were obtained and analyzed. The document analysis serves two purposes: (1) to enrich and enhance results obtained through questionnaires, and (2) triangulate results with survey findings.

3.2.3. Data analysis techniques

In the study, the intention is to investigate child protection practices in nongovernmental agencies. Thus, the unit of analysis is organizational level child protection systems and practices. Four stages of data analysis suggested by Walliman (2006): data reduction, data display, data consolidation and data integration were employed. Data reduction refers to condensing the dimensionality of quantitative data via for example descriptive statistics and qualitative data via

thematic analysis. Data consolidation deals with combining both quantitative and qualitative data to create new or combined variables and data display refers to describing data with graphs charts etc; in data integration, both qualitative and quantitative data are integrated into either a whole or separate sets.

In this study, the data collected through questionnaires were coded, entered, cleaned and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 20) computer software. The quantitative data was reduced into descriptive statistics such as percentages; correlations; chi-square tests; t-tests, and one-way ANOVA. The qualitative data were also transcribed, coded and interpreted thematically.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Major findings of the empirical study are presented in this chapter. Data obtained from multiple sources at different times will be analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively in order to demonstrate how child protection system inputs, processes and outputs are constrained and how these influence the protection of children in NGOs. The chapter begins with analysis of data on the general characteristics of respondents; followed by analysis of data on the components of child protection system. The final section presents analysis of data on the child protection practice of the agencies.

4.1. General Characteristics of Respondents

Two groups drawn from three NGOs constitute the respondents of the study: Children who are the beneficiaries of NGOs and pertinent agency staff. Respondents were selected from: Integrated Family Services Organization (IFSO), Emmanuel Development Association (EDA) and 4Killo Child Support and Community Development (4Killo). A total of 117 children, 39 from each agency, were primary respondents of the study. They were selected on the basis of being the beneficiaries of agency services. The children were randomly selected from agency lists. Regarding agency staff, a total of 18 respondents who are directly involved in child protective services were purposively selected. Seven respondents from IFSO, seven from EDA and four from 4killo are the participants.

4.1.1. Demographic Characteristics of children

A total of 117 children from three agencies, with 39 children from each, were the respondents of the study. Regarding the sex composition of respondents, 61 were female and 56 were male. It was also found that the children live in a myriad of living arrangements; with the majority (42.7%) living with their single mothers. About 28.2% of the child respondents live with both their parents; while the remaining 29.1% of the children live with their relatives (aunt or grandparents) besides those 3.4% who live with their single fathers.

Regarding their parental situation, it was found that sixty six (56.4%) of respondent children's fathers have abandoned their families, twelve (10.3%) divorced their mothers and four (3.4%) are diseased. Moreover, data regarding mothers revealed that twenty one (17.9%) of respondents' mothers have moved to other places (both local and abroad) in search of a job while fourteen (12%) are reported to be deceased.

Regarding what the remaining parents, those living with their children, do for a living, the majority (56.1%) of children's mothers are petty traders while the majority of children's fathers (37.14%) are daily laborers. The demographic characteristics of children respondents are summarized below.

Table 4.1 Demographic characteristics of children respondents

Variables	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Agency	IFSO	39	33.3
	EDA	39	33.3
	4Killo	39	33.3
	Total	117	100
Sex	Male	56	47.9
	Female	61	52.1
	Total	117	100
Living with	Parents	33	28.2
	Father	4	3.4
	Mother	50	42.7
	Relatives	24	20.6
	Siblings	6	5.1
	Total	117	100
Mother's Occupation	Wage worker	27	32.9
	Petty trade	46	56.1
	House wife	9	11
	Total	82	100
Father's Occupation	Wage worker	22	62.8
	Petty trade	7	20
	Professional	6	17.2
	Total	35	100

Source: survey data

In addition, respondent children's age ranges from 6-18; with an average age of 13.

Regarding the educational level of respondents, it spans from 1st to 12th grade with an average of 6. With a mean of 5.5, participants have been receiving service from their respective agencies for a time span ranging from one year to fourteen years; with the majority (22.2%) receiving service for three years. A summary of the data is presented below.

Table 4.2 Age, Educational Level and the number of years children have been receiving services

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	117	6	18	13.3	2.69
Education	117	1	12	5.9	2.46
Years receiving services	117	1	14	5.49	3.28

Source: survey data

4.1.2. Characteristics of Staff Respondents

18 respondents from the three agencies were the respondents; among whom ten (55.6%) were male while the remaining 44.4% were female. Regarding their position, three were managerial staff, six coordinators, seven social workers and two counselors. Summary of data on staff characteristics is presented below.

Table 4.3 Characteristics of staff respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Agency	IFSO	7	38.9
	EDA	7	38.9
	4Killo	4	22.2
	Total	18	100
Sex	Male	10	55.6
	Female	8	44.4
	Total	18	100
Position	Management	3	16.7
	Coordinator	6	33.3
	Social Worker	7	38.9
	Counselor	2	11.1
	Total	18	100
Profession	Social Work	10	55.6
	Sociology	3	16.7
	Psychology	3	16.7
	Management	2	11
	Total	18	100
Education	Diploma	1	5.6
	BA/BSc	12	66.7
	MA/MSc	5	27.8
	Total	18	100

Source: survey data

Concerning their years of service, it was found that the minimum is 2, the maximum 20 and an average of 7.2 with a standard deviation of 5.36. The findings are summarized below.

Table 4.4 Staff years of service by agency

Agency	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
IFSO	7	2	20	9.3	6.47
EDA	7	3	15	6.3	3.83
4Killo	4	2	10	5	2.33

4.2. Availability, Accessibility and Use of services

This section deals with data analysis on the availability, accessibility and use of child protective services as perceived by children and agency staff. Regarding reporting, especially to authorities, when they are faced with the risk of abuse and exploitation, there is disparity among children from different agencies. Since children from IFSO are referred to the agency by police after having been abused or exploited, all of them reported that they have information on the mechanisms of reporting. Nonetheless, in almost all cases, they have been informed by neighbors, friends and/or relatives. In the case of EDA, 66.7% of the children reported that they have information on reporting mechanisms while 33.3% of them stated that they don't have information on reporting mechanisms. As in the previous case, the source of information they had are neighbors, friends and/or family members. The majority of children (64.1%) from 4 Killo also reported that they have information on the mechanisms of reporting abuse and exploitation.

Irrespective of whether they have information on the mechanisms of reporting to authorities, almost all of the children noted that they prefer telling incidents of abuse and exploitation to their friends and/or siblings. This is also in contrast with the children's attitude of getting proper support from authorities which 86.3% of them stated they would get. In the 13.7% of cases where children reported that they don't believe they won't get proper protection, the majority reported that they won't get proper attention from the authorities because they are "children". A girl from 4 Killo reported: *"The adults in our community know each other very well. Therefore, I don't believe that there is any way that a policeman or a judge takes measures against adults based on my complaints!"*

Asked whether governmental agencies such as police are providing sufficient child protective services, 54.7% of the children reported no. Ease of access and the provision of child friendly services are reported as challenges in need of improvement.

The children reported a plethora of ways of dealing with protection risks they face in multiple contexts. At home, if and when maltreatment occurs they try to deal with it by reconciling with perpetrators through neighbors or other family members; since, as one child stated “they got nowhere to go”. At school, they tell teachers or school administrators to deal with an issue. This is not, however, true when perpetrators are teachers; for, as one of the children’s response captures: “it’s our words against theirs”. When an abuse occurs in the community, it is reported that it is dealt with by telling “adults” and trying to reconcile.

Though some children noted the relatively better treatment by CPU in police stations, they generally have doubts that they will get proper treatment and protection if they reported incidents of abuse and maltreatment. Moreover, children feel that existing formal components of the child protection system such as the police have not been effective in protecting them from abuse and maltreatment. Consequently, they resort to using informal systems of protection in their community. The children stated that they want “adults” in their community to listen and take their reports seriously. These include: family members, neighbors, teachers and elders in the community.

Regarding their knowledge of and participation in child protective activities at school and in their community, the majority of child respondents are aware of the existence of school-based child led groups, CBOs and NGOs in their community. The participation of children is, however, limited to school-based child led groups. The type of school-based child led groups identified by

the respondents include: child rights club, student's clubs, civic and ethical education club, know your country club, sport club, language development club, girls club, gender club, and anti-AIDS club. 77.8% of the children also reported that they participate in one or more of the groups. Forum for expressing themselves, developing knowledge and awareness and helping children to protect themselves as well as to properly take care of their health and personal hygiene are among the many benefits of participating in the groups. The effectiveness of clubs is varied; child rights club is reported to be the most effective in listening to the information that they bring and taking the issue to the formal system such as police. Despite their keen will, children's participation in the clubs is constrained by both organizational and family factors. At the organizational level, restrictions on the number of members a club can have and lack of parental consent to spend time after school which is required by the clubs. Regarding the quality of services in their community, 66.7% of the respondents evaluate services like library, water and sanitation, healthcare and child friendly spaces to be poor.

4.3. Child Protection System

This section deals with data analysis on what is actually happening in the agencies in terms of the structure, function and capacity of their child protection systems. Analysis of the findings integrates both quantitative and qualitative data drawn from multiple sources. This section deals with data analysis on the aspects of the structure, function and capacity of the system; including: engagement with formal and informal elements, types of services provided and human and financial resources in the agencies.

4.3.1. Structure

In a child protection system, structure is conceived of as the nature of relation and cooperation between the various actors in the system. In this study, these actors can be either formal or informal and include: Government, Agencies working on children, CBOs and Children. Positive relations and strong cooperation are important for agencies to be successful in their service provision. The extent to which the agencies have established a good structure is to be measured through analysis of staff satisfaction of relation with actors and evaluation of their respective agency's level of cooperation with the aforementioned actors.

Staff satisfaction with such aspects of child protection system structure as the existence of an entity within the government which oversees NGOs working in child protection, mechanisms at national level for coordination on child protection policies, legislation and programming, coalitions among agencies working on children and the goals of child protection being shared among similar agencies is measured. The midpoint value of a 5-point scale (2.5) is considered as a hypothesized mean against which the mean ratings of staff are checked for their significance using the one sample t-test. This means, if the mean rating of staff is significantly higher than the hypothesized mean, then we assume that they are satisfied with that particular structural element and vice versa. Results of the analysis are summarized below.

Table 4.5 One sample t-test for the mean ratings of staff satisfaction with their agency's child protection system structure

Aspects	Test Value= 2.5		t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)
	Mean Rating	Mean Difference			
Existence of an entity within the government which oversees NGOs working in child protection	5	2.5		17	
Regular monitoring of the quality of services	4.94	2.444	44.000	17	.000
Mechanisms at national level for coordination on child protection policies, legislation and programming	4.89	2.389	31.341	17	.000
Coalitions among agencies working on children	4.94	2.444	44.000	17	.000
The goals of child protection being shared among similar agencies	5	2.5		17	

As shown in Table 4.5, staff ratings of their satisfaction with all aspects of system structure are significantly greater than the hypothesized mean; ergo, we can assume that they are satisfied with their respective agency's child protection system structure.

Further analysis of data revealed that stronger relations and cooperation are established with government agencies and beneficiary children across the three NGOs. Though not statistically significant, there are differences among the agencies in terms of their level of cooperation with other agencies working on children and CBOs. The results are summarized below

Table 4.6 Nature of agency cooperation with various actors as perceived by staff

Actors	Agency						Total	χ^2	Sig(2 tailed)
	IFSO		EDA		4Killo				
	Strong	very strong	Strong	very strong	Strong	very strong			
Government	0	7	0	7	0	4	18	-----	
Agencies working on children	6	1	0	7	0	4	18	14.143	.001
CBOs	2	5	0	7	0	4	18	3.536	.171
Children	0	7	0	7	0	4	18	-----	

This is corroborated by children’s response on the frequency with which they participate in agency activities such as trainings which showed that the majority (89.7%) participate at least once a year. Moreover, children were asked about the frequency with which they participate in research and training activities organized by agencies; summary of the result is presented below.

Table 4.7 Frequency of children’s participation in trainings by agency

Agency	Never	Once a year	Twice a year	Total	χ^2	df	Sig(2-tailed)
IFSO	0	34(87.2%)	5(12.8%)	39	24.743	4	.000
EDA	0	39(100%)	0	39			
4KILLO	7(17.9%)	32(82.1%)	0	39			
TOTAL	7	105	5	117			

The results in Table 4.7 show that the majority of children participate in agency activities such as trainings and research once a year. There is also no statistically significant difference across children from the three agencies.

4.3.2. Function

In a systems approach to child protection, the major functions of agencies are governance and management. Governance refers to the translation of inputs (determinants) into output (performance); while management has to do with how financial and human resources are handled by agencies. In this study, organizational culture on child protection and the professional quality (qualification, motivation) of staff are considered as important input elements. The analysis in this section is premised on the assumption that ensuring quality of inputs is a necessary condition for the betterment of the system.

4.3.2.1. Governance

As noted in previous sections, in a child protection system, governance denotes the process of converting input (governance determinants) in to output (governance performance). Governance determinants are: There are professionals with relevant expertise on child protection, there are organizational policies and guidelines on child protection, there are mechanisms of monitoring and evaluation of services, there are agency values that promote the protection of children and the agency provides coordinated response to multiple risks. Staffs were asked if their respective agencies fulfill the aforementioned governance determinants; it is found that the three agencies fulfill all of the governance determinants.

Regarding governance performances, staffs were asked to evaluate their respective agencies in terms of: enforceability of agency policies and guidelines, the coordination of services for multiple risks, the integration of agency values and cultural contexts and social mobilization. Results of their evaluation are summarized below.

Table 4.8 Agency functions as perceived by staff

Aspects of function	Agencies						Total	χ^2	Sig(2 tailed)
	IFSO		EDA		4 Killo				
	G	VG	G	VG	G	VG			
Enforceability of agency policies and guidelines	3	4	2	5	1	3	18	0.482	.786
The coordination of services for multiple risks	1	6	0	7	1	3	18	1.728	.422
The integration of agency values and cultural contexts	0	7	0	7	1	3	18	3.706	.157
Social mobilization	0	7	0	7	1	3	18	3.706	.157

The results in table 4.8 show that staff ratings regarding the performance of the various child protection functions of their agencies are generally good. There is also no statistically significant difference among staff ratings across the three agencies.

Further analysis of data was conducted to see children's level of satisfaction with overall agency functions. The midpoint value of a 5-point scale (2.5) is considered as a hypothesized mean against which the mean ratings of children are checked for their significance using the one sample t-test. This means, if the mean rating of children is significantly higher than the hypothesized mean, then we assume that the children are satisfied with that particular protection function and vice versa. Results of the analysis are presented below.

respondents were asked to rate their respective agencies in terms of the aforesaid characteristics; results of their ratings are presented in the table below.

Table 4.10 Staff ratings of management functions

Aspects	Agencies						Total	χ^2	Sig(2 taile)
	IFSO		EDA		4Killo				
	G	VG	G	VG	G	VG			
Critical processes for the management of financial resources	2	5	0	7	1	3	18	2.314	.314
Capacity building and professional development of staff	2	5	0	7	4		18	11.6*	.003
Allocation of adequate human resource	0	7	0	7	1	3	18	3.706	.157
Coordination with other agencies	0	7	0	7	1	3	18	3.706	.157

The results in Table 4.10 depict that staff ratings of human resource management, particularly allocation, management and development, in their respective agencies is generally very good. There is also no statistically significant difference among the ratings of staff across the three agencies except for capacity building and professional development of staff. The rating of staff from 4Killo in lieu with capacity building and professional development of staff is significantly lower than that of IFSO and the rating of staff from IFSO staff is significantly lower than that of EDA.

4.3.2.2.2 Financial Management

It was found that the processes that govern the management of resources in the agencies are by and large directed by Proclamation No. 621/2009 which was enacted on 13 February 2009

taking effect as the overall legal framework under which charities, societies, associations, non-governmental and civil society organizations are governed.

As outlined in the Preamble of Proclamation No. 621/2009, the Charities and Societies Law has two basic objectives, namely, to: (1) realize citizens' constitutional right to freedom of association and (2) enhance and strengthen the role of charities in the overall development of Ethiopia. The proclamation further states that only Ethiopian Charities/Societies are allowed to work on human and democratic rights, religious, ethnic or gender equality, child rights and the right of disabled persons, conflict resolution and reconciliation, and supporting justice and law enforcement sectors. The Proclamation has provided for the establishment of an independent body called Charities and Societies Agency (ChSA) to oversee the activities of CSOs; which issues directives on: (1) Administration costs and Program costs (70/30)(2) Audit report and activity(3) Charitable committees(4) Charitable endowments(5) Consortium guidelines(6) Income generating activities(7) Property and Public collection

The major sources of funds for the agencies are Illsole (an Italian organization) for IFSO and CCFC (a Canadian organization) for EDA and 4 Killo CSCD. It was noted during interviews with staff that, with the proclamation's restrictions on the amount of funds that can be generated from foreign sources (which is less than 10%) and their major donors being foreign organizations, they are facing serious financial bottleneck.

4.3.3. Capacity

In this study, capacity refers to the human, financial and socio-cultural resources at the disposal of agencies. The capacity with which the agencies are operating is to be measured through analysis of data on staff and beneficiary children's evaluation of their respective

agency's human, financial and social capital. This section begins with analysis of data on staff and children's evaluation of their agency's human capacity; followed by analysis of data on financial capacity with emphasis on donors and their nature of influence on agency services. Finally, analysis of data on socio-cultural capacity is presented. Staff and children were asked to evaluate their respective agency's human resource capacity at agency, family and community levels. Results of their evaluation are summarized below.

Table 4.11 Agency human capacity as perceived by staff

Aspects	Agencies						Total	χ^2	Sig(2 taile)
	IFSO		EDA		4Killo				
	G	VG	G	VG	G	VG			
Is the agency workforce trained	2	5		7	1	3	18	2.314	.314
Family members and community residents have the knowledge and capacity to protect children		7		7	2	2	18	7.87*	.019
Is the physical agency setting suited to the work	2	5		7	2	2	18	3.949	.139
The physical structure of the community provide children basic protection	1	6		7	2	2	18	4.629	.099
Agency workers have the equipment they need to perform the job		7		7	2	2	18	7.87*	.019

The results in table 4.11 show that staff evaluation regarding the various aspects of human capacity is good across the three agencies. Moreover, there is no significant difference between respondents' rating across the three agencies except for: family members and community residents have the knowledge and capacity to protect children and agency workers have the equipment they need to perform the job. Staff from IFSO and EDA rated the communities they are working in to have better knowledge and capacity to protect children than 4Killo. Furthermore, the rating of staff from 4Killo is lower than the rest regarding having the

equipment they need to perform the job. Beneficiary children were also asked about their satisfaction with the overall agency capacity.

Table 4.12 Agency capacity as perceived by children

Aspects	Satisfaction			Total	χ^2	Sig(2 tailed)
	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied			
Agency staff with expertise on child protection		75(64.1%)	42(35.9%)	117	9.308	.002
Financial support provided	1(0.9%)	80(68.4%)	36(30.8%)	117	80.359	.000
Regular monitoring and evaluation of services		84(71.8%)	33(20.2%)	117	22.231	.000
Collaboration with authorities, institutions, other agencies, communities and families to improve services		75(64.1%)	42(35.9%)	117	9.308	.002
Relevance of services offered		76(65%)	41(35%)	117	10.470	.001
Variety of protective services provided		75(64.1%)	42(35.9%)	117	9.308	.002

Children’s satisfaction regarding the human resource capacity of agencies is high across the three agencies, as shown in table 4.12. There are statistically significant differences among their ratings across the agencies. The differences are particularly higher regarding financial support provided and regular monitoring and evaluation of services; their ratings are lower compared to the remaining aspects. The overall findings in Table 4.10 and Table 4.11 indicate that the satisfaction level of both staff and children respondents regarding their respective agency’s human resource capacity is high.

Staff respondents were also asked to evaluate their satisfaction regarding their respective agency’s socio-cultural capacity; which involved aspects of: The values, beliefs and expectations

of effective protection are shared by communities, Staff, children and communities are committed and engaged in child protection activities, The agency values continuous monitoring and evaluation and uses feedback to improve services and The beliefs, values, attitudes and ethos of communities in which you operate are in line with your agency's values. Results of their evaluation are summarized in the table below.

Table 4.13 Agency socio-cultural capacity as perceived by staff

Aspects	Agency Satisfaction						Total	χ^2	Sig(2 tailed)
	IFSO		EDA		4Killo				
	Sat	V.Sat	Sat	V.Sat	Sat	V.Sat			
Family support and community development is valued	0	7	0	7	1	3	18	3.71	.157
The values, beliefs and expectations of effective protection are shared by communities	0	7	0	7	1	3	18	3.71	.157
Staff, children and communities are committed and engaged in child protection activities	0	7	0	7	2	2	18	7.87*	.019
The agency values continuous monitoring and evaluation and uses feedback to improve services	0	7	0	7	1	3	18	3.71	.157
The beliefs, values, attitudes and ethos of communities in which you operate are in line with your agency's values	0	7	0	7	2	2	18	7.87*	.019

The results in Table 4.13 show that staff satisfaction regarding the overall socio-cultural capacity of agencies is high across the three agencies. There is no significant difference between

respondents' ratings of their satisfaction across the agencies except for two aspects. The satisfaction level of staff from EDA and IFSO is significantly higher than staff from 4Killo regarding staff, children and communities are committed and engaged in child protection activities and the values, beliefs and expectations of effective protection are shared by communities.

Staff respondents were also asked about the nature and level of donors' influence on agency services. Majority of the respondents stated that their donors are actually involved in child centered work, are committed to supporting agency work and share agency values. Moreover, had it not been for the limitations posed by the new charities and societies proclamation, they would have contributed immensely to the betterment of beneficiary children's lives.

4.4. Child Protection Practice

The child protection practice in agencies is measured in terms of its efficacy and sustainability; the former denoting the reduction of protective risks and the later creation of an enabling environment where children can flourish. Findings of data analysis on the efficacy and sustainability of services as measured by children and staff level of satisfaction is presented in this section.

4.4.1. Efficacy

In this study, the effectiveness of child protection system is viewed in terms the extent to which it has attained its goals. As noted in preceding sections, the goal of any child protection system is the protection of children from abuse, exploitation and neglect and the creation of an enabling environment. Thus, this section presents findings concerning the effectiveness of

existing child protection practices in terms of: the state of implementation of child protection activities, comparison with best practices and children's evaluation of services.

Staff respondents were asked to evaluate the state of implementation of child protection activities in their respective agency based on a given list of possible parameters. Their responses showed that none of the three agencies had completely implemented all of the activities.

Therefore, the analysis could concentrate on the activities that are being implemented. In general, about two-thirds of respondents from IFSO labeled it as active; while about half of the respondents from EDA and 4Killo labeled their agencies active in implementing aspects of child protection system. These differences were however not statistically significant.

Table 4.14 The state of implementation of child protection activities as perceived by staff

Practice	Agency						χ^2	Sig(2-tailed)
	IFSO		EDA		4 Killo			
	Yes	T	Yes	T	Yes	T		
There are organizational policies and guidelines on child protection	7(100%)	7	5(71.4%)	7	4(100%)	4	3.94	.786
There are mechanisms of monitoring and evaluation of services	7(100%)	7	7(100%)	7	4(100%)	4		
There are agency values that promote the protection of children	5(71.4%)	7	5(71.4%)	7	2(50%)	4	0.72	.157
Training, finance and other logistical support is provided to CBOs	4(57.1%)	7	3(42.9%)	7	2(50%)	4	0.4	.413
Community members and teachers have been trained and are key actors in preventing child abuse and reporting when it occurred	3(42.9%)	7	3(42.9%)	7	1(20%)	4	0.48	.422

Children were also asked to rate their benefactor agency's engagement in child protection activities; about 23% (N=9) from 4 Killo, 51% (N=20) from EDA and 62% (N=24) from IFSO rated their agency's engagement as good. There is also a significant difference between children's ratings across the three agencies ($\chi^2=30.92$, df 8, $P < 0.05$). Majority of the children from IFSO perceive the child protection services in the agency to be effective. About half of the children from EDA perceive services of the agency are effective; whereas, the majority of children from 4 Killo do not perceive the agency services to be effective. Staff respondents were also asked to rate their agency based on five sets of good practice parameters; results of their rating are presented below.

Table 4.15 Staff rating of agency services

Aspects	Agencies						Total	χ^2	Sig. (2tailed)
	IFSO		EDA		4Killo				
	G	VG	G	VG	G	VG			
Incorporating and building upon existing local supports for children	3	4	0	7	2	2	18	4.47	.104
Encouraging genuine child participation	3	4	0	7	2	2	18	4.47	.107
Providing ongoing contextually appropriate training and capacity building and material supports to beneficiaries	0	7	0	7	2	2	18	7.8*	.019
Using a systems approach to child protection	0	7	0	7	2	2	18	7.8*	.019
There is support from community leaders	2	5	0	7	3	1	18	7.14	.028

The results in Table 4.15 show that respondents' rating of their agency's service effectiveness is high across the three agencies. There is however statistically significant difference between their ratings especially for providing ongoing contextually appropriate

training and capacity building and material supports to beneficiaries and using a systems approach to child protection. The rating of 4Killo is significantly lower in both aspects.

Further analysis of data was conducted on the effectiveness of agency services; this time using children’s evaluation of agency services. The midpoint value of a 5-point scale (2.5) is considered as a hypothesized mean against which the mean ratings of children are checked for their significance using the one sample t-test. This means, if the mean rating of children is significantly higher than the hypothesized mean, then we assume that they consider that particular service effective and vice versa. Results of the analysis are summarized below.

Table 4.16 One sample t-test for the mean ratings of children’s satisfaction with efficiency

Services	Test value=2.5		t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)
	Mean rating	Mean Difference			
Ensuring a Better Quality of Life for Families through the Developmental services	4.37	1.868	34.751	116	.000
Teaching Children and Caregivers about Personal Safety and Developing Resources for Families	4.38	1.876	37.788	116	.000
Detering the Abuse of children through Education and Community Awareness	4.41	1.910	41.827	116	.000
Providing Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Services	4.24	1.739	43.906	116	.000
Creating and Promoting Well-Being and Fostering Children’s Participation in Society	4.26	1.756	43.323	116	.000
Raising Awareness about Child Abuse and Family Violence through Training and Education	4.26	1.756	43.323	116	.000
Supporting Child Development by Encouraging Community Participation, Child Rights and Child Protection	4.32	1.816	42.067	116	.000

As is seen in Table 4.16 above, the mean ratings of children are significantly greater than the hypothesized mean; ergo, it is fair to assume that they consider those services to be effective.

4.4.2. Sustainability

For the purpose of this study, sustainability is measured in relation to the extent to which, as a result of agency services (1) children are better aware of their rights (2) children are active participants in child protective activities (3) families are better able to provide for their children and avoided violence, (4) communities implement child protection activities and (5) institutions such as schools have adopted protection systems. These will be examined by the relationship between the duration of service reception and children's awareness and participation in child protection, staff evaluation of their respective agency in terms of the aforementioned parameters.

Analysis of data was conducted to further investigate the aforementioned relationship based on children's satisfaction with their protective gains at the agency. Accordingly, children were asked to rate their level of satisfaction regarding their protection gain on five competencies. The midpoint value of a five point scale (2.5) is considered as a hypothesized mean against which the mean ratings of children are checked for their significance using the one sample t-test. This means, if the mean rating of children is significantly higher than the hypothesized mean, then we assume that the children are satisfied with that particular protection competence and vice versa. Results of the analysis are presented below

Table 4.17 One sample t-test for the mean ratings of children’s satisfaction with the protective competencies gained

Competencies	Test value=2.5		t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)
	Mean rating	Mean Difference			
Awareness of child rights	4.02	1.517	22.452	116	.000
Participation in CLGs at school	4.07	1.568	25.982	116	.000
Reporting of children with protective risks	3.93	1.432	20.938	116	.000
Reporting incidents of abuse	3.91	1.415	17.859	116	.000
Communicating messages of child protection to your community	3.98	1.483	23.965	116	.000
Communicating messages of child protection to other children	3.96	1.457	23.367	116	.000

The results in Table 4.17 show that children’s mean ratings of their satisfaction with: awareness of child rights and protection concerns and participation in child protection activities, reporting of children with protective risks, reporting incidents of abuse, communicating messages of child protection to your community and communicating messages of child protection to other children are significantly higher than their respective hypothesized means. As a result, we can assume that the children are satisfied with their gains in these competencies. However, children’s satisfaction with their competencies of reporting of children with protective risks and reporting their own incidents of abuse are relatively lower.

Furthermore, agency staff were asked on a 5-point scale to rate their level of satisfaction regarding their benefactors’ protective gains on four aspects. The value 2.5, the midpoint of the 5-point scale, is considered as a hypothesized mean against which the mean ratings of staff are checked for their significance using the one sample t-test. This means, if the mean rating of staff

is significantly higher than the hypothesized mean, then we assume that they are satisfied with that aspect and vice versa. Summary of the results is presented below.

Table 4.18 One sample t-test for the mean ratings of staff satisfaction with the protective gains of beneficiaries

Competencies	Test value= 2.5				
	Mean rating	Mean Difference	t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)
Children are better aware of their rights	4.89	2.389	31.341	17	.000
Families are better able to provide for their children and avoided violence	4.72	2.222	20.456	17	.000
Communities implement child protection activities	4.89	2.389	31.341	17	.000
Institutions such as schools have adopted protection systems	4.89	2.389	31.341	17	.000

As is seen in Table 4.18, the mean ratings of staff respondents regarding their satisfaction with the four aspects of protective gains for beneficiaries are significantly higher than the hypothesized mean. Ergo, we can assume that they are satisfied by the protective gains of beneficiaries. The results particularly relating to protective work at the community and school levels seem to contradict with the results from children's data. Further analysis of data on children's sources of information on reporting mechanisms and who they prefer reporting incidents to suggests that sources of information on mechanisms of reporting incidents of abuse for almost all children are family members and/or neighbors. In addition, their participation in CLGs at schools is not entirely dependent on their own will; rather, inability to spend the extra time required to be involved in the activities of clubs, which their parents will not allow, prevents them from participation.

4.5. State of the Child Protection System and Practice in NGOs

This section deals with analysis of empirical data pertaining to the efficacy and sustainability of child protective services in NGOs. Data obtained from various sources will be quantitatively analyzed in order to demonstrate how child protection system inputs (structure, function and capacity) influence the, processes and outputs (efficacy and sustainability) of child protection practice in agencies and in turn the protection of children. The section begins with analysis of data on the relation between child protection system structure and the efficacy and sustainability of services; followed by analysis of data on the relation between child protection system functions and the efficacy and sustainability of services. Finally, analysis of data on the relation between child protection system capacity and the efficacy and sustainability of services will be presented.

4.5.1. Structure vis-à-vis Efficacy and Sustainability

As has been discussed in previous sections, the structure of a child protection system denotes the relationship and cooperation among actors in the child protection system. Actors in a child protection system include: government, families, communities, agencies working on child protection and children themselves. As is discussed in section 4.3, staff respondents are satisfied with their respective agency's relation with those actors and rate their level of cooperation to be by and large strong. In this section, an attempt is made to see the relation between cooperation with the various actors and the efficacy and sustainability of services. Analysis of the result is presented below.

Table 4.19 Correlation matrix of Structure variables with Efficacy (Cross-sectional data)

Variables	Variables					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1.Efficacy of services	1					
2.An entity within the government which oversees NGOs working on child protection	.050	1				
3.Regular monitoring of the quality of services	.605* *	.500*	1			
4.Mechanisms at national level for coordination on child protection policies, legislation and programming	-.012		-.086	1		
5.Coalitions among agencies working on children	-.009		-.059	-.086	1	
6.The goals of child protection are shared among similar agencies						1

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)*Correlation is significant at 0.05 level

The results in table 4.19 depict that the efficacy of services has a significant positive relationship with only regular monitoring of the quality of services ($r=.605$, $p<.01$). In addition, regular monitoring of the quality of services has a significant positive relationship with the existence of an entity within the government which oversees NGOs working on child protection ($r=.500$, $p<.05$). The remaining variables either don't have or have a negative relationship with each other. Next, let us examine the nature of relation between structure variables and the sustainability of agency services. Analysis of the results is presented as follows.

Table 4.20 Correlation matrix of Structure variables with Sustainability (Cross-sectional data)

Variables	Variables					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1.Sustainability of services	1					
2.An entity within the government which oversees NGOs working on child protection		1				
3.Regular monitoring of the quality of services	.739* *		1			
4.Mechanisms at national level for coordination on child protection policies, legislation and programming	.124		-.086	1		
5.Coalitions among agencies working on children	.085		-.059	-.086	1	
6.The goals of child protection are shared among similar agencies						1

The results in table 4.20 depict that the sustainability of services has a significant positive relationship with only regular monitoring of the quality of services ($r=.739$, $p<.01$). Though not significant, the sustainability of services has a positive relationship with the existence of mechanisms at national level for coordination on child protection policies, legislation and programming and coalitions among agencies working on children.

Finally, analysis of data was conducted to see the relationship between the duration of time children have been receiving services from agencies and their level of awareness and participation in child protective activities. Results of the analysis are presented below

Table 4.21 Correlation matrix of child variables (Cross-sectional data)

Variables	Variables					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Number of years receiving services	1					
2. Awareness of reporting mechanisms	.338 *	1				
3. Participation in CLG at school	.315 *	.586**	1			
4. Awareness of children's rights	.244 *	.642**	.536*	1		
5. Awareness of other NGOs working on child protection	.352 *	.802**	.64**	.42*	1	
6. Participation in child protection activities	.300*	.739**	.514*	.83**	.50*	1

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed) * Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Results in Table 4.21 Show that the number of years children have been receiving services is significantly related with their awareness of reporting mechanisms, participation in CLG at school, awareness of children's rights, awareness of other NGOs working on child protection and participation in child protection activities. In addition, there is also a significant relation between children's awareness of reporting mechanisms and participation in CLG at schools. Moreover, there is significant relation between children's awareness of reporting mechanisms, their participation in CLGs and their awareness of child rights. Furthermore, children's awareness of reporting mechanisms, participation in CLGs, awareness of child rights and awareness of other NGOs working on child protection are directly related to their participation in child protection activities. The positive and significant relationship between duration of service receipt and their awareness of reporting mechanisms, participation in CLG at

school, awareness of children’s rights, awareness of other NGOs working on child protection and participation in child protection activities signifies that the number of years children have been receiving services is a strong predictor of their overall awareness of and participation in child protection.

4.5.2. Function vis-à-vis Efficacy and Sustainability

Governance and management are the primary functions of a child protection system.

Analysis of data was conducted to see the relationship between these variables and the efficacy and sustainability of services. Results of the analysis are summarized below.

Table 4.22 Correlation Matrix for Governance variables with Efficacy

Variables	Variables					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Efficacy	1					
2. Enforceability of agency policies and guidelines	.199	1				
3. The coordination of services for multiple risks	.547*	.125	1			
4. The involvement of children, communities and other stakeholders	.605**	.343	.686**	1		
5. The integration of agency values and cultural contexts	.605**	.343	.686**	1.00**	1	
6. Social mobilization	.605**	.343	.686**	1.00**	1.00**	1

The results in Table 4.22 show that the efficacy of child protection practice is significantly correlated with all governance variables but enforceability of agency policies and guidelines. In addition, the enforceability of agency policies and guidelines does not have significant relation with the remaining governance variables. On the other hand, the coordination

of services for multiple risks is significantly correlated with the involvement of children, communities and other stakeholders, the integration of agency values and cultural contexts and social mobilization. Moreover, the integration of agency values and cultural contexts is perfectly correlated with social mobilization. The positive and significant relation among governance variables and in relation to the efficacy of services attests to the fact that the governance of a child protection system is an important predictor for child protection practices.

Table 4.23 Correlation Matrix for Governance variables with Sustainability

Variables	Variables					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Sustainability	1					
2. Enforceability of agency policies and guidelines	.035	1				
3. The coordination of services for multiple risks	.282	.125	1			
4. The involvement of children, communities and other stakeholders	.521*	.343	.686**	1		
5. The integration of agency values and cultural contexts	.521*	.343	.686**	1.00**	1	
6. Social mobilization	.521*	.343	.686**	1.00**	1.00**	1

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed) * Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Results in Table 4.23 show that the sustainability of child protection practices is significantly correlated with governance variables: the involvement of children, communities and other stakeholders, the integration of agency values and cultural contexts and social mobilization. The enforceability of agency policies and coordination of services for multiple risks are not significantly correlated with the sustainability of services. The coordination of services for multiple risks, however, is significantly related with the involvement of children, communities

and other stakeholders, the integration of agency values and cultural contexts and social mobilization.

4.5.2.1. Management vis-à-vis Efficacy and Sustainability

Analysis of data on the relationship between management of financial, human and informational resources and the efficacy and sustainability of services revealed that: management variables of Capacity building and professional development of staff, Allocation of adequate human resource and Coordination with child protection agencies and service providers are important predictors of the sustainability of services while Critical processes for the management of financial resources is not. On the other hand, Allocation of adequate human resource and Coordination with child protection agencies and service providers are important predictors for the efficacy of services; while Critical processes for the management of financial resources and Capacity building and professional development of staff are not significantly correlated with the efficacy of services. Results of the analysis are presented in tables 4.24 and 4.25 below.

Table 4.24 Correlation Matrix for Management variables with Sustainability

Variables	Variables				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Sustainability	1				
2. Critical processes for the management of financial resources	.290	1			
3. Capacity building and professional development of staff	.565*	.000	1		
4. Allocation of adequate human resource	.521*	.542*	.343	1	
5. Coordination with child protection agencies and service providers	.521*	.542*	.343	1.00**	1

Table 4.25 Correlation Matrix for Management variables with Efficacy

Variables	Variables				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Efficacy	1				
2. Critical processes for the management of financial resources	.362	1			
3. Capacity building and professional development of staff	.423	.000	1		
4. Allocation of adequate human resource	.605**	.542*	.343	1	
5. Coordination with child protection agencies and service providers	.605**	.542*	.343	1.00**	1

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed) * Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

As shown in the tables above, management variables have a positive and significant relation with the efficacy and sustainability of services; which is a testament to the fact that the management of a child protection system is an important predictor of the efficacy and sustainability of a child protection practice.

4.5.3. *Capacity vis-à-vis Efficacy and Sustainability*

In this section, analysis of data on the relation between the capacity variables of a child protection system and the efficacy and sustainability of practices is presented. As is shown in table 4.25 below, capacity variables: Family members and community residents have the knowledge and capacity to protect children, the physical agency setting is suited to the work, The physical structure of the community provide children basic protection and Agency workers have the equipment they need to perform the job have a positive and significant relation with the

efficacy of child protection practice; while the agency workforce being trained is not an important predictor of the efficacy of services.

Table 4.26 Correlation Matrix for Capacity variables with Efficacy

Variables	Variables					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Efficacy	1					
2. Is the agency workforce trained	.267	1				
3. Family members and community residents have the knowledge and capacity to protect children	.883**	.316	1			
4. Is the physical agency setting suited to the work	.573*	.837**	.661**	1		
5. The physical structure of the community provide children basic protection	.739**	.600**	.791**	.837**	1	
6. Agency workers have the equipment they need to perform the job	.883**	.316	1.00**	.661**	.791**	1

Moreover, capacity variables: Family members and community residents have the knowledge and capacity to protect children, the physical agency setting is suited to the work, The physical structure of the community provide children basic protection and Agency workers have the equipment they need to perform the job have a positive and significant relation with the sustainability of child protection practice; while the agency workforce being trained is not an important predictor of the sustainability of services. Due to the positive and significant relation between capacity variables and the efficacy and sustainability of services, we can conclude that the capacity of a child protection system is an important predictor for the efficacy and sustainability of a child protection practice.

Table 4.27 Correlation Matrix for Capacity variables with Sustainability

Variables	Variables					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Sustainability	1					
2. Is the agency workforce trained	.290	1				
3. Family members and community residents have the knowledge and capacity to protect children	.918**	.316	1			
4. Is the physical agency setting suited to the work	.667**	.837**	.661**	1		
5. The physical structure of the community provide children basic protection	.826**	.600**	.791**	.837**	1	
6. Agency workers have the equipment they need to perform the job	.918**	.316	1.00**	.661**	.791**	1

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed) *Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

4.6. Convergence and/or Divergence in Child Protection Practices among the Agencies

In this section, additional analyses of data were conducted to see if there are differences on staff and children's perceptions concerning the child protection system and practice in their respective agencies. The analysis involves combined scores of staff and children's ratings on actual child protection practices and system components. The combined scores for the actual child protection system and practice are derived from questionnaire items concerning respondents' ratings of: the nature of cooperation with other child protection actors, governance and management functions, agency capacity and practice variables of efficacy and sustainability.

Table 4.28 ANOVA on the differences of perceptions of staff concerning efficacy and sustainability of services by Structure

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Efficacy of services	Between Groups	4.587	1	4.587	1.819	.196
	Within Groups	40.357	16	2.522		
	Total	44.944	17			
Sustainability of services	Between Groups	6.671	1	6.671	6.839	.019
	Within Groups	15.607	16	.975		
	Total	22.278	17			

The ANOVA results in Table 4.28 show that there is no significant difference among the three agencies concerning the structure of their child protection system and the resulting efficacy and sustainability of services as perceived by staff respondents.

Table 4.29 ANOVA on the differences of perceptions of staff concerning efficacy and sustainability of services by governance

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Efficacy of services	Between Groups	16.763	2	8.381	4.461	.030
	Within Groups	28.182	15	1.879		
	Total	44.944	17			
Sustainability of services	Between Groups	6.899	2	3.449	3.365	.062
	Within Groups	15.379	15	1.025		
	Total	22.278	17			

The ANOVA results in Table 4.29 also show that there is no significant difference among the three agencies concerning the governance of their child protection system and the resulting efficacy and sustainability of services as perceived by staff respondents.

Table 4.30 ANOVA on the differences of perceptions of staff concerning efficacy and sustainability of services by management

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Efficacy of services	Between Groups	19.016	2	9.508	5.500	.016
	Within Groups	25.929	15	1.729		
	Total	44.944	17			
Sustainability of services	Between Groups	9.378	2	4.689	5.452	.017
	Within Groups	12.900	15	.860		
	Total	22.278	17			

The ANOVA results in Table 4.30 also show that there is no significant difference among the three agencies concerning the management of their child protection system and the resulting efficacy and sustainability of services as perceived by staff respondents.

Table 4.31 ANOVA on the differences of perceptions of staff concerning efficacy and sustainability of services by Capacity

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Efficacy of services	Between Groups	35.516	4	8.879	12.242	.000
	Within Groups	9.429	13	.725		
	Total	44.944	17			
Sustainability of services	Between Groups	19.921	4	4.980	27.466	.000
	Within Groups	2.357	13	.181		
	Total	22.278	17			

Moreover, as is shown by the ANOVA results in Table 4.31, there is no significant difference among the three agencies concerning the capacity of their child protection system and the resulting efficacy and sustainability of services as perceived by staff respondents. As is the case with staff respondents, ANOVA of data on children's evaluation of agency services indicates that there is no significant difference among their ratings of agency services across the three agencies.

Table 4.32 ANOVA on the differences of perceptions of children concerning efficacy and sustainability of services by agency

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Efficacy of services	Between Groups	4856.017	2	2428.009	270.712	.000
	Within Groups	1022.462	114	8.969		
	Total	5878.479	116			
Sustainability of services	Between Groups	707.915	2	353.957	63.712	.000
	Within Groups	633.333	114	5.556		
	Total	1341.248	116			

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter provides summary and discussion of the major empirical findings of the study vis-à-vis the research questions. The first section provides discussion of the findings on the availability, accessibility, use and effectiveness of child protection services and systems. The next section deals with a discussion of the state of child protection system in NGOs; followed by a discussion of the child protection practice. Following these, the methodological reflections: reliability, validity, and limitations of the study will be presented. Finally, conclusions, further reflections and implications of the study for improved child protection policy, system and practice are drawn and discussed.

5.1. Availability, Accessibility, Use and Effectiveness of Child Protection Services and Systems

The first research question of the study is: What is children's perception of the availability, accessibility, use and effectiveness of child protection services and systems? The discussion here focuses on major findings concerning: children's knowledge of the procedures to report incidents of abuse and exploitation, their attitude toward getting proper support and treatment if they reported incidents to the authorities, how they deal with protection risks they face and their knowledge of and participation in child protective activities at school and in their community.

Findings of the study have demonstrated that most of the children have some knowledge about the procedures of reporting incidents of abuse and exploitation. The sources of information on this are found to be, by and large, family, friends and/or neighbors. Nonetheless, children noted that they don't usually report incidents to authorities; rather, they prefer telling friends or

family members. Problems of accessibility and fear of “not being taken seriously” are reported to be the major challenges against reporting incidents to authorities.

Regarding their knowledge of and participation in child protective activities at school and in their community, the majority of child respondents are aware of the existence of school-based child led groups, CBOs and NGOs in their community. The participation of children is, however, limited to school-based child led groups. Despite their keen will, children’s participation in the clubs is constrained by both organizational and family factors. At the organizational level, restrictions on the number of members a club can have and lack of parental consent to spend time after school which is required by the clubs.

From the findings above, it is evident that components of the child protection system, especially formal ones, are not accessible to children. Granted they are not even close to being enough, formal mechanisms adjudicated with addressing child protection issues are in existence. Despite their scale of services, they are not children’s primary “go-to”. Owing to their inaccessibility and social stereotypes, though maybe not of their own making, they have definitely reinforced, they are regarded as forces of fear than rescue. Consequently, they are perceived by children ineffective in providing protection. Moreover, children’s major outlet of participation in protective activities, which they believe has an immense contribution in being able to exchange information with peers and identifying and dealing with their concerns, is largely dependent on the good will of schools and family.

Despite its faults and flaws, the informal (family and community) component of the child protection system is proving vital in providing information on and dealing with the protective risks of children. Considering the fact that the abuse, exploitation and maltreatment of children

takes place by and large in this setting, addressing children's cry for a strong voice in it is an unequivocal first step in improving the protection of children. Furthermore, it elucidates the fact that any child protection system that fails to incorporate and build upon its informal component is doomed to be ineffective.

Child-led groups are perceived by children to be vital instruments of sharing information, developing confidence, dealing with their problems by themselves and rendering them a strong voice in their family, school and community. As a result, removing their constraints of participation, strengthening, training and equipping these clubs can make insurmountable differences in ensuring children's voices are heard.

5.2. Child Protection System in NGOs

The second research question is: What is the perception of children and staff regarding what the NGOs are actually doing in terms of protecting children and the structure, function and capacity of their services? This section discusses findings on the structure, function and capacity of the child protection system in the NGOs vis-à-vis beneficiary children's protective gains.

5.2.1. Structure

As discussed in previous chapters, in child protection system terms, structure refers to the level of relation and cooperation among the various actors in the system. The findings on this demonstrate the existence of an entity within the government which oversees NGOs working in child protection, regular monitoring of the quality of services, mechanisms at national level for coordination on child protection policies, legislation and programming, coalitions among agencies working on children and that the goals of child protection are shared among similar agencies. Moreover, strong cooperation is reported to have been established between the NGOs

which participated in the study and government organizations, other agencies working on children, CBOs and beneficiary children.

So as to corroborate this, children were asked about their level of participation in trainings, research and other activities organized by the agencies. It was found that the majority of children participate in such activities at least once a year. The majority of these activities are reported to have been aimed at disseminating messages of protecting children from abuse and maltreatment.

The relationship these agencies have established with the aforementioned actors has various manifestations. Government organizations are involved in the selection of areas of operation, identification of vulnerable families and children and licensing among others. Other agencies working on children are vital in sharing resources, information and best practices. CBOs are also formed, trained and strengthened in order for them to have the knowledge and capacity to protect children in the community setting. Besides their participation in training, research and other events, children and their families are the primary sources of information in the betterment of services.

5.2.2. Function

Governance and management are the primary factions of a child protection system. Governance denotes the process of converting input (governance determinants) in to output (governance performance). Regarding governance determinants, it is found that the three agencies fulfill all of the governance determinants: there are professionals with relevant expertise on child protection, there are organizational policies and guidelines on child protection, there are

mechanisms of monitoring and evaluation of services, there are agency values that promote the protection of children and the agency provides coordinated response to multiple risks.

Regarding governance performances, staffs were asked to evaluate their respective agencies in terms of: enforceability of agency policies and guidelines, the coordination of services for multiple risks, the integration of agency values and cultural contexts and social mobilization. It is found that the performance of child protection functions by the agencies is generally good. Moreover, participant children have reported to be satisfied with the overall functions of their respective benefactors.

Human resource management, particularly allocation, management and development, in the respective agencies is found to be generally very good. However, capacity building and professional development of staff is found to be lower.

It was found that the processes that govern the management of financial resources in the agencies are by and large directed by Proclamation No. 621/2009 which was enacted on 13 February 2009 taking effect as the overall legal framework under which charities, societies, associations, non-governmental and civil society organizations are governed. It was noted during interviews with staff that, with the proclamation's restrictions on the amount of funds that can be generated from foreign sources (which is less than 10%) and their major donors being foreign organizations, they are facing serious financial bottleneck.

5.2.3. Capacity

In this study, capacity refers to the human, financial and socio-cultural resources at the disposal of agencies. The findings depict that children are satisfied with such aspects of agency capacity as: agency staff with expertise on child protection, financial support provided, regular

monitoring and evaluation of services, collaboration with authorities, institutions, other agencies, communities and families to improve services, relevance of services offered and variety of protective services provided.

In addition, both children and staff are satisfied with such aspects of agency capacity as: family support and community development is valued, the values, beliefs and expectations of effective protection are shared by communities, The beliefs, values, attitudes and ethos of communities in which you operate are in line with your agency's values and Staff, children and communities are committed and engaged in child protection activities.

Majority of the respondents also stated that their donors are actually involved in child centered work, are committed to supporting agency work and share agency values. Moreover, had it not been for the limitations posed by the new charities and societies proclamation, they would have contributed immensely to the betterment of beneficiary children's lives.

5.3. Child Protection Practice in NGOs

The third research question of the study is: What is the perception of children and staff regarding the actual practice of child protection in NGOs and the extent to which services are effective and sustainable? To this end, it was found that services are effective in terms of: incorporating and building upon existing local supports for children, encouraging genuine child participation, providing ongoing contextually appropriate training and capacity building and material supports to beneficiaries, using a systems approach to child protection and support from community leaders. Moreover, children are satisfied with agency services pertaining to: ensuring a better quality of life for families through the developmental services, creating and promoting

well-being and fostering children's Participation in society and supporting child development by encouraging community participation, child rights and child protection among others.

Regarding the sustainability of services, the findings indicate that as a result of agency services, children are better aware of their rights, families are better able to provide for their children and avoided violence, communities implement child protection activities and institutions such as schools have adopted protection systems. Children are also satisfied with their awareness of child rights, participation in CLGs at school, reporting incidents of abuse and communicating messages of child protection to friends and the community.

5.4. State of the Child Protection System and Practice in NGOs

The fourth research question of the study is: what is the relation between child protection system and its implementation in NGOs? What is needed for improvement? And how can that happen? This is answered by examining the relationship between the structure, function and capacity of child protection system and the efficacy and sustainability of services.

The structure of child protection system, especially the regular monitoring of the quality of services has a significant positive relationship with the existence of an entity within the government which oversees NGOs working on child protection and in turn the efficacy of services. Moreover, the sustainability of services has a positive relationship with only regular monitoring of the quality of services, the existence of mechanisms at national level for coordination on child protection policies, legislation and programming and coalitions among agencies working on children.

With regard to children's participation, the findings indicate that the duration of time children have been receiving services from the agencies and their awareness of reporting

mechanisms, participation in CLG at school, awareness of children's rights, awareness of other NGOs working on child protection and participation in child protection activities have a positive and significant relationship; signifying that the number of years children have been receiving services is a strong predictor of their overall awareness of and participation in child protection.

The coordination of services for multiple risks, the involvement of children, communities and other stakeholders, the integration of agency values and cultural contexts and social mobilization have a positive and significant relation among themselves and in relation to the efficacy of services attesting to the fact that the governance of a child protection system is an important predictor for the efficiency of services. Moreover, the sustainability of child protection practices is significantly correlated with governance variables: the involvement of children, communities and other stakeholders, the integration of agency values and cultural contexts and social mobilization.

Critical processes for the management of financial resources, Capacity building and professional development of staff, Allocation of adequate human resource and Coordination with child protection agencies and service providers have a positive and significant relation with the efficacy and sustainability of services.

Agency capacity manifested by: Family members and community residents have the knowledge and capacity to protect children, the physical agency setting is suited to the work, The physical structure of the community provide children basic protection and Agency workers have the equipment they need to perform the job has a positive and significant relation with the sustainability and efficiency of child protection practices.

The fifth research question is: Are there similarities and/or differences among NGOs regarding their child protection systems and practices? To this end, the findings depict that there is no significant difference among the three agencies concerning the structure, function and capacity of their child protection system and the resulting efficacy and sustainability of services.

5.5. Methodological reflections: Reliability, Validity, and Limitations

The conceptual framework of the study, which was developed based on the main concepts and assumptions of systems theory together with literature on a systems approach to child protection contributed toward an understanding of agency specific system and practice of child protection. This was supported by the empirical findings of the study.

The mixed methods approach, which involves the collection of data drawn from different sources and at different time points, and analyzed through different methods both quantitative and qualitative, was used so as to be able to get comprehensive insights about the topic under study. In essence, the use of mixed methods research is to improve validity of theoretical propositions and obtain a more complete picture of the phenomenon under study (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006). The term legitimation is used by authors of mixed methods to refer to the credibility (replacement for quantitative concept of internal validity), transferability (replacement for quantitative concept of external validity), dependability (replacement for quantitative concept of reliability), and confirmability (replacement for quantitative concept of objectivity) of findings and inferences (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2006).

Four types of legitimation were considered in this study: sample integration, inside-outside validation, weakness minimization legitimation and paradigmatic mixing legitimation. Selecting and involving relatively representative samples for both quantitative and

qualitative components of the study maintained the first legitimization type. The selection of the three Ethiopian resident's charities provides an important insight about the study's topic in the Ethiopian NGOs setting. Quantitative data drawn from large random samples of children and staff were integrated with qualitative data collected from a subset of these samples.

With regard to the second legitimization type, an attempt was made to accurately present and utilize the views and perceptions of all participants concerning the topic under study. Presenting preliminary findings to peers and discussions about the conceptualizations, interpretations and conclusions being made from the data were used to ensure the insider-outsider legitimization of the study. Careful and systematic combination of quantitative and qualitative components of the study in analyzing, weighting and interpreting the results enables to ensure the minimization of weaknesses legitimization. In this study, inter-subjective approach to knowledge generation and complementarity of methods are the bases of the paradigm assumption; and, designing systematic interview questions, establishing rapport with interviewees, recording and accurate transcription of interviews have also contributed to improve reliability in this study.

This study has several limitations that might suggest future research. First, the study focuses on NGOs. State sponsored social services are not treated in this study for reasons that the magnitude and capacity of services is relatively lower. The focus is on micro level data analysis, particularly organizational level practices.

Second, some limitations are inherent in the measurement of variables related to child protective practices. The study employed proxy indicators such as: children's level of knowledge on child rights, children's level of participation in protective activities as measured by their

participation in CLGs, research and training activities among others and children's perceived availability, accessibility, use and effectiveness of services as well as staff satisfaction with regard to children's protective gains and efficiency of services. Hence, the findings limit our understanding of macro level child protection systems and practices in the Ethiopian context. These limitations point to future research.

5.6. Conclusions and Implications of the study

The findings in this study provided useful insights regarding the adoption and practice of a systems approach to child protection in NGOs. The first theoretically relevant insight emerged in this study is that establishing a better relation and forging cooperation with the various actors in a child protection system is an important first step in ensuring the efficiency and sustainability of services.

The conceptual model of this study was based on two major assumptions concerning the adoption and implementation of a systems approach to child protection. First, enhancing the quality of services in general and the protection of children in particular is the primary responsibility of agencies working on children and this is influenced directly by the child protection system in agencies. Second, the efficiency and sustainability of child protective services is directly related to the structure, function and capacity of child protection systems in agencies. Empirical findings of the study demonstrated that government administered mechanisms of child protection, though mildly available, are not accessible and effective in protecting children from abuse and exploitation. Consequently, children resort to the informal component (family, peers and community) both to report incidents and deal with protective risks. Moreover, the availability and accessibility of recreational, educational and healthcare facilities

in their community is low. These attest to the fact that the protection of children from abuse and maltreatment and the enhancement of their well-being require the contribution of and cooperation between numerous actors i.e. a systems approach.

At the structural level of the child protection system, the agencies have established a strong cooperation with government organizations, other NGOs, CBOs and beneficiary children and their families. This is manifested by the existence of an entity within the government which oversees NGOs working in child protection, regular monitoring of the quality of services, mechanisms at national level for coordination on child protection policies, legislation and programming, coalitions among agencies working on children and that the goals of child protection are shared among similar agencies and communities.

At the functional level of the child protection system, the agencies fulfill all of the governance determinants: there are professionals with relevant expertise on child protection, there are organizational policies and guidelines on child protection, there are mechanisms of monitoring and evaluation of services, there are agency values that promote the protection of children and the agency provides coordinated response to multiple risks. Furthermore, these governance determinants are performing well in terms of: enforceability of agency policies and guidelines, the coordination of services for multiple risks, the integration of agency values and cultural contexts and social mobilization.

The findings also depict that both children and staff are satisfied with such aspects of agency capacity as: agency staff with expertise on child protection, financial support provided, regular monitoring and evaluation of services, collaboration with authorities, institutions, other agencies, communities and families to improve services, relevance of services offered and

variety of protective services provided. Moreover, the agencies have established strong socio-cultural capacity manifested by: family support and community development is valued, the values, beliefs and expectations of effective protection are shared by communities, The beliefs, values, attitudes and ethos of communities in which you operate are in line with your agency's values and Staff, children and communities are committed and engaged in child protection activities.

The second theoretical insight is that the efficiency and sustainability of child protective services in the agencies hinges on a stronger child protection system. This is demonstrated by the strong positive relationship between the efficiency and sustainability of services and cooperation with various actors in the system, governance and management of agency services and the human, financial and socio-cultural capacity of agencies. It was also found that there is no significant difference among the agencies in terms of the structure, function and capacity of their child protection system and the resulting efficiency and sustainability of services.

Overall, the findings in this study show that many of the necessary conditions for a child protection system to effectively function are present in the context of NGOs. This leads to the argument that improving the efficiency and sustainability of child protection services can be ensured in the presence of a strong system (structure, function and capacity). This in turn suggests an overarching theoretical insight that adopting a systems approach to child protection is an important first step in improving the efficiency and sustainability of services. That is, the theoretical assumptions concerning effective child protective services can be applied across the aisle. This further suggests that a systems approach should be taken into consideration in the development of a national child protection system.

The findings above suggested important implications for improved efficiency and sustainability of child protective services in agencies; some of them are briefly discussed below.

5.6.1. Implications of the Study for Improved Child Protection

One of the implications of this study is that the protection of children through efficient and sustainable services is facilitated by the presence of an enabling system. Ergo, agencies should:

1. Further strengthen their relation and cooperation with government organizations, other NGOs, CBOs and beneficiary children, families and communities
2. Improve the governance and management of their services
3. Boost their human, financial and socio-cultural capacities

The second implication of the study is that building a strong system at the agency level does not suffice for the protection of children at all levels; unless there are national policies and programs, well informed and capable families and communities, willing and able institutions and children who are aware of their rights and are active participants in their protection. This begs for actions on the part of:

1. The government to develop and implement a child protection policy and programs in accordance with the constitution, CRC and other domestic and international laws. In addition, amend the charities and societies proclamation that is causing serious financial bottleneck for the agencies
2. Families and communities in ensuring children have a voice in matters involving their rights and their protection from abuse, exploitation and maltreatment, develop their knowledge and capacity on child protection

3. Institutions such as schools, law enforcement and social services in educating children on their rights and their violation, making protective services accessible, developing child protection guidelines and improving efficiency of their services
4. Children to be better aware of their rights, report incidents of abuse, actively participate in child led groups, trainings and research and other child protection activities

5.6.2 Implications for Social Work practice

Social work is a profession envisioned with the realization of human rights and social justice to all, especially the vulnerable in the society. Children, as vulnerable segment in society, require the protection of their human rights and a just society in which they can flourish. Consequently, the protection of children from abuse, exploitation and neglect and the creation of an enabling environment to promote their wellbeing through counseling, advocacy, lobbying and facilitation are, and should always be, one of the primary areas of social work practice.

Adopting a systems (holistic) approach to the protection of children in Ethiopia could be an important mechanism of intervention to address the multi-faceted problems of children in the country. In studying the child protection practice in NGOs setting, it is assumed that the study is relevant in providing an evidence base for the development of a child protection system at the national level. The systems approach can be one of the models of social work intervention in dealing with the protective issues of children since it is vital in:(1) creating better relation and cooperation with the various actors (2) creating shared goals and working towards their achievement (3) boost and make better use of available resources and (4) making services effective and sustainable.

Review of the literature revealed that a variety of reputable international organizations are adopting a systems approach to child protection with resulting betterment of service provision and in turn protection of children in various parts of the world. In addition they are lobbying for its adoption at national levels in a plethora of regions with success in many. Despite its limitations and micro focus, this study has attempted to shade light on the adoption of a systems approach in Ethiopian NGOs setting and that it can work.

In the protection of children, those aspects that have social work implications include: the protection of children is everyone's business, interventions should be based on the best interest of children, collaborative practice, ensure continued participation of children, build on existing local systems and advocate for the development of a national child protection system.

The protection of children is not the sole responsibility of any one actor; rather, families, communities, public and private organizations, NGOs, the state and children themselves. Children are better protected and cared for in their families. If and when they are unable or unwilling to do so, it becomes the responsibility of communities. NGOs, public and private organizations play a vital role in boosting the capacity of families and communities by providing information and resources. Children also play an immense role by developing their knowledge about and participation in child protective activities. The government's role is also unprecedented in developing a national child protection policy and making sure national and international laws already in place are thoroughly implemented.

The best interest principle requires family services, child protection and placement services to protect children from harm protect their rights and promote their development in gender, age and culturally appropriate ways. This includes: making the child's ongoing safety

and wellbeing the primary focus of decision-making, sharing appropriate information, expertise and resources with other service providers supporting the child and enabling the child and the child's family to access appropriate services in order to reduce the long-term effects of abuse or neglect among others.

Collaborative work between state and non-state actors, communities and institutions can improve outcomes for children, young people and their families. Effectiveness of child protection mechanisms is also linked to child participation. It is important that children have ownership of the program, are engaged in implementation and feel a sense of being part of the mainstream with a degree of power within their limits; for example, being able to report an abuse and attract response gives children confidence and a sense of power over their actions.

Findings of the study have demonstrated that children prefer reporting incidents of abuse and seek support from their peers, family members and neighbors; as a result, building upon existing local mechanisms and improving the knowledge and capacity of these actors can play a vital role in the betterment of children's protection. Finally, coordinated advocacy and awareness-raising efforts with authorities at the provincial and national level will be strengthened when conducted jointly with the various actors in the system. Moreover, sharing information, resources and best practices among the actors can be vital in developing a national child protection system.

References

- Begun, J. W., Zimmerman, B. & Dooley, K. (2003). "Health care organizations as complex adaptive systems," in Mick, S.M. and Wyttenbach, M. (Eds.) *Advances in Health Care Organization Theory*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Blau, J. (1999). *Illusions of prosperity: America's working families in an age of economic insecurity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Butchart, A. & Harvey, A. (2006). *Preventing child maltreatment: a guide to taking action and generating evidence*. Geneva: World Health Organization
- Cannan, C. & Warren, C (ed). (1997). *Social action with children*. London. Routledge.
- Central Statistics Agency. (2007). *Summary and Statistical Report of the 2007 Population and Housing Census Results: Population by age and sex*. Addis Ababa
- Cohen, B. J. (2002). Alternative organizing principles for the design of service delivery systems. *Administration in Social Work*, 26(2), p. 17.
- Cree, V. E & Davis, A. (2007). *Social Work: Voices from the inside*. London. Routledge.
- Cree, V. E. (2008). *Sociology for social workers and probation officers*. London. Routledge.
- Crosson-Tower, C. (2002). *When children are abused: An educator's guide to intervention*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Csaky, C. (2009). *Living without Fear: An overview of child protection systems in Colombia*
Save the Children UK.

- Darlington, Y., Feeney, J. A., & Rixon, K. (2005). Interagency collaboration between child protection and mental health services: Practices, attitudes and barriers. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 29(10), p. 1085.
- Denscombe, M. (2003). *The good research guide: for small-scale social research projects*. Maidenhead. Open University press.
- Dessaiegn, N. (2006). *Guddifachaa practice as child problem intervention in oromo society: the case of ada'a liban district*. MSW thesis, Addis Ababa University
- Dessaiegn, R, Akalewold, B &Yoseph, E. (2008). *CSOs/NGOs in Ethiopia: Partners in Development and Good Governance*. A Report Prepared for the Ad Hoc CSO/NGO Task Force. Unpublished manuscript. Addis Ababa.
- Eman, M. (2012). *The impact of the charities and societies proclamation on civil society organizations (CSOs) in Addis Ababa: A case study on selected women and children CSOs*.MA thesis. Addis Ababa University
- Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (2009). 'Proclamation to Provide for the Registration and Regulation of Charities and Societies. Proclamation No. 621/2009, Negarit Gazeta, Addis Ababa
- MoWCYA.(2008). *Alternative Child Care Guidelines on Community Based Child Care, Reunification, and Reintegration Program*. Addis Ababa.
- Forbs, B., & Oswald, E. (2011). World Vision International Guidance Note: Child Protection in World Vision. World Vision International

- Forum for Street Children in Ethiopia. (2003). *The situation of street children in eight major towns of Ethiopia*. Unpublished research report. Addis Ababa.
- Gaad, E. (2006). System analysis of the UAE education system. *International Journal of Education Management*, 20, 4, p. 291.
- Getenet, T. (2000). *Obstacles and prospects surrounding child abuse management in Addis Ababa*. Addis Ababa. Save the children Sweden
- Glisson, C. (2007). Assessing and changing organizational culture and climate for effective services. *Research in Social Work Practice*, 17(6), p. 736.
- Green, R. S. & Ellis, P. T. (2007). Foster youth evaluate the performance of group home services in California. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 31(2), p. 174.
- Haile, Z. (2008). *A Review of Legal and Policy Frameworks Protecting Orphans and Vulnerable Children in the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children UK.
- Hardcastle, D. A. (2010). *Community practice: theories and skills for social workers*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Hardin, M. (2002). *How and why to involve the courts in your Child and Family Services Review (CFSR): Suggestions for agency administrators* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.abanet.org/child/courtimp.html>.
- Higgins, D. L. (2010). *Community development approaches to safety and wellbeing of Indigenous children*. Resource sheet no. 1. Produced by the Closing the Gap

Clearinghouse. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare & Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

Hmelo-Silver, C. E. & Pfeffer, M. G. (2004). Comparing expert and novice understanding of a complex system from the perspective of structures, behaviors, and functions. *Cognitive Science*,

International Labor Organization. (2008). A future without child labor. Geneva. ILO

Juba, D. S. (1997). A systems perspective on the introduction of narrative practice in human services organizations in the era of managed care. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 19 (2),177-93.

Kasaw, A. (2006). *The need to strengthen the link between formal and informal community caregiving for aids orphans*. MSW thesis, Addis Ababa University

Keeping Children Safe Coalition. (2006). Standards for Child Protection, Tool 1. [Brochure]. United Kingdom: Keeping Children Safe Coalition.

Kernan, E. & Lansford, J. E. (2004). Providing for the best interests of the child? The Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 25, p. 523.

Leischow, S. J. & Milstein, B. (2008). Systems thinking to improve the public's health. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*, 35(2S).

Lemke, J. L. & Sabelli, N. H. (2008). Complex systems and educational change: Towards a new research agenda. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 40, 1.

- Mathews, B. & Bross, D. C. (2008). Mandated reporting is still a policy with reason: Empirical evidence and philosophical grounds. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 32, p. 511.
- Medrano, T. & Tabben-Toussaint, A. (2012). *Child Protection Basics*. FHI 360 Child Protection Toolkit. Research Triangle Park, NC: FHI 360; 2012.
- Mekonnen, M. (2007). *Street children in Addis Ababa: exploring policy framework for interventions*. MSW thesis, Addis Ababa University
- Mizikaci, F. (2006). A systems approach to program evaluation model for quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 14(1), p. 37.
- Mizrahi, T & Davis, L. E . (2008). *Encyclopedia of Social work*. New York. Oxford university press.
- Mulroy, E. A. (2004). Theoretical perspectives on the social environment to guide management and community practice: An organization-in-environment approach. *Administration in Social Work*, 28(1), p. 77.
- Netting, F. E. & O'Connor, M. K. (2002). *Organization practice: A social worker's guide to understanding human services*. Boston. Allyn & Bacon.
- Payne, M. (2005). *Modern Social Work Theory*. Basingstoke, Hampshire. Palgrave.
- Phillips, R & Pittman, R. H (ed). (2009). *An introduction to community development*. New York. Routledge.

- Rogowski, S. (2011). Social work with children and families: Challenges and possibilities in the Neo-liberal world. *British Journal of social work* (2012) 42, 921-940 available at <http://bjsw.oxfordjournals.org/> [accessed on 20 September 2015]
- Rothery, M. (2007). "Critical Ecological Systems Theory." In Coady, N. and Lehmann, P. (Eds.) *Theoretical Perspectives for Direct Social Work Practice*. Springer Publishing Company.
- Save the Children. (2006). *Why effective national child protection systems are needed: Save the Children's key recommendations in response to the UN Secretary General's Study on Violence against Children*. United Kingdom: Save the Children.
- Save the Children. (2008). *A 'Rough Guide' to Child Protection Systems*. London: Save the Children.
- Save the Children. (2009). *Child protection systems in emergencies: A review of current thinking and experience*. United Kingdom: Save the Children
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York, NY: Doubleday/Currency.
- Skinner, K. & Bell, L. (2007). Changing structures: Necessary but not sufficient. *Child Abuse Review*, 6(4), p. 209.
- Solomon, S. (2006). *Child labour in the informal sector: a case study of child shoe polishers in gulele kefla ketma*. MSW thesis, Addis Ababa University
- Stake , R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stevens, I. (2008). Applying complexity theory to risk in child protection practice. *Childhood*, 14(1), p. 128.

UN General Assembly, Convention on the Rights of the Child, 20 November 1989, United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1577, p. 3, available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/3ae6b38f0.html> [accessed 27 October 2015].

UNICEF EAPRO (2009). East Asia and Pacific Child Protection Programme Strategy Toolkit. East Asia and Pacific Regional Office. Bangkok, Thailand: UNICEF.

UNICEF. (2008). *UNICEF Child Protection Strategy*: retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/protection/files/CP_Strategy_English.pdf Accessed 2 September 2010.

Vanderstoep, S. W & Johnson, D. D. (2009). *Research methods for everyday life: blending qualitative and quantitative approaches*. San Fransesco. Jossey-bass.

Walliman, N. (2006). *Social research methods*. London. Sage publications.

West, A. (2005). *International Policy Lessons and Best Practices for the Protection of Vulnerable Children in China*. Paper Presented at the First International Forum on Children's Development in China, Beijing, China on 29 – 31 October 2005 [Retrieved November 26 from http://www.unicef.org/china/P3_WEST_paper.pdf]

Whessells, M. (2009). *What are we learning about community-based child protection mechanisms?: An Inter-Agency Review of the Evidence From Humanitarian and Development Settings*. New York. UNICEF.

Wolczyn, F., Daro, D., Fluke, J., Feldman, S., Glodek, C, Lifanda, K. (2010). *Adapting a Systems Approach to Child Protection: Key Concepts and Considerations*. New York. UNICEF

Interview guide for key informants

1. What do you understand about the concept system? How do you think that a child protection system should operate? What components do you think should underlie a child protection system in agencies?
2. How does your agency demonstrate that it is promoting the protection of children?
3. What values, goals and procedures are in place to ensure the adequacy of service offerings in your agency? And to what extent are such goals and procedures related to the efficacy of services?
4. How do you evaluate the effectiveness of child protective services in general and the practice of your agency in particular? To what extent do you believe that a systems approach is valid and implementable in terms of improving the sustainability and scalability of services?
5. What is the level of your satisfaction with regard to the current performance of NGOs in promoting child protection? What are their major problems in terms of policy environment, governance, leadership and resources?
6. What do you think are the most important challenges and constraints at national and institutional levels in terms of fostering child protection?
7. What do you think are the necessary conditions and resources required for the effective implementation of a child protection system that can effect change effectively and sustainably in your agency?
8. In what ways do you think the current practice of child protection can be improved?

Questionnaire to Agency Staff

I. General

1.1. Agency.....

1.2. Position.....

1.3. Sex male a) Female b) Male

1.4. Educational qualification

a) Diploma b) BA/BSC c) MA/MSc d) PhD e) other (specify).....

1.5. Area of specialization.....

1.6. Year/s of service in agency.....

II. Child protection system

Structure, function and capacity

2.1 how do you evaluate the importance of the following components of CPS(Structure)	Not important at all	Important somehow	Neutral	Important	Very important
1. An entity within the government which oversees NGOs working in child protection	1	2	3	4	5
2. Regular monitoring of the quality of services	1	2	3	4	5
3. Mechanisms at national level for coordination on child protection policies, legislation and programming	1	2	3	4	5
4. Coalitions among agencies working on children	1	2	3	4	5
5. The goals of child protection are shared among similar agencies	1	2	3	4	5
2.2 how do you evaluate the importance of cooperation with the following actors (Structure)					
1. Government	1	2	3	4	5
2. Agencies working on children	1	2	3	4	5
3. CBOs	1	2	3	4	5
4. Children	1	2	3	4	5
5. Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5

Function

2.3 Please evaluate the state of art of implementation of child protection services in communities where your agency operates as per the following (Function)	Yes we have implemented	We are currently implementing	We are planning to implement	We do not have
1. CBOs are formed and strengthened	1	2	3	4
2. Training, finance and other logistical support is provided to CBOs	1	2	3	4
3. Communities are involved through training and sensitization on child protection violation and responding to child protection concerns	1	2	3	4
4. Local leaders are trained on peer support to parents who mistreat children	1	2	3	4
5. Community members and teachers have been trained and are key actors in preventing child abuse and reporting when it occurred	1	2	3	4

2.4 Does your agency fulfill the following governance determinants?	No	Yes
1. There are professionals with relevant expertise on child protection	1	2
2. There are organizational policies and guidelines on child protection	1	2
3. There are mechanisms of monitoring and evaluation of services	1	2
4. There are agency values that promote the protection of children	1	2
5. The agency provides coordinated response to multiple risks	1	2

2.5 To what extent do you think the following performances play an important role in promoting the wellbeing of children	Very poor	Poor	satisfactory	Good	Very good
1. Enforceability of agency policies and guidelines	1	2	3	4	5
2. The coordination of services for multiple risks	1	2	3	4	5
3. The involvement of children, communities and other stakeholders	1	2	3	4	5
4. The integration of agency values and cultural contexts	1	2	3	4	5
5. Social mobilization	1	2	3	4	5

2.6 does your agency perform the following functions with regard to individual children	No	Yes
1. Needs assessment	1	2
2. Gate-keeping	1	2
3. Investigation	1	2
4. Placement	1	2
5. Reintegration	1	2

2.7 To what extent is the current child protection system in your agency supplemented by.....	Very poor	Poor	satisfactory	Good	Very good
1. ...critical processes for the management of financial resources	1	2	3	4	5
2. ...capacity building and professional development of staff	1	2	3	4	5
3. ...allocation of adequate human resource	1	2	3	4	5
4. ...coordination with child protection agencies and service providers	1	2	3	4	5

Capacity

2.8 to what extent do you think...	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very good
1. ...Is the agency workforce trained	1	2	3	4	5
2. ...family members and community residents have the knowledge and capacity to protect children	1	2	3	4	5
3. ...is the physical agency setting suited to the work	1	2	3	4	5
4. ...the physical structure of the community provide children basic protection	1	2	3	4	5
5. ...agency workers have the equipment they need to perform the job	1	2	3	4	5

2.9 how do you evaluate the services of your agency in terms of the following	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
1. Family support and community development is valued	1	2	3	4	5
2. The values, beliefs and expectations of effective protection are shared	1	2	3	4	5
3. Staff, children and communities are committed and engaged in child protection activities	1	2	3	4	5
4. The agency values continuous monitoring and evaluation and uses feedback to improve services	1	2	3	4	5
5. The beliefs, values, attitudes and ethos of communities in which you operate are in line with your agency's values	1	2	3	4	5

2.10 who are the major sources of funds for your agency?

.....

2.11 How do you express their level of influence on agency services?

.....

2.12 How do you express their commitment to your agency's child protective activities?

.....

Efficacy and Sustainability

2.16 How do you evaluate services in your agency in terms of the following	Very poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very good
1. Incorporating and building upon existing local supports for children	1	2	3	4	5
2. Encouraging genuine child participation	1	2	3	4	5
3. Providing ongoing contextually appropriate training and capacity building and material supports to beneficiaries	1	2	3	4	5
4. Using a systems approach to child protection	1	2	3	4	5
5. There is support from community leaders	1	2	3	4	5

2.17 How do you evaluate your agency's services in terms of the extent to which as a result of your agency's services....	Very poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very good
1. ...children are better aware of their rights	1	2	3	4	5
2. ...families are better able to provide for their children and avoided violence	1	2	3	4	5
3. ...communities implement child protection activities	1	2	3	4	5
4. ...institutions such as schools have adopted protection systems	1	2	3	4	5

Questionnaire for children

I. General

1.1 Benefactor agency.....

1.2 Age.....

1.3 School level.....

1.4 Family situation

A. Lives with.....

B. Number of siblings.....

C. Father's occupation.....

D. Mother's occupation.....

1.5. How long have you been receiving support from the agency.....

II. Availability, accessibility and use of services

2.1. Do you have information on the procedures to report incidents of abuse and exploitation?

A) Yes

B) No

If Yes, who informed you.....

If No, who do you think should have provided the information.....

2.2. Do you believe that you can get proper support and treatment if you reported incidents to the authorities? A) Yes B) No

If Yes, what made you think that.....

If No, why not.....

2.3. How do you deal with the protection risks you face

2.4. Who do you prefer reporting/telling to if you had an incident of abuse and exploitation and why?

2.5. Are there child led groups in your school? A) Yes B) No

If yes, do you participate in those groups A) Yes B) No

If Yes, what do you think have you gained as a result.....

If No, why not.....

2.6. Can you identify and list NGOs working on child protection within your community?

2.7. What is your Attitude towards the activities and contribution of the NGOs in terms of assisting children and addressing child protection issues?

2.8. Can you identify traditional CBOs in your community?

2.9. Do you think existing formal child protection systems such as police are working effectively for children? A) Yes B) No

If No, what needs to be improved?

III. Child protection systems and practices

3.1. Your placement to the agency is:

- A) By referral from local authorities
- B) By referral from another agency
- C) Other (Please specify).....

3.2 How do you evaluate yourself in the following issues	Very poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very good
1. Awareness of child rights	1	2	3	4	5
2. Participation in child led groups	1	2	3	4	5
3. Awareness of children with protective risks	1	2	3	4	5
4. Reporting incidents of abuse	1	2	3	4	5
5. Interest to communicate messages of child protection to your community	1	2	3	4	5
6. Communicating messages to other children	1	2	3	4	5

3.3 How do you evaluate your participation in the following activities	Very poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very good
1. Identifying and reporting child protection concerns	1	2	3	4	5
2. Raising awareness of child rights and child protection among your peers, family and community members	1	2	3	4	5
3. Mapping risks and vulnerabilities	1	2	3	4	5
4. Organizing action to prevent or respond to child protection concerns	1	2	3	4	5
5. Raising your concerns with government officials at different levels so that practice and policies can be developed and implemented in your best interests.	1	2	3	4	5

3.4 How often do you participate in trainings/research activities organized by the agency A)

- Never
- B) once a year
- C) once every two years
- D) other (please specify).....

3.5 How do you evaluate the impact of children's participation in child protection activities in terms of the following	Very Poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very Good
1. Children are more visible in the community and there is increased value in listening to children	1	2	3	4	5
2. Children have increased confidence	1	2	3	4	5
3. Children have increased information	1	2	3	4	5
4. Children have improved communication, negotiation and problem solving skills	1	2	3	4	5
5. Children are more able to defend their rights and their own self protection	1	2	3	4	5
6. Children contribute to improved protection of other children	1	2	3	4	5
7. Children play a role in reducing school dropouts	1	2	3	4	5
8. More attention is given to children's needs and priorities	1	2	3	4	5
9. Children influence community development plans	1	2	3	4	5

3.6 Does the agency employ one or more of the following methods to identify and follow up child protection concerns in your community	Yes	No
1. Observation of a child protection concern by a child in school or in the community which is shared with child group members and/or with adult members	1	2
2. Children sharing their own concerns within their child group	1	2
3. Victims/survivors reporting their concerns directly to members of the CBOs or to their parents/caregivers who report to the agency/authorities	1	2
4. Teachers identifying child protection concerns	1	2
5. Agency staff identifying child protection risks/concerns through home visits	1	2

3.7 How do you rate the agency in	Very poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very good
1. Providing Treatment, Therapies, and Access to Services for Traumatized Children and Families	1	2	3	4	5
2. Ensuring a Better Quality of Life for Families through the Developmental services	1	2	3	4	5
3. Teaching Children and Caregivers about Personal Safety and Developing Resources for Families	1	2	3	4	5
4. Protecting Children's Health by Preventing and Treating Malnutrition	1	2	3	4	5
5. Deterring the Abuse of children through Education and Community Awareness	1	2	3	4	5
6. Protecting Children from Corporal Punishment	1	2	3	4	5
7. Equipping Children with the Tools to Improve Chances of finishing school	1	2	3	4	5
8. Integrating the Mass Media to Address Children's Rights	1	2	3	4	5
9. Protecting Children from Falling into Delinquency through awareness raising	1	2	3	4	5
10. Providing Programs to Support Child Abuse Victims, Foster Peer Support, and Protect Children with Disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
11. Mobilizing Community Action and Advocacy through Street Theater	1	2	3	4	5
12. Providing Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Services	1	2	3	4	5
13. Creating and Promoting Well-Being and Fostering Children's Participation in Society	1	2	3	4	5
14. Raising Awareness about Child Abuse and Family Violence through Training and Education	1	2	3	4	5
15. Supporting Child Development by Encouraging Community Participation, Child Rights and Child Protection	1	2	3	4	5
16. Educating the Public about Child Sexual Abuse and child protection through Mass Media and Social Marketing Campaigns	1	2	3	4	5

3.8 How satisfied are you with the following issues in the agency	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Agency capacity					
1. Number of staff with expertise on child protection	1	2	3	4	5
2. Financial support provided	1	2	3	4	5
3. Regular monitoring and evaluation of services	1	2	3	4	5
4. Collaboration with authorities, institutions, other agencies, communities and families to improve services	1	2	3	4	5
5. Relevance of services offered	1	2	3	4	5
6. Variety of protective services provided	1	2	3	4	5
Child protection practice					
7. an organizational culture or climate that reflects child protection to be one of its most important roles	1	2	3	4	5
8. assessment of at risk and child protection needs of children	1	2	3	4	5
9. construction of child friendly spaces	1	2	3	4	5
10. awareness raising on child protection	1	2	3	4	5
11. services to address sexual and domestic violence	1	2	3	4	5
12. services on developing family skills and social support on parenting	1	2	3	4	5
13. establishing and training family groups	1	2	3	4	5

3.9 How do you evaluate the quality of the following facilities in your community	Very poor	poor	Neutral	Good	Very good
Facilities	1	2	3	4	5
1. Library	1	2	3	4	5
2. Water and sanitation	1	2	3	4	5
3. Health care	1	2	3	4	5
4. Child friendly spaces	1	2	3	4	5
Child protection services					
5. Counseling	1	2	3	4	5
6. Training	1	2	3	4	5
7. Financial support	1	2	3	4	5
8. Community mobilization	1	2	3	4	5
9. Legal support	1	2	3	4	5
10. Family support	1	2	3	4	5

2.10. What do you think are the major factors that affect the effectiveness and sustainability of services provided to you by the agency?

.....

2.11. In what ways do you think the current child protection practice in the agency be improved?

.....

Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own original work and has not been presented in any other university. All source materials and references used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Declared by:

Name: Eyob Tegafaw

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Confirmed by:

Name: Abebe Assefa (PhD), Advisor

Signature: _____

Date: _____

December, 2016

Addis Ababa