Graduate School of Development Studies

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION OR COERCION: THE CASE
OF PARENTAL PARTICIPATION IN PRIMARY
EDUCATION IN UGANDA (1970-2009):

A case study of Arua District

A Research Paper presented by:

AWUDO LULUA JIMMY
(UGANDA)

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for obtaining the degree of
MASTERS OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Specialization:
**Public policy and Management
(PPM)**

Members of the examining committee:

Dr Jos Mooij   Supervisor
Dr Sylvia Bergh   Reader

The Hague, The Netherlands
November, 2009

Disclaimer:

This document represents part of the author's study programme while at the Institute of Social Studies. The views stated therein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Institute.

Research papers are not made available for circulation outside of the Institute.

Inquiries:

Postal address:	Institute of Social Studies
	P.O. Box 29776
	2502 LT The Hague
	The Netherlands
Location:	Kortenaerkade 12
	2518 AX The Hague
	The Netherlands
Telephone:	+31 70 426 0460
Fax:	+31 70 426 0799

DEDICATION

I dedicate this Paper to my dear parents Mr. and Mrs. Awudo. For sacrificing all the resources at their disposal to educate me.

My Dear Wife Aseru Immaculate Awudo whose Love, support and encouragement has kept me going. Immaculate your support and care for the family in my absence is immeasurable.

And to my sweet lovely children, Eddie, Enid and Edith, who missed my fatherly love for fifteen months, l greatly missed your fun, lovely faces and smiles.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Contents

List of Tables

List of Acronyms

CG	Central Government
CCT	Centre Co-ordinating Tutor
DEO	District Education Officer
DIS	District Inspector of Schools
GoU	Government of Uganda
EPRC	Education Policy Review Commission
HIPC	Highly Indebted Poor Countries
HUMC	Health Unit Management Committee
LG	Local Government
LC	Local Councils
MOES	Ministry of Education and Sports
MFPED	Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
OAU	Organisation of African Unity
PTA	Parents, Teachers Association
PAF	Poverty Action Fund
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Fund
SFC	School Finance Committee
SMC	School Management Committee
UBOS	Uganda Bureau of Statistics
UPE	Universal Primary Education
WB	World Bank

Abstract

This study is about how the shift from Parents Teachers Association (PTA) to School Management Committee (SMC) has affected the participation /involvement of parents in the education of their children. This shift came as a result of reforms in government structures and institutions supported by international agencies. This policy shift is based on the belief that decentralised school management systems by SMC responds better to the local needs as communities participate in identifying their priorities and devise strategies to address them with local knowledge and parents will be better placed to demand transparency and accountability in the operations of SMC.

The participation of parents in education of their children was expected to lead to reduction of absenteeism by pupils and teachers, improvement of quality of education as parents will take keen interest in monitoring the activities of the teachers; improve school and home relationships.

The findings of the research point out that parent's participation in education of their children under PTA (1970-1997) and SMC (1998 to date) was and still not voluntary but some threat of force made them to participate under PTA while under SMC there was no threat of force so the participation by parents appeared to have reduced as a result government of Uganda has directed district local governments to come up with some bylaws to encourage parental participation in education.

An exploratory study was done where qualitative methods of data collection were used. Primary and secondary data were used and semi structured interviews were done with leaders(political, civil and institutional) at district, sub county and school level while focus group discussion was done with parents who were purposively selected.

The main conclusion is that it appears voluntary parental participation in education of their children under PTA before UPE and under SMC after UPE is a myth than a reality.

Relevance to Development Studies

This study is relevant to development studies because it deals with participation of beneficiaries in determining how improvements can be made in their lives using their local knowledge in regard to poverty reduction strategies under the decentralisation system of Education. Effective service delivery in education in order to attain Education for All and poverty reduction in developing countries calls for effective involvement and participation of parents and communities for effective implementation of policies. In this case the paper looks at the effect of the Shift in institutions of management of primary schools from PTA to SMC on parent's participation. The finding of this paper will contribute to the body of knowledge in development studies on venues and avenues of community participation. The paper points out that for such ventures to succeed, local communities should be at the centre of such policies and for education decentralisation efforts be made to insure that the parents understand their roles and responsibilities. There should be effective accountability mechanisms in place that includes the parents to ensure proper utilisation of funds received inform of UPE capitation grants from the District Local Government and contribution by the parents

Keywords

Participation, Decentralisation, Accountability, Community and Stakeholder

Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In the last two decades, the world has seen shifts in views on the extent to which the state should provide and control education and other services to its citizens. As part of education and public sector reforms, many countries choose to decentralise the administration and financing of education services to the regional, local and school level. This shift in education administration and financing swept across many developing countries including Uganda and it also lead to institutional change in the management of primary schools from PTA to SMC for the case of Uganda in 1998.

It is important to note at the on set that missionaries played an important role in establishment and management of education institutions in Uganda. According to Hansen,B.H(1984) the Uganda agreement between the colonial government and Christian missionaries defined four main areas of educational work: The expansion of primary sector; training of teachers and catechists; technical training of craftsmen and education of the sons of chiefs with the view of becoming chiefs themselves and young people as interpreters or clerks for colonial administration. To date missionaries still maintain some schools and in addition to government rules and regulations, they have additional rules and regulation for moral up bringing of children.

The Education system left by the British Colonial Administration, had both academic and technical training at the primary, secondary and tertiary level. Currently there are four levels of education in Uganda: Pre-primary; Primary; Post Primary and Tertiary Education. Pre-primary takes three years and it's provided by private individuals or religious organisations. Primary education in Uganda takes seven years at the end of which national primary leaving exams are administered and those who perform well join secondary school or vocational school for four and three years respectively and those who fail are made to repeat the same class or drop out of school. While post-primary education takes four to six years and those who can not continue drop out. Tertiary education takes between two to four years depending on the course and a ward at the end of the course that is diploma or degree respectively.

Uganda's education suffered a set back during the political instability through which the country went between 1972-1986 as a result funds to the sector reduced due to the economic regression. However, there was a dramatic change in the education sector of Uganda in 1996 when the incumbent president of Uganda promised to offer free primary education to four children per family during the presidential campaigns. After presidential endorsement of Universal Primary Education (UPE), in February 1996 Government of Uganda approved the UPE policy and developed the UPE programme in December 1996. The Government of republic of Uganda launched a 20 years Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) and Poverty Action Fund (PAF) in which

primary education was made one of the components of the strategy for elimination of poverty by 2020(Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development[MFPED] 1997).

Education is said to reduce poverty because, it helps to improve the labour productivity and educated people will have better employment opportunities; Time taken in school reduces the chances of women conceiving and thus it reduces cases of unplanned pregnancies' and population increase; It increases in take of health services like immunisation, family planning and other health seeking habits thus improving the health of the community.

This position was re echoed by the Secretary General of United Nations Ban Ki-moon when he was addressing an event focusing on "education for all" on 25 September, 2008 where he highlighted the key role of education for slashing poverty, illiteracy and other social economic ills by 2015.He continued and stated that "We have evidence that education improves individual incomes".

Implementation of UPE started in February 1997 with government providing tuition for four children per family(Ministry of Education and Sports [MOES] 1998).The situation changed in 2001 when one of the opponents of President Museveni declared during Presidential campaigns that all school going age children will have free primary education instead of Four children per family. This made the in President to declare free primary education during campaigns. This clearly shows how politicised the implementation of UPE programme in Uganda.

The importance given to education sector enabled it to benefit from Poverty Action Fund(PAF) through the UPE capitation grant to improve access to basic education by removing the burdens of paying school fees and providing schools with the necessary funds for administration and management(MOES 2002).

The UPE policy in Uganda was heavily dependant on financial and technical support from external donors. Before implementation of UPE, donors technically strengthened the capacity of education Ministry including district and local offices to manage their systems but later after introduction of UPE, the donors supported the devolution of funds and responsibilities to local governments and school management committees. This support took the form of training SMCs and budget support, out of a total cost of US$ 311 million budget for UPE between 1998 and 2000, US$ 115 million was provided by the International Development Association, of which US$ 75 million was a grant in the Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative (World Bank Group, 2007).

1.2   The Parents Teachers Association (PTA)

PTA is a community based association formed to provide a formal and organised voice representing members of the community whose children attend a particular primary school. However Passi (1995) in study entitled the rise of peoples organisations in primary education in Uganda noted that PTAs were formed when government reduced the influence of churches on primary education by   replacing missionary boards of education by SMC and school

supervisors by Education officers. The Churches in response reduced funding of primary schools and this made the primary schools to turn to parents to fill the financial gap left by the churches.

According to Muwonge (1991) in Passi (1995), PTAs were started as welfare associations in 1967 and what made the PTAs to grow in influence was the belief of parents and pupils that private benefits of education are high and direct to the beneficiaries and were prepared to bear the burden of accessing education and secondly the failure of government to deliver adequate primary education

Passi (1995) further noted that with the decline in state ability to finance schools in 1980s, the PTA took the responsibility for welfare of teachers, pupils, and the overall development of the school leaving government to cater for teacher's salaries.

The objectives of having PTAs were: To bring together parents, teachers and pupils under one association to have a collective voice; To cater for the welfare of pupils and teachers; To liaise with the SMC in advancing the interests of parents teachers and pupils; To promote and maintain academic and moral standards of the school(ibid).

Worth noting is the fact that PTA has non executive role and as a result their objectives don't give scope for policy making, decision making or policy implementation.However,during the political turmoil and economic hardships in the 1970s and 80s,PTA assumed the responsibility for financing of primary schools. Funding was collected from parents inform of school fees, building fund and teachers welfare and managed on a central account by the District Education office, from which instructional material and other goods were bought (Reinikka and Svensson, 2004;Dauda,2004).

The PTA has two organs, the general assembly and PTA executive. The general assembly is composed of all parents and teachers while the executive is composed of nine members' .However, there is no literature indicating clearly how the institutional structure of the PTA was created and I presume that it could have been copied from other existing associations.

The membership of PTA executive was composed of: Chairperson and the Vice Chairperson; Secretary and Treasurer; one representative each of teachers and elder; and two representatives of the alumnae.

However with introduction of UPE, government took over the responsibility of school financing from PTA and re-established SMC to over see managements of primary schools on behalf of government. This change was underscored drastically by the 'banning of PTAs' at the onset of UPE, a measure that was lifted later in 1998 in the face of protests (Dauda, 2004).

Parents and teachers protested because, parents lost influence over financing and decision making in the primary schools while teachers lost revenue which used to be paid as teachers welfare. The protests were mainly in the urban areas by teachers and PTAs who were used to the reliable PTA funds while rural teachers rejoiced because, they thought the new system would be better as the parents in rural areas are poor and their contributions were usually merger compared with those in urban areas and direct government financing would   improve their situation (Ibid).

The PTAs were discredited because they were accused of bribery and misuse of funds collected from parents; government argued that PTA was promoting inequality between schools, parents and communities because schools with rich parents are better off than with poor parents and parents who are rich send their children to good schools while poor parents send to low quality school or do not send them to school at all due to lack of school fees. It is important to note that since the study is not on educational outcomes I will not go in to details which system was batter.

Coupled with the above issues labelled against PTAs, some senior figures in government and line ministry feared having a powerful parents association was a threat to their authority and will make it difficult to push through education policies which are not friendly to parents. For example The New Vision, Ugandas Daily newspaper reported on 17/09/2009.under the title Parents Close School. The PTA executives demanded accountability from the head teacher for the funds parents contributed for school development, but he refused to comply, chairman informed the district education office about the same and their was no response. So the parents locked the office for the head teacher but the education officer came with police to open the office and Chairman PTA, secretary and treasurer were taken to police to make statements for locking the door. This shows that government is not interested in having a strong parent's organisation.

The government responded by directing The Ministry of Education and Sports to prepare a model constitution for PTAs and to provide guidelines for their functions and stated that PTAs may modify the proposed constitution to suit their needs (MOES 1997).But to date the ministry has not prepared a model constitution and a guideline for the operation of PTA but surprisingly PTA continue to exist parallel to SMC but have no mandate to manage schools but only mobilise parents in emergency situation to participate in school programmes.

1.3   Decentralization of Education in Uganda

Rondinelli (1981) defined decentralisation as the transfer of authority to plan, make decisions and manage public functions from a higher level of government to any individual organisation or agency at a lower level. Power and authority that is transferred can be political, administrative or fiscal decentralisation.

The Public sector reform through decentralization in Uganda was officially launched in October 1992 and for the case of education, responsibilities which used to be under taken by the ministry were shifted to the local governments at district level as a policy statement and it was given legitimacy and operationalised in the Local Council Statute 1993, the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995 and the Local Government Act (LGA) of 1997. Decentralisation policy in Uganda has the following core objectives; To transfer real power to local governments and reduce workload on remote and under resourced central officials; To improve financial accountability by establishing a clear link between the payment of taxes and the provision of services; To bring about political and administrative control over services to

the point at which they are delivered, as a means towards improving accountability, quality, and efficiency; To free local managers from central constraints and allow them to develop organisation structures tailored to their local circumstances; Improve local council capacities to plan, finance, and manage service delivery to their constituents.

According to Prinsen et al (2008),decentralisation of education in Uganda is characterised by, central government retaining the dominant role for efficiency and equity reasons in setting standards, textbook production, teacher training and overall financing, while local governments and school committees are mandated by the central government with authority and resources for construction of buildings and paying teachers salaries.

The type of decentralisation implemented in primary education in Uganda is both devolution and deconcentration

Devolution is the transfer of authority and responsibility to regional and local governments with their own discretionary authority to perform some functions which used to be done by the higher authority. Examples of devolution in primary education are; Teacher hiring and firing and payment of their salaries, construction works, monitoring and supervision and SMC selection were devolved to the district local government, while teacher training, curriculum development allocation of UPE grant to schools based on enrolment figures and school financing were not decentralised for the purpose of maintaining standards.

Deconcentration is handing over of administrative or managerial responsibility to sub national units within the same line ministries or other sector specific national agencies. Examples of deconcentration primary education are teacher training colleges run by government and supervision of construction work under school facilities grant (SFG) was deconcentrated at regional level by an engineer deployed by Ministry of education.

While the roles devolved to sub county local government are to monitor implementation of education programs and also nominate a member on the SMC to represent the local government, school development with funds collected locally, and the function of primary school management was devolved to SMC.As being statutory organs at the school level, the successful implementation of UPE greatly depended on SMC.They were charged with among others overall operation of the school; approving of the school budgets, monitoring finances of the school and reporting to parents the financial and operational status of the school

1.4   Evolution of UPE in Uganda

The colonial government left provision of education entirely in the hands of missionary organisations until 1922 when government got involved in provision of formal education. In 1952, government appointed the de Bunsen committee which recommended among other things: 'Expansion of secondary education in order to provide teachers for primary education; expansion of facilities for girls in primary and secondary schools and establishment of new primary schools' (MOES, 1999, p.8).

The need for expansion of primary education was recognised by the state government and the same recommendation was given by the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) in 1961 during OAU summit meeting, but the government didn't have adequate resources at its disposal to expand both primary education and higher levels of education. In 1963,a year after getting independence from the British colonial rule, the state government appointed Castle commission to devise recommendations to tackle the demand for skilled human resource to take over the running of government and private sector as a result a large portion of the budget went for secondary education to raise the required labour force (ibid).

This practice of neglecting funding for the expansion of primary education in favour of higher education persisted for two decades despite two attempts to promote UPE through the Third Five Year Development Plan from 1972-76 and Education Policy Review Commission (EPRC) of 1977; however the negative political climate and economic decline during that period could not enable government to implement UPE (Ibid).

When National Resistance Movement took over government in 1986, it instituted a series of commissions one of which was another EPRC appointed in 1987 and it met for two years and among other things it recommended the universalisation of primary education as soon as availability of resources could allow but not later than the year 2000. In 1989 the government appointed Education White Paper Committee with the task of scrutinizing the recommendations of EPRC and further stakeholder consultation on universalisation of primary education. This committee recommended UPE and it proposed time frame of up to 2003 before UPE implementation can kick off so that government can make the necessary arrangements. However some preparations like training teachers and head teachers and buying some scholastic materials started in 1993 under the umbrella of primary education and teacher development project (Ibid).

Worth noting is the fact that Education for all being the second Pillar of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), it has been backed by world community at global gatherings in Jomtein (1990), Dakar (2000) and Genoa (2001).The world community set itself a milestone that by 2015, education for all should be achieved and incidences of poverty should be reduced by half.

There were no increases in primary school enrolment figures until 1996 when President Museveni made a pledge to the electorate during presidential elections to provide "free" primary education to four children per family two of whom should be girls and orphans were exempted from paying school fees. So on being elected he fulfilled his pledged by announcing in December 1996 that implementation of UPE was to begin in January 1997 and that was the starting point of implementation of UPE in Uganda. (Ibid: 9)

Worth noting is the fact that, this is not universal primary education in reality because it was restricted to four children per household instead of all children of school going age and this made many households to register children of relatives and neighbours who have more than four children of primary school going age as their own so that they can go to school for free.

However in 2000 presidential elections, the opposition candidate promised to Ugandans that if elected president, all children of school going age will study

for free in all government aided primary schools not like of the incumbent president where only four children per family are allowed to study for free. This made the incumbent president to declare free primary education for all school going age children who attended government aided primary schools with effect from 2001.

Important to note is that UPE has been used as a political tool to get electoral support from the rural poor and it is usually the president who decides what should be done. AS Mwanga (2000) noted, the electorate were always told that UPE is a personal initiative of President Museveni and the programme for free education for all school going age children was granted by the President (the ruler). UPE is only implemented by government aided primary schools and parents are given the liberty to decide where to take there children, i.e. either to private primary school where the quality of education is high but also high school fees is paid or to government aided primary school implementing UPE. Much as UPE is praised for increase in access, problems of quality, equity and retention of girls in upper primary still persist; class rooms are inadequate leading to congestion in class rooms where it's extremely difficult for a teacher to control the class and above all there is reduction of funds to primary schools because what the government is paying as school fees does not reach half of what parents used to pay for management of the primary schools. Coupled with this UPE grant is paid to schools based on enrolment figures and this has created problem of ghost pupils as schools fraudulently create means of receiving can receiving more UPE grants. This also brings into question the credibility of the enrolment figures for which Ugandas UPE programme has been praised.

According to Ministry of Education and sports (1999) UPE has the following objectives; Making education equitable in order to eliminate disparities and inequalities; Making basic education accessible to the learners and relevant to their needs as well as meeting national goals; Establishing, providing and maintaining quality education as the basis for promoting the necessary human resource development; that education is affordable by the majority of Ugandans by providing, initially the minimum necessary facilities and resources, and progressively the optimal facilities to enable every child to enter and remain in school until they complete the primary cycle.

UPE has the following broad goals and aims; To eradicate illiteracy and to equip the individual with basic skills and knowledge to exploit the environment for self development as well as national development, for better health, nutrition and family life and the capability for continued learning; To inculcate a sense of service, duty and leadership for participation in civic, social and national affairs through group activities in educational institutions and the community. To promote scientific, technical and cultural knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to promote development; to contribute to the building of an integrated, self-sustaining and independent national economy (ibid).

It is important to note that adoption and implementation of UPE in Uganda was triggered by top level political demand and not by rational planning processes.UPE was declared during Presidential campaigns with the aim of getting votes from rural poor to whom payment of school fees was a burden. The unplanned implementation is shown by increased pupil enrolment

14

with no teachers, class rooms and furniture. There was increase in pupil enrolment but decline in the quality, equity and retention in primary education. To make the situation worse those responsible for the implementation of UPE usually take their children to private schools and they do not pay much attention to the conditions in the government aided primary schools because their children are not beneficiaries of the programme.

1.5   The School Management Committee (SMC)

School Management Committee (SMC) is a group of local opinion leaders selected to represent the government in each school; it is composed of twelve (12) members and are usually selected by the sitting committee with backing from the foundation board and approved by the district committee responsible for education. SMC is suppose to serves for two years and is eligible for another two years term in office after that new members are to be selected. They act as a form of board of directors charged with monitoring the school administration with special reference to government policy. According to Passi (1995) SMCs were established by state government after independence from colonial rule in an attempt to reduce the influence of churches on primary education and establish its own administrative system.

According to Education Act 1969, 'all government-aided primary schools were required to have a school management committee', but they hardly came in to operation due to the military coup of 1971 and ensuing political conflict in the 1970s and early 1980s (Government of Uganda, Ministry of Education,1969). Then in 1998, with the establishment of Universal Primary Education, SMCs were reconfirmed as the statutory organs at the school level and they represented government and thus formally in control of decentralized education (Government of Uganda, Ministry of Education and Sports, 1998.17).

According to Education Act Supplement (2008), School Management Committee is composed of twelve (12) members; Six (6) members, including the Chairperson, nominated by the foundation body; One representative each for local council committee, parish council, sub-county council, parents, staff and alumnae respectively.

Parents of a primary school are those who have children in the school and under UPE the parents have responsibilities to play in the education of their children. According to UPE Act (2008), parents have the following responsibilities: Registering their children of school going age at school; Providing parental guidance and psychosocial welfare to their children; Providing food, clothing, shelter, medical care and transport; Promoting moral, spiritual and cultural growth of their children; Participating in community support to SMC;Participating in the promotion of discipline of their children; Participating in the development and review of the curriculum.

However it's important to mention here that most of the roles parents are expected to perform have been performed by many parents unconsciously or consciously except that many parents in rural areas do not have the capacity to participate in development and review of curriculum .Similar view was expressed by the government in report produced in 1999 entitled ,Uganda's

experience with UPE,which stated that what parents are expected to do under UPE is what they were doing before except that sanctions are not applied to enforce compliance.(GoU,1999).

1.6   Background of Arua District

As many developing countries joined the bandwagon of structural adjustment and reforms in the various government sectors, Uganda could not wait and see how the reforms will perform in the other sub Saharan countries. However, decentralised services like education health in Uganda was first piloted in four districts and other districts were covered after a year.

Arua district was one of the first four districts which pioneered implementation of decentralised service delivery in all the sectors including primary education. This made Arua district to be among the first to change institution of school management and financing from PTA to SMC. Coupled with that Arua is one of three districts in Uganda to pass education ordinance in the country and this ordinance has turned all roles of stakeholders in education into duties especially in primary education with legal implications.

It is worthy noting that, during colonial period, people from this region were reserved for the armed forces as a result few education institutions were established by colonialists in the region and were mostly reserved for the children of the local chiefs. The purpose was to groom future leaders from the children of the chiefs. Most of the manual labour forces in the sugar cane plantations in Uganda were recruited from Arua district. This colonial legacy has serious implications on the people of Arua district as far as education is concerned. This can be seen in high illiteracy rates as compared to other regions in the country, high drop out rate especially in lower upper primary, few people who can act as role modals to encourage others to take education seriously and generally there was and still little importance attached to education. The implications of the colonial legacy are important to m study because it enabled me to find out effect of illiteracy on parental participation in education, whether lack of interest affected parental participation in education and whether parental participation in education can lead reduction in school drop out for girls in lower primary.

Table 1: Literacy Figures

Government level	Total literacy level	Male literacy level	Female literacy level
Central government	82%	76%	61%
Arua district	65%	80%	51%
Okollo sub county	52%	71%	48%

1.7 Problem Statement

Decentralization is envisaged by government of Uganda to develop into devolution with regard to primary schooling. The introduction of UPE lead to the shift in school financing from the parents to the government and it necessitated change in institutions of management at school level from PTA to SMC. However, in 1980s and early 90s funding was secured through the PTA as the governments could not afford to maintain primary schools due economic decline and political turmoil. This made the parents to participate in school financing, infrastructure development, welfare of teachers. The role of PTAs elected by parents was taken over by SMC selected by other stakeholders (foundation board, local governments and sitting SMC) other than parents. The purpose of the research is to see if the shift from PTA to SMC has any negative or positive effect on the extent of parental participation in education of their children in primary schools

1.8 Relevance and Justification

Much academic research has been done on parental participation in education of their children under UPE in Uganda for example among others (Prinsen et al, 2008; Dauda, 2004; Suzuki, 2002; Appleton, 2001; Passi, 1995). However, there is still a gap especially in the effect of changes in the institutions that manage primary schools PTA before UPE to SMC after UPE on parental participation.

Many reasons have been advanced in favour of parental participation in education of their children especially in terms of educational outcomes, for example; Parental participation leads to higher academic achievement especially when parents take keen interest in the academic progress of their children and help them out with their home work.

Parental participation in education leads to better school attendance and improved behaviour at home and school for children whose parents participate in school programmes especially by visiting schools to check on their children's

activities and also discuss with teachers on areas where the children needs improvement.

Participation in education enables parents to have greater appreciation of their role   education of their children especially when they see positive out comes in the performance of their children as a result of helping them out with home work and discussing with teachers how their children can progress academically.

However, one wonders if decentralisation of education, UPE and establishment of SMC after UPE created a conducive environment for the participation of the parents in the education of their children.

This research therefore seeks to assess the effect on parental participation of the changes in management institutions in primary education from PTA before UPE to SMC after UPE.

1.9   Research Objectives

The goal of the research is to have a better understanding of how parental and school relationship has been affected by the changes from PTA to SMC. The purpose is to show and explain whether UPE has increased or reduced parental participation. The objective of the research is to find out the effect of the shift in institutions of management from PTA before UPE to SMC after UPE on the participation of parents and guardians in education of their children.

1.10 Main Research Question

How has the Shift from PTA before UPE to SMC after UPE affected parental participation in primary education?

Research Sub-Questions

How did PTA executive involve parents in school activities before UPE and how are they involved now under SMC after UPE?

How did parents and teachers perceive their involvement in education under PTA before UPE and how do they perceive their involvement now under SMC after UPE?

How has SMC sustained parent's involvement in school development after UPE and how was it sustained under PTA before UPE?

To whom were teachers and PTA executive accountable before UPE and to whom are teachers and SMCs accountable after UPE?

1.11 Scope and Limitation of the study

This research is about Parental participation in education of their children in government aided primary schools leaving a side parental participation in

community owned schools and privately owned schools. This research mainly was looking at parental participation in the education of their children under PTA before decentralisation of education and introduction of UPE (1970-1986) and parental participation after education decentralisation, introduction of UPE and establishment of SMC (1997-2009). One wonders if decentralisation of education, UPE and establishment of SMC is a panacea or a tragedy as far as participation of the parents in the education of their children is concerned. Given the limited resources like time and finances, the study did not cover the entire district. Emphasis was at the sub county level because there are so many schools in the district which can not be covered in a short period of time and most of the responsibilities for monitoring and supervision of schools is with the sub counties so its easer to know what goes on in the schools from the sub county than from the district.

A case study was conducted in Arua district to assess the effect of the shift from Parents Teachers Association to School Management Committee on the parental participation in education within the rural environment context of Okollo sub-county.Arua district may not represent all the districts in the country, but it has fairly good cases of schools were SMCs and PTAs are working and schools where the PTAs and SMCs are non Functional and the case study allowed for the collection of sufficient data.Okollo sub county was selected because I knew the place so well that it was easy to trace key informants' up to their homes; I knew the language spoken their and no need for a translator but if I went to another sub county I would need some one to interpret some of the words for me which would be time consuming and costly and it was easer for me to get personal opinion of the respondents because they knew me and there was no suspicion.

Table 2: Ownership of Primary Schools

Level of government	Government	Private	Community	Total
Arua District	272	17	31	320
Okollo sub county	8	-	3	11

Source: Uganda Districts Information Source Book 2007/08

I chose Arua District for convenience because it was easier for me because I know the people who are subject matter specialists in area of my research, access documents and also to set appointments with District, Sub-county and school officials who could provide the necessary information.Arua district is one of the districts to have education ordinance This ordinance has turned the roles and responsibilities of parents in the (Education act 2008) into duties with legal implications and failure by parents to fulfil their obligation is punishable and above all Arua District was a pioneer in the decentralisation reforms in Uganda. This research has incorporated views on parental participation from the district and sub county local councils, head teachers, chairmen PTA and SMC, and Parents.

1.12 Limitations

Firstly, Resources were not enough for the research to cover the entire district though the findings points to the trend of events in the district.

Secondly, Timing of the data collection was not convenient because it was rainy season so reaching schools deep in the villages was not possible because the community access roads became impassable. Coupled with that most parents were busy with field work so getting them for focus group discussion was an up hill task and some head teachers went back to their homes during the school holidays and following them for interviews was exhausting and time consuming.

Thirdly, there was also limited data especially about participation of parents in the education of their children in the district. There was also no credible survey and research on the same in the district which limited my findings. However the effects of this was countered by the research done by Dauda (2004) on PTA and Local Accountability in Jenna District and a case study of Jinja municipality in Eastern region of Uganda and Suzuki(2002) on Parental participation and accountability in primary schools in Uganda in Mukono District near the capital city in the central region. The findings of these two surveys showed to me the trends which have developed over time and also enabled me to extract information from Arua district from a rural district perspective. This was further strengthened by Action research done by Care International in Uganda on UPE in Arua district in 2006.

1.13 Methodology

The survey used basically qualitative methods of data collection because the sub questions require explanatory discussion of descriptive results of the case study. Data from primary and secondary sources were used. Primary data was collected through semi-structured interviews with leaders responsible for education sector at District, Sub County and School level and focus group discussions with parents, while secondary data was collected from reports, development plans, articles, journals and books.

The respondents from the district were (District education officer, District inspector of schools and Secretary for education in the District council); Chairperson local council three, Secretary for Education at Sub county, Sub county Chief for sub county and Centre Coordinating Tutor while at the school level, Four head teachers, three chairpersons of SMC and PTA respectively and two focus group discussions with 10 parents per group.

Four primary schools were selected for data collection. One school was selected per parish to insure that the whole sub county covered. The selection of the schools was purposely done based on functionality of the SMC and PTA. The report on functionality of the SMC and PTA   for all the schools in the sub county was obtained from the Centre Coordinating Tutor (CCT).

Question 1 on how parents were involved in school activities under PTA before UPE and how they are involved under SMC after UPE, interviews were done with some selected members of PTA and SMC and Focus group discussions with selected parents who have been involved in school activities

both under PTA before UPE and SMC after UPE.This enabled the researcher to understand the kind of activities the parents were involved in and what type of participation was used. Focus group discussion was done with parents because it was time saving and it enabled me to get views from many people where there was consensus which is difficult if not impossible to get when you interview individuals. While interviews were done with key informants so as to get their personal opinion on issues people usually fear to discuss publically for fear of reprisals'

Question 2 on how parental participation has been sustained, the researcher administered semi-structured interviews to chairpersons of PTA and SMC and officials from sub county and district to find out how they insure that parents participate and what they do to insure that all parents who have children in the school do participate. Individual interviews were done because it enabled the researcher to probe the respondent's further. The individual interviews allowed the respondents to respond to questions which may be critical of the Government which they will not answer when they are in a group.

Question 3 on to whom the PTA before UPE, SMC after UPE and teachers report, I used both primary and secondary data. Secondary data was collected from the operational guidelines of SMC, while for primary data, the researcher used focus group discussion with some selected parents to find out if PTAs and Teachers before UPE used to report to them about their activities and if SMCs and teachers after UPE are reporting to them about their activities. This enabled me to get the views of parents about accountability. I also administered semi-structured interviews to selected Head teachers, chairpersons SMC, Sub County and District officials to find out about the reporting mechanism under SMC after UPE between 1998 to date. This enabled me to understand how these respondents perceive accountability under UPE by SMC.

Question 4 on the perceptions of parents and teachers, the researcher used focus group discussion with parents to understand how parents perceived their involvement under PTA before UPE and how they perceive their involvement under SMC after UPE.While for the teachers the researcher conducted semi structured interviews with selected teachers who have served both under the PTA and SMC so as to understand their perception of being involved under PTA before UPE and SMC after UPE. During free time in the evening I had some interactions with teachers and parents to probe further their perception of participation under PTA before UPE(1970-1997) and under SMC after UPE (1998 to date).Some of these interactions enabled me to under stand the situation better because the respondents opened up more during such interactions than during formal interviews.

However, the methodology used has both weaknesses in terms of coverage and strengths in quality of data collected and use of time and resources as discussed below.

 Few people selected were directly involved with primary education and have the required knowledge about PTA, SMC and UPE and this made the data collected from them though small but of good quality because all stake holders were adequately represented.

It was not so much demanding in terms of resources and time as such much time was used in transcribing and organising the data.

However if I am to go for another collection, I will increase the number of respondent by having at list six sub counties to be representative of the whole district and have at least one focus group discussion in each sub county; I will attend SMC meetings of some primary schools to see the type and level of participation by the parents representatives; give at least 20 self administered questionnaires to some respondents to for purposes of triangulation with other methods of data collection; and organise a feed back seminar for the respondents to get their comments and clarifications on the information gathered.

It is important to point here that, this being a case study of Arua district, the findings can not be generalised for Uganda as a country. This is because of the methodology employed could not allow generalisation of findings as the factors that influence the findings vary from place to place. However, the findings of this research may be used as point of reference by Districts and rural sub counties to investigate similar problems.

1.14 Structure of the Paper

This paper is divided into five chapters. This first chapter gives the introduction and general background to the study. It started with the education system in Uganda after independence, composition and election of PTA and their roles, decentralisation of education, introduction of UPE and establishment of SMC to over see schools on behalf of the government. It describes the problem, states the aim, objectives and research questions, justification and relevance, methodology used in terms of techniques and methods of data collection. It also presents the scope and limitations of the study.

Chapter two presents the debates on pros and cons of participation, debates on user fee, debates on accountability and debates on capture of user committees by elites.

Chapter three defines the terms and concepts used in the study for purposes of clarity and focus. It gives the details on the main concepts as used in the research which are: participation in school, decentralisation, community, accountability and stakeholder. It describes the decision making and resource allocation powers and roles of government, parent's donors and development partners.

Chapter four presents findings and discussion of the findings on parental participation in education of their children under UPE and SMC in Arua District Local Government. It also presents the main barriers to parental participation in education of their children.

Chapter five presents the conclusions and recommendations of the research.

Chapter 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON PARENTAL PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATION

2.1 Introduction

This section of research presents reviews of literature and is divided into four sub sections. The first section presents literature on pro and con of participation; the second presents the arguments on pro and con of user fees; the third presents arguments on accountability of user committees and the last presents arguments on elite capture of user committee. The review concludes by coming up with some trends and emerging themes from the review and links them to the research question to make them valid for this study.

2.2 Debates on participation

Community participation has become a catch word in the development world because of the numerous benefits attributed to it by institutions like World Bank and other donor agencies and Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs).The debates on participation is central to this research and it gives the paper focus and areas for further probing and it also gives bases for conceptual framing and analysis of findings in the research .Various scholars have written about the merits of participation among others for example;

Crook and Manor (1999) argued that community participation in Primary education leads to increased accountability of schools to the community. Blair (2000) concurred with this argument and noted that, greater parents' participation holds local institutions like SMC and PTA more responsive to the needs of the parents and accountable for resources and their actions to the parents.

Along the same line Sullivan (1991) argued that, greater parental participation in school programmes usually leads to stronger parental power base in influencing decision making in primary schools.

Similarly, Cleaver (2007) argues that, though poor people especially in rural areas have representatives on user committees like SMC, HUMC, but the bitter reality is that this does not mean such people are participating in any meaningful way. Probe, 1999; Heyslek, 2003; Ahmed and Nash, 2005 in Prinsen et al (2008) concurred and noted that, although Parents are assumed to participate through the school governing bodies like SMC and PTA, accessing such bodies is usually restricted by the guidelines based on ones education level and status in the community and not all schools have these governing bodies selected or elected and those established are in most cases not functional. Passi,1995;De Grauwe et al,2005;Ahmed & Wath,2005; in Prinsen et al (Ibid) further confirmed the argument that , where SMC and PTA are active, there is always conflict between PTA and SMC because of unclearly defined or overlapping roles and responsibilities or some groups tend to go beyond their mandate.

Furthermore, Cornwall and Gaventa (2001) argued that the operating guidelines of user committees like SMC restricts operations of Committees and does not give room for innovation and this has made them often cosmetic and tokenistic in the area of parents participation; 'by denying people the agency to make choices outside the frame of references afforded by their role in these programmes and by overlooking the complexity of power relations between service providers and community members…they(user committees) operate with a limited conception of Participation'.

Along the same line, Chapman (2000) noted that, initiatives to decentralise school governance' often leave out crucial decision-making responsibilities and power to the Central government, while allocation of resources for context specific needs to districts and schools to manage their own affair with expenditure guidelines from the central government. It points to the fact that parents do not participate in determining how the schools should be managed using their local knowledge.

The debates on participation have generated questions on what motivates participation. Whose interest does participation serve? How do power relations influence participation?

The question on guidelines and power base will be discussed further to determine the extent of parental participation

2.3 Debates on user fee

User fee are payments which people make in return for services like health, education, water and there has been much debate about the social and economic implications of user fees on the community. The demand for Education for All by the world body led to abolition of fees in primary schools in many developing countries world over including Uganda. This lead to introduction of UPE in Uganda and government took over payment of school fees instead of parents. The abolition of fees in primary schools in Uganda led to the shift in school management from PTA to SMC.This makes debates on user fees important for this study because PTA managed primary schools with fees paid by the parents and this study seeks to determine if the abolition of user fee has effect on participation of parents. A number of authors have written on user fees among others;

Tan, Lee and Mingat (1984) argued that, introduction of user fees raises additional resources and such resources could be used to improve the quantity and the quality of the services to the beneficiaries.

Along the same line Appleton (1997) noted that introduction of user fees may create a sense of ownership in the parents which in turn fosters local participation in decision making in the use of the user fees.

Similarly Cornia (1998) in Appleton (1997) suggested that introduction of user fees may encourage efficiency and cost effectiveness in resource use because the beneficiaries know how difficult it is to mobilise resources and they will not want to see the hard to mobilise resources being put to waste. Due to differences in objectives and priorities between the state and the beneficiaries' payment of user fees avails opportunities for beneficiaries to demand for consideration of their priorities.

However, Shaw et al (1995) argued that, user fees has the potential of increasing the gap between the poor and relatively rich communities because the relatively rich communities are in a better position to raise user fees which improves the quality of services rendered to them than the relatively poor communities.

In addition, Appleton (1997) agreed that introduction of user fees increases the available resources for improvement in the quality or quantity of services but increments are usually not much, instead user fees affect the usage of services especially by the poor because they rarely afford to pay the charges.

The debate on user fee especially in education has generated some ideas which are worth investigating. The issues like creating sense of ownership needs to be investigated further to determine if it is created only for those who can afford to pay or all the parents; Fees raising resources for development needs to be investigated further to determine who bears more burden in paying and who gets more benefit because the one who bears more burden of the fees may not necessarily be the one benefiting more. Increase in gap needs to be investigated further to determine the effects on usage of services and why that gap is created and how it can be reduced.

The questions of user fee creating sense of ownership increase in resources and who bears the burden of user fees are linked to research question on participation and will be further discussed in the analysis of the findings. However, increase in gap between rural and urban, and those parents of different social classes is beyond the mandate of this research but it is an area which needs further investigation in future

2.4   Debates on Institutional accountability

The concept of accountability varies from one individual, group and institution to another .To the central government and the district and sub county local governments and to the members of the SMC they are fully accountable to the parents. This accountability is actually answerability and usually fiscal accountability for funds received inform of UPE capitation grants. The debates on institutional accountability is relevant to this study because none accountability is claimed by some parents in the focus group discussion to lead to reduction parental participation in education under SMC as PTA used to account to parents directly before UPE and shift in management of schools from PTA to SMC.The debates will most likely aid in responding to research question on accountability of PTA and SMC.

Crook & Manor (1998) argued that, accountability of institutions like schools and local governments to people increases when there is wider participation of the people concerned in the institutions through their representatives in the SMC, PTA, LC and information about the operations of the institutions are assumed to be enhanced.

However, Jenkins and Goetz (1999) pointed out that, such arguments like community participation increases accountability tend to ignore the power inequality between the two parties which hinders information sharing because they assume communities are homogenous and issues of power relations don't exist but in reality communities have distinct and conflicting interests.

Similarly, Suzuki (2002) argued that although school governors claim to display their expenditure for parents to see many parents are illiterate and they do not have the desire and time to go to the office of the headmaster to just see the accountability for the funds this is some times caused by the power imbalance between the head teacher and the parents. She further noted that head teachers tend to manipulate parents in rural areas especially where the members of the SMC are illiterate resulting in information asymmetry which acts as a hindrance to further parental action.

Pryor (2005) argued along the same line that structures through which parents are supposed to participate and hold SMC accountable did not involve them in any meaningful way, because no body listens to the voices of parents through their representatives and usually the head teacher ,chairperson SMC dominate SMC meetings and schools usually send accountability to district local government.

Suzuki (2002) further argued that most parents do not fill being part of the SMC because of not being directly involved in their election and coupled with that most SMC and PTA chairpersons are opinion leaders in their local communities and therefore ordinary parents usually respect them and fear to hold them accountable because they also hold other position in the village.

The debate on accountability of user committee in the case of education brings out the question to whom do user committees' account (Central government, Local politicians or parents). The issue needs to be investigated further to determine who are the powerful and what makes them powerful and how does power imbalance affect accountability. These questions link directly to the question of institutional accountability and bases for further analysis in the findings.

2.5   Debates on elite capture of user committees

User committee is a new catch word which has come into play. In most cases they are not formed by the demands of the beneficiary community but usually imposed by the donor with the aim of making beneficiaries part of the intervention so that they can contribute financial and other resources. User committee being new in the intervention arena, there is not much relevant literature about their dealings. However for purposes of this research debates on elite capture of user fees is important because, they are meant to be the venue and avenue for parental participation in education of their children and the debates aid discussion and analysis on election of PTA and SMC.

Sasaoka et al (2009) argued that 'SMC has become a closed door business which is in the hands of local elites and it's restricted by central government guidelines'. This argument is based on the fact that, most user committees in rural are managed by retired civil servants, serving civil servants and politicians. The guidelines also stipulate that one should have served in public service and has some minimum level of education.

Similarly,Soudien&Sayed,2004;De Grauwe,2005 argued that some voices are heard more than others in user committees, like head teachers and chairpersons SMC have strong influence on the committees and this makes some of the committees two men show.

Along the same line, World Bank, 2003; OECD, 2004; Ahmad et al., 2005 in Prinsen et al (2008).argued that Elites in rural areas usually capture decentralised services and resources because they can easily mobilise and present themselves as the right group to manage these funds. Darrow and Thomas (2005) in the same vain argued that elites usually capture services like education and health because of the connections they have with people who provide these services based on their status in the community as a result; the poor are neglected in favour of the wealthy.

However Manor (2004) argued that, although user committees are a damaging second wave of decentralisation, the notion that user committees are usually captured by local elites is limited by lack of credible evidence. This is basically due to limited or inadequate research done on user committees in the area of elite capture.

Similarly, Prinsen et al (2008) argued that it was shortage of empirical research which enticed them to study elite capture of user committees and concluded that actually local elites do not capture user committees because; they do not hold those positions for life like chiefdoms and the selection/election guidelines does not allow them to occupy the same position for longer than the stipulated periods. They further noted that what actually happens is that, local elites are members on two or three user committees and they rotate within these committees and these user committees are usually dominated by two or three people.

The debate on elite captures brings out issue of local elites being members on different user committees in their locality. The questions which needed to be investigated further are; who are the local elites, was there elite capture of PTA and SMC, which type of elites are more represented on the committees(retirees, serving officers, politicians),how does elite dominance affect participation of other stakeholders? The questions raised have aided the analysis of findings on election of PTA and SMC.

In summary this section reviewed debates on participation, user fees, accountability of institutions (PTA and SMC) and elite capture of user committees. The purpose of the debates was to generate more ideas which could be addressed by the research questions and also further discussed in the analysis of the findings. The issues raised which are related to research questions, findings or the entire study have been taken in to consideration for further probing, while those out side the mandate of this research have been earmarked as areas for further research.

Chapter 3
DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS AND ANALYTICAL TOOL

3.1   Introduction

This section defines the terms and concepts which are adopted in the analysis of the findings for purposes of clarity and focus and also defines the analytical tool used in the analysis of the research findings.

3.2   Participation in school

There are different types of participation for a program, and it is of paramount importance to determine whose underlying interest it is in advocating for a participatory process. There is also need to make distinction between participation as a means (instrumental participation) and participation as an end in itself (transformational participation).Instrumental participation involves users of the service or program in the activity design and strategies to make it effective and sustainable, while transformational participation aims at people having influence over their own situation(Wilcox,1994).

Participation in school refers to the process and activities that allow the parents to be heard and empowering them to be part of the decision making process and enabling them to take direct action on education issues (Uemura, 1999).

According to (Vincent, 1996; Tomlinson, 1991; Epstein, 1990), there are six types of parental participation in schools which may enable parents to influence school management. The six types of participation are useful for this study because they help to determine the extent and degree of parental involvement at any given point of participation in school. While it is useful for analysis in the sense that it also points to extent of interaction between parents and schools and determines the level of power and authority parents have over school activities.

The six types of participation are arranged according to the level of interaction between the parents and the schools. Starting with parenting where there is least interaction, one way of information transmission and each entity acts more or less independent of the other. But in the subsequent types, like communication, there is two way information sharing, which develops into, working together by parents volunteering to take part in school activities but have not become active participants to influence decisions. This level brings parents closer to schools and start sharing responsibility of helping their children with class work and other related school work and this pushes the parents into deciding what is best for the school children and lastly it leads to collaboration where the parents and schools feel that they need each other and partnership develops where resources and responsibilities are shared between schools and the parents. In a nut shell parenting is the least form of participation and collaboration is the highest form of participation while

communication and volunteering are towards least form and home learning and decision making are towards the highest form of participation.

Parenting

These are activities usually conducted to help families understand parenting skills, understand child and adolescent development and set home conditions to support learning at home for the child. Parents are supposed to provide information on their children to schools so that educators in the school understand family backgrounds and goals for their children. In this typology, families have the responsibility to provide for the children's health and safety and for creating conducive environment for the children's learning. (Epstien, 1987 in Georgiou, S.N, 1999).

Communicating

These are two way processes and activities designed to inform stakeholders about school programmes and student progress through notices, memos, meetings, report cards. Under this typology the schools have the responsibility to inform the families of their pupils about school programs, policies, rules and regulations and to advice families about their children's conduct, achievements and progress in the school. This kind of involvement increases the school to home and home to school interaction which can lead to partnership between school and parents (Epstein, 1987, in Georgiou, S.N, 1999).

Volunteering

These are activities designed to improve the parental participation in schools through serving on the SMC or PTA because those who serve on these bodies offer their valuable time and energy which could have been used some where else free of charge for the benefit of the school community. Other areas where parents participate by volunteering are accompanying children for picnics, sports and games and also tell children about the culture of the community.
This typology involves parents in the educational process of their children though not very active. The teachers usually request parents to offer their help on voluntary basis on various occasions to do some activities in the school or they are invited as an audience for various events in school like inter class competitions, school open days.

Home learning

These are processes which involve parents and their children in their academic learning activities at home that are co-ordinated with pupil's class work and that contribute to pupil's success in school. These include interactive homework, goal setting for academic subjects and other curricular activities.

Epstein(1992,1141) says that 'students at all grade levels do better academic work and have more positive school attidutes,higher aspirations, and other positive behaviour if they have parents who are

aware,knowledgeable,encouraging and involved in their education'. Following similar arguments, Henderson (1987), in Georgiou S.N (1999, 34) Maintains that 'parental involvement improves students achievement', and that children of parents who are involved in school activities do better than children with similar background but whose parents do not participate in school activities.

Decision making

These are activities which are supposed to be undertaken by school governing bodies and parents or their representatives in the management of primary schools and they include among others; designing and developing school mission statements, reviewing and improving school policies that affect children and being active participants on school committees (SMC and PTA). Under this typology parents are supposed to participate in planning, priority setting, budgeting and other aspects of school governing so as to make use of local knowledge in addressing school specific problems.

Collaborating

These are processes and activities drawn up by school governing bodies and parents to coordinate the work and resources of the community in order to strengthen school programmes and pupil learning and development. The collaborating parties are supposed to share costs and benefits and have power and influence to regulate each others activities. However if the family, school and community develop partnerships where the cooperating parties share resources, it benefits children's education and development.

The different typologies of participation help in determining whether parental participation is voluntary or parents have all along been coerced to participate while in the analysis it will help to determine the type of participation involved in election of committees and the extent of participation of the representatives in the committees

3.3 Decentralisation

Decentralization refers to the transfer of power, authority and responsibility for decision making and resource allocation from the centre to the periphery.

Rondineli (1998, 2) defines decentralisation as the 'transfer of authority and responsibility for public functions from the central government to subordinate or quasi-independent government organisations or the private sector'.

Decentralisation in basic education in the case of Uganda has taken the form of deconcentration and devolution.

For purposes of this research, deconcentration will mean the handing over of some amount of administrative authority or responsibility from the ministry of education to district education committee that is; decision making authority has been transferred within the same ministry, while evolution is the transfer of power and authority to regulate basic education service to district local

30

government, sub county local governments and lastly to school management committee.

Decentralisation is useful for this study because the shift in education management from PTA to SMC was as a result of decentralisation. It is linked to the question of participation because it aims to make beneficiaries responsible for their needs, while it demands that institutions be accountable to communities they serve, it might have lead to elite capture of resources and also useful for analysis of the findings on participation to determine if parents are participating, to find out if institutions are accountable to parents.

3.4 Accountability

Accountability is an obligation to bear consequences' for what has happened. It can be answerability for what you have done or taking responsibility for what has happened. It may be implied or dictated by law, regulation or agreement.

It is a means by which individuals, groups and institutions are held responsible for their decisions and actions.

Cornwall et al., (2000) in their IDS Bulleten, entitled accountability through participation: developing workable partnerships in health sector, defines accountability as 'giving account' to another party who has a stake in what has been done. It involves a sense of taking responsibility, but it also holds the meaning of being held responsible by others,-being 'held to account'

The concept of accountability will be used to determine to whom institutions of PTA and SMC Account and also help in the analysis to determine findings on accountability of the institutions.

3.5 Community

Community is a group of people with devise characteristics and they are linked to one another by social ties, share common perspectives and engage in joint activities based on geographical locations or settings. In rural Uganda the concept of community is useful and habitation based and it's usually of people with the same ethnic background and have a lot in common. In rural Uganda there are power relations between the rich and poor educated and uneducated but this does not prevent them from community action or taking on communal responsibility, for example paying school fees for a neighbours child who is bright but the parents don't pay, rich person paying for the repair of community water source, rich person paying for the medical bills of a poor neighbour whether related or not, but by the mere fact that you know the person.

The concept of community is discussed to determine if the elites captured the user committees and it will be used to determine who the elites are in the analysis of the findings and also the impact of elite capture on community participation in education.

3.6   Stake holder

Stake holders are individuals, groups and organisations whose interests are affected by changes in their life worlds and whose activities affect changes in their life worlds.

For purposes of this study Stakeholder analysis is used to identify individuals, groups and institutions that influence parental participation under PTA and SMC either positively or negatively and to anticipate the kind of influence (stakeholders) will have on the parental participation and to devise strategies to get support for parental participation and reduce any obstacles to parental participation. There are two types of stakeholders, primary and secondary stakeholders. Primary stakeholders are individuals, groups and institutions who are directly affected either positively or negatively by parental participation in education or (stakeholders) whose activities affect parental participation directly while secondary stakeholders are those who affected indirectly parental participation or their actions affect participation indirectly. They are generally intermediaries involved in the process of services. Examples of secondary stakeholders in primary education includes; donors, governments, NGOS and CSOs which play advocacy role in education (ODA, 1995)

Terms which will be of value for stakeholder analysis are influence and importance of stakeholders. Influence refers to the extent to which individuals, groups and institutions are able to persuade or coerce others in making decisions or courses of action while importance refers to priority given to satisfy the needs, and interests of the stakeholders (Ibid)

Stakeholder analysis will be used for the discussion of the research findings to determine the relative power and influence at play in the election of PTA and SMC and Accountability of institutions.

Chapter 4
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

4.1   Introduction

The presentation of the research findings is divided in two parts. The first part covers the period from (1970-1997) when schools were managed by PTA before UPE and the second part covers the period (1998-2009) when UPE was introduced and schools managed by SMC. It is important to note that PTA still exists but under UPE they are not involved directly in the management of schools but only to mobilise parents to help in emergency situations and also SMC was established in 1965 but due to the political and economic decline in the 1970s, 80s and 90s the country went through they could not function as the governments then had no finances to operationalise SMC. For purposes of clarity in the discussion and analysis of the findings, PTA will refer to management system before UPE, while SMC will refer to the one after UPE.

4.2   FINDINGS UNDER PTA BEFORE UPE (1970-1997)

Introduction

This section discusses and analyses the findings on parental participation in election of PTA, parent's participation, sustainance of parent's participation, perception of parents on their involvement and accountability of PTA.

The discussion and analysis covers the period (1970-97) when primary schools were financed by parents and managed by PTA before UPE.

Table 3: Stakeholders Analysis in Primary Education under PTA

Stakeholder	Type of Stakeholder	Interest of stakeholder	Influence/Power Of stakeholder
Central Govt	Secondary	Control of education standards	Low influence but high importance
Local Govt	Secondary	Control education activities	Low influence but High importance
Parents	Primary	Send children to school Finance and Control school activities	High influence and high importance
Teachers	Primary	Have good working conditions To get support from parents	Low influence but high importance
Pupils	Primary	To acquire knowledge and skills	Low influence and high importance

Source: Adopted from ODA Stakeholder analysis Guide 1995

Table 4: Participation Matrix Under PTA

Type of participation	Information giving	Consultation	Partnership	Control
Election of PTA	Pupil Government		Teachers	Parents
Accountability of PTA	Pupils Government		Teachers	Parents
School management	Pupils	Government	Teachers	Parents
School financing	Pupils	Teachers	Government	Parents

Source: Adopted from ODA stakeholder analysis Guide 1995

Explanatory notes on participation matrix

Stakeholders who have low influence and low importance are informed because they don't purse any risk to education.

Stakeholder who have high influence and low importance are consulted and monitored because they could be a source of significant risk

Stakeholders who have high importance but low influence require special initiative to protect their interests and partnerships are formed with them for effective achievement of objectives

Stakeholders who have high influence and high importance need good working relationship to ensure effective coalitions for effective achievement of objectives

PTA Elections before UPE

Discussions of the findings under PTA election answer the question on parental participation in the election of their representatives. As Manor (2004) argued that there are basically three main methods which can be used to select members of user committees like HUMC (Health Unit Management Committee), SMC, and PTA: they may be composed largely or entirely of all the persons within a particular location like parents of a school; may be largely or wholly appointed from above, usually by officials from the line ministry; or

it may be some sort of democratic process. Sometimes these methods are combined, especially the first and the third and also the methods used has implications on equity and bottom-up participation in decision making.

The election of PTA executive followed the first method described by Manor where election is supposed to be done by the parents and teachers of school in the general assembly. The PTA executive had 9 members elected by the general PTA assembly and each village was to have a representation on the PTA executive.

The type of participation parents used in the election of PTA was volunteering because they were doing an activity designed to improve parental participation in education.

What is really surprising about PTA election is the uniform number and composition of the PTA executive in the whole district. By the mere fact that PTA had no constitution and operating guidelines one wonders where such a uniform structure came about as reported by Centre co-ordinating Tutor in charge of Okollo sub county and the District education officer Arua district.

Secondly election of PTA executive appeared to be a preserve of educated people who had retired from active service or those still actively serving and business people who are respected in their community because of their wealth. These people have informal influence based on their social and economic status in the community. This assertion was confirmed by a parent and I quote '*Election of parents on PTA executive was restricted to a few people based on their education and wealth. Educated people were thought to represent people's interest better while rich people were thought to help in cases of emergency when parent's contribution takes long*'.

The assertion can further be confirmed by looking at the records of PTA executives before UPE in the schools visited in Okollo Sub County.

Table 5: Composition of PTA for Schools Visited

Schools	Retired Servants	Active Service	Business people	Total
Nayi	4	2	3	9
Robu	5	2	2	9
Keri	4	1	3	9
Foto	3	3	3	9

Source: Own construction

It is important to point here that some of the executives were not parents in the schools where they were serving in the PTA executive especially serving civil servants because their children were studying where they were working.

Similarly, the secretary education Arua district noted that more parents in urban schools participated in the education of their children by volunteering their services than in rural areas, and that explained why PTAs in urban

schools were more active than in rural areas. Dauda (2004) stated that PTAs in urban areas were active and raised funds for running of the schools and teachers welfare. Based on the stakeholder analysis and parental participation matrix one can deduce that parents had high influence and high importance and this enabled them to control election of PTA and this influence and importance was derived parents control of school financing.

Parental participation under PTA before UPE 1970-1997

It should be noted that the findings under this sub heading still addresses the research question one on parental participation. Based on the stakeholder analysis and participation matrix, parents had relative influence and importance to persuade or coerce other stakeholders into making decisions or following courses of action which were beneficial to them. This relative power and influence gave parents the opportunity to satisfy their needs and interests while neglecting the interests of less influential and powerful stakeholders.

When assessing stakeholders involved in primary education on the basis of influence and importance, Pupils had low influence but high importance, teachers had low influence and moderate importance, and government had influence but low importance while parents had high degree of influence and high importance.

What was surprising at this point was the spontaneous establishment of PTA in all the primary schools in Uganda given the fact that PTA did not have a constitution, operating guidelines and a national organisation which represents the entire parent

Parental participation in the education of their children under PTA took different forms depending on the needs of the time. Parents took part in decision making in school improvement programmes and in determining the amount of school fees to be paid. It is important to note that due to power relations voices of some parents were hard more than others.

Parental participation Under PTA also took the form of collaboration between the schools and the parents. Parents and schools collaborated in generating activities that could raise resources for strengthening school programmes and pupils learning and development. There was communication between parents and schools on the school programmes and progress of pupils in school. Parents used to be invited to attend end of term school assembly in which pupils performances used to be announced and this gave parents opportunity to meet with the teachers to discuss the academic progress of their children. This point was confirmed by a quote from a parent who said that *'parents used to be invited to attend end of term school assembles where pupils results for end of the term were declared'.*

It is important to point out at this point that, though parents participated in their children's education by paying school fees, teacher's welfare, uniforms and other scholastic materials, this was not really because of conviction that children's education was their responsibility, but the fear of punishment for non compliance.

Parental perception of involvement under PTA before UPE 1970-1997

The findings under this sub heading address the second research question on perception of parents and teachers on their involvement under PTA. It is important to not that PTA as an institution of school management was formed by parents and teachers .

What made the parents to perceive that they were involved in the management of the primary schools was the communication between the parents and schools before and after PTA executive meetings. In some schools parents were consulted by their representatives before going for PTA executive meeting and later informed of what came out of the meeting as quoted from one parent. *'Our representatives in the PTA executive used to have meetings with us at village level before and after PTA executive meeting and this made us involved in the running of our school'.*

The communication between parents and the schools about school programmes through the representatives on the executive and through the PTA general assembly made parents perceive themselves being part of the system. Similarly collaboration between parents and schools in generating resources and deciding together resource use made the parents to perceive that they were recognised as stakeholders.

While for the teachers they felt not so much involved because they did not influence decisions though they were important stakeholders. However looking at what parents did for teachers in terms of giving them teachers welfare, one would interpret it that parents realised teachers were important stakeholders but with low influence hence required special initiatives to protect their interests.

It is important to point out that perception about participation varied from parent to parent and school to school depending on how easy or difficult it was for a parent to meet school dues. Those who found paying school dues hard perceived participation in school activities as a burden and schools which kept their parents informed of any development made parents perceive being involved.

However analysis based on participation matrix indicates that parents had more control over school management because they were the ones financing primary schools while teachers were in partnership with parents in school management. Meaning that, teachers also participated to some extend in management of the schools.

Sustenance of parental participation under PTA before UPE 1970-1997

This section answers question on how PTA insured that parent contributions were maintained. The Parental participation in the education of their children started during the colonial rule with the establishment of formal mission schools. As one elderly respondent(parent) explained and I quote, *'Missionaries with support from county chief made parents to construct grass thatched huts for class room and for sleeping , and parents brought food for their children from home and*

any person who refused to participate in the school work was canned 10 strokes by the county chief.

Parental participation under PTA was sustained by sanctioning non compliance as it was during the colonial period when schools were mostly under the missionaries. Parents who did not participate in school project work were made to pay in kind in form of animals or cash. And in some instances the local police force was sent by the sub county chief following a request from PTA Chairperson to enforce compliance by parents who refused to take part in school project. The fear of sanctioning non compliance made parents to participate in school development programmes. This therefore means that parental participation under PTA was not volunteering but coercion.

However the zeal to participate in the education of children varied from parent to parent, school to school. Parents who knew the benefit of having educated children readily participated in school activities but parents who did not see the value of education did not bother much though they had resources.

It is important to point out that on the face one would think that parental participation under PTA was sustained by the parents desire to educate their children and desire to support their schools from closure due to reduction in government funding. However the bitter truth was that parental participation was sustained by threat of sanctioning so it was the fear of being punished which made parents to participate in school development programmes and education of their children.

Accountability Mechanisms under PTA before UPE

Analysis of findings in this sub heading addresses research question three on accountability. The need to know to whom PTA as an institution was accountable after the reduction of government funding to primary schools came as a result of parents take over of school financing. The accountability parents wanted was fiscal accountability for the funds collected and therefore it was answerability.

The accountability for the funds collected was given to the parents' representatives who in turn informed the parents about the use of the funds and direct accountability to parents during PTA general assembly.

The type of participation used by PTA to account for funds was communication and collaboration. The communication was passed through the parents representatives who collaborated by taking the massage to the parents

The PTA gave accountability to parents because they had high influence and importance derived from their ability to finance primary schools. Although government then had influence but it had less importance because it was not funding primary schools like the parents.

However based on participation matrix parents had high influence and importantance so they needed to be controlled, while teachers needed partnership because they had high influence but low importance but their support was needed.

It is important to point out that though accountability for use of funds was given to parents through their representatives or in the general assembly,

the bitter fact was that parents were only given figures but value for money was not assessed. It therefore showed that parents were interested in answerability but not responsibility for actions.

4.3 FINDINGS ON SMC AFTER UPE (1998-2009)

Introduction

This section presents discussion and analysis of findings on, SMC selection; parents participation, perception, sustenance, and accountability under SMC.

The findings presented will cover the period from 1998-2009 when primary schools were managed by school management committee after the introduction of UPE.

Table 6: Stakeholders Involved in Primary Education under SMC

Stakeholder	Type	Interest	Influence/Power
Central Govt	Secondary	Achieve UPE objective Control resources Avoid liability	High influence and high importance
Local Govt	Secondary	Achieve target Control activities	High influence and high importance
Donors	Secondary	Institutional learning Achieve education for all Avoid liability	High influence and high importance
Parents	Primary	Participate in school management Receive accountability for funds	Low influence but high power importance
Teachers	Primary	Have good working conditions	Low influence high power high power
Foundation Board	Secondary	Control school management	High influence and low importance
Pupils	Primary	Acquire knowledge and skills	Low influence and low influence

Sources: Adopted from ODA Stakeholder Analysis Guide 1995

Table 7: Participation Matrix under SMC

Type of participation	Information giving	Consultation	Partnership	Control
Election of SMC	Parents Teachers Pupils Donors		Foundation board	Central and local Government
Accountability for funds	Parents Pupils Foundation board Donors		Teachers	Central and local government
School management	Pupils Donors	Parents Foundation board	Teachers	Central and local government
School financing	Pupils Teachers	Parents Foundation board	Donors	Central and local government

Sources: Adopted from ODA Stake Analysis Guide 1995

Explanatory notes on participation matrix

Stakeholders who have low influence and low importance are informed because they don't purse any risk to education.

Stakeholder who have high influence and low importance are consulted and monitored because they could be a source of significant risk

Stakeholders who have high importance but low influence require special initiative to protect their interests and partnerships are formed with them for effective achievement of objectives

Stakeholders who have high influence and high importance need good working relationship to ensure effective coalitions for effective achievement of objective.

SMC elections

The findings under this sub heading address the research question on elections of the SMC.Devolution of administration and management of primary schools at after the introduction of UPE necessitated change in the institution of school governance at the school level and it lead to the creation of SMC.The election of SMC was based on Manor's second method of choosing user committees, where members are wholly or largely appointed from above by officials from line ministry or organs responsible for the institution like foundation board, local government officials.

Important to point is that, though parents are primary stakeholders they are not given greater mandate in the election of SMC.This point was confirmed by parents during focus group discussion and I quote '*we are many but we have mandate to elect only one representative and in most cases it is the PTA chairperson, so he can not effectively defend our interest because those elected by other groups are many*'.

However the District education secretary and Sub county education secretary had a different view and to them it did not matter who elects SMC as long as those elected are parents from the community which the school serves.

What surprised me was the fact that out of the four schools I visited none followed the criteria for selection of the SMC, but the incumbent SMC propose names which are send to the District education committee for approval. The mandated stakeholders like foundation board, local governments, parents and alumnae are not involved as the guideline stipulated. The manipulation of the guideline by the incumbent SMC could be interpreted that decision making authority is concentrated only in the hands of a few and they usually act on behalf of other stake holders in primary education.

An important point to note is that SMC is suppose to serve only two terms of three years. In two of the schools visited, the SMC have stayed in office more than the mandatory three years, without election of new members. This could be interpreted that there was communication gap between the stake holders mandated to select the committee or decision making in the management of primary schools was concentrated in the hands of a few individuals who were more interested in perpetuating their stay in office.

Table 8: Composition of SMC for Schools Visited

Schools	Retired Civil servant	Serving Civil servant	Local councillor	Business People	Total
Neyi	5	3	2	2	12
Robu	6	2	3	1	12
Keri	3	4	3	2	12
Foto	4	2	3	3	12

Source: own construction

The table above shows that SMC was dominated by retirees and due to high level of illiteracy, the same persons are elected to serve on different user committees in the village. For example, one SMC chairperson, in one of the rural school is secretary education in village council, Chairperson of a water project undertaken by world vision international UK, Member of the sub county land board and Vice chairperson Health Unit management committee (HUMC).One can conclude that the guideline concentrates power in the hands of a few educated people.

Parental participation under SMC 1997-2009

The findings under this sub section address the research question on parental participation as a result of the shift from PTA to SMC.The introduction of UPE and establishment of SMC relieved parents of the burden of paying school fees and the government assigned parents specific roles and responsibilities in Education Act *supplement* (*2008* .p.14) which states that 'No person or agency shall levy or order another person to levy any charge for purposes of education in any primary school implementing UPE'. The financing o f school activities reverted back to government through the UPE capitation grant.

The type of participation parents' use under SMC is volunteering in school activities and usually on request from the head teacher who is the mouth piece of the SMC.Parents also participate in education through their representatives in the SMC.Parents also participate by communicating with the schools through letters, end of term reports.

Parents under SMC do not participate in decision making on the use of the UPE fund because that responsibility is left for school finance committee composed of only teachers and allocate the use of the UPE grant without any input from the parents.

The reduction in parental participation is based on the analysis of influence and importance of stakeholders involved in school management Parents have high influence but low importance to influence decision making while government has high influence and importance and hence influences decision making because it finances primary education.

Based on participation matrix, as government has high influence and high importance it is controlled because the risk of losing government support will mean no financing, while parents have high influence but low importance, losing their support will not be risky so they can be consulted but it is upon the SMC to take their advice.

However parents are suppose to participate by volunteering their time and resources to assist the schools in emergency situations. As it is voluntary non participation by parents is not sanctioned in any way and it results in reduction of parental participation. As Dauda (2004) noted that parents in urban schools tended to respond better to requests to volunteer than those in rural schools because they considered such activity as a waste of their valuable time and energy which they could use fruitfully in their gardens.

This state of affairs is confirmed by a quotation from a chairperson SMC who noted that *'The government has taken over all the responsibility of educating our children through the universal primary education, construction of class rooms, teacher's houses and pit latrines through School Facilities Grant (FSG) and parents have no power and authority over schools because school financing used to give them that power base'.*

It's interesting to note that, despite the fact that schools implementing UPE have finance committee, some head teachers disregard this committee and go ahead to implement school activities without actively involving the teachers in the implementation of the plans. At least in one of the school visited, the head teacher did not involve teachers in implementation of UPE. This fact was confirmed by secretary education committee in the District, who noted that, *'The problem of head teachers withdrawing money and not giving it to the teachers to implement UPE programmes in their departments has reduced which was shown by the number of complaints received. However there are still isolated cases in rural schools and in schools where the SMC is weak. But when the issue is reported the education office in the district takes disciplinary actions against such head teachers'.*

This is a clear manifestation of differences in interest between the teachers and the head teachers and is a new possible source for tension in school where the head teacher uses the teachers to plan and allocate use of UPE funds to enable him withdraw money and it shows lack of collaboration and communication in decision making between the teachers and head teachers.

It is important to point out that although decentralisation of education was initiated with the intension of giving parents space to participate in local decision making, but the political and administrative orientation it took does not give parents meaning participation(Golooba-Mutebi,2000;Saito,2003).

Perception of parents and teachers of their involvement under SMC

The findings under this sub section address the research question on perception. The shift in school financing from parents to government under UPE influenced parent's perception of involvement in education of their children to a great deal. Much as UPE reduced financial burden on parents it also reduced parents influence on the primary schools and teachers because they were no longer supplementing teacher's salaries with teachers welfare which was abolished under UPE.

The type of participation parents had under SMC was volunteering their services to do some work or make contributions to the schools and these were managed by the SMC.The perception of parent can be analysed based on the stakeholders' analysis. Under PTA parents were Primary stakeholders but under SMC parents have become secondary stakeholders and their activities do not have adverse effects on SMC operations because they do not fund the operations of SMC.As parents do not have significant influence in management of primary schools they feel that they are not involved.

However, the teachers feel more involved in the management of schools under UPE because the guideline mandated them to allocate the UPE capitation grant to different departments in the school and as teachers head departments they are the ones to implement programs in their departments with the UPE funds. This is done without direct participation of the PTA and SMC chairpersons, but they are only given information on where the money will be spent. As one head teacher noted **'**_Government has done good to have only teachers in the finance committee to plan and allocate UPE capitation grant because teachers know what is best for the education of the children. When planning used to be done together with parents representatives we used to get a lot of problems but now we tell them what we have done and as experts in the field they don't doubt us and this has made our work easy'._

It should be noted that the parents feel that they have been left out in the implementation of UPE under SMC while the teachers felt that they have been fully involved in the implementation of UPE. This feeling of being side lined in the school management leads to reduced parental participation in the education of their children.

Sustenance of parental participation under SMC 1997-2009

Discussions in this section address the research question on sustainace of parental participartion.With the introduction of UPE in 1997 and re establishment of SMC, parental participation became voluntary (not punishable by law) as financing school activities was taken over by the government and responsibility of overseeing the management of primary schools shifted from PTA to SMC. This position is confirmed by a directive from (Education Act _supplement_ ,2008 ,p.15) noting that, 'the management of any school implementing UPE is not deterred from collecting or receiving voluntary contributions or payments from the parents and well wishers to contain a state of emergency or any agent matter concerning the school'.

This view is a reflection that as important stakeholder, parents have not been involved in the management of UPE and do not have much say on the operation of the SMC.

The parents under SMC have high influence but low importance while the government has high influence and high power devised from school financing while parents do not finance school activities.

However it appears reducing parental participation to volunteering in primary education has back fired because parents have refused to volunteer their time and resources and they have ignored the roles which they were expected to play. In order to sustain parental participation in education Arua district came up with education ordinance which turned the roles parents were

45

expected to play under UPE into duties. It section on parents states that any parent who keeps at home, does not provide scholastic material, and does no perform any duty he is suppose to facilitate education of his child commits an offence and will be detained for one day and fined 10 Euros(Arua District education ordinance,2009).

However some political pronouncements by the ruling party is partly to blame for reduced parental participation because some parents interpret such pronouncements to mean that UPE was meant to reduced the financial burden on parents so there is no need for contribution from parents.

Important to note is that Arua district council passed Arua District Education Ordinance in which parents responsibilities under (UPE in the Education Act Supplement 2008) have been turned into duties with legal implications. Meaning that under the ordinance any parent who does not perform his duty breaks a law and is punishable by detention and a fine. It means that parental participation is in most cases sustained by threat of suctions and SMC will have to employ the same system which the PTA before UPE employed to sustain parental participation in education.

Accountability mechanisms under SMC.1997-2009

Analysis of findings under this sub heading address the research question on SMC accountability. The need to determine to whom SMC is accountable came as a result of a shift in school financing from parents to government. The accountability discussed is fiscal accountability or answerability for use of funds by the SMC. The accountability mechanism of SMC under UPE leaves a lot to be desired especially by the parents as primary stakeholder. The SMC accounts directly to the district not to the parents. As one district official said and I quote *'accountability goes with responsibility, that is why UPE accountability is designed that way, but there is also down ward accountability where the head teachers indicate the amount of UPE received and how it has been used on the notice board in the school for every body including parents to see'.*

Based on stakeholder analysis central and local governments have high influence and high importance in the implementation of UPE because they provide finances for the operation of SMC.While parents have high influence but low importance in the implementation of UPE that is SMC gives accountability to the stakeholder with high influence and importance.

The same situation can be analysed using the participation matrix where government which has high influence and importance is controlled so that it will not stop funding of UPE while parents who have high influence but low importance are only informed of what has happened. This explains why SMC sends accountability to government but gives to parents' information about the same.

The claim of downward accountability to parents for the use of the UPE capitation grant is by displaying the amounts received and how it was used on school notice board. The notice boards are in most cases located in headmaster's office which is not easily accessible to many parents because, some parents don't read and write and others don't visit the school or the office some even fair to enter the office. This form of accountability is

46

responsibility by parent's representatives on SMC for their actions on behalf of parents.

To answer the question to whom SMCs are accountable, one needs to understand the rational of education decentralisation and if the purpose of education decentralisation is to enable parents to participate in decision making in the education of their children, then the school SMC is the venue and avenue for parents to participate. To realise the parental participation, SMC should become more accountable to the parents because at the end of the day it's the parents who have the greatest interest in educating their children.

However the research finding does not support the assertion that decentralisation of education management leads to greater parental participation and increase of accountability by SMC, but rather participation has little effect on accountability other than reducing level of participation regardless of extend of decentralisation.

Chapter 5
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusion

Based on the research question and sub questions used to investigate parental participation in education under PTA before UPE and under SMC after UPE it appears that;

Parental involvement under PTA before UPE was noticeable because they shouldered most of the responsibilities in school with exception of teacher's salaries. This necessitated active parental involvement to cater for the needs of the schools however under SMC, government took over school financing and it reduced the burden of paying fees and teachers welfare and led to reduction of parental participation in education.

Perception on involvement under PTA most parents felt that they were involved more in school activities under PTA before UPE because they financed most of the activities while teachers felt they are more involved in school activities under SMC after UPE because they are directly involved in planning and budgeting the use of UPE capitation grant through the school management committee which is only composed of teachers.

Sustenance of parental participation under PTA before UPE was through threat of sanctioning and this made parents to participate for fear of being punished but under SMC after UPE the SMC had no mandate to sanction none participation of parents and this resulted in reduction in parental participation.

Accountability by PTA before UPE was directly to the parents because the parents were responsible for financing most school activities while under SMC after UPE accountability was to the government which provided the funds for SMC operation. Under PTA it was both upward to district education office and down ward to parents accountability but under SMC after UPE it is only upward accountability though there is claim of down ward accountability through the parents representatives on SMC but in realty it is mainly upward accountability.

On the basis of the findings of this research, it appears as if voluntary parental participation in the education of their children is a myth. This conclusion is based on the fact that the idea of forming SMC is not a demand generated by the parents but it's a global movement to involve parent in an effort to achieve Education for All and is pushed by donor so that the institutions helps to monitor implementation of UPE which is heavily supported technically and financially. The methods of election of SMC is top-down and dominated by a few well to do individuals who are in most cases retired civil servants, serving civil servant and politicians and are members on many committees water committee, health, land board and even members of SMC in other schools. Coupled with that, parental participation in PTA

contributions and other activities has been sustained by sanctions and under SMC, Arua District has enacted education ordinance which has turned the roles of parents under UPE in to duties and failure to fulfil duties attracts a fine or one day detention or both as the situation warrants. It can be concluded that from the above findings that voluntary contribution and participation seems to be a myth than reality.

5.2 Recommendations

For education decentralisation to achieve its objective of involving parents directly in management of primary schools so that they become responsive to the needs of the local communities there is need for urgent dialogue between government and parents.

Parents should participate in election of SMC directly among themselves instead of being elected by other stakeholders. This will give parents the bases to demand better services and lead to responsive service delivery.

Government should strengthen the existing parents association and come up with a constitution and guideline for their operation. Being institutions created by parents they are in better position to be responsive to the parents needs and have local knowledge.

Instead of giving accountability to the District the schools should also give accountability to parents at the end of every term. This will make the parents feel that they importance has been recognised by the schools.

Sustenance of parental participation in education should be through collaboration where parents should be ask on the methods which could enable them participate better in school activities.

References

AHIMBISIBWE.C (2009) Parents close school. *The New Vision.* Kampala.

Ahmad, J, S.Devarajan, S.Khemani, S.Shah (2005). Decentralisation and Service Delivery. Washington: D.C, World Bank.

Appleton, s. (1997). User fees, expenditure restructuring and voucher systems in education. Helsinki, World Bank.

Appleton, s. (2001). Education, incomes and poverty in Uganda in the 1990s. Nottingham; university of Nottingham**: 1-50.**'

ARUA, DISTRICT (2009) Arua District Education Ordinance. IN ARUA, DISTRICT (Ed.), UPPU.

Arua, District (Three Year Rolling Development Plan,).

Batageka, L. (2005). Universal primary education: Uganda. London, Overseas Development Institute.

Blair, H. (2000). "Participation and accountability at the periphary: Democratic local governance in six countries." World Development **28**(1): 23-39.

Bray, M. (1996). Directions in development: Decentralisation of education; community financing. Washington D.C, World Bank.

Bray, M. (2007). "Educational governance at local level: Governance and Free Education: Directions, Mechanisms and Policy Tensions." 23-35

Chapman, D., E.Barcikowski, M.Sowah, E.Gyamera and G.Woode. (2002). "Do communities know best? Testing a premise of educational decentralisation: Community member's perceptions of their local schools in Ghana." International journal of Educational Development **22**: 181-189.

Cleaver, F. (2007). "Understanding Agency in Collective Action." Journal of Human Development **8**(2): 223-244.

Cornwall, A, H.Lucas and K.Pasteur (2000). "Accountability through participation: developing modals in health sector." **31**(1): 1-13.

Cornwall, A and J.Geventa (2001). From Users and Choosers to Makers and Shakers: Repositioning Participation in social policy. Brighton, IDS.

Crook, R and J.Manor (1998). <u>Democracy and Decentralisation in South Asia and West Africa: Participation, Accountability and Performance</u>. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Darrow, M and A. Thomas (2005). "Power, Capture and Conflict: a call for human rights accountability in development cooperation." <u>Human rights quarterly</u> **27**: 471-538.

Dauda, C. (2004). "The importance of de facto decentralisation in primary education in sub Saharan Africa." <u>journal of planning education and research</u> **24**(1): 28-40.

De Grauwe, A, C.Lugaz, D.Balde, C.Diakhate, C.Dougnon, D.Moustapha and D.Odushina (2005). "Does decentralisation lead to school improvement? Findings and lessons from research in West Africa." <u>Journal of Education for International Development</u> **1**(1): 1-15.

Fountain, Publishers (2007). <u>Uganda Districts information Hand Book. Expanded Edition 2007-08</u>. Kampala, Fountain.

Georgiou, S. N. (1999). <u>Parental involvement in Cyprus</u>. Cyprus, Nicosia.

Goetz, A.M and R.Jenkins (1999). Accounts and Accountability: theoretical implications of the right to information movement in India, Brighton, Institute of development studies.

Golooba, M. F. (2000). Reassessing participation in Uganda. <u>New institutional theory, institutional reform and poverty reduction</u>. London London School of economics.

GOVERNMENT, OF UGANDA (1993) The Local Council Statute. IN MINISTRY, OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT (Ed.), Government of Uganda.

Government, of Uganda (1995). Constitution of Republic of Uganda, Law Development Centre.

Government, of Uganda (1996). The Education Management committees' amendment rules Ministry, of Education, Government of Uganda. **224**.

Government, of Uganda (1997). The Local Government Act, Law Development Centre.**243.**

Government, of Uganda (2008). The Education Act (pre-primary, primary and post-primary) Act. Ministry, of Education and Sports, UPPC.**127.**

Hansen.B.H (1984). <u>Mission, Church and State in a colonial Setting, Uganda 1890-1925</u>. London, Heinemann.

Maired.D, K. A., S.Humphreys (2007). School processes, local governance and community participation: understanding Access. Brighton, University of Sussex**:** 1-59.

Manor, J. (2004). "User committees: a potentially damaging second wave of decentralisation." <u>The European journal of development research</u> **16**(1): 192-213.

Mwanga, N.K (2000). The politics of primary Education in Uganda: Parents Participation and National reforms. <u>PHD</u>. Toronto, University of Toronto.

Nishimura, M and Y. Sasoaka (2009). "Does universal primary education policy weaken decentralisation? Participation and accountability frameworks in East Africa." <u>Compare: A journal of comparative and international Education:</u> 1-17.

OVERSEAS, DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION (1995) Guidance note on how to do stakeholder analysis of aid projects and programmes. ODA.

Passi, F. O. (1995). The rise of people's organisation in primary education in Uganda. <u>Service provision under stress in east Africa</u>. J.Semboja and O. Therkildsen. Copenhagen, centre for development research.

Prinsen, G and K.Titeca (2008). "Uganda's decentralised primary education: Musical chairs and inverted elite capture in school management committees." <u>Journal of public administration and development</u> **28**: 149-164.

Pryor.J (2005). "Can community participation mobilise social capital for improvement of rural schooling? A case study from Ghana." Compare **25**(2): 193-203.

PRYOR.J (2003) Community Participation in Rural Schooling: The cart before the horse, a case study from Ghana. Sussex, Centre for International Education, University of Sussex, UK.

Reinkka, R, and J.Svensson (2004). "Local capture: evidence from a central government transfer programme in Uganda." The quarterly journal of economics **119**: 679-700.

Rondinelli, D. (1998). Decentralisation briefing notes. Washington, D.C, World Bank.

Saito, F. (2003). Decentralisation and development partnerships-lessons from Uganda. Tokyo, Springer.

Shew, P and C.Griffin (1995). Financing health care in sub-Saharan Africa through user fee and insurance. Washington, D.C, World Bank.

Sullivan, M. (1991). Supporting change in primary school. London, Longman.

Suzuki, I. (2002). "Parental participation and accountability in primary schools in Uganda." Compare: journal of comparative education **32**(2): 243-259

Tan, J.P, K.H.Lee and A.Mingat (1984). User charges for education: the ability and willingness to pay in Malawi. Washington, D.C, World Bank.

Watt, P. (2001). Community support for basic education in sub-Saharan Africa. Washington, D.C, World Bank.