



DECENTRALIZATION AND EDUCATION SERVICE DELIVERY

A CASE OF KIBALE SUB COUNTY, PALLISA DISTRICT

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BY

OTUKOL CLEMENT

BU/UP/2021/2417

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT

SCIENCES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE AWARD OF A BACHELOR'S DEGREE OF PUBLIC

ADMINISTRATION OF BUSITEMA UNIVERSITY

AUGUST, 2024

DECLARATION

I OTUKOL CLEMENT truly declare that this research report carried out on the topic “Decentralization and Education Service Delivery, a case of Kibale Sub County, Pallisa District Local Government” was entirely my content, and this has been a result of my effort and the supervisor’s guidance.

This is my original work and it has never been submitted to any university for academic or other purposes.

Signed: 

Date: 30/08/2024

OTUKOL CLEMENT

BU/UP/2021/2417

APPROVAL

This is to certify that this research report of Otukol Clement titled, "Decentralization and education service delivery, a case study of Kibale Sub County, Pallisa district" has my approval as the University Supervisor.

Signed.....

Date..... 31st August 2024

Supervisor's Name: MR. MAYENDE THOMAS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My sincere thanks goes to my parent, sisters, brothers and friends for the support, resources and care they have rendered to me in the course of my studies right from childhood until now. I recognize their input especially at the level when am pursuing a Bachelors of Public Administration and Management.

In a special way, I will also acknowledge the great work that was done by the head teacher of the schools where I did my research from.

I further acknowledge with sincere appreciation to my supervisor Mr. Thomas Mayende for the guidance and support during this research. I should say thank you to every person; and also fellow students and even the general community that contributed to my academic progress during this research are hereby appreciated.

May the Almighty God bless you all, Amen!

ACRONYMS

LG	Local Government.
EFA	Education for All.
NRA	National Resistance Army.
NRM	National Resistance Movement.
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme.
CVI	Content Validity Index.

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Showing Conceptual Framework	8
--	---

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 3.1 Showing Reliability and Validity results.....	21
Table 2 4.1 Showing Gender of the Respondent.....	23
Table 3 4.2 Showing Age of Respondent.....	23
Table 4 4.3 Showing Marital Status of the Respondent.....	24
Table 5 4.4: Showing the Level of Education.....	25
Table 6 4.5 Showing Correlation between the Variables	25
Table 7 4.6 Showing Regression Analysis on Decentralization.....	26
Table 8 4.7 Showing Regression Analysis on Innovation and Quality of Education	26
Table 9 4.8 Showing Regression Analysis on School Governance and Management.....	27

ABSTRACT

The study examined the impact of decentralization on education service delivery, a case of Kibale Sub County, Pallisa district local government with independent variable; decentralization (impact of decentralization, innovation, school governance and management) and education service delivery as the dependent variable, research questions were; what is the impact of decentralization on education service delivery outcomes?, what is the potential of decentralization to promote innovation and improve the quality of education? and what is the impact of decentralization on school governance and management?

A cross-sectional research design was employed with a qualitative approach in data collection. The study population comprised of 02 Headteachers, 02 Deputy Headteachers and 36 teachers from the two schools in Kibale Sub County, Pallisa District. A sample of 36 respondents was used. The interview guide was aimed at collecting the key expression from the respondents to supplement data from the questionnaires

The study concluded that; to a large extent, decentralization has a potential to improve efficiency, accountability, community involvement in education service delivery but it poses some challenges that need to be addressed to ensure maximum results.

TABLE OF CONTENT

Contents

DECLARATION	i
APPROVAL	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iii
ACRONYMS	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	v
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
TABLE OF CONTENT	viii
CHAPTER ONE	1
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	5
1.3 Objectives of the Study	5
1.4 Purpose of the Study	5
1.5 Research Questions	5
1.6 Scope of the Study	5
1.6.1 Contextual Scope	6
1.6.2 Geographical Scope	6
1.6.3 Time Scope	6
1.7 Significance of the Study	6

1.8 Conceptual Framework	8
1.9 Definition of Terms	8
CHAPTER TWO	11
LITERATURE REVIEW	11
2.0 Introduction	11
2.1 The Impact of Decentralization on Education Service Delivery Outcomes	11
2.2 The Potential of Decentralization to Promote Innovation and Improve the Quality of Education	13
2.3 The Impact of Decentralization on School Governance and Management	14
2.4 Summary of Literature Reviewed	16
CHAPTER THREE	18
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	18
3.0 Introduction	18
3.1 Research Design	18
3.2 Study Population	18
3.3 Sample Size	18
3.4 Sampling Method	19
3.4.1 Purposive Sampling	19
3.5 Type and Sources Data	19
3.6 Data Collection methods	19
3.6.1. Interview Guide	19
3.7 Data Analysis Plan	20

3.7.1 Qualitative Data Analysis	20
3.8 Ethical Considerations	20
3.9 Reliability and Validity	20
3.7.2 Reliability	21
3.10 Ethical Considerations	21
CHAPTER FOUR	22
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS	22
4.0 Introduction	22
4.1 Response Rate	22
4.2 Demographic Characteristics	22
4.2.1 Gender of the Respondent	22
4.2.2 Age of the Respondents	23
4.2.3 Marital Status of the Respondents	24
4.2.4 Level of Education	24
4.2.5 Correlation between the variables	25
4.2.6 Regression Analysis	26
4.3 Responses to Impact of decentralization on education service delivery outcomes. ...	27
4.4 The potential of decentralization to promote innovation and improve the quality of education.	30
4.5 The Impact of Decentralization on School Governance and Management.	31
CHAPTER FIVE	32
5.0 Introduction	32

5.1 Discussion of the Findings	32
5.1.1 The Impact of Decentralization on Education Service Delivery Outcomes	32
5.1.2 The Potential of decentralization to Promote Innovation and Improve the Quality of education.....	33
5.1.3 The Impact of Decentralization on School Governance and Management	34
5.2 Conclusion	34
5.3 Recommendations	34
5.4 Limitations.....	34
5.5 Areas for Further Research.....	35
REFERENCES.....	37
APPENDIX 1: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION.....	39
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE	40
APPENDIX III: INTERVIEW GUIDE	43
APPENDIX IV: WORK PLAN.....	44
APPENDIX V: RESEARCH BUDGET	45
APPENDIX VI: MAP OF PALLISA DISTRICT SHOWING STUDY AREA	46
APPENDIX VI: SAMPLE SIZES (S) REQUIRED FOR THE GIVEN POPULATION	47

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This study examined the impact of decentralization on education service delivery in Kibale Sub County, Pallisa District. Decentralization was the independent variable while education service delivery was the dependent variable. This chapter presents the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research objectives, research questions, and scope of the study, significance of the study, conceptual framework and definition of terms.

1.1 Background of the study

There has been a global trend of decentralizing education systems over the last decades. Most countries are experimenting with or considering some form of educational decentralization which implies delegation of power and authority from the central government to the regional or local levels, or to schools. The policies and practices for implementing decentralization reforms vary widely across countries, and also within countries, in terms of how much authority is allocated and to which level in the system it is delegated (Winkler, 1993). Centralization and decentralization are not "either-or" conditions, and in many countries a balance between the two is found, (Maslowski et al, 2007).

Many third world countries are facing challenges of delivering public services to the grassroots in order to ensure sustainable development. However, the policy of decentralization aims at increasing efficiency in service delivery (Steiner, 2006). According to Sääksjärvi, Lassila, & Nordström, (2005), these services should be delivered in an effective, predictable, reliable and customer friendly manner. The study further notes that through the education sector most especially the decentralized Local Governments (LG) can achieve the objectives, better use of the resources, fulfill social responsibility, enable the public to get personal satisfaction and government to take useful decisions.

Effective service delivery in the sectors of education and perhaps health at the local level (Kakumba, 2010; Wasswa, 2008; Bashaasha, Mangheni & Nkonya, 2011) is of paramount importance even though central government is still anxious to retain authority and resources, that sometimes impedes effective local decision making in the above sectors. The most

REFERENCES

- International Journal of Educational Management (2017). Decentralization and Educational Governance: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 31(6), 531-548.
- World Bank (2018). Decentralization and Educational Governance: A review of Literature. World Bank, Policy Research Working Paper 8640.
- Journal of Educational Administration (2019). Decentralization and Educational Governance: A review of the Literature. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 57(3), 331-348.
- World Bank (2008). World Development Report 2008. Agriculture for Development. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank.
- UNESCO (2015). World Teachers Day 2015: Teachers make a difference. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- OECD (2007). Decentralization and school Autonomy: An International Perspective. Organizations for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- DFID (2005). Decentralization and Education: A review of Literature. Department of International Development.
- Barrera-Osorio, Fasih, Patrinos & Santibanez, (2009). Decentralized decision making in schools: The theory of and evidence on school autonomy. *World Bank Research Observer*, 24(2), 147-165.
- Gurr, (2017). School autonomy and community involvement. In M.A. Peters (E.d), *Encyclopedia of Educational Philosophy and Theory* (pp. 1-6). Springer.
- Hanushek, E.A (2003). The failure of input-based schooling policies. *Economic Journal*, 113(485), F64-F98.
- Hess, F.M. (2006). *EDUCATIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Realities, challenges, possibilities*. Harvard Education Press.
- Lubienski, C. (2003). The public and private in public education: Theoretical and empirical perspectives. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 18(3), 331-346.

- Whitty, G (2006). Teacher professionalism in a new era. In E.A. Hanushek & F. Welch (Eds.), Handbook of the economics of education (Vol. 2, pp. 1069 - 1100). Elsevier.
- Caldwell, (2005). School-based management. In J.W. Guthrie (Ed.), Encyclopedia of education (2nd ed., pp. 215-219). Macmillan.
- Fullan, M. (2017). The new meaning of educational change (4th ed.). teachers College Press.
- Hess, F. M. (2006). Educational entrepreneurship: Realities, challenges, possibilities. Havard Edition Press.
- Hargraves, A. (2003). Teaching in the knowledge society: Edition in the age of insecurity. Teachers College Press.
- Lubienski, C. (2003). The relationship between decentralization and equity in education. In W. K. Cummings & J. H. Williams (Eds.), Decentralization and the management of education (pp. 131-154). World Bank.