

# Decentralisation and Education Service Delivery in Selected Local Governments in Uganda

<sup>1</sup>Rosebell Twinomujuni

Researcher

Ndejje University, P O Box 7088  
Kampala, Uganda

<sup>2</sup>Henry Musoke Buwule

Senior Lecturer in Business  
Administration

Ndejje University, P O Box 7088  
Kampala, Uganda

<sup>3</sup>David KW Ssonko

Senior Lecturer in Management  
Science

Ndejje University, P O Box 7088  
Kampala, Uganda

<sup>4</sup>Nazarious Rukanyangira

Senior Lecturer in Business Administration  
Muni University, P O Box 725 Arua, Uganda

Or

Ndejje University  
P.o Box 7088, Kampala, Uganda

**Abstract:-** The paper was largely undertaken to explore the impact of educational decentralization on education service delivery in chosen Local Governments in Uganda. The results point out to moderate level of Education Service Delivery in Ugandan Local Governments ( $M = 2.74$ ,  $SD = 1.095$ ) with a statistically significant negative influence of nominal participation on education service delivery ( $\beta = -0.514$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Results also showed instrumental participation has got a statistically significant positive influence on Education decentralization ( $\beta = 0.299$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) with administrative decentralization has a negative significant influence on education service delivery ( $\beta = -0.264$ ,  $p = 0.003 < 0.05$ ). Results also showed instrumental participation has got a statistically significant positive influence on Education decentralization ( $\beta = 0.299$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) with administrative decentralization has a negative significant influence on education service delivery ( $\beta = -0.264$ ,  $p = 0.003 < 0.05$ ). The study concluded that education service delivery remains crucial but with appropriate integration of administrative decentralization. Henceforth among others the Ministry of Education and Sports in partnership with local educational authorities ought to develop and institutionalize strategies that periodically strengthen powers of local authorities to allocate financial resources and as well develop regulatory controls in public educational institutions for enhanced education service delivery.

**Keywords:-** Decentralisation, Education Service Delivery, Educational Institutions, Financial Resources.

## I. INTRODUCTION

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). To weigh this possibility, the

current study examined the effect of decentralization of education services in chosen Local governments in Uganda.

Smoke, P. (2015), avers that the state of Uganda through decentralised authority to local governments has a task to deliver a broad range of public services and in particular education services as one of the traditional public services. Service delivery (Thomas, J. C., 2013), can be defined as any contact with the public administration during which customers or citizens, residents or enterprises seek or provide data, handle the affairs or fulfill the duties. According to Sääksjärvi, M., Lassila, A., & Nordström, H. (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 decentralised local governments 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.

The current study was underpinned by the expectancy-disconfirmation model (EDM) which has become the main approach in explaining citizen satisfaction with public services (Zhang, Chen, Petrovsky, & Walker, 2021). It posits that citizens compare the performance of a service against their expectations of that service.

In Uganda, decentralization policy was aimed at ensuring responsive and accountable citizens in addition to promoting capacity building at the local level and fostering a sense of local ownership (Mushemeza, 2019). Other such social democratic policies that Uganda embraced are privatization, liberalization and commercialization of higher education. Decentralization of the Ugandan education system is closely linked to other education reforms including the universalisation of basic and secondary education, growing privatization and commercialization of higher education (Ahmad, Devarajan, Khemani, & Shah, 2005). However, the Ugandan process of decentralization,

devolution of education service delivery was mainly driven by political will rather than technical educational reform which aimed at ensuring that all citizens participate in the education process across the country (Yvonne, 2012; Ziersch, 2011). Through decentralization, public services have been brought closer to the people in developing countries like Uganda.

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 important principles of government is to ensure that you have a diversified portfolio of programs (Twinomujuni, R., Mawa, M., Musoke, H. B., & Rukanyangira, N., 2022) and the government should also be capable of differentiating the services but without compromising on the Quality in order to gain the trust of citizens and be able to reap and create more revenue streams.

#### ➤ *Statement of the Problem*

Decentralisation has a positive impact on service delivery (Muriu, 2014). In introducing decentralisation it was deemed that the participation when implemented using Decentralised education services and Quality of the services, Local government would have improved service delivery (Uganda Local Government Performance assessment report, 2019/2020).

However, Local government's service delivery in the Education sector averagely increased by only 9 % (from 56% to 65 %) instead of the desired 44 % raise (from 56% to 100%) leaving a big crevice of 35% not achieved ((Uganda Local Government Performance assessment report, 2019/2020). ) despite interventions through provision of more teachers ,continuously improving quality of classrooms and instructional materials and establishing functional Parents teachers' Associations(PTA) (Districts state of affairs annual performance reports, 2019/2020), the timely payment of teachers at all levels, payment of grants like UPE grants, support to early childhood grade reading (Uganda Local Government Performance assessment report, 2019/2020). There has also remained complaints on, Poor performance in national exams, Limited services in upcountry schools, Marginal increment in number of school children, delayed feedback and complaint handling ,limited brand popularity of government aided schools, irregular Innovations and constructions of classrooms and toilets, as well as no limited and /or no teachers Houses all (Districts state of affairs annual performance reports, 2019/2020) which may be attributed to emergence of economical and look alike private schools, poor monitoring and support supervision of schools and not resolving citizen's complaints in time leaving them ranting and resorting to international schools for the able Ugandans (Uganda Local Government Performance assessment report, 2019/2020).

This seems to indicate that Local Governments are not experiencing service delivery as was expected. The unmet levels of service delivery left a performance gap in terms of the existing decentralisation levels.

Considering the unmet education Service delivery levels made by the selected local governments the current study therefore sought to establish how much decentralisation contributed to Ugandan Education Service Delivery.

#### ➤ *Objectives*

To scrutinise the impact of decentralization on education service delivery in chosen Local Governments in Uganda.

## II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### ➤ *The Concept of Education Service Delivery*

The government of Uganda attaches great importance to education service delivery as a power full tool for transforming society. She has therefore given local councils responsibilities and powers to run and manage schools. Education service delivery at primarily level is a responsibility of the District Education Officer under the supervision of the district councils (Mulindwa 2006).

In addition, the government of Uganda has set aside conditional grants under the education sector which include Classroom Construction Grant (CCG), School Facilities Grant (SFG) and Universal Primary Education (UPE) in order to ensure quality education service delivery, These grants are meant to construct classrooms, build teachers' houses, general management of the schools, and teachers' welfare among others to improve performance of the sector (Kisembo 2006).

The Education Act enacted in 2008 sub-section (ii) gives full effect to the decentralization of Education services. In the education sector, the authority for primary education has been transferred to local governments, along with the legal framework centered on the Constitution and the Local Government Act (Twinomujuni, R., Mawa, M., Musoke, H. B., & Rukanyangira, N., 2022.). In the primary education sub-sector(Act (Twinomujuni, R., Mawa, M., Musoke, H. B., & Rukanyangira, N., 2022.), decentralization to local governments and schools has progressed since the introduction of Universal Primary Education (UPE) in 1997 while decentralization in the secondary education sub-sector lags behind the primary education sector.

Rukanyangira, N., & Oidu, M. K. (2021) avers that Service delivery in the education sector is hampered by the limitation in funding by government and academicians who may have all it takes to research and nurture projects and therefore the private sector support on such initiatives will be a giant step in economic development of Uganda.

➤ *The Concept of Educational Decentralization*

Decentralization of education has been a worldwide phenomenon the last decades (He, A. E. (2011)). Countries on every continent have started to decentralize their educational systems. This decentralization process has been promoted by international development organizations and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) (Fowler, A. (2013).) The pursuit of decentralization is widespread, as both developed and developing countries attempt to challenge central governments' monopoly of policymaking power (Ebel, R. D., & Yilmaz, S. (2002)). In the western world, educational decentralization has been carried out to reorganize the organizational structure of government (Lefèvre, C. (1998)).

The transition from a socialist system to a market economy and democracy has resulted in educational decentralisation of the state throughout post-communist Central and Eastern Europe (Guasti, P. (2016)). Educational decentralization has the potential to improve economic and financial management and as result enhance service delivery. However, it is not a panacea for all economic problems; rather, it increases the potential for a better service delivery.

According to Neblo, M. A., Esterling, K. M., & Lazer, D. M. (2018), a representative government works best when it is close to the people. The economists' rationale for decentralization is in fact based on the allocative efficiency argument.

Musgrave (1959) argues in the seminal work that policies of sub national branches of government should be allowed to differ in order to reflect the preferences of the residents. Oates (1972) expanded on Musgrave's arguments, stating that "each public service should be provided by the jurisdiction having control over the minimum geographic area that would internalize the benefits and costs of such provision."

In a world where most governments have experienced the pitfalls of centralized education service provision, mainly poor decision-making, administrative and fiscal inefficiency, and poor quality and access to services, the theoretical advantages of decentralization have become extremely appealing (Von Braun, J., & Grote, U., 2002). In general, the process of decentralization can substantially improve efficiency, transparency, accountability, and responsiveness of service provision compared with centralized systems (Dabla-Norris, E. (2006)). Decentralized education provision worldwide promises to be more efficient, better reflect local priorities, encourage participation, and, eventually, improve coverage and quality (Litvack, J. I., & Seddon, J. (Eds.), 1999) and in particular, governments with severe fiscal constraints are enticed by the potential of decentralization to increase efficiency. Beneficiary cost recovery schemes such as community financing have emerged as means for central governments to off-load some of the fiscal burden of education service provision (Akpan, E. O. (2011)).

In most parts of the world, the evidence about the impact of decentralization on education services is mixed and limited (Joshi, A. (2013) as in Brazil, it has increased overall access (enrollments) but has done little to reverse persistent regional inequities in access to schooling, per capita expenditures, and quality. Litvack, J. I., & Seddon, J. (Eds.). (1999) on the other hand avers that Chile's experience also suggests that decentralization does not by itself remove inequalities between localities of varying incomes, and quality in poorer communities continues to lag.

In addition to global trends in decentralization, Africa's encounter with various forms of local governance as has been argued pre-dates colonialism (Twinomujuni, R., Mawa, M., Musoke, H. B., & Rukanyangira, N. (2022)). Commentators (Olowu, D., & Wunsch, J. S., 2004). point out that Africa's encounter with modes of social formations and indigenous governance systems which are associated with modern day decentralized governance such as markets, self-help community organization, farmers unions, and local interest groups has always been part of African societies.

According to Turner, M., Hulme, D., Turner, M., & Hulme, D. (1997), historically, experimentations with decentralization of education in Africa dates back to the colonial reforms of the 1950s; however, it must be noted that this experience differs from country to country, with the occurrence of local government in some countries stretching beyond colonial days. For instance Nnabuihe, O. E., & Onwuzuruigbo, I. (2021), asserts that globalization; internal economic crisis; structural adjustment; and democratization; as well as local domestic forces including urbanization, and the quest to strengthen pre-existing ethnic identities may have influenced the emergence of decentralisation.

According to Sanyare, F. N. (2013) decentralisation reforms in Africa have progressed in five distinct phases, each representing a development epoch and influenced by different political, economic, and social motivations. Faced with mostly vast and difficult to traverse terrain, with fewer than is necessary colonial administrators, Africa's colonisers are believed to have initiated and implemented a form of decentralized local governance (Sanyare, F. N., 2013). The coloniser's primary tactic was helped by existing traditional rulers who became a preferred way to reach the hinterland and Bergh, S. (2004) affirms that, this form of local governance, often referred to as 'indirect rule' first appeared in Asian states, particularly in India in the early 1950s, and reached Africa by the 1960s.

Namukas, I. K., & Buye, R. (2009), asserts that in Africa, sub-Saharan Africa the factors that encourage decentralization include positive effects such as political Stability and economic development, as well as push factors like existing regional Inequalities and inadequacies, real and perceived, of central governments. Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Brinkerhoff, J. M. (2015), opines that multilateral and bilateral donor communities are encouraging countries in the South to decentralize and/or privatize public services. Among these countries Uganda has proceeded quickly in an

almost all at-once decentralization strategy (Namukas, I. K., & Buye, R. (2009).

In Uganda, decentralization is not totally new. Regional governments mainly in the form of monarchies and chiefdoms were abolished in 1966, four Years after independence (Twinomujuni, R., Mawa, M., Musoke, H. B., & Rukanyangira, N. (2022), and the post-independence constitution of Uganda laid a legal framework for redcentralization based on regional governments but this never took off. Namukas, I. K., & Buye, R. (2009) avows that the current Ugandan government administered some decentralization in the areas under its control in the early 1980s while it was still a guerilla force called the National Resistance Army (now a political force called National Resistance Movement. After it came to power in 1986, the government adopted 3 country-wide decentralization, cost sharing and Privatization as policies supported by multinational donor agencies such as the World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme (Namukas, I. K., & Buye, R. (2009)).

Since 1997, Uganda government has pursued a devolution form of decentralisation in which political, administrative and fiscal powers were transferred to elected local leaders (executive and councilors), and service delivery systems and processes placed in the hands of local government technical officials Francis, P., & James, R. (2003) and the Local citizens were given the right to hold local leaders accountable through elected representatives working as subnational legislative structures called Local Government Councils: District Councils, Municipal Councils, Sub-County Councils, Town Councils, and all-inclusive Village/ Cell Councils (MoLG, 2000).

Twinomujuni, R., Mawa, M., Musoke, H. B., & Rukanyangira, N. (2022); Namukas, I. K., & Buye, R. (2009), avows that to date most government-administered services in uganda (except a few, such as the police and the Army) that have not yet been privatized are decentralized and these include education, basic services in water and sanitation, feeder roads and Agricultural extension. Decentralization has changed the delivery of public Services, particularly education.

Uganda's decentralization program has, in principle, (Francis, P., & James, R. , 2003; Kakumba, 2010) facilitated immense opportunities for communities to participate in the water, education and health sector planning and decision making processes in their respective communities and local governments. However, these opportunities have not been optimally exercised. Riggs, E., Gibbs, L., Kilpatrick, N., Gussy, M., van Gemert, C., Ali, S., & Waters, E. (2015 affirms that Access to water-, education-, and health-related information remains low at community level, which is a concern as access to information is a necessary condition for participation. However, in all scholarly literature available it is evident that alertness among community members and the leaders of the right of citizens to participate in decision-making processes remains significantly low.

### ➤ *The Concept of Service Delivery*

Citizen participation on any level of government is timeless Fourie, D. J. (2001), and the dynamics and the relationships of citizen participation on all levels are unique, due to the fact that many problems and solutions have their roots in the activities of local government and its administration. Furthermore, the extension of democracy to all spheres of society and to all tiers of the administrative hierarchy, have been a central theme of the democratization process. The notion of "bringing the government to the people" is important, not only in strengthening civil society, but also in mobilizing the population to implement the programmes of reconstruction and development necessary to transform the civil society (Fourie, D. J. (2001).Therefore, the dynamics come in as a result of the role and purpose of a government, that is, capacity to act, deliberation and openness Jennstål, J. (2018). With role and purpose in mind,(Fourie, D. J. (2001), affirms that attention is then devoted to the problems and pitfalls of citizen participation in government administration.

Booth, A., & Dunn, J. F. (2013); .Sanders (2007) argues that structural factors such as governance, curriculum, group memberships, and ethnic-specific parenting styles have more serious implications for links between home and school than beliefs and attitudes of parents and teachers. The authors believe that parents are more likely to involve themselves in the primary grades than in the middle and high schools because middle schools' teachers have neither the time nor the resources to closely monitor the performance of each student and keep parents informed of ways in which they can assist their children. This has led to limited communication between teachers and parents hence the community is not fully involved in managing of school activities beyond provision of monetary resources.

In their observation Onsomu and Mujidi (2011) confirm that in majority of Africa countries, teachers appear not to accommodate community involvement or entice parents to become more involved. Some of these provide fewer instructions for parents, vary meeting times for parents, find less effective communication mechanisms and do less or no home visits. In support Twinomujuni, R., Mawa, M., Musoke, H. B., & Rukanyangira, N. (2022); Naidoo and Anton (2013)affirm that in most cases the family-community are not given chance in doing the business of schooling, create site-based decision making that involves parents and recreate a school structure that is less bureaucratic, less impersonal and less budget-driven and in general overcoming barriers to parent involvement in the broad context of needed systemic changes. This is the case in local governments such as Mbale, Mukono, Gulu and Bushenyi whereby there is schools do not effectively allow parents and community members to effectively participate in the education services.

Given the ever increasing organisations in education sector entering the private sector in Uganda the politicians and administrators should be looking for ways to attract and retain citizens in order to remain relevant in the society. Hence, the current study sought to examine the general impact of decentralisation on service delivery and whether quality of services can influence service delivery in decentralised education services sector in Uganda. Several important studies mentioned above have used different setups to focus on the effects of service delivery of citizens in imperfectly organised societies, hence leaving a gap which this research contributes to the literature by reporting on what is, to the best of the researcher’s knowledge, the first research designed to assess the impact of enhancing service delivery by improving quality of services in the education services sector in Uganda.

➤ *Theories Underpinning Education Service Delivery*

Looking at the current study and given the importance of service delivery in the education services Sector the

expectancy-disconfirmation model (EDM) seems to explain the meaning, nature, and challenges associated with citizen participation’s contribution to service delivery.

The expectancy-disconfirmation model (EDM) has become the predominant approach in explaining citizen satisfaction with public services (Zhang, Chen, Petrovsky, & Walker, 2021). It posits that citizens compare the performance of a service against their expectations of that service. Satisfaction occurs if the perceived performance meets or exceeds the expectations Zhang, et al. (2021). Across studies and settings, citizens’ satisfaction with public services is not only a function of how well they perceive these services to work but also of their expectations of these services (Zhang, J., Chen, W., Petrovsky, N., & Walker, R. M. ,2021). It is therefore important to understand what citizens expect from public services when assessing their satisfaction.

Table 1 Summary of Reviewed Literature Gaps

Author	Gaps	Explanation
Harwood and Garry, (2006); Hultman and Shaw, (2003).	Knowledge	Previous research has mainly focused on decentralised education services practices in larger firms and that there is a scarcity of empirical studies about the decentralised Education practices in local governments.
(Uganda Local Government Performance assessment report, 2019/2020).	Evidence	Despite interventions made by local governments in enhancing citizen satisfaction there have remained complaints on service delivery.
Simpson et al (2006) Yau et al(2000) Siu et al (2003).	Geographical	Most of the previous debates have been in the context of western culture. Subsequently Decentralised education services models developed by the western world may not necessarily apply in different socio-cultural contexts like Uganda.
Zikmund et al. (2010) and Kothari (2004),	Population	The parent population of the study is the sub county and district administrative units drawn from first districts to be to be decentralized which were not adequately represented or under-researched in the prior studies regarding citizen participation and decentralized education service delivery.

III. METHODOLOGY

The current study employed a cross sectional survey design. The study was cross-sectional because it was conducted across participants at a point in time. A cross-sectional study design is where the purpose of the study is descriptive and in the form of a survey (Levin, K. A. (2006). The survey design was employed to enable collection of data from a large number of respondents belonging to various categories.

➤ *Population and Sample*

Using Yamane’s (1967) formula a sample size of 284 will be selected from the target population of 976 respondents.

➤ *Data Collection from the Field*

• *Data Collection Procedure*

This study necessitated collecting data from respondents at Bushenyi, Mbale, Gulu and Mukono District. So to successfully do that the following procedure was adopted:

Table 2 Formal Approvals for Field Research

Phase	Field research approvals	Accomplishment
one	University approval of proposal and tools	Approved
	Ethics Committees and NCST approval	Approved
	Districts or local governments’ and other key informants approval to gather data	Granted

The above table explains the formal approval process for the field research that included university approval of proposal and tools, ethics committees and NCST approval and company’ approval for collection of data that was carried out.

Table 3 Execution of Field Research to Get Quantitative Data

Phase	Conducting field research	Accomplishment
Two	Preparation of research tools	Achieved
	Recruitment and training of 04 research assistants	Achieved
	Two Research assistants deployed to Mbale and Gulu	Done
	Two Research assistants deployed to Mukono and Bushenyi	Done

The above table revealed that execution of field research to get quantitative data was achieved for the preparation of research tools, Recruitment and training of 04 research assistants and the respective deployments of research assistants. Field research to get qualitative data.

Table 4 Field Research to Get Qualitative Data

Phase	Use of qualitative methods	Accomplishment
Three	Interviews of key respondents	Done
	Review of primary documents	Done
	Review of secondary literature	Done

In the above table it was noted that field research to get qualitative data was accomplished using the following methods; interview of key respondents, review primary documents and review of secondary literature.

Table 5 Data Processing and Analysis

Phase	Data	Accomplishment
Four	Data collected as proposed	Done
	Quantitative data analysed with SPSS	Done
	Qualitative data analysed thematically	Done
	Thesis assembled and submitted	Done

The above table showed that data processing and analysis was accomplished basing on data collected as proposed, quantitative analysis with SPSS, qualitative data analysed thematically and the thesis assembled and submitted. The data procedure triangulated different methods of data collection and analysis.

#### ➤ Research Findings

The objective of the study was to investigate the influence of educational decentralization on education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda.

Table 6 Pearson Correlational Results for the Relationship between Political Educational Decentralization and Education Service Delivery in Selected Local Governments in Uganda

Correlations			
		Education service delivery	Political decentralization
Education service delivery	Pearson Correlation	1	0.008
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.913
	N	212	212
Political decentralization	Pearson Correlation	0.008	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.913	
	N	212	212

Source: Primary Data (2022)

As in **Table**, study findings show a very weak positive relationship between Political educational decentralization and education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda ( $r = 0.008$ ). This result is however not statistically insignificant ( $p = 0.913$ ). The result shows that when Political educational decentralization is reduced education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda also reduces and an increase in Political educational decentralization increases education service delivery. The result is in line with the earlier found by Tabiti, 2011 that the notion of "bringing the government to the people" is important, not only in strengthening civil society, but also in mobilizing the population to implement the programmes of reconstruction and development necessary to transform the civil society. The finding perhaps demonstrates the need for the ministry of education to consider having effective means of implementing political education decentralization.

Table 7 Pearson Correlational Results for the Relationship between Administrative Educational Decentralization and Education Service Delivery in Selected Local Governments in Uganda

<b>Correlations</b>			
		<b>Education service delivery</b>	<b>Administrative decentralization</b>
<b>Education service delivery</b>	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.206**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.003
	N	212	212
<b>Administrative decentralization</b>	Pearson Correlation	-0.206**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.003	
	N	212	212

\*\***. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

Source: Primary Data (2022)

The study results in **Table** reveal that there is a very weak negative relationship between Administrative educational decentralization and education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda ( $r = -0.206$ ). This result is statistically significant ( $p = 0.003$ ). The result shows that high levels Administrative educational decentralization implementation leads low quality education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda and vice versa. The result is in line with the earlier found by Stanton (2009) that whilst local councils having the authority to pass by-laws with respect to the implementation of their legally assigned functions and responsibilities, there is limited autonomy and need provincial approval when contracting out responsibilities as to better services. The result is an indication to the ministry of education that there is a need to keep close observation on Administrative educational decentralization and possibly modify its dimensions.

Table 8 Pearson Correlational Results for the Relationship between Fiscal Educational Decentralization and Education Service Delivery in Selected Local Governments in Uganda

<b>Correlations</b>			
		<b>Education service delivery</b>	<b>Fiscal decentralization</b>
<b>Education service delivery</b>	Pearson Correlation	1	0.034
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.625
	N	212	212
<b>Fiscal decentralization</b>	Pearson Correlation	0.034	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.625	
	N	212	212

Source: Primary Data (2022)

Results in **Table** indicate a very weak positive correlation between Fiscal educational decentralization and education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda ( $r = 0.034$ ). The result is however not statistically significant ( $p = 0.625$ ). The result means that when Fiscal educational decentralization is increased education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda is also improved whereas when Fiscal educational decentralization is reduced, education service delivery is also reduced. The result is centrally to what was earlier found by Adam et al. (2012) that irrespective of whether public sector efficiency concerns education or health services, an inverted U-shaped relationship exists between government efficiency in providing these services and fiscal decentralization. There are different from what Elhiraika (2013) had earlier found that fiscal decentralization on basic service delivery had a

negative and significant impact on demand for health relative to demand for other public services. This result calls for the ministry of education to consider monitoring Fiscal educational decentralization to promote effectiveness.

➤ *Regression Results for the Influence of Educational Decentralization on Education Service Delivery in Selected Local Governments in Uganda*

The regression results for the overall influence of the aspects of educational decentralization combined together on education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda are presented. The comparisons of the current results from the study are as well made in relationship to the findings from the earlier carried out studies. These results are presented in the table below;

Table 9 Multiple Regression Results for the Influence of Educational Decentralization on Education Service Delivery in Selected Local Governments in Uganda

Model		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>				
		Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.186	0.596		5.345	0.000
	Political decentralization	0.010	0.114	0.006	0.091	0.927
	Administrative decentralization	-0.264	0.088	-0.205	-3.005	0.003
	Fiscal decentralization	0.033	0.124	0.019	0.268	0.789
	R =	0.207 <sup>a</sup>				
	R Square =	0.043				
	F <sub>(3,208)</sub> =	3.109				
	p =	0.027 <sup>b</sup>				

**a. Dependent Variable: Education service delivery**

Source: Primary Data (2022)

As indicated in **Table** the study findings show that the sects of education decentralization that include; political decentralization, administrative decentralization and fiscal decentralization jointly have significant effect on education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda,  $F(3,208) = 3.109$ ,  $p = 0.027$ . As revealed by the multiple correlation coefficient of 0.207, there is a positive but very weak correlation between educational decentralization and education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda. The null hypothesis that educational decentralization has no effect on education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda is rejected.

The evidence is sufficient to prove that educational decentralization has a significant influence on education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda is rejected at 5% level of significance. The result as well shows that the dimensions of education decentralization identified as; political decentralization, administrative decentralization and fiscal decentralization explain 20.7% of the disparity in education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda (R Square = 0.207). The remaining 79.3% of the disparity in education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda is explained by other factors not considered in this study.

With reference from the model a, results indicate that Fiscal decentralization has got a positive influence though not significant effect on education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda ( $\beta = 0.033$ ,  $p = 0.789$ ). This result demonstrates if other factors in the model are kept constant, a unit increase in the level of Fiscal decentralization improves education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda by 0.033 units and vice versa. This result possibly indicates the need for the government to create opportunities for the local people to get involved in economic activities from which revenue can be generated.

The results as presented in the model and in **Table** indicate that administrative decentralization has a negative significant influence on education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda ( $\beta = -0.264$ ,  $p = 0.003 < 0.05$ ). This result indicates that keeping other factors in the model constant, a unit increase in the administrative

decentralization lowers education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda by 0.264 units and vice versa. This result calls for the ministry of education to consider effective dimensions of administrative decentralization for better results.

The results as in the model and **Table** Political decentralization has got a positive influence that is however not significant on education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda ( $\beta = 0.010$ ,  $p = 0.927 > 0.05$ ). This finding reveals that keeping other factors considered in this model constant, a unit increase in Political decentralization improves education service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda by 0.010 units and vice versa. This result calls for the ministry of education to put in place a mechanism that allows effective monitoring of political decentralization.

The study result on the overall show that the effect of the different education decentralization dimensions is highest with Fiscal decentralization ( $t = 0.268$ ) followed by Political decentralization ( $t = 0.091$ ) and least with Administrative decentralization ( $t = -3.005$ ). It is thus an indication by this result that the policy makers at the ministry of education always prioritize Fiscal decentralization followed by others in the respective order to better health service delivery.

➤ *Citizen Perception of Decentralisation of Education service*

When the citizen were asked of their perception about service quality, majority responses were;

I am convinced that government provides the best quality education services which meet the standards and are of desirable interest for all stakeholders. (Key Informant Interview, 2022).

Another key informant postulated that the government of Uganda is a major stakeholder in the education sector is more concerned with providing best quality education that has stood the test of time in a conducive environment and hence provides not only instructional materials but infrastructure as well. (Key Informant Interview, 2022).



The central themes that emerged from the above key interviews were best quality standing the taste of time and standards.

**Best quality and standards:** The service has stood the taste of time and in the perspective of quality service, it is services that have stood the taste of time that are important in explaining the clients' choice and consideration.

In response to the question of the interview guide about the effect of decentralisation on education service delivery, some Key informants candidly stated that;

I took my children to the leading school in my district because with the decentralisation of educational services the local authorities have put in more efforts to improve their schools grading and performance.... Yet some times when I try to get a vacancy for my children, I don't I find difficulty because of limited quality schools..... I am concerned about the influence of local leaders in our schools yet some of them do not have the required expertise... the local leaders are recruiting relatives to handle education affairs ... and others (Key Informants Interview, 2022).

Local leaders effort and influence of non experts are the major themes that emerged from the above transcribed data.

In response to the question of the interview guide about the level of decentralisation considered in the education sector , some informants apparently stated that;

All secondary schools and tertiary institutions are managed from the centre ... the ministry of education still provides policy guidelines to decentralised governments...may consider cooperation with the private sector because they offer better quality (Key Informant Interview, 2022).

In response to another question of the interview guide about the impact of the citizen participation on emerging themes in Marketing at local governments, some Key informants candidly stressed that;

I am becoming more concerned and aware about the natural environment... cutting of our major forests and swamps... and sometimes worried what happens after clearing all swamps and forests... My key financiers will not fund the project if the services are not environmentally friendly... I have not seen many participating in projects that concern the community surrounding it unless it has a direct benefit... many educational institutions funds social investments that support the community projects. (Key Informant Interview, 2022).

The major key themes that emerged from the above data are environment conservation and corporate social responsibility.

**Environment conservation:** The major concern of environmental conservation is a major theme that has emerged.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

The current study realised the need to examine the effect of decentralisation on service delivery in selected Local Governments in Uganda and it evident that there is need for fairness in recruitment of service providers, consistent efforts of local leaders and involvement of all major stakeholders.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Policy makers need to come up with strategies that promote increased levels of authority to the lower level education authorities and the local leaders as part of the educational decentralization for enhanced education service delivery in Local Governments.

There is need for management of local educational facilities to solicit for frameworks that increase their discretion in decision making for enhanced education service delivery in Local Governments.

There is need for the educationists to develop mechanisms that enable the locally elected representatives to take full responsibility in the management resources used in the provision education services if education service delivery is to be improved.

#### REFERENCES

- [1]. Ahmad, J.K., Devarajan, S., Khemani, S., and Shah, S., (2005). 'Decentralization and Service Delivery'. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3603.
- [2]. Akpan, E. O. (2011). Fiscal decentralization and social outcomes in Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 3(4), 167-183.
- [3]. Alornyeku, F. K. (2011). *The Impact Of Bureaucracy On Public Service Delivery: A Study of Kumasi Metropolitan Assembly*. Unpublished MSc, research project, Ghana: Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology.
- [4]. Bashaasha, B., Mangheni, M. N., & Nkonya, E. (2011). *Decentralization and rural service delivery in Uganda*. Internat. Food Policy Research Inst.
- [5]. Bennett, Robert J., ed. (1990). *Decentralization, Local Governments and Markets* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- [6]. Bergh, S. (2004) *Democratic decentralisation and local participation: a review of recent research*. *Development in Practice*, 14(6), 780-790.
- [7]. Bird, Richard M. (1995). *Financing Local Services: Patterns, Problems and Possibilities*, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.
- [8]. Booth, A., & Dunn, J. F. (2013). *Family-school links: How do they affect educational outcomes?*. Routledge.

- [9]. Bouckaert, G., & Van de Walle, S. (2003). Comparing measures of citizen trust and user satisfaction as indicators of 'good governance': Difficulties in linking trust and satisfaction indicators. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 69(3), 329-343.
- [10]. Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Brinkerhoff, J. M. (2015). Public sector management reform in developing countries: Perspectives beyond NPM orthodoxy. *Public Administration and Development*, 35(4), 222-237.
- [11]. Cook, J. B. (2017). *Citizen Participation: A Concepts Battery*. Columbia: University of Missouri. Department of Regional and Community Affairs.
- [12]. Crook, R. C., Crook, R. C., & Manor, J. (1998). *Democracy and decentralisation in South Asia and West Africa: Participation, accountability and performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- [13]. Dabla-Norris, E. (2006). The challenge of fiscal decentralisation in transition countries. *Comparative Economic Studies*, 48, 100-131.
- [14]. Districts state of affairs annual performance reports, 2019/2020),
- [15]. Ebel, R. D., & Yilmaz, S. (2002). *Concept of fiscal decentralization and worldwide overview*. Washington, DC: World Bank Institute.
- [16]. Fourie, D. J. (2001). Mechanisms to improve citizen participation in government and its administration. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 4(1), 216-233.
- [17]. Fowler, A. (2013). *Striking a balance: A guide to enhancing the effectiveness of non-governmental organisations in international development*. Routledge.
- [18]. Francis, P., & James, R. (2003). Balancing rural poverty reduction and citizen participation: The contradictions of Uganda's decentralization program. *World Development*, 31(2), 325-337.
- [19]. Guasti, P. (2016). Development of citizen participation in Central and Eastern Europe after the EU enlargement and economic crises. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 49(3), 219-231.
- [20]. He, A. E. (2011). Educational decentralization: a review of popular discourse on Chinese-English bilingual education. *Asia Pacific journal of education*, 31(01), 91-105.
- [21]. Holtmann, E., & Rademacher, C. (2016). Decentralization of Power and of Decision-Making—An Institutional Driver for Systems Change to Democracy. *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung*, 281-298.
- [22]. Jennstål, J. (2018). Deliberative participation and personality: the effect of traits, situations, and motivation. *European Political Science Review*, 10(3), 417-440.
- [23]. JICA, (2012). *Basic education sector analysis report-Uganda*. International development center of Japan inc.
- [24]. Joshi, A. (2013). Do they work? Assessing the impact of transparency and accountability initiatives in service delivery. *Development Policy Review*, 31, s29-s48.
- [25]. Kakumba, U. (2010). Local government citizen participation and rural development: reflections on Uganda's decentralization system. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 76(1), 171-186.
- [26]. Kitembo, S.W. (2006). *Handbook on decentralization in Uganda*. Makerere University Kampala. Fountain publishers
- [27]. Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. New Age International.
- [28]. Lefèvre, C. (1998). Metropolitan government and governance in western countries: a critical review. *International journal of urban and regional research*, 22(1), 9-25.
- [29]. Levin, K. A. (2006). Study design III: Cross-sectional studies. *Evidence-based dentistry*, 7(1), 24-25.
- [30]. Litvack, J. I., & Seddon, J. (Eds.). (1999). *Decentralization briefing notes*. Washington, DC: World Bank Institute.
- [31]. Ministry of Local Government, (November, 2013), *PRINCIPLES OF SERVICE DELIVERY IN UGANDA'S LOCAL GOVERNMENTS Handbook*, Kampala, Uganda
- [32]. Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (2003). *Research methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi; African Centre for Technology Studies.
- [33]. Muriu, A. R. (2014). 1 How does Citizen Participation impact Decentralized Service Delivery? Lessons from the Kenya Local Authority Service Delivery Action Plan (LASDAP, 2002-2010) i.
- [34]. Mushemeza, D. E. (2013). *Financial Management of Education in a Decentralized Setting: The Case of Uganda*. A paper prepared for CODESRIA – Working Group on Finance and Education (WGFE)
- [35]. Mushemeza, D.E. (2019). *Decentralisation in Uganda Trends, Achievements, Challenges and Proposals for Consolidation*. A CODE Policy Research Paper Series No.93, 2019
- [36]. Namukas, I. K., & Buye, R. (2009). Decentralisation and education in Africa: the case of Uganda. *Decentralisation, school-based management, and quality*, 175-194.
- [37]. Neblo, M. A., Esterling, K. M., & Lazer, D. M. (2018). *Politics with the people: Building a directly representative democracy (Vol. 555)*. Cambridge University Press.
- [38]. Nnabuihe, O. E., & Onwuzuruigbo, I. (2021). Designing disorder: spatial ordering and ethno-religious conflicts in Jos metropolis, North-Central Nigeria. *Planning Perspectives*, 36(1), 75-93.
- [39]. Oates, Wallace (1972). *Fiscal Federalism* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich).
- [40]. Olowu, D., & Wunsch, J. S. (2004). *Local governance in Africa: The challenges of democratic decentralization*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

- [41]. Onsomu, N.E., and Mujidi, J. (2011). Community Schools in Kenya: Case Study on Community Participation in Funding and Managing Schools. International Institute for Educational Planning, UNESCO.
- [42]. Riggs, E., Gibbs, L., Kilpatrick, N., Gussy, M., van Gemert, C., Ali, S., & Waters, E. (2015). Breaking down the barriers: a qualitative study to understand child oral health in refugee and migrant communities in Australia. *Ethnicity & health*, 20(3), 241-257.
- [43]. Rukanyangira, N., & Oidu, M. K. (2021). Higher education institutions contribution to research and innovations through public private partnership (PPP).
- [44]. Rukanyangira, N., Muyinda, W. M., & Mawa, M. (2018). Relationship marketing strategy and quality of products in the manufacturing sector in Uganda.
- [45]. Sääksjärvi, M., Lassila, A., & Nordström, H. (2005, June). Evaluating the software as a service business model: From CPU time-sharing to online innovation sharing. In IADIS international conference e-society (pp. 177-186). Qawra, Malta.
- [46]. Sanders, M. G. (2007). *Building School-Community Partnerships: Collaboration for Student Success*. New York: Delta Kappan Publishers.
- [47]. Sanyare, F. N. (2013). *Decentralised Local Governance and Community Development: Empirical Perspectives from Northern Ghana* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Manchester).
- [48]. Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009). *Research Methods for Business Students* (5th ed.). Harlow: Financial Time Prentice Hall.
- [49]. Shittu, A. and Musbaudeen, A. (2015): Public Participation in Local Government Planning and Development: Evidence from Lagos, Nigeria. *Convenent University, Journal of Politics and International Affairs*, 3(3), 2042.
- [50]. Smoke, P. (2015), managing public sector decentralization in developing countries: Moving beyond conventional recipes. *Public Administration and Development*, 35(4), 250-262
- [51]. Stanton, A. (2009). *Decentralisation and Municipalities in South Africa: An Analysis of The Mandate to Deliver Basic Services*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Pietermaritzburg : University of KwaZulu-Natal.
- [52]. Steiner, S. (2006). *Decentralization in Uganda: Exploring the Constraints for Poverty Reduction*. GIGA Research Programme: Transformation in the Process of Globalisation, No. 31 GIGA Working Paper Series.
- [53]. Steiner, S. (2016). *Decentralization in Uganda: Exploring the Constraints for Poverty Reduction*. Working papers of GIGA, N° 31
- [54]. Stigler, G. J. (1957). Perfect competition, historically contemplated. *Journal of political economy*, 65(1), 1-17.
- [55]. Thomas, J. C. (2013). Citizen, customer, partner: Rethinking the place of the public in public management. *Public Administration Review*, 73(6), 786-796.
- [56]. Turner, M., Hulme, D., Turner, M., & Hulme, D. (1997). *Decentralization within the State: Good Theory but Poor Practice?*. Governance, Administration and Development: Making the State Work, 151-174.
- [57]. Twinomujuni, R., Mawa, M., Musoke, H. B., & Rukanyangira, N. (2022). The mediating effect of educational decentralization in the relationship between citizen participation and education service delivery of local governments.
- [58]. Uganda Local Government Performance assessment report, 2019/2020.
- [59]. Von Braun, J., & Grote, U. (2002). Does decentralization serve the poor?. In *Managing fiscal decentralization* (pp. 84-112). Routledge.
- [60]. Wildasin, D. E. (1997). Externalities and bailouts. International Institute of Public Finance.
- [61]. World Bank. (2017). *The World Bank's Partnership with Nongovernmental Organizations*.
- [62]. Yamane, I., & Sato, K. (1967). Effect of temperature on the decomposition of organic substances in flooded soil. *Soil Science and Plant Nutrition*, 13(4), 94-100.
- [63]. Yau, O. H., McFetridge, P. R., Chow, R. P., Lee, J. S., Sin, L. Y., & Tse, A. C. (2000). Is relationship marketing for everyone?. *European journal of marketing*, 34(9/10), 1111-1127.
- [64]. Zhang, J., Chen, W., Petrovsky, N., & Walker, R. M. (2021). The Expectancy-Disconfirmation Model and Citizen Satisfaction with Public Services: A Meta-analysis and an Agenda for Best Practice. *Public Administration Review*.
- [65]. Zikmund-Fisher, B. J., Couper, M. P., Singer, E., Levin, C. A., Fowler Jr, F. J., Ziniel, S., ... & Fagerlin, A. (2010). The DECISIONS study: a nationwide survey of United States adults regarding 9 common medical decisions. *Medical Decision Making*, 30(5\_suppl), 20-34.