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ABSTRACT

This study was set out to determine the impact of government spending on development of Government primary schools physical infrastructures. Specifically, the research was undertaken to find out the attitude of stakeholders towards Government spending in primary education, to determine the level of Government funding for physical infrastructure, to know how the funds for physical infrastructure are managed by a relevant authority and to determine the level of development of primary schools physical infrastructure in terms of quality and capacity.

The study adopted case study design and cross-sectional data collected from 68 randomly selected respondents from 34 schools located in Morogoro Municipal Council to obtain relevant data for the survey. Data were collected through administered questionnaires and key informant interview. SPSS program was used for analysing quantitative data; whereby descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis were carried out.

The results of the study show that, to a certain extent there is a slightly positive impact of government spending in primary school physical infrastructure since respondents mentioned some achievements obtained from government fund. The actual amount of money reaching schools for capitation grants is clearly much less today compared to increase in enrolments of pupils.

In overall, the level of development of primary school physical infrastructures is not adequate enough; the numbers of classrooms, latrines and staff houses constructed in the surveyed schools are too small compared to the actual demands. Based on these findings, it is recommended that the budget be increased. The funding should also be based on actual requirements of schools. The full amount of capitation grants stipulated in the policy should reach schools in a predictable and timely manner. Governments and stakeholders in educational sector should seek for the improvement of physical structures and facilities by providing more essential ones and repairing the damaged ones through educational subsidies to aid teaching/learning in pre-schools.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Chapter Overview

This chapter consists of five main sections which are background information, problem statement, justification of the study, research objectives and research questions, research gap and study limitation. In essence, the background of the problem provides through analysis on Government spending in primary school physical infrastructure. The problem statement has established the knowledge gap for this study while the research objectives have been set to discover answers to the research questions.

1.2 Background Information

Education has an immense impact on the development of any society as it produces a rational man. For a country to achieve and sustain growth and development, literate population is therefore of paramount importance. Primary education, as compared to other levels of education, is seen as the first step in laying the foundation for future educational opportunities and lifelong skills. Primary education has a myriad of advantages such as enabling people to participate in the social, economic and political activities of their communities by reducing ignorance and negative effects of poverty.

On realizing the importance of primary education, the Government of Tanzania has been increasing funds to improve access to and quality education (URT, 2011). However, despite the funding, primary schools across the country are reported of having inadequate and poor school physical infrastructure and teaching resources which reduce quality of education (United Republic of Tanzania, 2001; World Bank, 1999). In order to ensure access and quality education and training, facilities occupy a central position. These facilities provide shelter and working space for students and teachers and thus reducing absenteeism and dropouts (URT, 2001). Their inadequacy
is reported to decline the performance and the survival rates of pupils, and the quality of education (UNDAP, 2011; UN, 2011).

The number of school physical facilities in Tanzania runs down as there are five students per desk and the average teacher does not have a chair and table (WB, 1999). The shortage of desks in both primary and secondary schools in the country has increased to over 1,700,000 despite Tanzania being rich in forestry resources.

The demand for desks is 4,988,843 but the government has managed to provide only 3,260,750 thus creating a shortfall of 1,728,093.

According to the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP) II, Cluster II, Goal 1 focused on ensuring equitable Early Childhood Development (ECD) programmes, primary and secondary education for all girls and boys. It emphasizes on Quality education which encompasses improvement in physical infrastructure, teaching and learning materials, human resources and school governance. It also includes quality teaching and learning environment to motivate learning, and development of reading, strategic thinking, communication, and problem solving skills and culture. To increase access and improve quality of education, including physical education, there is also need to strengthen monitoring of budgetary allocations and accountability through Public Expenditure Reviews, Value for Money audits and other initiatives such as Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys (PETS). This is among other areas where cross-cutting linkages to governance and accountability within the education sector will be emphasized (URT, 2010).

Budget implementation essentially refers to utilizing funds to provide or to improve social services. For instance, when the budget is used for constructing school infrastructure, employing teachers and purchasing teaching and learning materials, the community gets a school where children will study and access quality education that will in turn bring them development. If the community needs classrooms, teachers and teaching/learning materials so as to establish a school, there must be funds adequately available. Whenever allocated funds are little to the extent of not
being able to construct the needed classrooms, there will be an incomplete school and thus resulting into children failing to study and taught as intended. This is a reality facing Tanzania, because there are no fully equipped primary and secondary schools. Data of BEST1 2011 indicate that there are still so many schools with shortage of teachers whereby the teacher-pupil ratio is 1:53 for primary schools. Primary schools don’t have enough toilets for which the ratio is 1:54 and 1:51 for girls and boys respectively, instead of 1:20 and 1:25. The classroom pupil ratio is 1:66, whereas textbook-pupil ratio still remains at 1:3 for primary schools instead of the required 1:1. These problems are increasingly affecting the teaching and learning environment. Inadequate development budget for the sector of education and poor budget implementation are the major sources causing these problems (URT, budget 2009, 2010).

Development funds are pivotal for primary school infrastructure. The government therefore must provide all funds budgeted for development as planned in the PEDP II. It is not that the government has no money, but rather a lot of it is spent on unproductive and unnecessary expenditures. For instance, MoEVT alone expend about Tsh. 320 billion for other expenditures such as trips, fuel costs, allowances, refreshments during meetings, purchasing vehicles, and hospitality to visitors. Therefore it is important for the government to identify priorities and not using money on expenditures that can be cut down.

1.3 Problem Statement

The Education and Training Policy of Tanzania of 1995 requires the provision of quality education to all. The Government, therefore, has been allocating a significant amount of money for that purpose. The money is allocated, among other things, to cater for the development of education infrastructure including primary school physical infrastructure such as construction and expansion of classrooms, teachers’ houses and offices, toilets and furniture (Mapima et al, 2007). However, Government fund is reportedly being more prone to corruption and mismanagement than private money. The question therefore remains whether the expansion in education
infrastructure has been matched with a commensurate increase in funding (URT, 2010).

Despite the large number of studies conducted by Gaurav (2008) on primary education indicated that lack of funding in primary schools had significance impact on primary schools infrastructures, however, there is less empirical evidence that shows the influence of Government spending to primary schools physical infrastructures. Furthermore, Kweka et al (1993) have shown the decline in the quality of education provided in Tanzania reported a positive correlation between physical infrastructure and quality education. According to Aika (2012) many primary schools are experience insufficient fund to maintain schools and interference by parents. Others include lack of accommodation for teachers, where the heads teachers fail to arrest these situations, the smooth running of primary schools is compromised. It is also evidenced from UNDAP (2011) that Millennium Development Goals insisted much on increasing school enrolment rate while put less emphasis on improving primary school physical infrastructure (UNDAP, 2011). Therefore, this study intended to fill this gap by looking at the impact of Government spending on the development of physical infrastructure of public primary schools in Tanzania.
1.4 Justification of the Study

Tanzania has made significant progress towards ‘Achieving Universal Primary Education,’ Millennium Development Goal 2. Since the eradication of school fees for primary education in 2001, primary school enrolment expanded to 95% in 2009. Pre-primary and secondary education has also achieved steady expansions.

Despite the progress, however, there are still challenges such as regional disparities in primary education access. In addition, quality standards are declining at both primary and secondary levels as a result of the rapid increase in the school going population. Enrolment expansion has not been matched by a necessary supply of quality related inputs such as qualified teachers, educational materials, sufficient number of classrooms, investments in school infrastructure as well as safety, water, sanitation and hygiene. (UN, 2012)

This study also assessed the availability of teaching and learning materials at school level, construction of school infrastructure, procurement of desks, the implementation of the policy of compulsory enrolment and attendance to all school age children in pre and primary schools. Enrolment for pre-primary is almost 90 percent while for primary schools is 97.2 percent. The dropout rate stands at 6%. According to (URT, 2008) it was reveal that the pace of development of school infrastructure remains slow. The shortage of classrooms, teacher houses, pit latrines and desks is almost 60 percent. Schools have been receiving CGs and DGs, but the common complaint has been the insufficiency of the funds to cover their needs. (URT, 2008)

The research findings will be useful by many stakeholders including pupils, Researchers, Ministry of Education and Vocation training, Gender and Children, planners and policy makers. It will be useful to guide the evaluation of public spending towards schools physical infrastructures. It will also help to mobilize District, Regional, National, and International Resources for the Primary education development program.
1.5 Study Objectives

1.5.1 General objective

To assess the impact of Government spending in the development of primary schools physical infrastructure in Tanzania.

1.5.2 Specific objectives

1) To determine the level of Government funding for physical infrastructure.

2) To determine the way funds for physical infrastructure are managed by a relevant authority.

3) To determine the level of development of primary schools physical infrastructure.

4) To find out the attitude of stakeholders towards Government spending in primary education.

1.5.3 Research questions

1. What is the level of Government spending for primary school physical infrastructure?

2. How is the Government funding for primary school physical infrastructures is managed?

3. To what extent are the primary school physical infrastructures adequate for the municipality?

4. What is the attitude of stakeholders towards Government spending in primary education?

1.5.4 Limitation of the Study

Resistance from some respondents due to lack of trust on the subject matter on the study, resistance was among few individuals fearing that the results might have negative impact on their jobs but later after explanation the respondent did give co operation

Time constraints during conducting the study limited the possibility of accessing other information.
Some of the respondent’s had poor records keeping. The problem was overcome by using indirect questions to key informants.

1.5.5 Delimitation

However, to address the limitations, the first strategy was to conduct a case study based in Morogoro Municipality in order to save time and financial related problems, also to establish trust and transparency, potential participants were informed on information sheets and during initial meetings participants were informed that the research was independent, it had nothing to do with their jobs and the confidentiality and anonymity would be assured to them.

To further reassure participants, the interview questions were circulated to participants before consent was given and the details of a university member who could be contacted if a participant wanted to complain about the research process were distributed. In addition, to give participants some control over the interview process, the choice of when and where the interview would take place was left to each individual. In terms of scheduling interviews, several participants preferred to be interviewed at the end of their first working session, meaning 1300 pm.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Chapter Overview

This chapter consists of three sub-sections: the theoretical literature review, empirical literature review, and conceptual framework of this study. The chapter has reviewed the works and findings of other researchers. The major concepts of this study i.e. Impact of Government Spending in Development of Primary School Physical infrastructure have been conceptualized and operationalized.

Theoretical literature review has defined and assigned indicator variables of the key concepts while empirical review has reviewed other researcher’s work relating to Government spending and development of primary School physical infrastructure. Finally, the conceptual framework has established the cause-effect relationship of indicators variables of the study.

2.2 Definition of Key Concepts/Words

2.2.1. Government Spending

All money that comes into the possession of, or is distributed by, a public body and money raised by a private body where it is doing so under statutory authority. Social expenditure is classified as public when general government (i.e. central administration, local governments and social security institutions) controls the financial flows. Money expended by a government to pay for defence, development projects, education, health, infrastructure, law and order maintenance, etc. Public spending is supported by taxation (business dictionary, 2013).

According to (URT, 2008) The National Income Accounting, government spending, government expenditure, or government spending on goods and services includes all government consumption and investment but excludes transfer payments made by a state. Government acquisition of goods and services for current use to directly satisfy individual or collective needs of the members of the community is classed as
government final consumption expenditure. Government acquisition of goods and services intended to create future benefits, such as infrastructure investment or research spending, is classed as government investment (gross fixed capital formation). Government outlays that are not acquisition of goods and services, and instead represent transfers of money, such as social security payments, are called transfer payments and are not included in what the national income accounts refer to as government expenditure.

The two types of government spending, on final consumption and on gross capital formation, together constitute one of the major components of gross domestic product.

2.2.3 School infrastructure

It refers to everything from electricity, toilets, safe buildings, libraries, computer rooms, safe classrooms, sports halls and fields, laboratories for science experiments, running water and fencing. Also It includes toilets, running water, electricity, libraries, safe classrooms, sports field. For the purpose of this study, infrastructure means Classrooms, Furniture’s, Toilets and Desks. Performance in each of these areas is described as follows:

- **Infrastructure**: Infrastructure should be able to inherently perform well. This includes ensuring that buildings are weather tight, structurally sound, have low operating costs, and are spatially and resource efficient.
- **Programme**: Infrastructure should effectively support the activities that it is required to accommodate. For instance, school buildings should accommodate the current curriculum and preferred modes of teaching and learning.
- **People**: Infrastructure should allow users to be comfortable, healthy and productive and should meet users’ basic needs. It should also guarantee that human rights are respected. (Uwazi, 2010)
2.2.4 Physical infrastructure of school

The term 'Physical Infrastructure' stands for the physical facilities of the school. It is referred to buildings, grounds, furniture and Laboratory apparatus along with equipments essential for imparting education. (Uwazi, 2010)

2.2.2 Types of School Physical Infrastructures

According to URT (2006) the types of school physical infrastructures includes: school buildings, classrooms, latrines, administration block and staffrooms.

2.2.2.1 School Building:

The school building should be well planned, spaciously, functionally and with pleasing architectural features. The rooms of the building should be spacious and ventilated with all facilities like fans etc. While constructing a school building, it should be kept in mind that school buildings should have different facilities such a library, different types of laboratories (Physics. Chemistry Geography Biology Science, Home Sc., Drawing and Painting etc. workshops art and craft rooms, staff room, principal's office, school office, multimedia room, conference room or theatre etc. along with assembly ground, gymnasium etc.

2.2.2.2 Classrooms:

Classroom is the backbone of any school physical infrastructure. Every school should, have adequate number of classrooms and every classroom should have a pleasant look. Walls should be painted by some light colours and rooms should be carefully decorated. New charts Paintings should be fixed on the walls. The front wall should have blackboard at appropriate height. The walls of the back should be having built-in cupboards for keeping books, tools, crafts materials, apparatus for experiments, maps and other teaching outs. In a classroom where there arc movable seats and work tables, where varied resources for learning arc readily available in storage cabinets. The seating can be changed in a variety of activities simultaneously. The classroom should be well lighted so that students seated at different corners are
able to see the teacher and the blackboard. The location of rooms would be airy and lighted naturally on the failure of power (Electricity).

While most countries have norms for classroom size (i.e. space per pupil and/or numbers of pupils per classroom), in many countries classrooms are generally too small for the number of students they have to accommodate, particularly in lower grades. Classrooms are usually designed to accommodate 40-60 students at 1.0/1.4m² per student and an overall size of 55/60m², although there are significant variations between and within countries (often as a result of development partners adopting different norms).

There is therefore no ‘standard’ size of classroom and this will vary from country to country and over time due to economic and other circumstances. When deciding on the size of the standard classroom for a programme a number of factors should be taken into account: the classroom should allow sufficient space for the maximum number of students that the teacher can effectively teach in comfort; in small rural communities it should allow adequate space for multi-grade teaching; it should allow and encourage innovative teaching methods; it should allow space for changes in teaching methods during its lifetime and it should allow space for the provision of ‘book corners’.

2.2.2.3 Latrines/ toilets

In most situations the latrine is the most appropriate and cost-effective way of providing school toilets. Costs vary widely but are often in the region of US$1,000-1,500 per latrine. Although the technology is simple and it is often expected that schools and communities will build them, it is important that the right design is chosen, that it is constructed and located properly and allows disabled access. Often, when this is not the case facilities are difficult to maintain, underutilised and sometimes dangerous. Where suitable site conditions exist latrines are simple to construct and a wide range of local materials can be used. Unless there are very good reasons the floor of the latrine should be made of reinforced concrete both for strength and ease of maintenance. Where there is a high water table or the ground is
particularly hard or soft there will be the need to take specialist advice. The use of the double-pit VIP latrine should be considered for use in schools as it is more sustainable and a changing and bathing room for girls to use during menstruation should be provided if possible.

Standards for pupil: latrine ratios vary by country and by type of schools and whether urinals are used. However in a non-boarding school a ratio of 25:1 for girls and 40:1 for boys would represent a good level of provision assuming the facilities are constructed to an adequate quality and are well located. In many situations a ratio of 1:60 may represent a more achievable target.

Sitting of latrines is an extremely important issue and security, privacy, the environment, water access and cultural conditions all need to be considered. While layouts will vary from site to site latrine blocks should be about 10m from and downwind of school buildings and boys’ and girls’ facilities should be separated by at least 10m and preferably screened from each other. Latrines should also be at least 30 meters away from any wells. Access paths should be provided if possible, toilets should not be situated near the school perimeter and doors should face inwards towards the school.

Toilets should be located so that there is no possibility of the contamination of local water resources and that they cannot become flooded with surface water. Finally, any local religious and cultural traditions need to be taken into account in both the design and location of toilets.

2.2.2.4 The Administrative Block:

In a school infrastructure the administrative block should be well planned. The leadership and service functions are done in administrative block. The school office should be centrally located so as to serve as a good co-ordination centre, easily accessible to visitors, teachers and students. The principal's office should be large enough to accommodate small conference and should open into the general office as well as to the corridor.
2.2.2.5 Staff Room:

In the physical infrastructure there must be a room where the teachers can meet and interact with each other, do corrections of home/school work of students and refer to books etc. This room should have lockers for teachers so that they can safeguard various reference books and instructional materials and answer books and their personal belongings.

2.3 Introduction of Development grant

Development funds are money used for the construction of classrooms, teacher houses, toilets and laboratory and desks. The condition, location and nature of school infrastructure have an impact on access and quality of education whereby the children’s homes will be closer to a school as a result pupils will be able to attend classes because of short distance and safety issues. Also the school where the quality of infrastructure (particularly classrooms, laboratories, desks water and sanitation facilities) is improved, enrolment and completion rates are also improved and there is less teacher absenteeism, and where the condition of school facilities is improved, learning outcomes are also improved (Boneventura, 2011).

In Tanzania, the government averaged Sh109 billion per year during PEDP I (2002-2006) but are only averaging Sh14 billion during PEDP II (2007-2011), meaning PEDP development funds are only 13 per cent of what they used to be (baker, 2010).

2.3.1 Capitation Grants

Primary aims of the grant were to replace revenue lost to schools because of the abolition of fees and to improve the quality of education by making real resources available at the school level. In particular, the capital on grant was meant to finance the purchase of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials, as well as to fund repairs, administration materials, and examination expenses.
2.3.2 Facts about the capitation grant

Data about capitation grant disbursements per district council and at school level are surprisingly inaccessible. Since capitation grants are public money intended to improve the quality of learning, it is in the interest of citizens that such information be more readily available. The Government would equally benefit from access to such data as monitoring is essential for appropriate planning. There is, therefore, an urgent need for a systematic approach to monitoring and reporting the amounts in capitation grants disbursed from central government to councils and from the councils to schools. While this information is not yet available, this brief relies on information from Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys of the sector, the budget books, and interviews conducted with teachers.

During the first phase of free universal education under PEDP I (2002-2006), the capitation grant policy stated it to be 10 US dollars per pupil per year. This policy was revised to 10,000 TZ shillings in PEDP II (2007-2011). Between 2001 and 2009 the cost of living in Tanzania increased substantially. Tshs 593 in 2002 bought the same amount of goods as Tshs 1,000 in 2009 (NBS 2009). Initially (between 2002 and 2006), the capitation grant was protected against this erosion of the value of the shilling as it was expressed in US dollars. But when the policy was revised under PEDP II, the real value of the capitation grant dropped sharply. In 2002, the $10 grant was worth the equivalent of Tshs 9,666. In 2009, the Tshs 10,000 grant was worth only Tshs 6,078 (expressed in 2002 shillings), a 37 percent decline in value. But even without adjusting for inflation, the actual amount of money reaching schools for capitation grants is clearly much less today compared to what it was between 2002 and 2003. According to the Education Public Expenditure Tracking Survey of 2004, in the period 2002-2003 schools received on average 5,400 shillings per capita. In 2007/08 however, the money actually reaching the schools had declined to 4,189 shillings per pupil (URT, 2010). This may be of particular interest to both teachers and citizens, who have an interest in ensuring that adequate resources for achieving quality at the school level are made available.
2.4 Tanzania Policies on School Physical Infrastructures

Tanzania has passed through many policies and reforms in education with its mission and vision:

2.4.1 Tanzania Development Vision 2025

Vision 2025 targets at a high quality livelihood for all Tanzanians through the realization of, among others, universal primary education, the eradication of illiteracy and the attainment of a level of tertiary education and training commensurate with high quality human resources required to effectively respond to the developmental challenges at all levels. (URT, 2001)

2.4.2 Basic Education Master Plan (BEMP) and the Education Sector Development Programme (Ed-SDP)

Based on the Education and Training Policy the Basic Education Master Plan (BEMP) was developed years later (1996). Related to these developments, the Education Sector Development Programme (Ed – SDP) was established in 1997 revolving around issues of systems, structures, management and administration, quality, access, participation, equity and finance.

The development of above policies and evolution of education reforms as well as the 1991, 1993 and 1996 National Conferences on Education followed by a number of advocacy workshops were to provide a national framework for the attainment of the EFA goals and targets.

2.4.3 The Education Management Structure.

The Education Sector Co-ordination Committee (ESCC) now Education Sector Steering Committee (ESSC), the Sector Management Committee (SMC), the Sector Management Team (SMT) were established in 1996 by strengthening and incorporating members outside the government stakeholder ministries, NGOs/CBOs, Institutions and donors supporting basic education. Since they were established they have been very instrumental in designing, developing the programmes and
implementing decisions on national education policies and ensuring that the EFA goals and targets are consistent with the broader government policies. The Inter-Agency Group and the Government Donor Six Member Committee also have been very instrumental in spearheading the process to date.

2.4.4 The Education Sector Development Programme (Ed.SDP)

Initiated nearly two years ago had made considerable progress in strategic planning. Currently, a number of strategic plans for various programmes and activities have been articulated. These include those addressing access and equity, quality improvement, strengthening management, monitoring and evaluation, and financing. An important step on our road towards a sector wide approach to the development of education sector is the signing of a statement of partnership and code of conduct between the government and partners in education in order to achieve the Ed-SDP objectives. Basically, the principles guiding the partnership are:

- Government ownership and formulation of vision, policy, programmes and projects
- Government responsibility and accountability of financial resources
- Openness, transparency and dialogue with partners based on mutual trust partners’ agreement that all projects and their components are consistent with Ed-SDP

2.4.5 Investment in EFA Since 1990

The Government is the main funding agency of basic education. In 1990, the total recurrent educational expenditure allocated to primary education was 46% after dropping from 58% in 1982/83. The figure has now been recovered to 65% (1998) following Government determination to improve the resourcing of basic education.

Parents contribution has been increasing over the years from Tshs. 20 (equivalent of US$2.7) to 2000/= (equivalent of US$ 2.9) during the second half of 1998. However the prices of instructional materials and equipment as well as transportation costs have increased over time such that in real terms the increased fees do not take unit
cost into account. However, parents have been meeting other substantial costs in terms of construction of classrooms, uniforms, desks, sports equipment, food, exercise books and learning material

2.4.6 Tanzania Education Policy of 1995

Tanzania Education policy is focusing on issues of establishment of schools and expansion of education and training opportunities; access and equity; tertiary and higher education and training; education financing and management and administration are proposed with the aim of guiding formal, Non formal, vocational tertiary and higher Education and training, as well as the promotion of science and technology in the country (URT, 1995).

2.4.7 Primary Education Development Program (PEDP I and PEDP II)

Primary school enrolment under the first Primary Education Development Programme (PEDP I) increased from 88% in 2001 to 96% in 2006. Following these achievements, the Government prepared PEDP II and its implementation began in 2007/2008 fiscal year. The objectives of PEDP II, among others, include improvement of learning environment in schools, which goes hand in hand with the construction of classrooms, teacher’s houses, toilets and purchase of desks. This programme also aimed at improving the teaching and learning environment by increasing the number of text and reference books for pupils. In order to meet this objective, PEDP II indicated that a capitation grant of 10,000 TSH will be provided to each pupil per each year for the period of five years. (boniventura, 2006)

Primary Education Development Plan is funded by the Government, Development Partners in Education and loan from the World Bank. The loan was for a period of 3 years amounting to US $ 150 million in three equal instalments. For the first year of implementation the Government received the first instalment, which was expended in the construction of 13,868 classrooms and pit-latrines. Other funds were used for capacity building of the School Committees, monitoring implementation at regional and central levels. The second year of implementation more funds were disbursed to Local Authorities for construction, purchase of textbooks, desks, science kits,
administration at school level and capacity building of School Committees (URT, 2006).

The construction of infrastructure under PEDP II is not impressive. Records show that in the 24 schools surveyed, only one classroom was built in the three years since the implementation of PEDP II began. Also, only a single school was able to get funds for the construction of teachers’ houses and only two schools were able to get funds for the construction of toilets as well as for the purchase of desks. This shows that the implementation of PEDP II within the past three years has not been satisfactory. This public expenditure tracking survey found that a meager amount of funds reaches schools. The data from the 24 heads of schools reveals that total amount of money received by all 24 schools was only Tsh 15.9 million in the period from 2007/2008 to2009/2010. Of the funds received, the amount of money allocated for the construction of classrooms was Tsh 3.1 million, Tsh 10.6 million for construction of teachers’ houses and Tsh 1.6 million for the construction of toilets while the money allocated for the purchase of desks was only Tsh. 635,000. The sluggish pace of construction of school infrastructure in primary schools has been affecting the teaching and learning process and pupils’ performance as well. Currently the student toilet ratio is 1:57 for girls instead of 1:20, and for the boys the ratio is 1:55 instead of 1:20. Also, the student classroom ratio is 1:73 instead of 1:40 (BEST 2010); this means that whenever a teacher enters the class he or she must teach 73 pupils at once.

2.4.8 The amount allocated in the budget is less than that approved by PEDP policy.

The amount allocated in the budget for capitation grants has systematically been lower than the amount stated in the PEDP policy adopted by Cabinet. In 2007/08, for example, the shortfall in the capitation grant allocation was Tshs 4,481 as Government allocated 5,519 shillings per pupil compared to the amount of 10,000 shillings per pupil stated in the policy. Figure 5 below shows the shortfall in capitation grant allocations over the past four years.
2.4.9 The Comparison between PEDP I and PEDP II

In comparing PEDP I and PEDP II, this report used the PETS report which was done by Repoa. The following are the differences in the implementation of PEDP I and PEDP II. In the implementation of PEDP I, the capitation grant from the Central Government to the district level was disbursed as was stipulated in the programme. The average amount in capitation grant received at the district level for each pupil for the five-year period was Tsh 8,700. This different from the funds disbursed at district level under PEDP II of which only Tsh. 5,005 has been sent to the district headquarters for the past three years since the implementation of PEDP II began. The disbursement of development funds to schools under PEDP I was also better. Under PEDP I, almost 85% of the funds allocated for school development were able to reach school. However, under PEDP II some schools have not received any development funds for the past three years of the implementation of the programme. Therefore, most of schools have not received development funds. PEDP I was implemented through earmarked funds from development partners while PEDP II is implemented through the General Budget Support (GBS). This could be one of the reasons for the poor performance of PEDP II. The Government has not been allocating as much in funds for the programme as was planned. During the implementation of PEDP I funds given by development partners were injected directly to the programme but under PEDP II development partners have been contributing through General Budget Support, leaving Government to determine the amount of funds to be spent on different projects.

2.4.10 Not all money that is budgeted is received at the schools.

For the capitation grant to have an impact, the money needs to reach the schools. Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys (PETS) provide a good tool for assessing whether money allocated to capitation grants actually gets to schools. Recently, in collaboration with its donors, the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training commissioned a tracking of public expenditure for the fiscal year 2007/08. This survey reveals that, in addition to allocations falling short of the policy, not all
money that is allocated actually flows to the schools. A region, district council, or school may receive more or less than its budget allocation; usually they receive less. For instance, in 2007/8 the amount in capitation grants reaching the schools averaged 4,189 shillings per pupil, while the district councils reported making disbursements averaging 4,570 shillings per pupil (MoEVT 2010).

2.4.11 Parent’s contribution towards school development funds

Parents are obliged to contribute 20% for the construction and purchase of the school infrastructure under PEDP II, but most are not aware of this. They still think that it is the duty of the government to improve the education sector (Bonaventura, 2006). School and community involvement, (through school management committees, parent teacher associations or similar bodies) has an important role in any infrastructure programme. Participation at this level can increase local ownership, improve the planning process, ensure local priorities are addressed, provide oversight and promote better maintenance. Infrastructure programmes have the potential to play a role in strengthening school management and the strategy therefore needs to set out (Roger et al, 2010).

2.4.12 Overview of Public Spending in Education Globally

By replacing revenue lost by schools due to the abolition of school fees and contributions, the introduction of the capitation grant allowed children from all wealth backgrounds to go to school. This reduced social exclusion as children from poor households could now afford to attend school. Governments of the world invested the equivalent of PPP$ 2.46 trillion in education in 2004 (or 1.97 trillion if converted into U.S. dollars on the basis of market exchange rates). This figure represents 4.4% of global GDP in PPP$. PPPs (purchasing power parities) are rates of currency conversion which eliminate differences in price levels among countries. This means that a given sum of money, when converted into U.S. dollars at PPP rates will buy the same basket of goods and services in all countries (UNESCO, 2011)
Governments in North America and Western Europe invested the highest shares of national resources in education: 5.6% of GDP. The region is followed by the Arab States (4.9%) and sub-Saharan Africa (4.5%). The regions of Latin America and the Caribbean as well as Central and Eastern Europe are close to the world average, with 4.4% and 4.2% respectively. By far the lowest level of public spending is found in Central Asia and in East Asia and the Pacific, both of which report only 2.8% of GDP. However, the figure for East Asia and the Pacific should be interpreted with caution as the average is based on an estimate for China for 1999 (UNESCO, 2011).

2.4.13 Situation of Physical Infrastructure in Africa

In sub-Saharan Africa and the poorest countries in Asia, the challenge of providing adequate primary education facilities is huge. To meet the Education for All target of providing universal access to primary education worldwide it is estimated that up to 10 million classrooms need to be built at a cost of US$72 billion (World Bank 2003). In sub-Saharan Africa alone it is estimated that up to US$30 billion will be required to address the shortfall in provision of suitable and safe learning environments. Typically, classrooms are overcrowded, many buildings and other facilities are inadequate, sites are poorly planned and there is little maintenance. This situation is not conducive to good teaching and learning (World Bank 2003).

The evidence is clear that for primary school programmes unit costs are significantly lower when small and medium sized contractors are used when compared to the use of larger national or international contractors. In Africa at least, the most effective approach in terms of cost has been where procurement has been delegated to schools and communities supported by the correct resources and technical assistance. Average unit costs for classroom construction are approximately US$270/m² when international competitive bidding is used, US$180/m² for national or local competitive bidding and US$100/m² for community managed programmes. Community managed programmes also have advantages in developmental terms because more local labour and materials will be used and more money will be retained in the local economy. Where schools and communities are involved and the process is well planned and effectively implemented, their ability to undertake
similar projects in the future and the possibilities for building school management capacity are increased (Roger et al, 2010)

In nine major disasters that have occurred since 2000 in El Salvador, Venezuela, Italy, Turkey, Cambodia, USA, Pakistan and China more than 28,000 children and teachers have lost their lives because of unsafe school buildings. The 2005 Pakistan earthquake alone killed at least 17,000 and seriously injured 50,000 students and in total over 300,000 children was affected. An estimated 6,500 primary schools were destroyed or badly damaged and in some districts 80% of schools were destroyed. The poor seismic resistance of the existing building stock was a significant factor in the large death toll amongst children. The issue of ‘school safety’ incorporating adequate building standards and construction quality has now been put high on the reconstruction agenda (Roger et al, 2010)

According to Theunynck (2009), where there are limited resources it is important that they are they targeted efficiently and equitably. This is often not the case and facilities are not constructed in a way that effectively matches demand. Even where average pupil/classroom ratios are high, it is not uncommon to find schools where there are unused or underused facilities. In Guinea, as many as 16% of classrooms were recorded as unused in 2000 and in Madagascar the number was about 7% in 2005. This is because of a tendency to construct schools with a standard number of classrooms rather than with the number of classrooms required by the actual and planned enrolment. The provision of smaller schools in rural communities can result in more efficient use of resources, reduce travelling distances and increase access.

Given the need for infrastructure and the limited resources available there is a responsibility on governments and development partners to work together to develop approaches that will contribute to significant, measurable and sustainable progress towards national goals and targets (Roger et al, 2010).
The approaches required to achieve this should be based around the development of long term partnerships with a strong focus on good governance, capacity building, developing management systems and on ensuring that schools and communities (through school management committees and parent teacher associations) have participation in the process. Communities, non-governmental organisations, the private sector and religious organisations can and do make valuable contributions but do not replace the government’s responsibility for providing adequate facilities (Roger et al, 2013)

2.4.14 Government Spending in Physical Infrastructure in East Africa

Under the School Improvement Grants Programme in Kenya, 4,686 primary schools have received grants totalling £47 million. School committees are supported to develop School Infrastructure Development Plans (SIDPs), which they implement using their grants. Capacity building has been at the core of the programme and over 4 years 23,430 members of school management and infrastructure committees have received training to ensure that they have the skills to develop their SIDPs and manage their resources effectively and transparently within the programme guidelines. This has been done at a cost of 8% of the value of grants disbursed. (Uwazi, 2010)

2.4.15 Government Spending in Physical Infrastructure in Tanzania

Tanzania invested in development project whereby the budget of each sector is twofold: the first part is for development funds and the second is for recurrent expenditure funds. Budget for development is for incurring cost of big projects in the sector of education such as construction of classrooms, dormitories, laboratories, libraries and teachers’ houses. These funds are allocated to increase investment in the sector of education, unlike the budget for recurrent expenditure which is spent on paying salaries, allowances and various trips inside and outside the country. (Boneventura, 2006)
Despite the fact that the sector of education faces problems of infrastructure, the amount allocated in the budget of development continues to further decrease while at the same time more funds are allocated for recurrent expenditure (In the financial year of 2011/2012, it is Tsh 232.86 billion, which is 10.2 percent of the total budget of the sector of education is allocated to implement development activities of the sector of education. Recurrent expenditure has Tsh 2050.14 billion which equals to 89.8 percent of the total budget of the sector of education. Apart from the seemingly increase of the development budget by Tsh 33.23 billion between 2010/2011 and 2011/2012, nevertheless the development budget for the education sector is still very small when compared to the neighbouring countries which is 20-24% in Uganda and 14-15% in Kenya (Boneventura, 2006).

A total of Shs. 155.1 billion was unspent in the last three years. This amount could be sufficient to build 3,875 houses for teachers according to the estimated costs of building one house at Shs. 40 million as outlined by PEDEP II (phase two of the Primary Education Development Program). By building these houses we could have reduced the problem of teachers lacking accommodation, especially for schools situated in remote rural villages. The education sector was budgeted to consume 20% of the national budget in fiscal year 2008/2009. That share decreased to 17% in fiscal year 2011/2012 (Hakielimu, 2011).

2.4.16 Regular Planned Disbursements of Funds in Developing countries

Many schools in developing countries are poorly designed and constructed, with facilities that are badly laid out and that are either too hot or too cold or are dark, unhygienic, uncomfortable, inaccessible, dangerous and generally not conducive to effective teaching and learning.

These problems are often caused not by a lack of resources but as the result of inappropriate standards, a lack of imagination, a poor understanding of the links between infrastructure provision and education delivery and an incorrect perception that doing things differently is going to increase costs. Good design does not have to cost more – in fact it should improve overall value for money as well as making the
whole school environment more welcoming and a place where teachers are supported and learning is encouraged.

Erratic disbursement of funds is a common problem that faces construction programmes and delayed disbursement is one of the major reasons for government and community partnerships to falter and for contractors to fail to complete works on time and budget. Almost as damaging are unplanned and unexpected disbursements which typically are allocated to construction programmes near the end of the financial year and which are expected to be utilized in extremely short timeframes. When funding is not disbursed as agreed, confidence in the whole programme is undermined and the likelihood of corruption and a poorly executed project is increased. Government and development partners must ensure that there are regular and planned disbursements of funds in order to minimize programme risk.

Erratic disbursements and late payments can be very disruptive to construction programmes in three main ways. Firstly, when small contractors are being used, late payments cause cash flow problems, delay on site, conflict and can result in in them going out of business. Secondly, where funds are being disbursed to schools or communities, disbursements must coincide with capacity building initiatives or raised expectations will not be met. Finally, programmes should be designed around the construction season (which must take into account factors such as the rainy season and agricultural activities) and when payments are delayed this can result in this programme being disrupted.

2.4.17 Millennium Development Goal 2

The second goal in the United Nations Millennium Development Goal is to achieve Universal Primary Education, more specifically, to “ensure that by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling." Currently, there are more than 75 million children around the world of primary school age who are not in school. The majority of these children are in regions of sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia and within these countries, girls are at the greatest disadvantage in receiving access to education at the primary school age. Since the Millennium Development Goals were launched, many developing
countries, such as China, Chile, Cuba, Singapore and Sri Lanka, have successfully completed a campaign towards universal primary education (Murname, 2010).

There has been great progress achieved since 1999 in the achievement of the millennium development goal (MDG). UNESCO has found that:

- Number of children enrolled in primary schools worldwide rose by more than 40 million between 1999 and 2007
- Net primary enrolment in sub-Saharan Africa rose from 58% to 74% over the same period
- International aid commitments to basic education almost doubled from $2.1 billion in 2002 to $4.1 billion in 2007

However, despite all these important achievements, the world is currently not on course to achieve its target of universal primary education (UPE) by 2015. Currently, 120 million children could still be out of school in 2015 and girls will still lag behind boys in school enrolment and attendance. Sub-Saharan Africa is particularly affected as over a quarter of its children of primary school age were out of school in 2007. It is estimated that there is a $16.2 billion annual external financing gap between available domestic resources and what is needed to achieve the basic education goals in low income countries, with current aid levels addressing only 15% of that gap and resources are all too often not provided to those countries who need it most and the amounts pledged not fully honoured. Difficulties faced by donors in the sphere of achieving UPE, highlighted by researchers at the Overseas Development Institute, include:

- Lack of conducive environment of the primary schools particularly physical infrastructure such as classrooms, desks, latrines, laboratories as well as water and sanitation lead to poor attendance and retention of pupils.
- Recipient governments are reluctant to borrow funds for the recurrent costs education entails especially for development school fund which can help to improve primary physical infrastructure.
In these remote locations, insufficient school funds contribute to low attendance rates by creating undesirable and unsafe learning environments. In 1996, the General Accounting Office (GAO) reported that poor conditions existed in many rural areas; one out of every two rural schools had at least one inadequate structural or mechanical feature (Lawrence). In these situations where regular school attendance is rare, a low population contributes to the problem. In other locations, large numbers are often the cause of low attendance rates.


Budget implementation is spending money to bring about and foster social services. For example when the budget is used for construction of school infrastructures, recruitment of teachers and procurement of teaching and learning equipments, the society gets school service whereas children acquire quality education for their development. If the society needs classrooms, teachers and teaching and learning facilities to start a school, enough funds are needed. If it happens that the budget set aside is small and cannot adequately support the construction of classrooms as required, the effect is to have an incomplete school that hinders the effective learning and teaching of our children.

2.4.18 Sources of Growth in Spending on Primary Education

This section considers how the increases in spending which frequently enabled enrolment and quality improvements; were achieved, from the point of view of domestic financing. Besides the economic and budgetary issues considered here, there are clearly important political dimensions to the determination of spending, enrolment and quality levels which are not considered. Political commitments to universal access to primary schooling galvanized both by the international MDG agenda and in a number of countries by national campaigns may justly be considered significant drivers of improved educational access and increased resource allocation (Sastavage 2005). In some cases, for example, these commitments formed an important part of political manifestos and democratic election campaigns (e.g. in Kenya and Uganda). Concern here is rather with describing the patterns of change,
but it is acknowledged that understanding country-level factors is essential for their explanation.

**2.4.19 Governance, Transparency, Accountability on Primary School Funding**

Mainstream good governance indicators include the World Bank’s Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGIs) Project, the Overseas Development Institute’s World Governance Assessments (WGAs), Mo Ibrahim Foundation’s Indexes of African Governance (IIAGs), and the African Governance Report Indicators (AGRIIs) of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. However, the WGIs, WGAs, IIAGs and AGRIIs are not citizen-based evaluations (Ivanyna & Shah, 2010). One of their important limitations is that they fail to capture how citizens perceive the governance environment and outcomes in their own countries.

In decentralized settings, the Local Governance Barometer (LGB) developed by the Impact Alliance – which includes the Netherlands Development Organization (SNV), the Institute for Democracy in South Africa (Idasa), and Pact of the United States – fits the bill very well. The LGB is a holistic model that generates a collective opinion about the state of governance in a certain locality (Memela, Mautjane, Nzo, & van Hoof, 2008). The criteria of the LGB in measuring good governance are effectiveness, the rule of law, accountability, participation and equity (Pact & Impact Alliance, 2006). In the context of the capitation grant, the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) indicators that are part of the Performance Measurement Framework can be employed to build further on the measurement of governance.

Thus, this study combined the LGB and PEFA indicators to construct the Primary Education Capitation Grant Governance Index. This Index encompasses four dimensions of governance: i) effectiveness; ii) rule of law; iii) accountability; and iv) participation (see Table 2). The study’s focus on observable variables for each dimension provides an indication of the governance of capitation grants in primary schools.
Table 1: Governance of the Capitation Grant in Public primary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Existence of clear plans for capitation spending</th>
<th>Incorporation of capitation items in school plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good management of capitation funds</td>
<td>Preparation of procurement summary for capitation spending at school level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance with PEDP financial and procurement guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capitation transactions record keeping at schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of law</td>
<td>Existence of clear rules on capitation disbursements and spending (PEFA)</td>
<td>Knowledge of PEDP financial and procurement guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measures taken against misuse of capitation funds</td>
<td>Awareness of capitation funds that reach schools as per formulae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cases of fraud in capitation spending reported to authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suspension of teachers/school committee members accused of misusing capitation funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Capitation expenditures reporting (PEFA)</td>
<td>Submission of capitation spending reports to ward authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transparency in capitation funds management</td>
<td>Presentation of capitation expenditure reports in parents’ meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Posting of capitation disbursements and expenditures on notice boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access to capitation spending records by CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Existence of</td>
<td>The involvement of parents in planning for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional framework for participatory planning and management

Stakeholders’ monitoring of capitation disbursements and spending

capitation items
Submission of procurement summary to School Committee for approval
Frequency of monitoring visits conducted by CSOs
Number of CSOs monitoring reports on capitation spending

Demandside factors) explains a substantial part of the cross-jurisdiction differences in the governance of the capitation grant in public primary schools. Demand-side factors include:

i. Exercising agency, for example, attending meetings and openly discussing matters of community importance

ii. Volunteerism, such as making labour and financial contributions to community service; and

iii. Political awareness, for example, voting in civic polls, attending campaign rallies, and listening to and/or reading news from the mass media

iv. On the supply-side, the study’s model predicts that the degree of school autonomy also explains a part of the cross-district differences of capitation grant governance in schools. Aspects of school autonomy include: School decision-making power, for example, planning, budgeting, and spending capabilities and

v. Share of school own source revenues, such as financial contributions from parents and donations from private sector.
2.4.20 Civic Engagement in Tanzania

Civic engagement refers to citizens’ interaction with a particular field of interest, for example, public finance policy, with a view to obtaining a favorable outcome from such interaction (World Bank, 2001). Thus, aspects of social accountability such as citizens’ agency, volunteerism and political awareness are all forms of civic engagement in Tanzania. For instance, budget advocacy through villagers’ participation in Village Assemblies (VA), civil society participation in Ward Development Committees (WDCs), District Consultative Committees (DCCs) and Regional Consultative Committees (RCCs) as well as public expenditure tracking systems/surveys (PETS) have become some of the most popular forms of exercising citizens’ agency in Tanzania.

2.4.20.1 Citizens’ Agency

Exercising agency refers to changes in the capabilities of individuals or groups to take purposeful actions (Narayan and Petesch, 2007). This concept assumes that ongoing contact between the public and their leaders provides the citizenry with the opportunity to draw attention to weaknesses in service delivery, and, as a result, the leaders would take appropriate measures in line with user preferences (Golooba-Mutebi, 2005). Civic initiative, or exercising agency, is thus considered to be the most important characteristic of, and a prerequisite for, good governance (Siraj, 2010).

In Tanzania, the quality of exchanges between community members and government at different levels has reached a higher platform recently as each side appreciates the attitude and effort of the other (Kessy, Mashindano, Rweyemamu, & Charle, 2006). In their study of democracy and poverty in Ruvuma region in Tanzania, the authors found that community members are starting to appreciate local government efforts in widening the participatory process in generating plans and programmes so as to make them more effective.
2.4.20.2 Volunteerism

Volunteering is working, the putting in of time and energy, which one person does for another or for the public, of their free will, and with no material compensation similar in quantity or quality to the market value for these services (Cohen, 2009). The participatory aspect of volunteerism can contribute to a heightened understanding of the forces which shape governments and societies, leading to greater transparency, accountability and improved governance (United Nations Development Programme, 2003). Traditionally, most tribes in Tanzania work through volunteerism guided by clear regulations. A recent study of social capital in Kwizu village in Same District found the community doing road and school maintenance in their village every Monday, a practice they termed as msaragambo. However, district authorities in some regions have been coercing residents to participate in msaragambo. In Tanga city, for example, authorities have ordered the closure of all businesses for the first six hours of every Saturday for city dwellers to engage in an involuntary operation to clean the city’s environment.

Lisaga, a mutual help system whereby a person who needs help for ploughing his land or for weeding asks his neighbours to join in and help on a specific day, is common in cotton growing areas of the Lake Zone (Shao, 2002). The host has to prepare meals and drinks for his lisaga team. The study noted that the food and drinks for lisaga may be even more expensive than direct hire for ox ploughing or casual labour. In addition, lisaga often conflicts with the interests of the individual farmers who may want to plough or weed their own farms at the same time as they are requested to help out their neighbours. In the civil society realm, home-based care to people living with HIV and AIDS (PLWAs) and provision of psychosocial support (PSS) to most vulnerable children (MVC) is largely done by volunteers. For example, under the Mama Mkubwa project in Makete District, volunteers visit the affected families and children regularly or weekly.
2.4.20.3 Political Awareness

In Tanzania, political awareness manifests itself through voter turnout, attendance in political rallies, and listening to and/or reading news from the mass media. People are more active today in terms of participation in elections despite the fact that attempts to influence the results through both legal and illegal means are common (Kessy et al., 2006). However, the inadequate presence of opposition parties in the civic polls means electoral platforms are monolithic and, hence, issues are overshadowed by preference for personalities, ethnicity and religion (Mmuya & Lemoyan, 2008).

Mass media is by far the most important means by which people access information. Of the three main types of mass media, radio continues to be the most accessible, followed by newspapers and then television (HakiElimu & REDET, 2006). A radio is the most commonly owned item within households, most likely due to its affordability, portability and low maintenance costs. Currently, internet may be limited in access, affordability and utility, but it is gaining in influence. Information via the internet travels faster, especially with the current wave of providing internet services through mobile phones and short message services (SMS).

2.3.15.5 School Autonomy in Tanzania

School autonomy is a form of school management in which schools are given decision-making authority over their operations (Arcia et al., 2011). Some authors have suggested using “de facto” autonomy – as opposed to “de jure” autonomy – as the relevant measure of autonomy. While “de jure” autonomy refers to whether the school has been appointed as autonomous or not, “de facto” autonomy is related to the level of autonomy the school is actually enjoying or exercising as measured by the number (or the percentage) of decisions the school makes (Gertler, Patrinos, & Rubio-Codina, 2007:8). Public primary schools in Tanzania derive their autonomy from their local councils. Thus, current school autonomy in Tanzania should be viewed in the context of the Decentralisation-by-Devolution Policy of 1998. School autonomy includes freedom to determine own school needs, set priorities and
budgets on the basis of the total resource envelope available at school level including subventions from the government (Mushi, 2006). Thus, Arcia et al. (2011) presented two sets of indicators for school autonomy; one for authority over the use of the school budget (school decision-making power) and authority to seek additional funds from non-government sources (share of school own source revenues).

**2.4.21 School Decision-Making Power**

The progression in school autonomy in the last two decades has led to the conceptualisation of school-based management (SBM) as a form of decentralisation in which the school is in charge of most managerial decisions but with the participation of parents through school committees (Barrera-Osorio, Fasih, Patrinos, & Santibáñez, 2009). School autonomy fosters governance by making the school committee in charge of school management (Arcia et al., 2011). Although PEDP has increased school autonomy, the role of local governments at district, ward and village levels in the delivery of primary education remained unclear. Interference by the District Primary Education Office (DPEO), Ward Education Coordinators (WECs) and village government officials have been creating tensions among the school committee members and teachers. The school committee is the lynchpin of the success of the PEDP at the community level (Tanzania Education Network, 2003), but members do not have full mandate on school management.

**2.4.22 Share of Own Source Revenues Versus Grants**

Public schools are fiscally decentralised if they are allowed to mobilise own resources for school operations and development expenditures (Eskeland & Filmer, 2002). Innovative local sources of education development finance can easily be tapped where there are effective community-based school committees running the relevant school (Lwaitama, 2004).

In Tanzania, there are two sources of own school revenues, namely donations from the private sector and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and contributions from parents and the wider community (URT, 2001 & 2006). Public primary schools also generate own revenues from gardening, selling tree seedlings, small restaurants
and milling machines. Other schools, especially those in urban centres, rent out their premises and charge those who operate petty businesses within their compounds. A recent government-commissioned PETS found that private contributions to schools, including parents’ contributions, constituted 28.4% of total non-wage resources (Claussen & Assad, 2010).

2.4.23 Challenges facing actors/organizations seeking to engage in budget and accountability monitoring in Tanzania

A number of challenges are experienced by participants engaged in budget and accountability monitoring fund in schools in Tanzania and is perceived limitations in the public resource management and accountability framework. Many of these limitations related to the non-implementation of the framework in practice. These points of discussion echo some of the critical observations processes, including the CAG and the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee.

2.5 Theoretical Framework

2.5.1 Systems theory

Systems theory was initially developed by biologist Ludwig von Bertalanffy as a rigorous method of describing the structure and mechanisms of complex systems. For example, Land and associates (2003) attempt to describe learning from a systems perspective. Banathy (1996) suggests that besides paying attention to this functional structure of the system, we should also look at the system from two other perspectives. One is to examine the instructional system as a synthetic organism in the context of its community and the larger society. The other is to explore what the instructional system does through time. The suggestions, in fact, echoes the ways that Reigeluth, Bathany, and Olson (1993) proposed to adopt systems design: "We should explore educational change and renewal from the larger vistas of the evolving society, and envision a new design. We should view the system we design from the perspectives of the overall societal context. Approaching education from this perspective, we shall enlarge our horizon and develop the largest possible picture of education within the largest possible context."
Systemic change recognizes the interrelationships and interdependencies among the parts of the educational system, with the consequence that desired changes in one part of the system are accompanied by changes in other parts that are necessary to support those desired changes and recognizes the interrelationships and interdependencies between the educational systems and its community, including parents, employers, social service agencies, religious organizations, and much more, with the consequence that all those stakeholders are given active ownership over the change effort (Jenlink et al 1996.) According to Banathy (1987), there are four subsystems in any educational enterprise: The learning experience subsystem: the cognitive information processing of the learner, the instructional subsystem: the production of the environment or opportunities for learners to learn by the instructional designers and teachers, the administrative subsystem: decision making of resource allocation by the administrators based on the instructional needs and governance input, the governance subsystem: the production of policies which provide directions and resources for the educational enterprise in order to meet their needs by "owners". Based on the interpretations of such analysis, the financing system is part of educational system.

2.5.2 The Stewardship theory

The “stewardship” approach focuses less on the differences between owners and agents and more on their shared fate. Stated another way, stewardship theory is motivated by the need “to explain relationships based upon … non-economic assumptions” (Davis, Schoorman and Donaldson 1997, p. 21). In terms provided by Donaldson and Davis (1991), a steward is a person who “essentially wants to do a good job, to be a good steward of the corporate assets.” (1991, p. 51).

The stewardship model is illuminated best in Davis, Schoolman and Donaldson (1997). They ask the seminal question: what actually makes the goals of agents and principals align? For if agents and principals are by nature separately and eternally at odds, are we left only with coercive (stick) or motivational (carrot) techniques to make alignment occur? Is it not possible that in some circumstances, agents could become stewards? And if so, when? The stewardship model proposes that there are
a number of motivational, identification and power-related characteristics of agents as well as numerous situational (environmental) factors in management philosophy (strongly related to “corporate culture”) and in national culture that might engender stewardship relationships. In contrast to agency theory – which posits enduring structural characteristics in the agent-principal relationship due to a basic economic model – stewardship theory assumes a complex set of contingent factors relating to agents, operators, and their organizational and national cultures. These factors in turn encourage stewardship-type relationships.

The model of Donaldson and Davis (1991) makes certain predictions about the likelihood of stewardship vs. agency relationships developing at a corporate level (Davis et al, 1994). For our purposes, it’s interesting to apply these ideas to Primary School financing/funding. Based on what we know about primary schools and how they operates/ works, in order to examine as to whether resources are enough and if are spent wisely.

*Stewardship assumption are based on people of Higher-order needs* are those satisfied through values that go beyond mere money (i.e., things that money can’t buy) such as the enjoyment of a job, the praise and trust of peers and others, the feeling of satisfying others in a relationship. *Identification* with the organizational mission and its processes implies personalizing outcomes and taking personal responsibility for activities.

### 2.6 Empirical Literature review

Kamla (2013) in the study factors inhibiting effective management of primary schools in Nigeria, the study aimed at identifying some of the problems militating against effective management of primary schools in Afikpo South local government area in Ebonyi State of Nigeria. A self-administered questionnaire containing eight research questions with twenty-four (24) questionnaire items was utilised for this study. The study found, among others that, high numbers of enrolment put pressure on meagre school facilities, while heads of schools, teachers and pupils are affected by a general lack of facilities. This is exemplified by some schools where classes took place outside the normal classrooms and in some cases, outside the school.
compound. The authors insist that provision of adequate and funding, expansion of schools to accommodate the increasing enrolment of pupils and a co-operative community incorporating parents of pupils.

In 2006, Aluede warned that large number of Primary schools suffered an immense deprivation of facilities that support teaching and learning. In a study conducted by Adepoju and Fabiyi (2007), it revealed the following: 12% of pupils sat on the floor; 38% of the classrooms have no ceilings; while 87% of the classrooms were overcrowded. With poor funding, the few classrooms built on some of the primary school grounds decay faster as a result of poor maintenance. This kind of situation has consistently presented enormous challenges to school heads. Ozigi (1977) believes that it is the duty of the headmaster to see to it that essential and basic equipment and materials are provided in adequate quantity and in good time. The headmaster should ensure that the building, ground and other physical facilities are well maintained and used. Lack of these vital materials is a source of frustration and annoyance as well as meaningless teaching results.

Dutta (2008) the study assessed the impact of infrastructure on the performance of primary schools in New Delhi: A mere 45.04 percent of students passing out of government-run primary schools - up to Class 5 - in India score 60 percent marks or more, reveals a new survey.

The study was based on the idea that the goal of infrastructure development in primary education is to increase school attendance motivation and to improve academic performance of students. On this backdrop, current study examined attitude towards school infrastructure of students in primary schools and its relation with school effectiveness (school attendance motivation and academic achievement). Multistage random sampling was followed in collection of data from 572 students of different schools located in 6 high and 6 less literate rural blocks in 6 different districts of West Bengal. Four questionnaires were developed to assess (a) Demographic and socio-economic conditions (b) Attitude towards school infrastructure (c) School attendance motivation and (d) Academic performance of students.
Nine attitudes (cleanliness, safety, comfort, adequacy, exploring, reliability, easiness, equal opportunity, willingness to participate in school activities) towards school infrastructure were initially conceptualized and accordingly one highly reliable (Kuder Richardson reliability = 0.90) 68-item questionnaire was developed. More students (above 70%) felt that school infrastructures were easy to handle, reliable and capable to develop students’ inquisitiveness. On the other hand, they felt that infrastructures were not safe and easily accessible. They felt less willingness to participate into sports and cultural programs. Results revealed that attitude varies with differences in religion, socio economic status, districts, literacy rate of blocks, and with available school infrastructure facilities.

Attitude is formed by one’s perception of infrastructure. Principal component analysis explored 3 latent perceptions of school infrastructures as basic, supportive and activity based infrastructures. Students usually paid attention to basic (Classroom, blackboard, teaching, book, Mid-day meal), next supportive (Drinking water, Toilet, Friend, Book bank, Health checkup) and finally activity based (TLM, Games, Cultural programs) infrastructures. Perception of above 3 infrastructures also varies with differences in religion, socio economic status, districts, literacy rate of blocks, and with available school infrastructure facilities.

Attitude determines one’s motivation to use infrastructure. Results revealed that only 67% of students were motivated to attend the school. This motivation does not vary with one’s socioeconomic status contrary to common assumptions. School attendance motivation varies with exposure. Students of high literate blocks and of good school infrastructure motivated more to attend the school than their counterparts. It is noted that all the attitudinal variables towards school infrastructure are related to school attendance motivation. Stepwise regression analysis shows that linear combination of 4 variables (Easiness, Willingness to Participate, Exploring, Safety) predicted changes in school attendance motivation. This suggests that students like infrastructures that can be controlled easily, safe and exploring. Their willingness to participate in different school programs motivated them to attend school. In comparison with other infrastructure types, activity based infrastructure is more preferred to students for school attendance motivation. TLM satisfaction had
very little effect on school attendance motivation. Findings raised question about proper use of TLM in primary school. Basic infrastructures like mid-day meal, textbooks and teaching predicted changes in school attendance motivation. Among supportive infrastructures, friendship, health check up and toilet facilities acted as important motivating factors to attend school.

Though attitude and school infrastructure perception play important roles in school attendance motivation, they failed to show any predictable change in academic performance of students. Even school attendance motivation failed to correlate academic performance.

Kweka et al.,(1987) in the study financing primary schools in Tanzania, according to the study primary Education in Tanzania, is poor especially in physical infrastructures such as classes, housing for teachers. In this study included bush schools, madrassa (Quran schools), nursery schools and primary schools. They are, however, very few due to the weak position of the government of Tanzania because of high dependent to foreign aids.

Berner, (April 1993). In a study of the District of Columbia school system found out that many school systems, particularly those in urban and high-poverty areas, are plagued by decaying buildings that threaten the health, safety, and learning opportunities of students. Good facilities appear to be an important precondition for student learning, provided that other conditions are present that support a strong academic program in the school. The results indicated that poor financing of primary schools was the source of poor physical building conditions and overcrowding. Decaying environmental conditions such as peeling paint, crumbling plaster, nonfunctioning toilets, poor lighting, inadequate ventilation, and inoperative heating and cooling systems which could in turn affect the learning as well as the health and the morale of staff and students.

Cash (1993) examined the relationship between financing and building condition and student achievement in small, rural Uganda primary schools. Poorer funding was associated with specific building condition factors such as substandard science facilities, classroom furniture, more graffiti, and noisy external environments.
Similarly, Hines’ (1996) study of large, urban primary schools in Virginia also found a relationship between building condition and financing. Indeed, Hines found that many building as 11 percentages were substandard buildings as compared to above-standard buildings. The study concluded that heating and air conditioning systems appeared to be very important, along with special instructional facilities (i.e., science laboratories or equipment) and color and interior painting, in contributing to student achievement.

Gaurav (2011) in the study the impact of government financing in physical infrastructures in West Bengal India, Multistage random sampling was followed in collection of data from 572 students of different schools located in 6 high and 6 less literate rural blocks in 6 different districts of West Bengal. Four questionnaires were developed to assess government financing on attitude towards school infrastructure school attendance motivation and academic performance of students.

Nine attitudes (cleanliness, safety, comfort, adequacy, exploring, reliability, easiness, equal opportunity, willingness to participate in school activities) towards school infrastructure were initially conceptualized and accordingly one highly reliable (Kuder Richardson reliability = 0.90) 68-item questionnaire was developed. More students (above 70%) felt that school infrastructures were easy to handle, reliable and capable to develop students’ inquisitiveness. On the other hand, they felt that infrastructures were not safe and easily accessible. They felt less willingness to participate into sports and cultural programs. Results revealed that attitude varies with differences in religion, socio economic status, districts, literacy rate of blocks, and with available school infrastructure facilities.

Attitude is formed by one’s perception of infrastructure. Principal component analysis explored 3 latent perceptions of school infrastructures as basic, supportive and activity based infrastructures. Students usually paid attention to basic (Classroom, blackboard, teaching, book, Mid-day meal), next supportive (Drinking water, Toilet, Friend, Book bank, Health checkup) and finally activity based (TLM, Games, Cultural programs) infrastructures. Perception of above 3 infrastructures also
varies with differences in religion, socio economic status, districts, literacy rate of blocks, and with available school infrastructure facilities.

Attitude determines one’s motivation to use infrastructure. Results revealed that only 67% of students were motivated to attend the school. This motivation does not vary with one’s socioeconomic status contrary to common assumptions. School attendance motivation varies with exposure. Students of high literate blocks and of good school infrastructure motivated more to attend the school than their counterparts.

2.7 Research Gap

There is a large literature on primary education in Tanzania (Kilasi, 2011; Manara and Mwombela, 2012; URT, 2010). Yet, very few studies have attempted to investigate the link between the Government funds, school infrastructure and the education outcomes in primary schools. This is a gap in the current debate on the effectiveness of the Government Spending on primary education which this proposed study aims to fill. Knowledge on the Impact of Government Spending on the Development of Primary Schools Physical Infrastructure is therefore important in filling the gap.

2.8 Conceptual Frameworks

According to Uma (2003) defines the conceptual as “a conceptual model of how one theorizes or makes logical sense of the relationships among the several factors that have been identified as important to the problem”. Physical Infrastructure means the physical facilities of the school. It is referred to buildings, toilets, furniture, teachers’ houses and desk. The proposed study conceptualizes that development of schools physical infrastructure is dependent on the governance of school fund by school committee in terms of participation, transparency and accountability.

The development of school infrastructure (No. of buildings and furniture and Quality of buildings and furniture) depend with level of government spending in physical infrastructure whereby good governance (accountability and transparency) and
stakeholders perceptions (Village leaders, parents, pupils and teachers) which is guided by the level of education, age, and locality are intermediate factors.

In situation when the level of Government spending is high while the Governance is poor then there will be a low level of development of Primary School physical infrastructure which will raise a negative perception to stakeholders. But when the level of Government spending is high with good Governance obvious the level of development of Primary School physical infrastructure will raise. At a situation when the level of Government spending is low but with a presence of good governance then with that little money there will be a high level of development of Primary School physical infrastructure which will bring good perception to stakeholders.

**Figure 1 Conceptual Frameworks**

**SOURCE:** Developed by Researcher (2013)
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Chapter Overview

This chapter presents a detailed account on how the research was conducted. The chapter describes location and justification of the study, the rationale behind the research design, sampling design and sampling size, methods which used in data collection and data analysis.

3.2 Study Location and Justification of the Study Area

The study was conducted in Morogoro Municipal Council in 34 schools from 19 wards. Morogoro Municipal Council is one of the 7 districts of the Morogoro Region of Tanzania. It covers 260 square kilometres (100 sq mi). According to URT (2013), Morogoro Municipality had a population of 2,218,492 people. It has nineteen wards with a total of sixty two (62) public primary Schools. The choice of schools based on at least a presentation of each ward.

Apart from the choice of school based on the least of wards, Morogoro municipal was selected for the study for two other reasons. First, it is among the municipal which have many primary schools in Tanzania mainland. Second, most of primary schools have different conditions of physical infrastructure thus no biased on the selection of school. Thirdly, availability of interviewees for data collection is easier than other district in terms of communication and transportation. Fourthly and lastly, Morogoro municipality is larger than other district with a population of 263,920 while Mvomero district has a population of 106,668 only (URT, 2003b: 59 & 99).

3.3 Unit of Analysis

The sampling unity of the study was composed of head teachers, school committee chair person, facilities teachers and District officials. The information obtained from head teachers, facilities teachers was about the money they received from government and expenditure. The information which was obtained was about the
level of government spending in physical infrastructure. Also in District officers and local leaders were interviewed on the amount of money they supply to primary schools for development of physical infrastructure improvement. Also School committee is among the unit of analysis whereby the information obtained from was about the school expenditure.

The number of wards with Schools and selected schools are as shown in the table below.

**TABLE 2: Number of wards and selected schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARDS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>SELECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bigwa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kichangani</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kihonda</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilakala</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingolwira</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mji Mkuu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwembesongo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlimani</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanja cha Ndege</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mji Mpya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saba Saba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uwanja wa Taifa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbuyuni</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mafiga</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazimbu</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mzinga</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Qualitative Research Design

A cross-sectional research design was used in which data collected at one point at a time. Also qualitative researchers in contrast see the world as socially constructed through individual perceptions. Their approach is to not believe that they understand and can identify reasons for behaviours. They are sceptical of providing possible explanations without carefully examining the process. Simply put, in the tourism example, they would approach the problem without preconceived explanations, and through a variety of techniques try to see the factors influencing destination choice. This design is useful for descriptive purpose and determination of relationship between variables (Babbie 1990). It was chosen due to the fact that a researcher can identify the population of interest to this study. The design is also quick, cheap and effective in utilizing limited resources in term of cash, transportation and time.

3.5 Sampling Design and Sample Size

Both simple random and purposive sampling methods were used. Simple random sampling was applied in the selection of schools while purposive sampling was used in the selection of respondents from each school. The sample size of the study was 68 respondents. According to Bailey (1994) a representative of at least 30 units is a sufficient sample size in social research.

3.6 Data collection

3.6.1 Primary data

These are raw data collected direct from the field which includes both qualitative and quantitative data. The scheduled interview was used in collection of primary data in this study. The target population were village leaders, head teachers and teachers, district education officers

3.6.1.1 Schedule interview

In this method of data collection administered questionnaire was used as a tool. The questionnaire with closed and open-ended questions used to collect quantitative data from the respondents through scheduled interviews.
3.6.1.2 Key informants interview

Key informants interview was used in this study to collect qualitative Data which support what have been revealed in interview. Checklist was used as a tool to collect qualitative data from the key informants such as parents, Ward education co coordinators, Ward or executive officer (WECs/WEO), Community development officers (CDOs), School Committee and District Education Officer (DEO).

3.6.2 Secondary Data

Secondary data was obtained through reviewing documents and reports from district and education officials.

3.7 Data processing and analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis were used. Analysis was done by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), computer software in conformity with the objective of the study. In quantitative data analysis, descriptive and inferential statistics were employed. In descriptive statistics analysis frequency, percentage means and means of variations was employed. In inferential statistics analysis, multiple logistic regression model will be used. In qualitative method structure content functional analysis was used.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 General Information about the chapter

4.1.1 An Overview

This chapter is concerned with researcher’s results, which most of them are discrete series, continuous series and categorical data. Data were presented in charts, frequencies and percentages. These data contain the characteristics besides the ones related to specific objectives; a) determining the level of Government funding for physical infrastructure b) assessing how the funds for physical infrastructure are managed by a relevant authority c) determining the level of development of primary schools physical infrastructure in terms of quality and capacity d) assessing the attitude of stakeholders towards Government spending in primary education. Data were collected using tools such as direct observation, interview and checklist that were administered through structured questionnaires to the sampled respondents.

Before going into the details of the study findings, it is important to understand the context including social economic characteristics of respondent and the age of School infrastructure under this study;

4.1.2 The Socio-Economic Characteristics of Respondent

The general information of school that were taken into account was sex of respondent, position of respondent in school, school age, number of classes, number of pupils, number of pupil per desk and number of latrines. These characteristics were considered to be important because they sometimes have certain influence on development initiatives introduced in a given setting (Howllet and Nagu, 2001). Results from the study (Table 1) show that most (69.1%) of the respondents were female and (30.9%) were male. This means that, it is likely that majority of women are involved in primary schools as opposite to men. Thus, there is a significant gender bias towards female teachers in the surveyed schools.
4.1.3 Age of respondents

The study investigated the age of respondents who took part in this study with the aim of understanding the relationship that exist between age variable and education issues in Morogoro. Age variable was investigated as important aspects on education management in Morogoro especially concerning primary education. This was due to the fact that age and social class influence education choices, the lines that traditionally divided social classes are becoming increasingly blurred. As the middle class in most developing countries continues to grow, many of these individuals now aspire to further climb the social class ladder. This opens up questions to the way the government funds physical infrastructures projects and education in general.

Table 3: Age of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of respondents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 and Above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2013)

Table 3 above shows that, respondents who took part in this study are of age and that the information given here in is from mature and experienced persons and are valid. Most of the respondents who were interviewed were of the age of 30 up to 41 and above because this is the actual working age in Tanzania to have a leading role, which is due to knowledge and experience. Their age range varied considerably. There were 5.6% of males at the age of 18-35 while females were 0% at this age. There were 22.2% of males at age between 35- 41 and females 16.7%. For the age of 48 and above, there were 33.3% males whilst females were 22.2%...
4.1.4 Sex of respondents

The study had more males participants compared to females participants. Table 6 below shows that 69.1% out of 100 respondents were male while 30.1% were female and so the views and opinions given in here are representative of all sexes.

4.1.5 Education Level of respondents

Education variable is important because when a stakeholder makes a decision, they usually make use of the information and experience in education field. Table 4 shows education level of respondents.

Table 4: Education of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2013)

Table 4 above shows that respondents who took part in this study are learned and their views and opinions can be trusted to inform and shape the purposes of this study. The level of education shown indicates that most of the respondents who took part in this study were well educated and therefore, the information provided is valid in relation to the research objectives.

4.1.6 Respondents Work Experience

Due to the nature education management especially primary school teaching activities long working duration of employees is very important that enabled the researcher to gather information relevant to the study. Based on the findings established in table 5 below 22.1% of the interviewed participants have worked
primary schools and ministry of education in Morogoro between one and five years whilst fifty seven 77.9% have worked for more than five years.

**Table 5: Duration of Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentages %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 5 years:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years:</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2013)

This shows that knowledge and experience matters where being able to understand the government funding, primary school status and academic performance of primary schools in Morogoro.

### 4.1.7 The School General Information

The age of a school is usually a factor that can explain the level of production and efficiency (Basnayuka and Gunaratine, 2002). According to study findings, the age of school was ranged between 9 and 61 years with an average of 30 years per school. Results in Table 6 below further show that most (48.5 %) of respondents were store keeping teachers, 36.8 % head teachers, and 14.7 % were assistance head teachers. The result further shows that the number of pupils is ranged between 203 and 1600. The average was 784.
Table 6: The School General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of school respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent position in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Teacher</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store keeping teacher</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Head teacher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 20 years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pupils</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2013)

This was expected to contribute negatively to physical infrastructures because majority of the schools are old, which means that their physical infrastructures need to be improved several times.

4.2 Government Spending

4.2.1 Government Funds Disbursement

This section presents the distribution of government fund to primary schools for five years starting from 2008 to 2012. The findings show that the average amount received from 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 were 2 750 764, 1 048 395, 1 259 596, 1 167 383 and 108 533 respectively. Figure 1 above shows that the budget distributed to primary schools was higher in 2008 and lower in 2009. The amount was varied each year as it indicated in the figure 2 from 2010 to 2012 the amount of...
fund was slightly drooped. This is not surprising because since 2002 the value of the capitation grant declined by over 35%. UWAZI (2010) argue that the actual amount of money reaching schools for capitation grants is clearly much less today compared to what it was between 2002 and 2003. According to the Education Public Expenditure Tracking Survey of 2004, in the period 2002-2003 schools received on average 5,400 shillings per capita. In 2007/08 however, the money actually reaching the schools had declined to 4,189 shillings per pupil (URT, 2010).
4.2.2 Timeliness of funds released

In a key informant’s interviews, many participants claimed about the delay and inadequate of fund. This is proved by one teacher who said

“We have more than 1,000 pupils in this school. At the moment there are 16 teachers in total. We receive a capitation grant, but it comes in instalments and sometimes it is much delayed. Besides that, it is not enough.”

4.2.3 The responsible person/body for improvement of School Infrastructures

The results show that about 82.4% of respondents who were interviewed (head teachers, store keeping teachers and assistant head teachers) were of the view that the improvement of the school infrastructure was the duty of the government while 17.6% mentioned parents and government to be responsible. Parents are obliged to contribute 20% for the construction and purchase of the school infrastructure under PEDP II, but most are not aware of this (HAKIELIMU, 2011). However, still parents...
and teachers think that it is the duty of the government to improve the education sector.

4.3 Management and Governance of Development fund

The heads of schools are the people who have skills and knowledge in school management and administration. They are responsible for receiving funds from the primary school education officers. They also plan for the expenditure of school funds in different development programmes (HAKIELIMU, 2011). The study found that school head teachers (50%) are responsible for receiving government fund for their schools. 25% of respondents claimed fund to be received by school committee and 17.6% received by both head teacher and school committee. Edqual (2009) in baseline study and consultation with head teachers through a needs analysis workshop revealed that head teachers now have greater responsibility for managing the school budget and mobilising resources from various sources. The study also revealed that the Education Development Programme (PEDP) funds are mostly ensured by school committee (73.5%). This means that school committees were mostly concerned with management of PEDP funds and purchasing of school materials.
Table 7: Management of school fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund receiver</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school committee and municipal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school committee</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head teacher and school committee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head teacher and bursar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head teacher</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure insurer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school committee</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school chairperson and head teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head teacher and school committee</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head teacher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2013)

4.4 The Level of School Development in Physical Infrastructures

4.4.1 The Status of School

The results shows that 57.4 % of the respondents claimed their school’s physical infrastructures status to be unsatisfactory, 22.1 % satisfactory, 15.7 % good, 2.9 % very good and 1.5 % was poor (Table 3). According to Lawson et al. (1999) poor teaching and learning environment is one of the reasons for poor performance of students to education particularly girls. In order to improve the quality of education, the provision of school learning materials and school infrastructure is important. School needs to be supplied with teaching and learning materials to facilitate teachers training.
Table 8: The Level of School infrastructure development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsatisfactory</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of desk per pupil</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possess school library</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>26.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possess school laboratory</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>26.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of classrooms</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of latrines</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2013)

School library plays a vital role in the learning process and is an essential component of a good school. The results in Table 3 further show that majority of school 73.5% don’t have library while no single school claimed to own a laboratory. The number of school classroom is ranged from 5 to 13 with average of 12. The recommended pupil-teacher ratios and class size for primary schools in Tanzania are 40 pupils per teacher and 40 pupils per class, respectively (MoEVT, 2009). As the findings show
that the average number of pupils was 784 thus, the mean class size for the surveyed schools could be 65 pupils per class. This mean is greatly exceeding the country’s set benchmark of 40. The findings (Table 2) show that 60% of the school, 3 pupils shares one desk in the surveyed schools. However in some schools the number of pupils per desks was 4:1 (26.5%) and 2:1 (10.3%).

4.4.2 School Sanitation Facilities

The data indicates that, number of school pit latrines is ranged from 5 to 38 with an average of 8.3. The Government target for school sanitation facilities is one pit latrine/toilet per 20 girl pupils and one per 25 boy pupils. The situation in schools that were surveyed shows that this target is far from being met. The average pupil to latrine ratio is approximate to be 65:1 and most of toilets are in poor quality.

**Table 9: Number of latrine in relation to size of pupil per school**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil number category</th>
<th>Latrine number</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201-700</td>
<td>5-19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701-1200</td>
<td>5-19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201-1600</td>
<td>5-19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonetheless, the number of latrine does not correlate with the number of pupils. UWAZI (2009) argue that good quality sanitation facilities are important for a healthy learning environment and should be made a priority in all schools.
4.4.3 Level of Expenditure for physical infrastructure

The study found that the main cost item at school level is construction costs which include construction of new classrooms, administration buildings, staff houses and latrines. The other main items are desks. The results (Fig.1) below show that the average amount spent on construction and renovation of classrooms is about 44 % which is greater than other expenditures on physical infrastructure. Other levels of expenditure were on desks cost which account for 25 %, latrine construction and renovation 23 %, staff house 6% and office construction 2%. The results further shows that among 34 schools of Morogoro Municipal only 3 schools were able to construct classrooms, 5 schools were able to construct toilets, only 1 school was able to construct staff office and 2 schools were able to construct teacher’s house. There is no correlation between the number of schools and the quantity of the construction made. This is still a challenge towards implementation of PEDP II objectives which aim at building 87,744 teachers’ houses, 60,896 classrooms, 107,224 toilets and the purchase of 821,877 desks.

Figure 3: Level of Expenditure for physical infrastructure

Source: Field Data (2013)
4.5 Perception of stakeholders towards Government spending in Primary School

The study also aimed at finding out attitude of different stakeholders toward government spending in primary school physical infrastructures (GSPSPI). Therefore this section presents the findings of the study on attitude of respondents towards GSPSPI

4.5.1 Awareness on PEDP

In a focus group discussion, participants were asked whether they are aware with PEDP. The study observed that the program is well known by Municipal leaders, private sector key actors in issues of education and to some teachers. As for parents it seems that, the program is not familiar to most of them however; they recognize that the government is supporting primary school. This was proved by one parent who said “As for me I’ am not familiar with what it called PEDP but from what I know the government is supporting primary education however, it still surprising me we keep on providing too much contributions in schools I don’t know why”

4.5.2 School Achievement versus Government Spending

Respondents were asked to mention the achievements obtained from the government spending on physical infrastructures. Result (Table 4) show that, the achievements obtained from government fund to physical infrastructure included that on; repairing and purchasing of classrooms, office staff, desks and latrines. Other achievements were on access to water, electricity and computer facilities. However, 41.8 % of the respondents claimed not to see any achievement on their physical infrastructure from government funds. This probably could be due to the claim that the amount is too little hence, does not meet the school requirements.
### Table 10: School achievements from government fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repairing of classrooms, desks and toilets</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing of desks</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of offices, classrooms, toilets and staff house</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing of computers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to electricity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water accessibility</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2013)

#### 4.5.3 Parents’ Awareness of Financial Contributions to Education

The survey showed that parents had a greater contribution towards development of primary school physical infrastructures since they contribute about 75.0% of school private contributions. The average amount of funds contributed by parents ranged from Tsh. 2000 to 10 000 per year for each student. Moreover parents were asked to give opinions on capitation and development funds disbursed to school and whether or not they are given a receipt after paying school contributions. Only 15 schools out of 34 provide receipts to parents who contribute for education development. Other parents state that they use to register their names on exercise books to those parents who contributed money to the schools “*These contributions are too much; water, guards, electricity and so and so and so I have three children and I suppose to contribute for each it real killing me.*” (Parent, Mazimbu)
4.5.4 Stakeholders’ Attitude towards Factors Affecting Government Spending on the Development of Primary Schools Physical Infrastructures.

4.6 Factor Analyses and Reliability

Table 11 shows the results of Factor Analysis. From the factor analyses of the variables, three factors were generated. Factor one is school size (Independent variable). Factor two is named parent support. Factor three is called Number of years since establishment. The amount of fund provided by the government had higher consideration with higher expected value of in the

Table 11: Results of Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s support</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years since establishment</td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Funding</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2013)

4.6.1 Reliability Testing

Although pre-testing of the questionnaires was done earlier to enhance reliability, this was done again for the entire case study, where the collected data were keyed in and the Cronbach Alpha was calculated. With values at an acceptable level of significance for Alpha being 0.70 (Huck and Cormier, 1996), it can be conclude that the final results are reliable.
4.6.2 Cronbach Alpha Values

Table 12: Cronbach Alpha Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s support</td>
<td>0.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years since establishment</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Funding</td>
<td>0.787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2013)

From the results above it shows that all variables examined had significant relationship; this implies that the government will take necessary measures to address situations relating to primary schools infrastructures.

4.6.3 Pearson Correlation

Table 13: Correlation Coefficients among Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s support</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years since establishment</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Funding</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation coefficients among the variables such as School size, Parent’s support, and Number of years since establishment are shown in table 13 above. The results above reveal that there are significant correlations existing between funding and school infrastructures in primary education in Morogoro. This implies that as funding influence the condition or state of infrastructures in Morogoro region and probably country wide. This coefficient is significant, which means it can be conclude beyond doubt that this relationship exists. There is a strong positive
correlation found between parent’s support and building of school infrastructure which means apart from other sources of funding in primary schools in Morogoro parent plays a great role in financing primary education especially on the aspects of infrastructures. This indicates that as parent’s support increases, infrastructure improvement also increases. This coefficient is significant which means there is a strong positive relationship.

The relationship between government funding and school infrastructure is positive and it has strong relationship and statistically significant, this implies that government funding influence on poor condition on the physical infrastructures of primary schools in Morogoro.

4.6.4 Simple Regression Analysis

The regression coefficients and their associated ‘t’ values are given in the following Table 13. Among all four independent variables, school size comes first as the most significant factor. There is a significant relationship between parent’s support and financing of school’s physical infrastructures since parents contributes to construction of new buildings. This implies that parent’s support is an important variable shows that parents are among the key actors in financing school physical infrastructures in Morogoro region. Number of years since establishment is the next significant variable to predict the status of physical infrastructure in Morogoro which may mean that old school are in poor status compared to new schools that were constructed in recent years.
Table 14: Simple Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B ST.Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t Sig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>2.083 .520</td>
<td>4.007 .000</td>
<td>1.053 3.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>.350 .090</td>
<td>.346 3.880 .000</td>
<td>.171 .528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s support</td>
<td>.070 .102</td>
<td>.070 .686 .494</td>
<td>-.132 .272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years since</td>
<td>.124 .100</td>
<td>.110 1.247 .215</td>
<td>-.073 .322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishment</td>
<td>Government Funding</td>
<td>.113 .091</td>
<td>.108 .1.421 .217</td>
<td>-.084 .310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above results also reveal that there is relationship between independent variables and dependent variables (physical infrastructures). This implies that school size, parent support determine the condition and status of physical infrastructures in primary schools in Morogoro.
Table 15: Summary of Variable Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 School size</td>
<td>Multiple Regression</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Parent’s support</td>
<td>Multiple Regression</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Number of years since establishment</td>
<td>Multiple Regression</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Government Funding</td>
<td>Multiple Regression</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study indicates that parent support has a significant positive impact on the improvement of physical infrastructures in Morogoro primary schools. This is because of community engagement and development of a sense of awareness among parents on the importance of primary education in region.

This study also reveals that school size influence the status and conditions of primary schools physical environment since large school were found to be in poor physical conditions due to minimal funding compared to small schools in Morogoro. This is due to the fact that many primary schools have many students compared to their carrying capacity some of them are too large and unnourished. Government funding had significant relationship with physical condition of primary schools in Morogoro as most of them were found to be in poor condition due to minimal financing. This is due to the fact that the central government in general and local government in particular depend much from donors for funding in primary education.

Table 16: Relationship between funding, physical infrastructure and primary education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical infrastructure and primary education</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on student achievement</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on teaching</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2013)
From Table above, it was revealed government funding has negative impact not only on the physical infrastructures bust rather to the delivery of education as well, for instance it was revealed that poor physical environment due to lack of funding had Impact on student achievement which ranked 67%. This finding is similar with that of Edwards (1991) who found out that students in school buildings in poor condition had achievement that was 6% below schools in fair condition and 11% below schools in excellent condition. Student scores on achievement tests, adjusted for socioeconomic status, was found to be up to 5 percentile points lower in buildings with lower quality ratings. Poorer achievement was associated with specific building condition factors such as substandard science facilities, air conditioning, conditions, classroom furniture, and noisy external environments.

The study sought to determine which aspects of the physical environment affected their teaching the most, and these teachers pointed to the availability and quality of classroom equipment and furnishings, as well as features such size as the most important environmental factors. In particular, the teachers emphasized that the ability to control classroom is crucial to the effective performance of both students and teachers this aspect ranked 75%

A study of working conditions in urban schools concluded that "physical conditions have direct positive and negative effects on teacher morale, sense of personal safety, feelings of effectiveness in the classroom, and on the general learning environment." Building renovations in one district led teachers to feel "a renewed sense of hope, of commitment, a belief that the district cared about what went on that building." In dilapidated buildings in another district, the atmosphere was punctuated more by despair and frustration, with teachers reporting that leaking roofs, burned out lights, and broken toilets were the typical backdrop for teaching and learning." (Corcoran et al., 1998). Also, it was found out that "where the problems with working conditions are serious enough to impinge on the work of teachers, they result in higher absenteeism, reduced levels of effort, lower effectiveness in the classroom, low morale, and reduced job satisfaction. Where working conditions are good, they result in enthusiasm, high morale, cooperation, and acceptance of responsibility."
Overcrowding ranked 81% it was found out that overcrowded schools are a serious problem in many school systems in Morogoro Municipality, particularly in the inner cities, where space for new construction is at a premium and funding for such construction is limited. As a result, students find themselves trying to learn while jammed into spaces never intended as classrooms, such as libraries, laboratories, and even toilets. It was revealed that overcrowding had an adverse impact on learning. These findings are similar with that of Rivera- (1995) who found out that students in such schools scored significantly lower on both mathematics and reading exams than did similar students in underutilized schools. In addition, when asked, students and teachers in overcrowded schools agreed that overcrowding negatively affected both classroom activities and instructional techniques. Likewise it was found that overcrowding and heavy teacher workloads created stressful working conditions for teachers and led to higher teacher absenteeism. Crowded classroom conditions not only make it difficult for students to concentrate on their lessons, but inevitably limit the amount of time teachers can spend on innovative teaching methods such as cooperative learning and group work or, indeed on teaching anything beyond the barest minimum of required material. In addition, because teachers must constantly struggle simply to maintain order in an overcrowded classroom, the likelihood increases that they will suffer from burnout earlier than might otherwise be the case.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Chapter overview

The aim of the study was to determine the impact of government spending in primary school physical infrastructure. The aim of the final chapter is to answer the research questions of the dissertation. Conclusions are drawn based on analysis from previous chapter. A suggestion for further studies is discussed as well in this chapter.

Based on the findings of the study the summary is presented followed by conclusion, recommendations and suggested areas for future research.

5.2 Summary of Findings

This study was set out to determine the impact of government spending in development of primary schools physical infrastructures. Specifically, the research was undertaken to find out the attitude of stakeholders towards Government spending in primary education, to determine the level of Government funding for physical infrastructure, to know how the funds for physical infrastructure are managed by a relevant authority and to determine the level of development of primary schools physical infrastructure in terms of quality and capacity. The study adopted case study design and cross-sectional data collected from 68 randomly selected respondents from 34 schools located in Morogoro Municipal Council to obtain relevant data for the survey. Data were collected through administered questionnaires and key informant interview. SPSS program was used for analysing quantitative data; whereby descriptive statistics and multiple logistic regression analysis were carried out.

The result of the study showed that, to a certain extent there is a slightly positive impact of government spending in primary school physical infrastructure since respondents mentioned some achievements obtained from government fund. The actual amount of money reaching schools for capitation grants is clearly much less
today compared to what it was between; it was revealed that heads of schools are the people who have skills and knowledge in school management and administration. The findings indicated that there was poor funding and management of funds allocated for primary schools infrastructural development.

The study found that physical infrastructures in primary school can influence learning; young children strive to make sense of the world in which they live. They try to organize the visual images and concrete objects in their environment into meaningful systems. Children want to determine how the space works and what activities can happen in that place. Specific design of infrastructures, when combined with a caring and knowledgeable teacher, can help the environment become a wonderful place for nurturing the development of young children. Children who live in the classroom will have many opportunities for expanding their knowledge by actively participating in a world that is appropriate for their level of development. It will include spaces for active play as well as spaces for privacy. Opportunities are provided for a child to work quietly and areas are available where small groups can collaborate on a project.

5.3 Conclusion

The study aimed at exploring the attitude of different stakeholders towards Government spending in primary education. In order to acquire the views of different educational stakeholders, three issues were discussed. These include stakeholders’ awareness on PEDP, distribution of fund to primary schools and parents’ awareness on financial contribution towards education. It is concluded that most parents were not aware with PEDP even the amount distributed to schools by the government. The program was much known by district leaders and to some teachers. The delay and inadequate of fund was found to be the constraints towards improving of primary schools physical infrastructure. The study further used binary logistic regression model in exploring stakeholders’ attitude towards factors affecting government spending on the development of primary schools physical infrastructures. It is concluded that variables such as class size and governance were significantly associated with improvement of primary school physical infrastructure.
With regard to the level of Government spending for primary school physical infrastructure, it is concluded that there is no specific amount of fund distributed in schools. The amount is varied from school to school and changes from year to year. The study used to make comparison in 5 years from 2008 to 2012 and found the amount distributed to primary schools were low and decreased to some years.

The study was also interested to find how the Government funding for primary school physical infrastructures was managed. It is concluded that the government fund for physical infrastructures was managed by school head teachers and school committee. School head teachers and school committee were the ones who responsible for receiving, ensuing and planning for expenditure of school fund.

With regards to the extent of the quality and capacity of primary school physical infrastructures, it is concluded that the level of development of primary school physical infrastructures is not adequate enough since the number of classroom, latrine and staff house constructed in the surveyed schools is too small compared to the number of schools. It was observed from the study that many schools lack library and laboratories. Due to the delay and inadequate fund for physical infrastructures many schools were able to make renovations rather than construction or purchasing. Generally, it is concluded that the government spending in physical infrastructure is not yet fulfilled the requirements of many schools. Thus, failure to improve the school infrastructure will continue to affect the teaching process and children will keep on studying in difficult environments. This situation will affect the quality of education provided in the country.

5.4 Recommendations

In view of the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:-

The study found that most of the surveyed primary schools physical infrastructures are unsatisfactory due to inadequate fund provided from the government. In order to improve children performance and improve the education process, educators must have adequate facilities that provide an atmosphere and amenities for student, educators must strive to improve student performance as well as to improve the
education process. The following recommendations that should be provided for possible improvements in order to help school leaders to make the best decisions concerning facility improvements

It is suggested that the budget needs to be increased in order to improve infrastructures of primary schools. It is further recommended that the full amount of capitation grants stipulated in the policy should reach schools in a predictable and timely manner. Because the capitation grant from the district arrives at schools late, the Government should change this system so as to facilitate the early availability of funds in schools. This exercise is possible because all schools have bank accounts and therefore the capitation grant can easily be disbursed to schools directly from the Central Government. If the Government will accept this proposal, there is a need to establish an independent body that will be monitoring the disbursement of funds from the Central Government to the school level as well as monitoring the expenditure of such funds at the school level.

School leaders must maintain facilities, making sure that preventative maintenance is completed; School leaders must ensure that buildings are kept clean and neat, which will help in the overall maintenance and aesthetics of the building;

School leaders should work together with school board members, and the superintendent to hand all necessary improvements to facilities to ensure the high levels of academic gain that is mandated by ministry of education officials;

School facilities guidelines should be developed through collaborative process with educators and interested persons dealing with design, construction and maintenance of school facilities. These guidelines will link educational goals and facilities design, will help to facilitate flexible, performance-based application will help to encourage collaborative development, will help to become a tool to train superintendents, and will help to guide for future capital investments

Governments and stakeholders in educational industries should seek for the improvement of physical structures and facilities by providing more essential ones
and repairing the damaged ones through educational subsidies to aid teaching/learning in pre-schools.

5.5 Areas for further research

The findings from this study are a result of a micro-survey conducted in 34 schools of Morogoro Municipal council. The major limitation of micro-studies is that they cannot be representative of the total population of Tanzania. In this case, there is a need for more studies on the subject in other parts of the country to enable generalisation of the observations. Furthermore, there are several areas in which other researcher can undertake the study further by focusing on the following subject matters below:

1. Understand what factors encourage or discourage parents from sending their children to government primary schools
2. Understand how different factors including investments and budgeting or other factors that will affect the level of school readiness among young children from poor, rural areas in Tanzania
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: QUESTIONAIRE

Public spending in primary school physical infrastructure baseline data, questionnaire for 2013 survey

INTERVIEW NUMBER-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

NAME OF THE INTERVIEWER---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

DATE OF THE INTERVIEW------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

A: Information of the school

1. Name of the district............................................................................................................................
2. Name of the village/ street....................................................................................................................
3. Name of ward.........................................................................................................................................
4. Name of the school...............................................................................................................................
5. Year of establishment...........................................................................................................................
6. Name of the teacher interviewed...........................................................................................................
7. Position she/he hold at the school........................................................................................................
8. Sex  1=.female  2=.male (cycle the true answer)
9. Number of classes.................................................................................................................................
10. Number of pupils..................................................................................................................................
11. Number of desk per pupil....................................................................................................................
12. Do you have library?    (a) Yes    (b) No
13. Do you have Laboratory? (a) Yes (b) No

B: Stakeholders Attitude towards Physical Infrastructure

14. How do you see/what is the status of your school infrastructure..................................................................................

15. What is the contribution of other stakeholders towards school infrastructure

Parents

.................................................................................................................................................................
16. Government

......................................................................................................................................................

......................................................................................................................................................

NGOs/CBOs

......................................................................................................................................................

......................................................................................................................................................

Community members .............................................................................................................................

Other donors...........................................................................................................................................

17. Is the government support on physical infrastructure enough? (a) Yes (b) No

C: SOURCES OF FUNDING

18. Is there any NGO/CBOs which support physical infrastructure in your school

(a) Yes (b) No

19. If yes mention them and their support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No.</th>
<th>Name of the NGO</th>
<th>Support with the amount of money spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. (a) Is the parents contribute on improving school physical infrastructure?

(a) Yes (b) No

21. If yes, how much do they contribute for physical infrastructure.................................

21. Do the community contribute for physical infrastructure of your school?

4. If yes how much? And what kind of infrastructure?.........................................................

22. Is there any other sources which support your school to improve infrastructure? (a) Yes (b) No
Mention them and support contributed............................................................

23. What is the support from the central / local government towards physical infrastructure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sn</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Is it enough to improve physical infrastructure in your school (a) Yes (b) No

**D: MANAGEMENT OF FUND**

25. Who is responsible to send you development fund? . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
26. Who is receiving that money? .................................................................
27. Who is ensured expenditure of fund? .....................................................
28. Is the fund enough to improve physical infrastructure of your school? (a) Yes (b) No

**E: ACHIEVEMENT OF PUBLIC SPENDING TOWARDS PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE**

29. Is there any achievements obtained after receiving fund from any sources for infrastructure improvements in your school? (yes) ( No)
30. If yes, mention them ..................................................................................
31. Are there in a good term? (yes), (No)
32. If the answer is No , give reasons ..................................................................
33. What is your opinions towards public spending in funding school infrastructure? ..............................................................................................................

Thanks a lot for your cooperation and time devotion.