THE ROLE OF DECENTRALIZATION ON MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS

A CASE STUDY OF

GICUMBI DISTRICT, RWANDA

BY

TUGIRIMANA Thierry

BPA|33395|111|DU

A DISERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF A BACHELOR'S DEGREE IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION OF KAMPALA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

MAY 2014

DECLARATION

I TUGIRIMANA Thierry declare this research work is my original effort and composition and has never been produced by anybody nor to any institution for any award.

Signature ....

TUGIRIMANA Thierry

Date...

APPROVAL

This research report produced by TUGIRIMANA Thierry has been under my public primary school supervision and now ready for handing in the academic board of Kampala international University for marking.

public primary school supervision: Amyama Charles

Signature: Amyamar

Date 28/10 2014

DEDICATION

I dedicate this piece of work to my parents, my father Mr. Kabanda jean Damascene and my mother Mrs. Mukagatare Epiphanie for their contribution in my academic career, To all my siblings who are my family, my Saul mate Mrs. Umuhoza Scovia, my beloved brothers mr ,Sesonga Julius and Nshimirimana Janvier, and to all my friends, and relatives to always work hard in whatever they do.

ACKNOWLEGEMENTS

I wish to thank my supervisor. Dr. Anyama Charles for his tireless efforts in imparting acknowledge and guidance on the research proposal and report writing. I say thanks a million times for ensuring a speedy conclusion of this peace of work.

I wish to acknowledge the help of my colleagues who proof read this research and edited it to a presentable standard and all the people who have helped me to complete my studies.

May the lord almighty bless you all .

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

This research report on the role of decentralization on management of public primary schools in Gicumbi district, Rwanda had specific objectives including an effort to understand decentralization as a system of governance, as well as to analyze the management of public primary schools.Literature according to various authors was cited in relation the study and objectives as in content of chapter two. The study was designed qualitatively and quantitatively with statistical nature of data analysis. Data finding were tabulated for easier interpretation and analysis. The study had two variables that is decentralization as the independent and management of public primary schools as the dependent. The research used stratified random sampling obtaining 65 respondents whom were used to obtain both primary and secondary data with the help of interview and questionnaires.

Findings showed that majority of the people at least had an understanding of decentralization. It was seen to increase job opportunities however characterized by corruption, misappropriation of funds. Performance and management of schools was fairly average with recommendation that the system should employ and public primary schools qualified staff besides placing emphasis on accountability on both financial and non financial resources. The role decentralization played was to increase children enrolment in the public primary schools, made decision making easier as each unit/ school easily made and implemented decisions relevant to it.

Recommendations given in chapter five were to sensitize all people to understand the system well, emphasize all people to understand the system well, emphasize accountability on quality service delivery than financial resources, motivation of school inspector by CAO and concerned officials and understanding that prosperity of decentralization depends on the way its implemented and handled. In the end the study suggested further research to analyze what caused a delay in response rate to local peoples needs.

CHAPTER ONE
PROBLEM AND ITS SCOPE

1.0 Introduction

Chapter one presents the background of the problem under study, its statement, the purpose of the study, objectives, research questions, scope and significance of the study.

1.1 Background of the study

Decentralization is the transfer of administrative and political powers from central to regional or sub- national governments. Decentralization is a long- time practice in Africa. However, it became more pronounced in the 1980s and 1990s when it featured as one of the World Bank's structural criteria. Decentralization programmed in Africa followed the recommendations of the World Bank for developing countries to devolve political and administrative powers to local and autonomous levels.

The reason for this focus is that most of the social services such as health, education, water and sanitation that are a resp0onsibility of government are systematically failing, (world bank, 2003). The adjustment programmed, therefore, had improved and more efficient distribution of goods and services as its prime target. In addition, the recommendation was made on the basis that decentralization would quicken decision- making processes and increase participation by the local people. This would result in decision better tailored to people's needs and reduce corruption and clienteles, which went along with centralized government.

Proponents of decentralization argue that the ills of centralized government include corruption, clienteles, and political alienation and that these can be cured by decentralization of power from central government to sub- national governments, (Fagot, 2000).

Narrowing to Uganda, the process of decentralization trances back to the establishment of the resistance council system in 1986 onwards. In October 1992, the president launched the decentralization programmed. Since then, the policy of decentralization has been included in the Uganda constitution and the 1997 local governments Act that was enacted. These two legal instruments have dramatically changed the central government frame work within which its local government operates.

It was expected that districts under decentralization were to have more power, resources, more responsibilities and more decision- making autonomy. Also their performance was to be increasingly important for growth, poverty eradication and long term rural development problems. Because of this it becomes relevant to analyze how district fare in aspects of decentralization as well as looking at various area of concern.

School education was introduced in Uganda by the White missionaries mainly for the children of chiefs and to provide for functionaries needed by the British colonial government. So right from the onset system was not for all and it therefore grew to become highly selective and competitive with fewer students continuing to the next level of education. As a result, many Ugandans remained illiterate with literacy rates standing at only 65% with primary education 'reaching only 50% of the age group' (ministry of education an sports 1999:7). It is against this background that in December 1996 president Yoweri Museveni launched a policy of universal primary education (PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS) in accordance with the government white paper on education (Ministry of Education And Sports 1992). Under this policy, government was to provide' free' education to a maximum of four children fro each family. This has now changed because president Museveni has now said that 'all children of school- going age should benefit from universal primary education (PUE) (Loup 2002).

Education has been one of those fields that have been decentralized leading to schools and academic institutions to be run and managed by officials appointed by the district boards or provinces among others to act as central government representatives. As a result, schools at district/ local government levels have thus drastic changes ranging from administrative, political to the actual service delivery affecting their sustainability and quality of services delivered to the schools beneficiaries.

The general assumption is that Decentralization has brought service centers to the beneficiaries. However in education, the public primary schools have a challenge of teachers either not reporting to schools in time or not even at all on ground that their head teachers have no overall authority over them but the district personnel who is never with them all the time.

The researcher now wonders about the relationship between decentralization and the management of public primary schools.

1.2 Problem statement

Upon education, decentralization of services' administration to district level in Rwanda in 1994 was intended to improve the quality of education from grassroots level with Public primary schools as the basic level with administrators being close to the schools and identify these schools' needs and work upon them immediately in their specific areas.

However, this has not been fully realized as management of these schools has become hard. The administrators claim to be under funded, with no PTA money to support them, yet work load is increasing. The administrators' other challenge include the less authority over the teachers and children, the poor performance in exams as compared to private schools (Ministry of education, 2009). Construction of school buildings/ structure is also appalling in public primary schools.

It is to this status/ situation that the researcher is interested to find out whether the management of public primary schools is being influenced by decentralization as a system of governance.

1.3 Purpose of the study

This study aimed at establishing the role of decentralization on management of public primary schools in Gacumbi district, Rwanda.

1.4 Objectives of the study

- To understand decentralization as a system of governance.
- To analyze the management of public primary schools.
- To find out the role of decentralization on management of public primary schools.

1.5 Research questions

- How is decentralization run as a system of governance?
- How are public primary schools managed?
- Of what role is decentralization upon management of public primary schools?

1.6 Scope of the study

1.6.1   Content scope

The study concentrated upon the role of decentralization on management of public primary schools with specific emphasis on understanding decentralization as a system of governance and analysis of how public primary schools are managed.

1.6.2   Time scope

The study was done in a period of 6 months between April and September 2014, following performance records between 2009- 2014.

1.6.2   Geographical scope

The study was conducted in Gicumbi district with reference to selected public primary schools.

- **Significance of the study**
  - The research shall help the local administration in management of public primary schools.
  - The research shall provide future scholars with data and information upon their research.

- **Definition of key terms**

  Decentralization   Is the transfer of administrative and political powers from central to regional or sub national governments.

  Education   Is the broadest sense in any act or experience that has formative effects on the mind, character or physical ability of an individual.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the literature related to the topic as cited by other or previous authors and or scholars. It is reviewed according to objectives of the study.

2.1 DECENTRALIZATION AS A SYSTEM OF GOVERNANCE

According to Shah (2004) definitions of decentralization are many but four types are prominent.

- Deconcentration – the transfer of administrative responsibilities from the central government to local governments within a central government ministry or agency.
- Devolution- the substantial transfer of powers and authority and functions from higher or central government to local units upon which the local units or government subsequently acquire significant and autonomous financial and legal powers to function without reference to central government.
- Delegation – the transfer of managerial and administrative responsibilities of central ministries for specifically defined functions to organizations that are external to the regular bureaucratic structure.
- Privatization – the transfer of responsibilities to private or individual companies in a process by which service delivery is made by private companies who win tenders through a competitive tendering administered by the government agency.

The ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MFPED) argues that devolution features prominently in Uganda (MFPED), 1998). One of the main features of devolution is the ability of local governments to exercise both financial and political autonomy.

Marisa R.K (2008) argues that decisions at local government are frequently influenced and/ or affected by the financial and dependence of local governments on the central government. This feature eliminates devolution as a decentralization practice in Uganda. A close look at the implementation of the decentralization policy indicates that the decentralization system in Uganda can well be described as a mixture of delegation, decentralization and privatization. Most of the public services are currently being offered by private firms who through competition bidding are awarded tenders to provide services.

Decentralization in most developing countries arose in the 1970s out of the dissatisfaction with the centralized systems of national planning and administration that were the by-products of former colonial systems. These systems have been emphasized in the 1950s and 1960s during the struggle for independence. The 1970s saw a need to involve more people in the planning and decision- making process and to direct planning to people's needs. In the 1990s the World Bank regarded decentralization as a necessary part of structural reform to promote efficient use of resources and to address local needs of developing countries.

Thus, Golola (2003) argues that 'the process of decentralization in sub- Sahara Africa has coincided, and perhaps even dictated by efforts by the donor community to reorient aid policies'. Apart from these internal and external donor pressures for countries to decentralize, globalization played a major role in the decentralization movement. Decentralization comes as a response to the global demand for equity, accountability and efficient service delivery. Decentralization is opposed to centralized government systems, which had minimal responsiveness to local needs.

Decentralization in Uganda is taking place along side broad economic and political reforms and should be seen in the context of these fundamental reforms. Uganda's 1995 constitution and 1997 local government act specify five levels of local government- district, county, sub-County, parish and village, among which the 78 districts and more than 900 sub counties have political authority and financial autonomy. Each of the decentralization efforts (political and financial) had specific goals of improving service delivery.

Financial decentralization is expected to facilitated access to resources by the local governments. The financial decentralization involves devolving budgetary and spending powers to the districts. Important expenditure responsibilities in the social sector were devolved to its sub- national government (Nsibambi, 1998). The goal of political decentralization was to involve more people in the decision-making and planning processes to respond to local needs. The local councils (LCs) are consultative forum for local decision- making, (Saito 1999).

Through elected representatives, policy proposal are channeled to the legislative bodies. Within the local councils (LC) framework, all districts are expected to compile district development plans, which must reflect grassroots needs. The LCV is the council in which development plans of the district are made. The local councils (LCS) are supposed to implement the development plans such a provision of public services. Within the local council (LC) framework, extension workers to implement the development plans are employed at the local council 3 level. The public service officials (local administrators) report to local council officials, who in turn account to the people, not to the central government as was the case in the former centralized system. This accountability procedure is reflective of the democratic process in service provision in Uganda.

Saito (1999) traces the planning process in the districts of Gicumbi, Takai and kikono and argues that the planning process and accountability procedure reflect popular participation in initiating and implementing development programmes.

The goal of financial decentralization was to transfer authority for collecting and allocating taxes and other financial grants to local governments. The provision, management and maintenance of primary education, roads and basic urban services were decentralized to districts. In spite of decentralization, however, some important decisions and responsibilities remained at the central government in the form of conditional grants with explicitly identified uses. In education the curriculum and most funding for primary education flow from the center but decisions about personal, school construction and operation maintenance are made locally (World Bank 2001). In Uganda, the provision of primary education services as a good example in which participation of the people in the delivery of services is exhibited. Parents and the local population provide labour for the construction of classrooms while government provides funding for corrugated iron sheets and other capital inputs.

Decentralization is a phenomenon that gained popularity in 1980s and it has been sprawling ever since all across the globe. Most of the developing countries have been adopting it keeping in view all its theoretical benefits. Decentralization s the allocation of power and authority of decision making from federal to provincial or district or sub- district level to increase the efficiency, effective and accountability of low level management (Roundinelli & Cheema 1983; Winkler & Cohen, 2005). It is assumed that with more autonomy at grass roots level, the organization will work in a better and effective way as implementers have a right and say in decision making process (Ibtisam, 1999).

Reyes (2006) in Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration have defined decentralization in education as a tool to "divide school system into smaller units while the power and authority remain in the central office. Decentralization is identified with districts, sub districts, area offices, charter schools, vouchers and contracted services".

According to USAID (2006) educational decentralization takes three principle forms. The first, decentralisation in which there is reallocation of decision making within education ministry and bureaucracy. The second one is delegation or school autonomy, which is the governing board. The third form is devolution in which there is a permanent transfer of decision making responsibilities in education from central government to lower level of government: province, municipalities or district.

2.2   MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS

In the implementation of public primary schools study system the major objectives were: making basic education accessible to the learners and relevant to their needs as well as meeting national goals; making education equitable in order to eliminate disparities and; establishing, providing and maintain quality education as the basis for promoting the necessary human resource development; initiating a fundamental positive transformation of society in the social, economic and political field; and ensuring that education is affordable by the majority of Ugandans by providing, initially the minimum necessary facilities and resources and progressively the optimal facilities and enable every child to enter and remain in school until they complete the primary education cycle. (Ministry of education and sports 1999:10).

Under the public primary schools' programme, the government of Rwanda abolished tuition fees and parents and teachers association (PTA) charges for primary education (PTA charges were introduced during the 1980s to complement the low salaries of teachers. Collections from PTA charges were used as an incentive for teachers and also for the general running of a school. Parents and teachers of respective schools would agree on the amount, which varied from school to school).

To ensure success of the programme, the government instituted complementary financing measures were taken. Financing of the education sector as a whole increased significantly from 2.1% GDP in 1995 to 4.8% GDP in 2000, while, the share of the education sector in the national budget increased from 13.7% in 1990 to 24.7% in 1998. Uganda's education sector investment plan also makes it mandatory that not less than 65% of the education budget must fund primary education. Public primary education was also implemented alongside the liberalization of the provision of education services that enabled private schools to operate. However, private primary schools are mainly concerned in urban areas where only 12% of the population resides.

Despite the abolition of tuition and PTA charges, primary education was not made compulsory. Neither was it made entirely free, since parents were still expected to contribute pens, exercise books, clothing and even bricks and labour for classroom construction through community work. During the implementation stage however, the government realized that parents were not willing to contribute large amounts of bricks and labour, partly because of the many other demands on their time. The government has therefore since provided cash for construction of more classrooms, paying of more teachers and purchase of the requisite scholastic materials, especially text books.

Key partners in the implementation of the public education policy include the ministry of education and sports, local authorities and the school management committees elected by parents.

Under the leadership of the chief administrative officer (CAOs), local authorities are responsible for ensuring that all public primary education funds released to reach schools and are not retained for any other purposes. Public primary schools' funds are therefore conditioned grants, over which districts authorities have little power of re-allocation to other uses. The CAOs are also responsible for ensuring prompt disbursement of public primary education grants to schools, proper accountability of public primary grants, the formulation of the education budget and its fulfillment and adequate briefing of district councils on the implementation of public primary schools.

Sub County represents the CAOs at the sub county level. They make regular visit to schools, implement local government by laws on public primary schools, keep a record of both pupils and teachers in the sub county, submit regular reports on education to the CAO, ensure safe water and sanitation in schools and in schools under their jurisdiction, enforce proper use and accountability for public primary schools' grants and public funds.

The schools are governed by school management committees. These committees are statutory organs at the school level representing the government. They give overall direction to the operation of the school, ensure that schools have development plans, approve and manage school budgets, monitor school finances and ensure transparency especially in use of grants. Head teachers of primary schools report to the district educational officers, but also work closely with the school management committees in running public primary schools. They are accountable for all money disbursed to schools and for school property.

2.3 ROLE OF DECENTRALIZATION ON MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Central government has decentralized public service. Under the local government Act of 1993, nursery, primary schools, special schools and technical schools fall under the administration and management of district councils. Each district has the authority to formulate, approve and execute its own development plan. Registration for public primary children, distribution of text books ad monthly remittances for school from Central Government are all channeled through the district administration officer. Decentralization has brought the schools closer to the administrative units above them and therefore potentially could be more responsive.

When Rwanda introduced public primary education, it also introduced a capitation grant system, which provides about $6per child per year for children in grade one through three and $9 per child per year for children in the next four years. The government pays teachers salaries and textbooks, but the grants are used to fund other school needs. Uganda's grant system is calculated centrally and released as a conditional block grant to districts, which in turn, release all funds to all schools on the basis of enrolment. The ministry has also released guidelines to schools for all allocation of funds, for example, 50% for scholastic material, 5% for administration, and so on. The School Management Committees manages the money at school level. The amounts received at the district offices are posted in the school. Some schools publicly display expenditures, but any one can ask to see records of how the money is spent. These have been regular audits that show increasing evidence that the funds do reach the schools and are utilized for the purpose intended (Azfar et al, 2000).

The decentralization programme which has moved apace with public primary schools has also complicated the management process of the teachers, as the more sought after head teachers migrate to their home districts where they can engage in subsistence farming and also establish a more sustainable social network. But skills are also in short supply so the private sector has wreaked havoc on the government sponsored public primary schools' programme by again enticing the more erudite ones away.

The need for active participation of parents and communities in school governance has assumed increased importance under decentralization of education. Currently with decentralization, the implementation of the public primary education policy puts much emphasis on local management of schools, particularly management of public primary schools' grant. Local Councils at various levels are expected to monitor the flow and use of the public primary schools' grants. At the school level the role of the school governing bodies is stressed (Graham Brown, 1998).

Districts are responsible for planning, monitoring and evaluation of education systems at district level. District education management plays a vital role in monitoring the performance of schools regarding increasing enrolment, controlling drop out, provision of teachers and ensuring quality education in respective districts. The purpose of this also is increase and make appropriate decisions. District management coordinates and integrates networks activities so that education system may try to achieve maximum internal efficiency through management, allocation and use of resources available for increasing the quantity and improving the quality of education. The districts can generate their own funds in addition to the funds transferred by federal and provincial government.

Rondinelli (1983) has rightly said, "The success or failure of any form of decentralization in education depends upon its successful implementation". Educational decentralization divides school system into smaller units, but the focus of power and authority remains in a single central administration and board of education (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996). Individuals at school get empowered because of this devolution of power. In most of the countries where education has been decentralized, curriculum and testing remained centralized practically whereas functions such as the selection of teachers, textbooks and other instructional materials and facility construction and maintenance are being entrusted increasingly to school (Behrman Deolalikar & Soon, 2002).

Decentralization tends to increase both formal and informal parental participation, raise parent's expectation of school performance and reduce teacher absenteeism from the classrooms. Though it is unlikely that decentralization may have any impact on how teachers use classrooms but parents may monitor teachers' attendance and can reduce the cost of some school inputs and these factors have an impact on school quality (Winkler & Cohen, 2005).

According to world bank (1998) expansion of coverage, quality improvement measures, decentralization of management and the community participation through the community education and school councils boosted the enrolment and increased accountability to all levels of EL Salvador under EDUCO programme (education through community) sponsored by world bank. Freund &Drori (2003) proved that devolution has a positive effect on retention level of students at matriculation level than previous year's devolution. Decentralization helped in raising school enrolment by 20% in Columbia (Faguet & Sanchez, 2006).

It is extremely difficult to disentangle the effects of education decentralization policies form other variables simultaneously affecting educational outcomes and there have been few rigorous attempts to do so. Tow studies that did attempt to isolate the effects of devolution in central America concluded that it increased parental participant, reduce teacher and student absenteeism, and increased student learning by a significant but small amount (educational Encyclopedia 2006).

International experience has shown that decentralization of education has led to improved educational outcomes in Columbia, in the sense of more students attending school. By contrast, in those places where central control persists outcomes have worsened. They show that enrolment increases as expenditure grow, and falls with the student- teacher ratio, as one would expect (Paul & Sanchez 2006). Decentralization has a great impact on reducing teacher absentees from primary levels schools and improves teacher performance (UNESCO, 2006).

CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter presents methods, designs and techniques that were used in the study. It presents a research design, study population, sampling design, study variables, instruments of data collection and sources of data , administration of the instruments, data processing, presentation analysis as well as study limitations.

3.1 Research design

The research was statistical in nature where data from questionnaires was tabulated for easy analysis and interpretation. Other methods used included the qualitative and quantitative methods.

3.2 Study population and area

The study area was Gicumbi district, Rwanda. The population of the study included teachers and administrators since these are actively engaged in the education system, parents and residents, who stay and or provide the schools with children, local area council's leaders in education sector and school children selected randomly.

3.3 Sampling design

The study used a sample size of 65 respondents. The research used the stratified random sampling where the heterogeneous population described in the study population with consideration to respective categories of parents, children in schools, and persons engaged in the education sector like teachers and administrators was all covered. This was purposely to reduce the weakness of simple random sampling like bias, unbalanced population representation.

3.4 Sources of data collection

Original data commonly known as Primary data was collected using questionnaires and interviews. The secondary data was reviewed from specific books, journals and reports related to topic.

3.5 Study variables

The study involved two variables, the first one being decentralization influencing the management of public primary schools as the dependent one.

3.6 Data collection instruments

3.7 Interviews

Interviews are dialogues between interviewers and interviewees for the purpose of gathering data about respondents. For this case, the interviews were accompanied by an interview guide (questions) to back up any collected data. Interviews were use because they offer a higher response rate and provide first hands information from persons of interest. They also ensure and improve completeness of answers. The only disadvantage with this method was respondents' mood and readiness affecting the researcher both in terms of time and responses.

So despite the weakness mentioned above interviews were used to yield rich data, and put flesh on questionnaire responses.

3.8 Questionnaires

This is one of the best methods to be used as they collect a vast number of deviant views about employees and other aspects as need arises about the topic and in a short time. These were subjected to the same sample population as that meant for interviews. These provided statistical information like on number or respondents used, and feelings of respondents through expression of their views, etc.

This method was chosen because it could be kept for further reference purposes even in the report and yet it is easy to distribute to respondents being physically everywhere.

3.9 Validation of the study

Purposely to provide a valid and reliable data results, instruments were pre-tested. This was achieved by the help of a public primary schools' supervisors, paying a preliminary visit to site and also picking five respondents though not from site to testify and refine the reliability and validity of the instruments.

3.10 Administration of instruments

The researcher presented to the local council authorities an introduction letter from the university seeking permission and authorization to use their area as my study area. After being authorized, the researcher went ahead to identify respondent as according to the sample and population and had them subjected to instruments.

These instruments were utilized for a period of at least two weeks after which withdrawn for purposes of processing and analysis for findings to draw out conclusion and assessment of variable relationships

3.10.1 Data processing and presentation

Data from respondents was edited and coded for purposes of concurrency and completeness. This was descriptively done (tabular form however with no tests for proof (inferential statistics)

3.10.2 Data analysis

The edited, coded as well as tabulated data was then analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively that is stating the percentages and volumes for instance majority or minority.

3.10.3 Limitation of the study

4 Collecting valid and accurate data is not easy to access for instance the chapter two literature reviews.

5 Identifying and follow up of respondents and instruments needed cooperativeness which was lacking among some few respondents.

CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE STUDY

4.0.   Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the study as well as the analysis of the findings. They are presented and analyzed according to the study objectives and research instruments used.

4.1   Data presentation and analysis

The study was composed of findings from both male and female. This is more evident from the following table.

Table 4.I: Sex of respondents

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	38	58.5%
Female	27	41.5%
Total	**65**	**100%**

Source of data: Primary data ,2014

The table 4.I above shows that t here were more men used in the study than women with the male being 58.5% while the female being 41.5%.

Among the males and females who participated in the study, there were categories of various types for instance the teachers, parents, residents and others. The detailed classification is shown in the table below.

Table 4.II: categories of respondents used in the study

Category used	Frequency	Percentage
Teachers	20	30.8
Parents	16	24.6
Residents	14	21.5
Children at schools	5	7.7
L.C Leaders	10	15.4
Total	**65**	**100%**

Source of data: Primary data,2014

The greatest percentage of respondents in the study was of teachers at 30.8% followed by parents at 24.6% and then residents at 21.5%. The least percentage was of the children at 7.7% and L.C leaders at 15.4%. No other category was registered as all residents used could fall in the categories classified. In this study, whether one was a head teacher or a teacher or an inspector of schools he or she was registered in the category of teachers since all these were teachers in the education section.

Objective I: Understanding decentralization as a system of governance

Decentralization has been known and defined in different ways and so the researcher felt it relevant to examine the respondents understanding of that term. What was found out was summarized in the table below.

Table 4.III: respondents' understanding of decentralization

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Where authority is vested in locals councils	27	41.5
One governed by local council five (LC. V)	26	40.0
Others	12	18.5
Total	65	100%

Source of data: Primary data,2014

According to the table 4.III above there was a category of others, these were those with other views. Some of these people completely never knew what decentralization meant, others said it was just a government's system of governance.

The majority of respondents (41.5%) stating that decentralization as a system is where authority is vested in local councils is a affair understanding with a slight difference from those who referred to it as governance by local council five (LC.V).

In any system of administration, there must be people with authority, responsibility. Similarly in a decentralized economy, there are authoritative people. These were specific areas of concern to the research. Findings to this were summarized below.

Table 4.IV: People in charge of the system of administration

Response	Frequency	Percentage
The local councils	30	46.2
The central government	15	23.1
The school administration	20	30.8
Any other	-	-
Total	65	100%

Source of data: Primary data,2014

Findings collected from field show that the local councils hold more powers upon the administration of systems in a decentralized way of governance. Since the study war related to schools, the administrators were assigned 30.8% of administration. The least percentage was that to the central government.

When majority of respondents stated local councils the researcher was inquisitive to find out why. Interviews revealed that what respondents meant by local councils were the district LCs like LC.5, the Sub County councils (LC III)since these are what they see running the work of administration and management.

With an exception of the 18.5% in table 4.III the rest had a hint about decentralization as a system of governance. Because of this, respondents were in position to cite possible advantages of the system in governance and these feelings were shown in the following table.

Table 4.V: Advantages of decentralized governance

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Services brought closer to people	18	27.7
Increase employment opportunities	15	23.1
Easier response to needs of local people	13	20.0
Relieves central government of much responsibilities	12	18.5
Any other	7	10.8
Total	**65**	**100%**

Source: Primary data,2014

From the above summarized findings (4.V) majority of respondents recognized that services had been brought closer to the people, 23.1% said employment opportunities had increased, 20% said response to the local peoples' needs had been made easier.

However stating that response to people's needs is eased does not guarantee a 100% positive response in favor of what they need or expect. The response maybe either positive or negative but when one is informed. This is what they loved on the decentralized system than having the centralized system that could keep waiting for as long you can't tell to receive a feedback about any progress.

There were other responses given. One parent who appeared not to have gone so far with studies appreciated the method because her son was given a job at the sub county as a Community Development Officer in their local sub county. This pleased her to the extent of asking the researcher that where could she have found the central government to ask for a job.

Besides this, the method could bring the local people to seek accountability of the work done in their localities hence an evaluation tool upon performance.

One of the political leaders interviewed was bold to explain to the researcher that he would not probably have made it to the sub county council if at all appointment was made from the central government. His argument was that central appointment would be biased to political parties and yet he was on the opposition side to the ruling party but elected by the local residents.

Objective II: Management of public primary Schools

Decentralization has shown to be advantageous but like always a coin has two sides so does the system. It's because of this that there was necessity to first search for the disadvantages of decentralization. The following table summarizes the findings from the field

Table 4.VI: disadvantages of decentralization

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Corruption	13	20
Accountability for what you never did	10	15.4
Theft in office i.e. misappropriation of funds	12	18.5
Others	30	46.2
Total	65	100%

Source: Primary data,2014

As earlier stated about the two sides of a coin, the residents were keen to spot disadvantages of the system. A minority percentage (15.4%) said local government employees were forced to account for what they never did, as to simplify their public primary schools' duties. 18.5% stated that the system is defected by theft by administrators in what you may term as professional theft like the misappropriation of funds, misallocation of funds meant for other duties or accounts. Corruption was registered by 20% of respondents. The implication of this is that this vice exists almost everywhere.

The other disadvantages were revealed through interviews with respondents. Among these were the teachers who had to carry their own cross by comparing the present system with the old system that was centralized. They showed that now days one has to go to the district headquarters in the relevant department of education to process appointment forms yet of recent it would be the head teacher with the whole duty.

Included among the others were the children who never knew anything as far as analysis of the system to yield advantages and or disadvantages. What these only minded was being taught while at schools and taken care of while at work. Interestingly the district local council, government had been assigned to different units as by respondents but when it narrows down to the management of schools, it was not certain who is responsible. The researcher did research about this and findings were summarized below.

Table 4.VII: Assigned person to manage public primary schools

Response	Frequency	Percentage
The district Education Officer	14	21.5
The Head teacher	20	30.8
The government	18	27.7
Any other	13	20.0
Total	65	100%

Source: Primary data,2014

The probable observation made is that majority of respondents (30.8%) assigned the duty to manage the schools to head teachers. This was followed by the government at 27.7% then by the district education officers at 21.5% and lastly those who had other responses at 20%.

Those who had other views were interviewed. Some of them were of the view that these schools are managed by Parents' Teachers Associations (PTAs). Others said that management was by the district school management committees while a smaller number of them refused to respond to what they were not sure of. Those who refused to respond were mainly some of the residents who never took children in the schools and those who had not bothered finding out. Still others explained that as private schools are being managed by the owners so do the government schools happen to be managed by the government itself.

Respondents were then asked to comment about the way PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS schools are managed, the following is what they said.

Table 4.VIII: Respondents' views about management of public primary schools

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Well	11	16.9
Average	40	61.5
Poorly	10	15.4
Not sure	4	6.1
Total	65	100%

Source of data: Primary source,2014

Majority of respondents (61.5%) felt that PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS schools were not excellent nor poor but average. This was followed by those (16.9%) who felt the schools were managed well, then those who felt the management was poor while the least (6.1%) wasn't sure how to rate the management.

Having commented about the management of the public primary schools, it was deemed necessary to suggest possible ways to improve the management. Respondents proposed various means as seen below.

Table 4.IX: suggestions proposed to improve management

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Employ qualified personnel	17	26.2
Increase the follow up/ inspection of schools	23	35.4
Emphasize accountability	15	23.1
Others	10	15.4
Total	65	100%

Source: Primary data,2014

Among the possible suggestions made by respondents, a bigger percentage (35.4%) proposed that the inspection/ monitoring be increased. This was followed by 26.2% who proposed employing qualified personnel and then the 23.1% who emphasized accountability. Others (15.4%) proposed divergent views with some saying the schools should be privatized that is to say sold off to individual people while others proposed the management of schools be apportioned to shares with different people becoming share holders.

Some of the respondents were interviewed to give more light about how to manage the schools, those who suggested employment of qualified personnel emphasized their argument that the schools should engage more qualified and competent persons in the administrative units.

It was discovered that inspection already exists however majority of the inspectors do not fulfill their cause but move around just to be seen that they are working. One school Kituntu Islamic P/S was evident of this when they said they last saw an inspector at the start of a term and Kiwongo P/S receiving them twice a term. One resident was furious to emphasize accountability. He said that for accountability principle to be effective, the school management committees and this case the PTAs should be given authority to demand accountability for their home area schools.

Objective III: Role of Decentralization on management of public primary schools

Respondents were found to have basic knowledge about decentralization as well as an idea about how schools are managed. This gave the researcher a good ground to ask them relate the two. Majority of them positively confirmed the influence. This can further be observed from the table below.

Table 4.X: Showing whether decentralization influences management of public primary schools

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	50	76.9
No	6	9.2
Sometimes	9	13.8
Total	65	100%

Source: Primary data,2014

From findings above, decentralization has an influence on management in the public primary schools. This has been confirmed depending on the bigger percentage (76.9%) saying "yes", 13.8% saying sometimes and only 9.2% saying "No".

When someone says sometimes, this is an incomplete answer that demands an explanation because of this the researcher was keen to have an interview done. The interviewed respondents said that sometimes they see the head teachers as the overall controller of both administrative and academic issues while at times they see regulations and directives being brought from above. This is what confuses them most.

Having realized that decentralization as a system of governance influences the way how these public primary schools are managed, the study had to examine the nature of the influence. The nature was summarized in the table below

Table 4.XI: How respondents analyzed decentralization upon management of the schools

Response	Frequency	Percentage
It is good	19	29.2
Not so fine or bad (average)	25	38.5
It is bad	8	12.3
Not sure	13	20
Total	65	100%

Source of data: primary data,2014

Relying on findings summarized in table 4.XI above majority of respondents (38.5%) felt the system was a fair way of governance while 29.2% saw it as a better method as compared to what they had seen. Those who were not sure (20%) were basically the residents who never knew much about school administration and children who just minded upon seeing a teacher in class and excelling in studies. It is observed that only 12.3% which as a minority percentage is the one that looked at it as a bad system.

Whether it was a good or bad system, it was put into function by the government after being seconded. This implies that it can't easily be put out or changed and so calls for mechanisms to make decentralization an effective tool in the deliverance of educational services in the public primary schools.
Mechanisms were suggested, some of these were a bit similar to the suggestions of how to manage the schools. Respondents suggested that teachers be motivated to respect their jobs. This may probably be true as it may be easy for you to take a cow to the well or water spring but you can not force it to drink water.

On the other hand the effects of decentralization were recognizable. These included the following

Table 4.XII: Effects of decentralization on management of public primary schools

Response	Frequency	Percentage
It has improved administration	22	33.8
It has worsened the situation	7	10.8
Identifies good and bad performers	17	26.2
Any other specified	19	29.2
Total	65	100%

Source: Primary data,2014

Decentralization basically had positive effects. This is evident from the table 4.XII above where only 10.8% felt it has worsened the situation. This rest (89.2%) recommended it though through their different observations made. This included improving administration (33.8%), 26.2% saying it identifies both good and bad performers, and 29.2% giving their opinions like it has eased accountability and follow up of activities, easy and faster listening to local people's needs and increased students' enrolment in schools to the level of primary completion.

CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATION CONCLUSION AND OF THE STUDY

5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the discussion, summary, conclusion, recommendations to the study as well as suggestions for further studies.

5.1 summary of the study

5.2 Understanding decentralization as a system of governance

Understanding decentralization never relied on whether one is a male or female and that's why both sexes were used. This is a good ground for analysis since every person has his/her own reasoning and way of seeing things. Due to the fact that different people hardly have one opinion various categories of respondents were used. With reference to table 4.II, these categories can be seen that is the teachers, parents, residents, LC. Leaders and even children in the schools. Having a greater percentage being teachers and academic section at 30.8% was relatively fie since these are among the administrators of these schools to achieve better management and success. Parents as the second percentage (24.6%) were also fairly good because these are the ones who follow up the schools' performance through their children's level of advancement.

LC. Leaders were also included however covering a small percentage (15.4%). Their covering a small percentage was because they have less council population as compared to the other people.

Like as earlier presented and analyzed in table 4.II that all those in the education section were categorized as teachers it brings a better assumption with a good understanding and judgment of the system of governance.

It was found out that the majority of respondents (41.5%) said decentralization is where authority is vested in local councils and secondly those who say it's governed by local council five LC. V (See table 4.III). This similarly matches with reforms made in the 1997 Local Government Act where the country has specified five levels of local government – district, country, Sub County, parish and village. Those who never knew anything like the children could not surely be categorized to any group. These only wait for being explained to if at all they can understand anything.

Findings still showed that people understood that authority and responsibilities under decentralization mostly belonged to local government. This is approximately right and shows that the residents within the sub county at least knew the decentralized system of governance. Some respondents referred to government as the owner of authority and responsibility, this is not right because should this be, then the system of government has changed to the centralized governance.

Maybe somehow somewhere thee two systems can't be completely disbanded, that's why the two systems exist in the country

These findings match with findings of Muriisa R.K (2008) who argued that decisions at local government are frequently influenced and or affected by the financial and political dependence of local governments on the central government.

Respondents were requested to compare the decentralized system to the centralized system; they instead gave advantages they appreciated from the decentralized system. These were summarized in table 4.V in chapter four. Majority of respondents said services had been brought closer to people, others that it increases employment opportunities

Giving advantages isn't easy since one can't talk of what he/she does not know. Though a bigger percentage of respondents gave the advantages of the system any system can be good depending on the management.

5.3 Analyzing management of public primary schools

Advantages of decentralization have been shown but where you find something good there's a bad side of it. The disadvantages given were corruption, misappropriation of funds, accountability for what you never did and others (Ref Table 4.VI)

When some of the respondents in the category of others said the teachers were now responsible for their own procession of appointment letters and documentation which was hard. This is good because they get an opportunity to reach the education offices at the district and ask as many questions as they can ending up learning so any things as far as administration and management of their places of work (i.e. the schools) is concerned.

According to majority of respondents, authority to manage public primary schools was assigned to the head teacher followed by those saying it's the government, then the DEO as well as others as stated in table in table 4.VI in chapter four.

Surely a head teacher is the person at the physical ground to effectively run the school and so according to this, respondents with this perspective were right. However on the other hand, a head teacher is a representative of the government to institute all government desire in ensuring management of the public primary schools.

Besides these schools being termed as government schools, they are managed with help of Parents Teachers Association along the mainstream government' administration.

Many of the respondents ended up generalizing the quality of management as average followed by those who said schools are well managed. (Table 4.VIII) whether they are averagely managed or well managed responsibility for management must be in the hands of somebody who at the same times need to be advised on how to improve and or maintain the good standards. This is where respondents raised their suggestions (Ref: table 4.IX)

Majority suggested an increase in the inspection of schools to see that they perform as expected while others proposed employing qualified personnel. Whatever the case maybe, you may employ these qualified personnel yet they're interested in the duty ahead of them, they may also have less time to make the follow up. This calls for motivation among the people assigned the task.

Privatizing a school cannot be a solution to better administration because the process of privatizing itself is discharging off of responsibilities and ownership of the school to private hands. Saying that management should be apportioned to shareholders is sometimes a fair deal however some of these shareholders are only money minded and may not mind the quality value of the school.

The other case of PTAs would be a good solution of management of schools but has been failed by central government when it refused it to demand fees from children on ground that this defies the system of being under public primary education.
The PTA system of management sometimes helps the follow up however depends on access to information from top officials from the district and central government. Imagine the PTA fails to know that the school has been given 200 millions for a specific activity, they wont demand for accountability from the head teacher nor a follow up upon the use of the funds.

5.4 Role of decentralization on management of public primary schools

The researcher found it easier to analyze the role of decentralization on management of public primary schools just because the respondents probably had some knowledge about the two. Some respondents could not distinguish the head teacher from the system whether he/ she was overall or just an agent of those from above.

The saying that you cant force a cow to drink when you've taken it to a well is at times right since most people, in their human nature, cant just be forced to deliver but it's a matter of enticing them through motivational skills and even raising their morale. Once this is done you may achieve what you had expected of them.

Decentralization has had effects on public primary schools' management and performance. Like Brown (1998) quoted, the need for active participation of parents and communities in schools governance has assumed increased importance under the decentralization of schools.
Good school managers have had quality performances out of these schools however complain of being underfunded yet these funds come with a lot of strings attached. This has been is what makes these decentralized units bow down to the central units/ governments.

Some of the respondents proposed increased monitoring and inspection of these schools' activities. This can be a good solution if both parents and school spublic primary schoolsrvisors from spublic primary schoolsrior levels join hands. For instance parents can easily observe and report that children are not attended to by teachers and demand an explanation from the head teacher who may act immediately by questioning the specific teacher for not teaching or forward the case up to demand for other teachers.

However as literature cited from USAID (2006) stated, it was right that it's unlikely that decentralization may have any impact on how teachers use classrooms but parents may monitor teachers' attendance and can reduce the costs of some schools inputs and these factors have an impact on school quality.

5.5 Summary

The study used 65 respondents with people actively engaged in the education section (quoted as teachers) covering a bigger percentage, followed by parents, residents, LC. leaders and lastly the children at the schools. (Table 4.II)

Decentralization was understood differently by the respondents however all had a unifying factor. Some took it to be where authority is vested in local councils, while others that it's where the local council five has full powers of governance. Still among these respondents there existed a class that never knew anything (that is the children) and others who thought it was just a governments system of governance.

Decentralization as a system was seen to be advantageous in a number of ways as it brought services closer to the people, increased employment opportunities and eased response to needs of local people. (Table 4.). The respondents even knew where to go in case of demanding for accountability for anything. Disadvantages of decentralization included teachers finding it hard to move to and from the district education officers for processing their appointments, allocations to schools and documentations upon their jobs. Corruption was registered at 20%, misappropriation of funds at 18.5% and forced accountability for funds never used. (Ref: Tale 4.VI)

According to respondents, responsibility for managing schools was to head teachers, others said the district education officers, and others said it's the government while others never knew. However those who said it was the head teacher were the majority (at 30.8%).

It was found out that the management of thee PUBLIC PRIMARY schools is generally average. Respondents ended up proposing suggestions to improve the management. Majority of respondents (35.4% proposed increasing the follow up / inspection of schools, 26.2% proposed employing qualified personnel while 23.1% stressed accountability of the use of both funds and other resources. Though inspection was the better solution proposed they said it needed motivation of the inspectors to serve diligently and as appropriate.

According to table 4.X almost all respondents (90.7%) confirmed decentralization having an influence on management of public primary schools. Only 9.2% never saw the influence.

Schools were averagely managed and so respondents suggested mechanisms to improve the administration. Suggestions proposed included motivating the teachers, inspectors an encouraging the parents to keep track on daily progress of the children and the school as a whole.

Furthermore effects of decentralization included an increase in children enrolment in schools.

5.6   Conclusion

The findings showed that decentralization was a system of governance where authority and responsibility are in the hands of local government and not the central body. The system was advantageous in that it brought services closer to the locals, increased employment opportunities, and eased and or quickened response rate to needs of local people. Disadvantages of the system were that it had corruption at local council levels, misappropriation of funds and uncertainty

on who manages an individual school. Administration of schools in a district was manned by a district education office that assigns inspectors to monitor the schools performance. It's however that these inspectors are not so efficient in their roles. Some schools are managed by head teachers as agents of the district with assistance from Parents Teachers Associations.

Schools were averagely managed however respondents recommended employment and public primary schools supervision of qualified staff, emphasizing accountability of both financial and non financial resources to improve the administration of these schools.

The impact of decentralization on schools included increasing children enrolment in schools, having faster decision making relevant to the specific school. The system was appreciated by the majority of people since it had an average improvement in performance of the schools.

5.7 Recommendation
5.8 Understanding decentralization as a system of governance

The locals who never understood the decentralized system of governance should be taught to understand it sine they may at times delay or sabotage its practices due to ignorance

Decentralization has been shown to ease and quicken decision making and response to people's needs. This should be kept up by ensuring that those in responsible offices should put in practice the decisions made.

Accountability should be emphasized more in efficient service delivery than on financial grounds since most officials were looking at finance as an ingredient to success.

5.9 Management of schools

Inspectors and parents of the schools should be motivated by the public primary schools' committees by either valuing their findings/ reports or showing the necessity to be genuine and effective in performing their duties.

Some respondents were uncertain about who manages a school; it's a joint effort with the head teacher as a representative for the government. This does not mean he is the overall but should work hand in hand with parents of children and residents of the area.

The chief administrative officers of the districts should ensure that all schools' grants and funds released by the ministry of education and sports should be disbursed according to the approved budgets and not for other purposes.

5.10 Role of decentralization upon management of public primary schools

Decentralization can fail anything or ministry depending on the way it's handled and implemented. This calls for a thorough understanding of the system by all stake holders in the education sector.

Having shown that it can identify good and bad performers the bad ones should be trained to improve their performance but if they can't improve chase them

5.10.1 Suggestion for further research

The researcher recommended that further research be done to analyze the factors that cause delay in response rate to local peoples' needs

REFERENCES

Ministry of Education and Sports, (2001) Fact file, Ministry of education and Sports www.education.go.ug/Factfle 2001.htm, downloaded 22nd April 2002

Olupot M. (8th April 2002) Museveni extends PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS for every child, The New vision, Kampala

Ministry of education and Sports, March2005: Education Sector Strategic Plan 2004-2015

Aztar O et. Al (2000) Making Decentralization Work: An Empirical Investigation of governance and Public services in Uganda (IRIS Centre university of Maryland) at www.worldbank.org/publicsector/decentralisation/uganda.doc

Golola L. M 2003, Decentralization, Local Bureaucracies and service deliveries in Uganda' in reforming Africa's institutions ed. Kayizzi-Mugerwa, S. New York: United University Press.

Saito, Fuihiko, (1999) Decentralization in Uganda challenges for the 21st century, Copenhagen, DANIDA

Nsibambi, Apollo (1998) Decentralization and civil society in Uganda: the quest for Good Governance, Kampala, Fountain

World Bank (2001) decentralization and governance: does decentralization improve Service delivery?

Rondinelli D.A. (1981) Government decentralization in comparative perspective: theory and practice in developing countries International Review of Administrative Sciences, 42(2), 133-145.

Ministry of Education and Sports (1998) Guidelines on Policy , roles and stake holders in the Implementation of Universal Primary Education

Behrman, J. R., Deolalikar, A.B., & Soon L., Y. (2002) Conceptual issues in the role of education decentralization in promoting effective schooling in Asian developing countries. Asian Developing Bank (ADB)

Winkler, D R (2005) Understanding decentralization

Reyes A. (2006) Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration (Val 1, pp 267- 270) California, Sage Publications

Fagot & Sanchez (2006) Administration through Local government in Underdeveloped countries,

APPENDICES
APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Respondent

I am TUGIRIMANA Thierry, a student at Kampala International University. The purpose of this questionnaire is to help me investigate and find out the role of decentralization on management of public primary schools. The research is for academic purposes only and will not be used elsewhere other than for that purpose. You have been chosen as a respondent because of the knowledge and information that you have with regard to the topic. All the information provided will e treated with confidentiality.

You are requested to tick the most appropriate answer or give your opinion where necessary in the space provided.

SECTION A: BIO DATA

6   Gender: Male   Female
7   What category do you belong to?
8   teaching/ academic staff   (iii) Residents
9   Parents   (iv) Any other specify

SECTION B: RESEARCH DATA
Objective I: Understanding decentralization as a system of governance

10 What do you understand by decentralization?
11 where authority is vested in local councils
12 One governed by LC. 5
13 Any other, please specify ....
14 Who is in charge of this system of administration?
15 The local councils   (iii) the school administration
16 The central government   (iv) Any other ....

17 What are the advantages of using decentralization as a system of governance?

18 Services are brought closer to the people

19 Increase employment opportunities

20 Easier response to needs of local people

21 Relieves central government of much responsibilities

22 Any other opinion, please specify ....

Objective II: Management of public primary schools

What are the disadvantages of using decentralization as a system of governance?

23 Corruption

24 Accountability

25 Any other opinion, please specify ....

26 Who is in charge of management of public primary schools?

27 The District Education Officer

28 The head teacher

29 The government

30 State your opinion if different ....

31 What can you comment about the way public primary schools are managed?

32 Well   (iii) Average

33 Poorly   (iv) Not sure

34 What suggestions do you propose to improve the management of public primary schools?

35 Employ qualified personnel

36 Increase the follow up of/ monitoring foe example through inspection
       of schools

37 Emphasize accountability

38 Any other please specify ....

Objective III: Role of decentralization on management of public primary schools

39 Does the decentralization system of governance influence management of public primary schools?

    (i) Yes   (ii) No   (iii) Sometimes

40 How have you found the decentralized system of governance in public primary schools administration?

41 Good   (iii) Average

42 Bad   (iv) Not sure

43 What mechanisms do you think can make decentralization an effective tool of delivery of educational services?

    ....

    ....

44 What has been the effect of decentralization an effective tool of delivery of educational services?

45 Improved administration

46 Worsened the situation

47 Identified good and bad performers

48 Any other please specify ....

<div align="center">Thank you for your response</div>